

# INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON

**Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries:  
ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines  
for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of  
Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)**

# Report

21 to 24 July 2014  
Puducherry, India



**International Collective in Support of Fishworkers**  
[www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net)



JACKIE SUNDE

Fish landing centre, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire)

# **INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON**

**Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries:  
ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines  
for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of  
Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)**

# **Report**

21 to 24 July 2014  
Puducherry, India



**International Collective in Support of Fishworkers**  
[www.icsf.net](http://www.icsf.net)

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON  
Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries:  
ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for  
Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of  
Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)

21 – 24 July 2014

**Proceedings  
November 2014**

**Report prepared by**  
Seema Shenoy and Sumana Narayanan

**Published by**  
Sebastian Mathew  
for International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)  
27 College Road, Chennai 600 006, India  
Email: [icsf@icsf.net](mailto:icsf@icsf.net) Website: <http://www.icsf.net>

**Edited by**  
KG Kumar

**Designed by**  
P Sivasakthivel

**Front cover photo by**  
Nicole Franz  
Fishers sorting the day's catch at Nagapattinam, India

**Back cover photo by**  
ICSF  
*SSF Workshop group photo*

**Printed at**  
L.S. Graphic Prints  
25 Swamy Naicken Street  
Chindhadripet, Chennai 600 002

Copyright © ICSF 2014

ISBN 978 93 80802 33 6

The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) would like to gratefully acknowledge the contribution and support of Norad, Misereor, Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Project, and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC).

While ICSF reserves all rights for this publication, any portion of it may be freely copied and distributed, provided appropriate credit is given. Any commercial use of this material is prohibited without prior permission. ICSF would appreciate receiving a copy of any publication that uses this publication as a source.

The opinions and positions expressed in this publication are those of the authors concerned and do not necessarily represent the official views of ICSF.

# Contents

---

List of Abbreviations .....	v
Preface.....	vii
Prospectus .....	ix
Introductory Session.....	1
<b>Welcome and Introduction to the Workshop/ Dedication of the Workshop to Chandrika Sharma .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction to the SSF Guidelines: Objectives of the Workshop .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The Road to Pondicherry: The Milestones Achieved by CSOs on the Way to the SSF Guidelines: Setting the Stage for Implementation.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Developing a Transformative Agenda towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: Opportunities and Limitations of the SSF Guidelines.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Field Trips: Puducherry and Nagapattinam .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Fishing Communities and Implementation of the SSF Guidelines: Issues Arising from Local, National and Regional Contexts.....</b>	<b>16</b>
The Netherlands: Inland fisheries in the Netherlands (Freerk Visserman and Cornelia Quist, The Netherlands).....	16
Costa Rica: Fishermen Association of San Juanillo (Henry García Zamora, Costa Rica) .....	17
Honduras: Culture and small-scale fisheries: The case of Honduras (Carmen Alyeda Melcias, Honduras) .....	19
Caribbean: Caribbean community fisherfolk, disaster risk and climate change: Implications of the SSF Guidelines (Mitchell Addison Lay, Antigua and Barbuda).....	20
West Africa: The role of women in artisanal fisheries in Africa (Micheline Somplehi Dion, Ivory Coast) .....	21
West Africa: Implementation of the SSF Guidelines for a sustainable artisanal fishery: The role of CAOPA (Gaoussou Gueye, Senegal).....	22
India: Women fishworkers and the implementation of the SSF Guidelines (Ujwala Jaykisan Patil and Shuddhawati Peke, India)...	23
Thailand: Situation and implementation of Thailand fisheries (Somboon Khamhang, Thailand).....	23

Indonesia: Fisheries of Indonesia (Muhammad Riza Adha Damanik, Masnu'ah Su'ud and Iin Rohimin, Indonesia) .....	24
Brazil: The state of artisanal fisheries and the struggle for collective rights (Maria José Honorato Pacheco and Náina Pierri, Brazil) .....	25
<b>Feedback from Groups in Plenary</b> .....	27
<b>Implementing the SSF Guidelines: A Perspective from FAO</b> .....	32
<b>Group Discussions</b> .....	37
<b>Reporting of Group Discussions in Plenary</b> .....	38
Group 1: Latin America .....	38
Group 2: Europe, Canada and the Caribbean .....	39
Group 3: Africa (Anglophone) .....	40
Group 4: Africa (Francophone).....	41
Group 5: Asia: Thailand and Indonesia .....	42
Group 6: Asia: India.....	43
<b>Panel Discussion: What is the Role of CSOs in Implementation?</b> .....	47
<b>Conclusion of the Workshop</b> .....	56
<b>Annexures</b>	
1. Programme .....	57
2. List of Participants .....	59
3. Report on Puducherry and Nagapattinam Field Trips: Coastal Commons and Fish Marketing .....	61
4. Report on Nagapattinam Field Trip: Traditional Governance Systems: Good Practices in Fisheries Management, Governance and Women's Role in Governance and Post-harvest Fish Trade .....	69
5. Feedback from Participants .....	81

# List of Abbreviations

4SSF	FAO Global Conference on Small-scale Fisheries	EMEDO	Environmental Management and Economic Development Organization, Tanzania
ADEPEG-CPA	Association pour le Développement des Communautés de Pêcheurs Artisans de Guinée	EU	European Union
AEC	ASEAN Economic Community	FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
ANP	Articulação Nacional das Pescadoras (National Articulation of Fisherwomen, Brazil)	FENACOPECI	National Federation of Fisheries Co-operatives in Ivory Coast
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations	FWO	fishworker organization
BOBLME	Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project	GAP	Global Assistance Programme (of FAO)
CAOPA	African Confederation of Artisanal Fisheries Professional Organizations	GEF	Global Environment Facility
CAPE/CFFA	Coalition pour des Accords de Peche Equitables (Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements)	GPO	Global Partnership for Oceans
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Common Market	ha	hectare
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity	ICSF	International Collective in Support of Fishworkers
CCRF	Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (of FAO)	ILO	International Labour Organization
CFP	Common Fisheries Policy (of the EU)	IPC	International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty
CNFO	Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations	IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
COFI	Committee on Fisheries (of FAO)	KNTI	Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia
CONAPACH	Confederación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales de Chile	MARE	Centre for Maritime Research, Amsterdam
CRFM	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism	MMKS	Maharashtra Machimar Kruti Samite, India
CSO	civil society organization	MPA	marine protected area
CWPRS	Central Water Power and Research Station, Pune	MPP	Movimento dos Pescadores e Pescadoras (Movement of Artisanal Fishermen and Fisherwomen, Brazil)
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council (of the UN)	NFF	National Fishworkers' Forum, India
EDF	Environmental Defense Fund	NGO	non-governmental organization
EIA	environmental impact assessment	nm	nautical mile
		OSPESCA	Organización del Sector Pesquero y Acuicola del Istmo Centroamericano (Central American Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization)

---

PPP	public-private partnership	SSF	FAO Voluntary Guidelines
REJOPRAO	Réseau des Journalistes pour une Pêche Responsable en Afrique de l'Ouest (West African Journalists Network for Responsible Fisheries)	Guidelines	for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication
SADC	South African Development Community	TED	turtle excluder device
SEWA	Self Employed Women's Association, India	VGSSF	Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries
SEZ	special economic zone	WFF	World Forum of Fishworkers and Fish Harvesters
SIFFS	South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies	WFFP	World Forum of Fisher Peoples
SNEHA	Social Need Education and Human Awareness, India	WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association
SSF	small-scale fisheries		



# Preface

---

The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF) organized a workshop entitled “Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)”, in Puducherry, India, between 21 and 24 July 2014. The Workshop marked the first civil society organization (CSO)-led meeting that was organized to address the implementation of the SSF Guidelines since its adoption at the 31st session of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI 31) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in June 2014. The Workshop preceded the 26th session of the General Body meeting of ICSF. It paid tribute to the memory of Chandrika Sharma, former Executive Secretary of ICSF—who was on board the ill-fated Malaysia Airlines Flight MH370 that went missing on 8 March 2014—recognizing her invaluable role in promoting and fighting for the rights of small-scale fishers, and for being a key leader in steering the process leading to the adoption of the SSF Guidelines.

The Workshop brought together CSOs, fishworker organizations (FWOs), fisher community representatives, and representatives of regional and international organizations (including FAO) from over 25 countries, aptly reflecting the diversity characteristic of the small-scale fisheries sector. The driving objectives of the Workshop were to deliberate upon the implementation process of the SSF Guidelines, and to create the space and opportunity for participants to

exchange views and experiences, and, specifically, to:

- identify context-based and collective priorities within the SSF Guidelines and address the opportunities and challenges they presented;
- discuss the development of strategic plans to take forward the process of implementation of the SSF Guidelines;
- identify the roles and responsibilities of the various actors, and at various levels—local, national, regional and international—in the implementation process;
- identify key partnerships and alliances with other organizations, including governments, funding agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and
- lay out a monitoring strategy to assess the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, and to examine if the interventions adopted a human-rights-based and gender-responsive approach.

The four-day programme comprised presentations from representatives of fishing communities, FWOs, and regional and international organizations; plenary and group discussions; and field visits and interactions with local community organizations. The Workshop recognized that CSOs would have to play a leading role in the implementation, ensuring that it was a community-centred and community-driven process. A theme that emerged throughout the discussions was the importance of recognizing and placing in context the social and power relations that existed, both within, and outside, the sector. It was only

through the acknowledgement and analysis of these relations that a true 'transformative', gender- and socially-just agenda could be set in place. An equally imperative analysis concerned the integration of the SSF Guidelines into existing national and regional policy and legislation.

A crucial aspect of the SSF Guidelines, which marked a significant departure from other instruments, was the recognition of the interdependence and interlinking of human rights and social development, particularly in the context of small-scale fisheries. Of vital importance, the participants agreed, was the need to take the deliberation process back to the local level, to the organizations and individuals who contributed to the drafting of the SSF Guidelines. Another responsibility that lay with CSOs was ensuring that small-scale fisheries be included in its totality, incorporating actors across the entire value chain. Capacity building and information dissemination were recognized as key first steps.

Drawing from various positive examples, the Workshop underscored the importance of recognizing

the political nature of the process, engaging with governments at various levels to lobby for, and influence, decisionmaking, which would ensure that the true spirit and guiding principles of the SSF Guidelines would be upheld. Having also identified the multi-sectoral approach and, therefore, engagement of actors implied by the SSF Guidelines, the negotiation of new partnerships with other sectors (for example, agriculture) and government departments (for example, women and child welfare) would also require the leadership of CSOs. Of equal importance would be the creation of alliances with new actors, such as funding agencies and environmental NGOs, and reconciling the differences in the driving agendas over the control, ownership and management of coastal and aquatic spaces and resources.

While the importance of context-appropriate implementation strategies was recognized, it was acknowledged that the collective strength of CSOs and FWOs in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines would provide added impetus and strength to the continued fight for the rights of small-scale fishers.<sup>3</sup>

# Prospectus

---

## International Workshop on Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)

21 - 24 July 2014

### Background

Of all activities related to the aquatic space, those in the fisheries sector provide the largest share of employment, food and nutrition security to the poor. Small-scale and artisanal fisheries, in particular, contribute about two-thirds of the global fish production destined for direct human consumption and accommodate over 90 per cent of those who make their living from fisheries. For every ten fishers and fishworkers, more than nine originate from small-scale fisheries. They include: coastal and marine; riparian and riverine; and lakeshore and lacustrine fishers and fishworkers who are either full- or part-time, or seasonal or occasional. They comprise both resident and migrant fishers and fishworkers, including internal and international migrants living and working in the proximity of urban centres or in far-flung rural areas. Women comprise at least half the work force in small-scale fisheries.

These fishers and fishworkers make a vital contribution to sustaining fisheries-based livelihoods, although their work often goes unrecognized and they are poorly compensated. Many small-scale fishing communities depend fully on access to fishery resources and land for enjoying benefits from fishing, for carrying out processing and marketing of fishery

products, and for housing and meeting other community needs. Despite the important contributions made by small-scale fisheries to poverty eradication and food security, small-scale fishers and fishworkers continue to be marginalized at different levels.

It was in this context that the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication<sup>1</sup> (SSF Guidelines) were developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to reverse this marginalization and to valorise the contribution of the sector to food security and nutrition, to poverty eradication and equitable development and sustainable utilization of fisheries resources. The SSF Guidelines were developed as a complement to the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF). Recognizing, among other things, that small-scale fishing communities suffer from unequal power relations and conflicts with large-scale fishing operations, and also that they face stiff competition from other actors, the SSF Guidelines promote adhering to human-rights standards and promoting a human-rights-based approach to fisheries development and management as

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.fao.org/cofi/42011-0d2bdfc444f14130c4c13ecb44218c4d6.pdf>

well as in the use of aquatic, coastal, riparian and lakeshore spaces.

## Rationale

The SSF Guidelines were formulated through a consultative and participatory process that dates to 2010, and directly involved representatives of governments and CSOs in their development. The SSF Guidelines include numerous elements that had been proposed by CSOs and supported by FAO Member States. They bring under one instrument elements of common concern hitherto dealt with by different instruments. As an international NGO in status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the FAO, ICSF has—in partnership with the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP), the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers (WFF) and the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC)—been providing leadership to the CSO community in all major consultations leading to the development of the SSF Guidelines. The majority of invitees to the Workshop have, in one way or another, contributed to this process and to the content of the SSF Guidelines, particularly to obtain feedback from active fishworker groups, including women’s groups and indigenous peoples’ groups. They are meeting at the Workshop to discuss implementation issues of the SSF Guidelines, as agreed by FAO Member States. Yet others invited are considered to be important potential actors for implementation of the SSF Guidelines.

## Objectives

The SSF Guidelines call upon all parties, including CSOs, to implement the objectives and recommendations through such mechanisms as South-

North-South co-operation, institutional capacity development, knowledge sharing, exchange of experiences and assistance in developing small-scale fisheries policies. All parties are also invited to participate in monitoring the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, especially by employing gender-responsive approaches.

Based on these premises, the objectives of the Workshop, from a CSO perspective, are to:

- exchange views and experiences regarding how the SSF Guidelines could benefit small-scale fishing communities worldwide, and identify constraints and opportunities for their adoption;
- identify and prioritize elements of the SSF Guidelines for implementation, propose relevant strategies, taking into account the diversity of small-scale fisheries, and discuss approaches to implementation for effectiveness at different levels;
- discuss respective roles and responsibilities of different organizations at national, regional and international levels towards implementation of the SSF Guidelines; and
- develop, work towards or sketch out a plan to monitor implementation initiatives of the SSF Guidelines to examine if they adopt a human-rights-based approach and a gender-responsive approach.

## Participants

Participants are expected from Africa, Asia, the Americas (North, Central and South), the Caribbean and Europe. Including ICSF Members, the Workshop is expecting 70 participants from 20 countries representing CSOs, governments, FAO and academia, who have been engaging with the development of the SSF Guidelines

and/or are interested in the implementation process.

### **Expected outcome**

The Workshop is expected to provide greater clarity on the SSF Guidelines, help develop a common perspective for a shared plan of action of small-scale fishing communities for implementation, and contribute to an improved understanding of the different challenges facing implementation. It is expected to also establish a monitoring mechanism for all significant implementation

initiatives of the SSF Guidelines from a CSO perspective to ensure that they comply with a human-rights-based and gender-transformative approach to fisheries.

### **Venue**

Le Pondy Hotel  
No.3, Lake View Road,  
Pudukkuppam, Nallvadu Post,  
Pondicherry 605007, INDIA  
Tel: +91 413 3040800  
Email: [info@lepondy.com](mailto:info@lepondy.com)  
Website: [www.lepondy.com](http://www.lepondy.com)



VISHNU NARENDRAN/CSF

Fisherwoman at Can Tho River, Mekong  
Delta, near Can Tho City, Vietnam

# Introductory Session

---

## **Welcome and Introduction to the Workshop/ Dedication of the Workshop to Chandrika Sharma**

*Moderators:* Vivienne Solis Rivera and Juan Carlos Cárdenas

In the formal introductory session of the Workshop, Juan Carlos Cárdenas, Centro Ecoceanos, welcomed the participants and hoped that the Workshop would be a fruitful meeting where people would share ideas, discuss issues faced by coastal communities and indigenous peoples, draw together different practices, and merge ideas and energies as a collective. He also emphasized the need to work on all three levels—local, national and global—in order to successfully bring about the implementation of the SSF Guidelines.

Vivienne Solis Rivera, R.L CoopeSoliDar, in dedicating the Workshop to Chandrika Sharma, highlighted Chandrika's various contributions in the fight to protect the rights of people. She hoped that Chandrika's work, which would continue to guide the Workshop over the coming days, would help build a collective vision in putting together a key structure for the work that lay ahead. The dedication, she added, was extended to all those who had committed their lives and work to the upliftment of small-scale fishing communities and who could not be present at the Workshop. She then invited V Vivekanandan, Member, ICSF, to introduce the life and work of Thomas Kocherry, a leader in the cause, who had recently passed away.

Vivek described Tom as a "warrior" in the fight for the rights of fishworkers. He had a huge impact in India and had made significant contributions to the fishworker

movement internationally as well. Tom, who was a priest of the Redemptorist Order, had started to work with fishing communities in Kerala in the early 1970s. He was one of the early leaders of the independent fishermen's trade union movement in India. His work subsequently spread throughout India and linked up with the work of others who were campaigning on similar issues in various states. Today, Vivek said, the six-week ban on semi-industrial and industrial fishing in India is taken for granted. But this measure had only come about due to the struggle and dedicated hard work of fishworkers in Kerala, to whom Tom gave outstanding leadership.

Similarly, in the early 1990s, Tom led a network of organizations across India to fight the threat of large foreign vessels and industrial boats, which were being given licences by the Indian government and were threatening the artisanal and traditional sector. The National Fishworkers' Forum (NFF), which was led by Tom at the time, and its partner organizations, succeeded in convincing the government to stop the licensing and revoke the licences already issued. In the late 1990s, Tom began networking with fishworker organizations in other countries, and they eventually came together as the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers in 1997, which subsequently gave rise to two distinct organizations—the World Forum of Fishworkers and Fish Harvesters (WFF) and the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP).

In his last years, Tom was involved in numerous causes for the rights of the Third World and against the imposition of inequitable policies and initiatives by the developed world on developing countries. These activities were not restricted to the fisheries sector, but addressed rights and issues across various sectors. Tom has left behind a great number of organizations and inspired a large group of people who continue to take forward the legacy of his work, Vivek said.

The Workshop participants shared a moment of silence in memory of Tom and the other leaders of the fishworkers' movement who have passed on.

Following a brief round of introductions by the participants, Vivienne set the workshop in motion by calling on the participants to work towards unity in addressing the important agenda that lay ahead. She pointed out the great diversity of the groups that were represented, and suggested that the discussions draw from the strength of this diversity. 3

ICSF



Vivienne Solis and Juan Carlos Cárdenas welcoming participants to the workshop on FAO's SSF Guidelines, held at Puducherry, India, in July 2014



## Introduction to the SSF Guidelines: Objectives of the Workshop

Presenters: Nalini Nayak and Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk

The session that followed, titled “Introduction to the SSF Guidelines: Links to the Objectives of the Workshop”, was facilitated by Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk, Member, ICSF, and Nalini Nayak, Member, ICSF, who provided a brief introduction to the SSF Guidelines and outlined the objectives of the Workshop as they related to the SSF Guidelines.

The session set the stage for the events and discussions that followed through the four days of the Workshop, while simultaneously attempting to set an agenda and put in place a strategic plan to collectively move forward.

Nalini impressed upon the Workshop participants that the achievement of having got the SSF Guidelines approved was not a small one; it was testimony to the collective dream shared by many who have long worked for small-scale fisheries.

One of the main purposes of organizing the Workshop, she said, was to decide on how the process was going to now move forward, towards implementation of the SSF Guidelines. She highlighted particular aspects of the SSF Guidelines that would prove to be challenges along the way. One concern was the voluntary nature of the SSF Guidelines.

However, since the approval of the SSF Guidelines followed from the States themselves having voted for it, governments would be morally, if not legally, bound to adhere to its principles. Nalini cited the frequency with which the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), which is also voluntary, was referred to by

governments as assurance that the implementation of the SSF Guidelines would be considered seriously.

Another positive, and not insignificant, achievement was that while the focus of the SSF Guidelines was on equity and food security in small-scale fisheries, the ‘human-rights framework’ enabled the linking of the activity of fishing to the life and livelihoods issues of fishing communities.

However, the fact that the SSF Guidelines dealt with these various issues would be a difficult challenge. It demanded that fisheries be addressed through a multi-dimensional perspective, an approach that was not only new to government bodies, but also to FWOs and other organizations.

The life and livelihoods issues faced by small-scale fishers, and now outlined in the SSF Guidelines, fell under the purview of various government departments, all of which would have to work in synergy.

A primary task of the CSOs therefore, Nalini said, was to remind governments of this intersectoral nature of the SSF Guidelines, and also to integrate this aspect in their own work.

Further, while the main thrust of the struggle so far had been the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups, it was equally important that FWOs and CSOs develop an understanding of sustainability and management that was going to be *inclusive*. Referring again to the importance of ensuring that the groups themselves had a

clear understanding of what a human-rights-based approach and associated terms meant, how they might differ across contexts, and what this difference in interpretation might imply, Nalini called upon the participants to reflect on this over the coming days.

Finally, with respect to implementation of the SSF Guidelines, she raised a number of questions that

were intended to fuel discussions over the coming days. Nalini stressed particularly the various actors who would now enter the picture, especially funding agencies and other organizations with an agenda perhaps not aligned with those of the primary actors who have so far been the key players in the process of the formulation and adoption of the SSF Guidelines. 3

ICSF



The Pondy Workshop set an agenda to put in place a strategic plan to collectively move forward to implement the FAO SSF Guidelines

## **The Road to Pondicherry: The Milestones Achieved by CSOs on the Way to the SSF Guidelines: Setting the Stage for Implementation**

*Presenter: Brian O’Riordan*

**B**rian O’Riordan’s presentation on the “Road to Pondicherry: The Milestones Achieved by CSOs on the Way to the SSF Guidelines: Setting the Stage for Implementation” traced the history of the collective journey to the SSF Guidelines, and identified important milestones. As suggested by the title of the presentation, revisiting the important achievements along the way was intended to help set the stage for the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. Also important was being able to identify who the CSOs and other groups were that were part of the process leading to the development of the SSF Guidelines, and who the new actors would be in future.

Brian described this ‘shared journey’ as having been undertaken in three distinct phases: the first being the Bangkok Process, leading up to the FAO Global Conference on Small-scale Fisheries (4SSF) in 2008; the second phase led up from the Bangkok process to the development of the SSF Guidelines in the period 2009-2012; the third and final phase was negotiating the SSF Guidelines, leading up to their adoption at COFI 31 in June 2014.

Having come from a similar background of promoting small-scale fisheries as a relatively sustainable way of life and as an important contributor to food security and poverty alleviation, the CSOs had also been brought together by the fight to defend the rights of life and livelihoods of fishing communities. Brian revisited the rights that were referred to in the SSF Guidelines which,

he said, acted as a tool for the realization of these ideals:

- right to access fishing grounds and resources
- right to access fish supplies and markets
- right to decent working and living conditions
- right of women to equality and non-discrimination
- right to participate in decision-making and management processes.

An important step was the establishment, in August 2011, of a platform of CSOs comprising WFF, WFFP, ICSF and IPC to engage in the process. The platform represented the intentions of fishworkers, mainly from the global South. Along the way, new agencies like Too Big to Ignore and Action Aid International joined the process. The other agencies who were now taking particular interest in the implementation process included the Global Partnership for Oceans (GPO), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) and The 50 in 10.

The first real milestone was in 2007 when COFI of the FAO—the highest international body dealing with fisheries-management issues—met and discussed small-scale fisheries as a separate agenda item (Report of the 27th session of COFI, Rome, 5–9 March 2007 <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1160e/a1160e00.pdf>). It was also the first time that CSOs came together as a group and produced a joint statement, and were allowed to speak ahead of an agenda item. An agenda paper, titled “Social Issues

in Small-scale Fisheries”, was also presented at this meeting (COFI 27th session, Rome, Italy, 5 – 9 March 2007 – <http://www.fao.org/3/a-j8992e.pdf>). The paper noted that only by combining fisheries management and social development within a human-rights framework was it possible to achieve responsible small-scale fisheries. COFI expressed support for a strategy of action that brought together responsible fisheries and social development. The Norwegian government then proposed convening a broad-based international conference on small-scale fisheries. This set the stage for the Bangkok 4SSF conference.

In preparation for the Bangkok conference, CSOs organized three regional meetings under the theme “Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities”:

- For South and South Asia, at Siem Reap, Cambodia, in May 2007, with 51 participants from 10 countries in the region, organized by ICSF (“Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Asia - Workshop and Symposium”, 3-8 May 2007, Siem Reap, Cambodia. [http://www.icsf.net/images/proceedings/pdf/english/issue\\_87/87\\_all.pdf](http://www.icsf.net/images/proceedings/pdf/english/issue_87/87_all.pdf)).
- For Eastern and Southern Africa, at Zanzibar in June 2008, with 45 participants from seven countries, jointly organized by ICSF, Masifundise Development Trust and the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) in collaboration with WFFP (“The Zanzibar Workshop Proceedings: Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Small-scale Fishing Communities on Coastal and Fisheries Management in Eastern and Southern Africa”, 24-27 June 2008, Zanzibar, Tanzania. [http://www.icsf.net/images/proceedings/pdf/english/issue\\_100/100\\_all.pdf](http://www.icsf.net/images/proceedings/pdf/english/issue_100/100_all.pdf)).
- For Latin America, at Punta de Tralca, Chile, in August 2008, with 80 participants from 12 Latin American countries, organized by ICSF, CeDePesca, Ecoceanos, and Confederación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales de Chile (CONAPACH) (“Workshop on Artisanal Fishing: Asserting Rights, Defining Responsibilities: Perspectives from Artisanal Fishing and Coastal Communities on Fisheries and Aquaculture Policies, Coastal Management, Access To Markets and Aquatic Biodiversity Conservation”, Punta de Tralca Chile, 4 – 8 August 2008. [http://rights.icsf.net/download.php?option=com\\_statements&sel\\_subsite=39&language=&file=http://rights.icsf.net/images/resources/statements/statements/110\\_Punta\\_de\\_Tralca\\_Workshop\\_Statement\\_Eng.doc](http://rights.icsf.net/download.php?option=com_statements&sel_subsite=39&language=&file=http://rights.icsf.net/images/resources/statements/statements/110_Punta_de_Tralca_Workshop_Statement_Eng.doc)).

At the same time, WFFP conducted widespread consultations within the organization to look at the issues that were tabled at the Bangkok conference. The common outcome of the three regional workshops was the recognition that a rights-based approach to fisheries requires that (a) fishery access and user rights, (b) post-harvest rights and (c) human rights be seen as indivisible, and that the development of responsible and sustainable small-scale, artisanal and indigenous fisheries is possible only if they are addressed in an integrated manner.

The second phase began with the consultation process, which followed after COFI in 2009 acknowledged the need for an international instrument on small-scale fisheries; the FAO Secretariat was tasked with exploring options. The envisioned instrument was proposed to be in the form of international guidelines, voluntary in

nature, addressing both inland and marine fisheries and with a focus on the needs of developing countries.

The regional consultations led by FAO that followed between 2009 and 2012 achieved a large buy-in from CSOs. Twenty national workshops were organized in Latin America, Africa and Asia and two regional workshops in Africa. Simultaneous discussions in Europe and other parts of the world took place. It is estimated that around 3,000 members of small-scale fisheries communities participated in the discussions. The consultations were a way of enabling the CSOs to influence the proposed SSF Guidelines through a bottom-up and consultative process.

What followed was the preparation of the Zero Draft (“International Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries - Zero Draft”, May 2012. [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FILE\\_DOCUMENT/ssf/SSF\\_guidelines/ZeroDraftSSFGuidelines\\_MAY2012.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FILE_DOCUMENT/ssf/SSF_guidelines/ZeroDraftSSFGuidelines_MAY2012.pdf)) and its circulation for comments in 2012. After having consolidated the inputs on the first Zero Draft, the second Zero Draft was released in May 2013 ahead of the first Technical Consultation.

The third phase began at the Technical Consultation, where delegates from 68 countries were present, and the CSOs, who were represented by 37 delegates from 18 countries, were the most organized, and the most vociferous. Since they were unable to resolve certain issues during the first round of the Technical Consultation, another round was convened in Rome in 2014.

Concluding with the final and significant milestone at the most recent COFI meeting, Brian pointed out that 116 of 143 members approved the adoption of the first international instrument dedicated to small-scale fisheries. COFI agreed to honour Chandrika for her invaluable

contribution to small-scale fisheries—which was not limited to the SSF Guidelines, but included her role in bringing attention to the small-scale fisheries sector and getting recognition for it. COFI also acknowledged the role of small-scale fisheries in contributing to livelihoods and food and nutritional security in many countries.

## Discussion

Reflecting on the text of the SSF Guidelines, Ravadee, Member, ICSF, commented on how the integration of social, community and economic development, guided by human-rights principles and the recognition of the rights of indigenous communities, adequately reflected the common vision that was intended by the CSOs, and marked an important progress.

C M Muralidharan, Member, ICSF, touched upon the challenge of bringing together key players during the implementation process, and suggested that a practical way forward would be to discuss strategies and methodologies to involve both the government and the grassroots fisher communities in the process. He suggested that the ecosystem approach to fisheries management adopted by the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project (BOBLME) of the FAO in South East Asia (and proposed for South Asia) could be one example of a methodology to ensure implementation of the SSF Guidelines through an appropriate governance system.

Muhammad Riza Adha Damanik of Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia (KNTI) pointed out that, from the Indonesian experience, there was a changing paradigm; small-scale fisheries used to be part of the problem, but they had, of late, been seen as part of the solution, as part of the strategy to combat poverty and the food crisis. He emphasized the need to separate and discuss the

implications of the SSF Guidelines at three levels: local, national and regional.

Mamayawa Sandouno, Member, ICSF, stressed the need to inform the communities of the SSF Guidelines and the plan for implementation, and involve the effective participation of the media.

Jackie Sunde, Member, ICSF, reminded the participants that during the 22 consultative workshops, despite the diversity in contexts, there was a synergy in the key themes, demands and priorities that emerged, a main plea being that fishing communities must participate in the future governance and management of their fisheries. In keeping with that demand, it would be important to involve the communities in the discussions on implementation.

Venkatesh Salagrama, Member, ICSF, expressed concerns over how the governments and fisheries administrations were now going to incorporate the concept of social equity in management practices, while carrying out their roles in the implementation process. He also brought to the fore the changing nature and increasing severity of the challenges facing the sector. What was earlier a conflict between, for example, small-scale fisheries and industrial fisheries, had now included players from other sectors.

Mamadou Niassé Lamine, Member, ICSF, shared Mamayawa's concern regarding awareness raising and information dissemination. He also cautioned against allowing other organizations, with potentially different agendas, to hijack the process that the CSOs had worked hard for.

Mogamad Naseegh Jaffer of WFFP commented on the question of implementation as being critical since the SSF Guidelines embody the value systems and ideological orientations

that have emerged from the grass roots. He emphasized the need to understand and agree upon the terms that outlined the principles of the SSF Guidelines, lest they be diluted during the process of implementation. He contended Brian's inclusion of other, more recent actors as being part of "us", of sharing the same platform. He cautioned that many of the funding agencies would not support the value system enshrined in the document, and so the terms of creating new alliances needed to be laid down right at the start.

Maria José Honorato Pacheco of Conselho Pastoral dos Pescadores re-stated Naseegh's call to not lose sight of the guiding principles, which included customary rights, human rights and the participation of communities. The responsibility of effective implementation, she emphasized, rested with the CSOs. Highlighting a major challenge, she suggested that a common strategy was needed to face capitalist/corporate interests which were exploiting the resources that the communities depended on.

Harinarayan Mohanty of WFF asked who would be responsible at the local level. He also pointed to the need to make information available to the members of communities themselves, many of whom were illiterate and had no access to legal documents.

Bringing to light a key concern, Juan Carlos of Ecoceanos, Chile, pointed out that the implementation of the SSF Guidelines was a political process. Echoing Maria's concern, he said that neoliberal systems contained a great concentration of power. Further, capitalist groups were influencing export policies. The process that CSOs must adopt, therefore, should be opposed to this trend, both in direction (bottom-up) and in principle (upholding values of the communities).

In response to Brian's observation that the CSOs were the most united and vociferous during the COFI meetings, Mitch of the Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations (CNFO), pointed out that the CSOs were better organized, understood better what the SSF Guidelines meant, and hence were best equipped to lead the implementation process at the national level. He added that it was important to simultaneously analyze existing legal and policy structures to examine how this new policy could be integrated with existing policy.

Peter Linford Adjei, Associate Member, ICSF, reiterated some of the points that were raised regarding education and information sharing and the role of CSOs, and suggested extending this to educating the Members themselves, and the need to examine and understand again what a 'human rights-based approach' entailed. It was only through a clear understanding of who the players in the process were, he said, could we start to take on other challenges, and prevent the process from being hijacked by vested interests.

Sherry Pictou of WFFP raised a concern about the emphasis in the text of the SSF Guidelines on developing countries. She said that if that emphasis was made repeatedly, industrialized countries like Canada would not feel obliged to adhere to the SSF Guidelines, and would continue promoting the policies (like privatization) whose outcomes the SSF Guidelines were developed to overcome. Sherry also suggested that the regional and national workshops be revisited, since the adoption of the bottom-up process implied that the CSOs were accountable to the communities with whom they had consulted. She suggested that since

organizing the meetings would require considerable funding, Skype meetings or conference calls could be organized (as they were being done among groups in Canada, details of which she offered to share, should they be needed).

Summarizing the discussions and comments, Ravadee highlighted the following key points:

- The SSF Guidelines set the context for a new paradigm of development. There was a need for organizations that were part of the process to develop a clear understanding of the terms and the guiding principles.
- Access to information was vital to ensure that the communities gained ownership of the SSF Guidelines and played an important part in the implementation process. Empowering communities to effectively utilize this instrument to overcome the challenges they faced would be a key outcome of the implementation.
- The values and principles of the SSF Guidelines should be upheld, without allowing for their dilution, or settling for compromises. The main task that lay ahead was translating concept into action. The priorities would need to be identified, and the roles of CSOs at various levels would need to be elaborated.
- The process would have to be empowering to the CSOs and the communities, which would provide the means to overcome challenges in the neoliberal context.

In conclusion, Ravadee called for greater focus on the common work at the national and regional levels, and the determination to overcome major challenges and ensure the translation of concepts into concrete action. 3

## **Developing a Transformative Agenda towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: Opportunities and Limitations of the SSF Guidelines**

*Presenter:* Cornelia Quist

*Moderators:* Jackie Sunde and Vivienne Solis Rivera

Cornelia Quist, Member, ICSF, made a presentation on “Developing a Transformative Agenda towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: Opportunities and Limitations of the SSF Guidelines”. The presentation took the participants through what was understood by a transformative agenda, and outlined the opportunities and limitations of the SSF Guidelines in the context of gender relations and equality issues. Cornelia began with a definition that set the tone for the presentation:

*A transformative agenda is guided by a vision of social justice and human rights. It is based on the fundamental understanding of social inequality as the root cause of poverty and unsustainable development and on the importance of social change.*

*It supports the human-rights approach to development, which incorporates the acceptance of equal and inalienable rights of all men and women to be able to make strategic life choices for their own well-being.*

*It acknowledges people as agents of social change.*

Power relations, Cornelia said, were constructed by people—and, therefore, could be changed by people. Gender relations were often the most misunderstood in society. It was of particular relevance to discuss the issue because of the bearing these relations had on fishing communities and because of the particular reference made by the SSF Guidelines to gender inequality. Social inequality, whose underlying causes were complex and

context-specific, stemmed from social relations that were based on power relations between people in a society (social hierarchy). These relations imposed a social role (a pattern of behaviour) that was understood and expected in society, and also formed the basis of the identity of a person in a particular position in that society. The roles were learnt through the process of socialization within social institutions, the foremost of which was the family and the community, and then reinforced by other social institutions (governance, law, education, etc.).

Small-scale fisheries were characterized by their household- and community-based nature. Their sustenance was dependent on key factors: reliance on kinship networks, intergenerational transfer of knowledge, access to fisheries resources and fisheries-related property. The most dominant power relations included class relations, gender relations and ethnicity relations.

Having understood social relations as stemming from differences in access to power, gender relations could then be identified as hierarchical relations leading to inequalities between women and men. A key aspect in the way in which gender was constructed was through division of labour, and by imposing different values on these expected roles. These unequal power relations also defined the ‘public sphere’ to be the man’s domain and the ‘private sphere’ to be the woman’s domain, further restricting women’s role in decisionmaking in policy and



programmes that directly impacted their lives. Gender relations were characterized by both *conflict* and *co-operation* between men and women. Citing some alarming facts regarding discrimination of women in the labour market from the World Development Report 2013 (<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11843>), Cornelia noted that the women's labour force participation had decreased between 1990 and 2012, women earned between 10 and 30 per cent less than men, in most countries women spent at least twice as much time as men on unpaid domestic work, and across developing countries, there was a nine percentage point gap between women and men in having access to a formal financial institution. This discrimination was reinforced by at least one sex-based legal differentiation in a total of 128 countries. Further, more than one in three women had experienced physical and/or sexual violence and one in three girls in developing countries was married before the age of 18.

### **Gender relations in small-scale fisheries**

With reference to the gender relations in small-scale fisheries (the relationship between gender-based division of labour, resource use and income), Cornelia highlighted the following points:

- Women and men in small-scale fishing communities tended to engage in different, though often complementary, economic activities and sometimes in different parts of the sea or land.
- Apart from greater involvement in post-harvest activities, women also provided various support activities to the fishing activities of their male partners.
- Women's economic activities were more difficult to categorize than men's.

- Women may also be engaged in non-fisheries economic activities and may have different non-paid domestic and community responsibilities.
- Women's work did not often receive the same level of investment (for example, technological support, capital, information and training).
- On account of being in the lowest nodes of the fisheries chain, working conditions were often poor and they lacked social security.
- Taboos and prejudices, combined with sexual violence and psychological humiliation, severely impacted women, and these issues were rarely addressed.
- Women either received no rights to fisheries resources and property (or had fewer rights than men) or their entitlements were mediated by male members.
- Women's intergenerational knowledge was also not often acknowledged in fisheries management and development projects.

Before introducing the concept of a transformative agenda, Cornelia explained that changing circumstances in time and place could make social (including gender) relations more flexible, and roles and responsibilities more negotiable, but, in other circumstances, also more rigid and non-negotiable.

A transformative agenda, she said, supported the human-rights approach to development, which incorporated the acceptance of *equal and inalienable rights* of all men and women to be able to make strategic life choices for their own well-being. While challenging the root causes of social inequality, this approach would link poverty reduction and sustainable development to decisions over equitable allocation of rights and the protection of small-scale fishworkers' access to resources and

markets. In addition, it would address the deficiencies in fisher people’s rights of access to healthcare, education, social security, decent work, decent housing, clean water, healthy food, freedom from violence, protection against disasters, and access to justice and the rule of law. It would also empower fisher people and fishing communities to participate in decisionmaking in the context of resource access, use and management.

Most national fisheries policies and international conventions—including CCRF—did not explicitly address issues of social inequality and were largely gender-blind. The SSF Guidelines made a crucial shift in this regard. Outlining the opportunities provided by the SSF Guidelines in this context, Cornelia pointed out that the SSF Guidelines emphasized:

- the importance of the human-rights approach;
- the recognition of the vital role of women in small-scale fisheries and gender equality as fundamental to development; and
- the importance of policy coherence and the promotion of holistic and inclusive development strategies, with special attention to be paid to ensuring gender equity and equality.

Further, the SSF Guidelines incorporated a special chapter on gender equality and made important references to gender mainstreaming and establishing policies and legislation to challenge discrimination against women in the sector.

What could be the potential challenges or limitations of the SSF Guidelines? While a dedicated chapter on gender equality was a major first step, the references were rather general and not very explicit. They lacked the emphasis for social analysis of gender relations and intersectionality. This was particularly important as the implementation of the SSF Guidelines

would require the investment of new resources (training, tools, technology, etc.), and the possible introduction of new institutional arrangements. However, without a rigorous social relations analysis, there was no guarantee of equal benefits from policies and programmes, given existing social inequalities—this would defeat the purpose of the inclusive approach outlined in the SSF Guidelines. There was the possibility that these inequalities would only be reinforced by new interventions by giving greater access to those who are positioned to take advantage of the benefits.

The SSF Guidelines also tended to rely on technical measures instead of advancing a substantive agenda for social transformation, and gave the impression that the terms ‘gender’ and ‘women’ were synonymous. Cornelia reiterated the need to “*stop fixing women, start fixing the context*”.

In outlining what a transformative agenda towards gender inequality in fisheries might appear to be, Cornelia referred to aspects highlighted in the Gender Note circulated earlier:

- to recognize and promote women’s equal rights to participate in all aspects (including decisionmaking) of resource management as well as in the social, economic, political, cultural and organizational life of artisanal and small-scale fishing communities;
- to make visible (collection of gender-disaggregated data), recognize and valorise women’s work (paid and unpaid) in both inland and marine fisheries in all aspects of the fisheries chain;
- to address the problem of the ‘double workload’ that women carried, by means of an equal division of domestic and community work between men and women and access to public services, such as childcare services

and community restaurants, that relieved the domestic workload;

- to guarantee that women had full access to legal protection and social-security systems, and rights related to (reproductive) health, social security and retirement;
- to change the cultural value system that promoted and 'legitimized' oppression, exploitation and even violence against women; and
- to make budgets gender-responsive to ensure that (national) budgets took account of the needs of women and girls, and men and boys equally, and investments were made in gender-responsive awareness and capacity-building programmes and in increasing the bargaining power of women.

A brief reference to community-based fisheries management was also made in the Gender Note, which was seen as an opportunity to foster empowerment of local resource user groups.

While developing a transformative agenda, Cornelia cautioned against assuming the homogeneity of small-scale fishers, and called also for identifying and incorporating the social inequality that divided them. She also called for a departure from the conventional perspective of gender issues centering around 'pitiful' women to a perspective based on the social power relations between men and women; both men and women must see the benefits from changing gender relations, and must act to make that change. It was of crucial importance to understand social patterns and values that were root causes of social inequality, at the level of the household, community, the fisheries sector, markets and institutions.

Cornelia also called for a need for CSOs themselves to reflect on their own patterns of practices and value systems. Social change, she said, was not a linear process but instead was a learning process that required constant

reflection and dialogue, needing constant monitoring and nurturing. Stressing the importance of adopting an approach that identified social relations instead of conventional categories (women, indigenous groups, etc.), she suggested that the approach should link all levels and should be participatory and bottom-up in nature. The collective of CSOs was, therefore, well poised to take on the task of early and regular documenting and monitoring, and to come together in developing functional systems by which knowledge may be accumulated and shared.

Cornelia concluded the presentation with a quote by the Indian economist Amartya Sen from his book *The Idea of Justice*: "Justice by its very nature has to have a universal reach, rather than being applicable to the problems and predicaments of some people but not of others."

## Discussion

Muhammad Adli Abdullah, Member, ICSF, commented that in some communities, and in some instances, the men were discriminated against and that the problem of gender inequality was not always applicable only to women. In response to this comment, Cornelia confirmed that the issues did not arise from 'men' vs 'women' but from unequal social relations, and that every context had different manifestations of this inequality.

Sebastian Mathew of ICSF asked if there were examples where a transformative agenda was applied and brought about positive changes and greater equality or social justice, or a changed relationship of communities with nature. In response to this query, Cornelia affirmed that the various movements, including ICSF's process with the SSF Guidelines, had been part of a larger transformative agenda. The identification of social inequality and

the deprivation of human rights came through a thorough social analysis of the small-scale fisheries sector. This had marked a significant change from when gender, like small-scale fisheries before it, was a non-issue.

Citing an example of where a tangible change was brought about, Cornelia mentioned the community-based management initiative in the Philippines that had not only allowed access to all community members, but also placed the responsibility of management on them. As a result, when there were conflicts between men and women, they were prompted to discuss the issue and find a solution. This need for dialogue, initiated by the community members themselves, brought about other changes, for example, a greater sharing of tasks between men and women.

Rosemarie Nyigulila Mwaipopo, Member, ICSF, shared her observation regarding the changing perspective of women about themselves and their ability to secure their livelihoods when being presented with the opportunity for change. This, in turn, changed how others perceive them—by the men in their households, and by others in the community, she said. It was important, therefore, to explore what women themselves identify and want as change, and incorporate this into the locally applicable transformative agenda. Also important was inculcating accountability and the sense of responsibility. Often, while addressing gender inequality, the equal responsibility of men and women to ensure sustainable use of resources was sidelined.

Mamayawa of the Association pour le Développement des Communautés

de Pêcheurs Artisans de Guinée (ADEPEG-CPA), Guinea, and Member, ICSF, while emphasizing the importance of education, said that in the African context, 80 per cent of the men and only 20 per cent of the women have access to higher education. This vast difference in access to education exacerbated the difference in opportunities provided to men and women.

Mitch of CNFO called for a clear analysis of context, and a clear idea of the roles that each actor played within the small-scale fisheries sector while developing a transformative agenda. With specific reference to the entire fisheries value chain, he emphasized that certain roles often remain invisible and unacknowledged and a transformative agenda should carry with it a change in this trend. Another important aspect was that since the small-scale fisheries sector was dependent on members of the household (that is, it was predominantly a household-based activity), the roles could be restricted to the fishing activity alone, but would have to incorporate this aspect as well.

Katia Frangoudes, Member, ICSF, suggested learning from positive examples from around the world. She cited examples from the EU where women's roles were transformed through the adoption and implementation of changed legal frameworks at the national level.

Confirming Katia's suggestion, Cornelia recommended that a system be developed where information could be continuously shared, ideas could be developed and examples could be gathered and monitored. 3

## Field Trips: Puducherry and Nagapattinam

Two field trips were organized on the second day of the workshop, on 22 July. One group (of 20 participants) visited sites along the Puducherry (Pondicherry) coast and interacted with the local NGO, PandyCAN. The other group (of 38 participants) went to Nagapattinam, where they visited the local fish auction hall and interacted with the area's *ooru panchayat* (a local unit of governance), members from the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS), and the women's organization SNEHA. Background information on both

areas, highlighting pertinent issues and the relevance of the provisions of the SSF Guidelines, was circulated to the participants prior to the workshop. (For the Puducherry field trip, see "Coastal commons and fish marketing" (<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/gbfieldtrip-pondy.doc>) and for the Nagapattinam field trip, see "Traditional governance systems: Good practices in fisheries management, governance and women's role in governance and post-harvest fish trade" (<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/gb%20field%20trip-nagai.doc>). (see Annexures 3 and 4.)

3

SUMANA NARAYANAN / ICSF



A fish market on Gingee Road, Puducherry. Twenty participants of the Pandy Workshop visited the fish market as part of the field trip

## **Fishing Communities and Implementation of the SSF Guidelines: Issues Arising from Local, National and Regional Contexts**

The objective of this session was to hear from the invited fisher community representatives about their life and livelihood experiences that illustrated the relevance of key elements in the SSF Guidelines. These experiences—narrated through representations from various regions—would serve as examples that would inform the discussions to follow on identifying the key priorities for the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, the levels at which effective implementation could take place and the process of developing the strategies needed. In keeping with ICSF’s commitment to derive from, and feed back into, the work at the local level, and through the communities themselves, the session solicited important lessons, challenges and opportunities that were faced in varying contexts.

Based on language considerations and to allow for more in-depth discussions, the participants (and presenters) were divided into two groups. Group I heard presentations from the Netherlands, Costa Rica and Honduras (Central America), the Caribbean and West Africa. Group II heard presentations from India, Thailand, Indonesia and Brazil.

### **GROUP I The Netherlands**

Inland fisheries in the Netherlands

*Presenters: Freerk Visserman (Professional inland fisher/Union of Inland Fishers of Fryslan, and Cornelia Quist, Member, ICSF)*

Cornelia introduced the inland fisheries of the Netherlands, highlighting

the changes in the sector, the main challenges faced and the plans for strengthening future action and strategies.

Professional inland fishers in the Netherlands used fixed gears, mainly eel fykes, but also gill-nets and seine-nets. The main commercial fish included eel, pike-perch and mitten crab. Inland fisheries in the Netherlands were household-based enterprises, and there were practically no wage workers in the fishery. Most enterprises processed their catch which was sold directly to the consumer. The fishery is an old traditional profession, and intergenerational and local ecological knowledge played an important role in the management of the fisheries. The professional inland fishers are organized in local unions—some over a hundred years old—which were federated at the national level in 1972.

Highlighting some of the changes that have challenged the fishery in the recent past, Cornelia noted that there had been a dramatic decrease in the number of professional inland fishers (from 3,000 in 1945 to 150 in 2014), accompanied by a sharp increase in the number of recreational fishers (2 mn in 2014), who shared the same waters and resources. The various reasons for this decline included: land reclamation and subsequent reduction of inland waters; sea/flood protection; chemical pollution; water-management regulations; changing fish-consumption patterns and decline in economic value of local produce.

Drawing from the strengths of the well-organized association of inland fishers, the steps identified to address the challenges included: strengthening

entrepreneurship; ensuring sustainable production of high-quality food products; providing other fisheries-related services (for example, fish-stock monitoring, resource management, education and recreation); development of a responsible participative fishery management with decentralized co-management; and collaboration with coastal fishers, trade and aquaculture sectors.

Freerk Visserman of the Union of Inland Fishers of Fryslan then introduced the Fryslan inland fishery and elaborated upon the various activities that were carried out through the local union and the other networks that he actively took part in. He listed the main activities of the Frysian Inland Fishers' Union—which leased fishing rights from the provincial government and redistributed them to the fishers, who are members of the union. Fishing rights were then inherited by the son or daughter and were thus passed from one generation to the next within the family. The objectives of the union went beyond those related to the direct management of the fishery, including: distribution of fishing rights; social and cultural valorisation; shortening the market chain and ensuring high-quality fish products; entrepreneurial development and capacity building; and lobbying for fishers' interests with the Provincial Council and the Water Management Board.

In addition to the challenges mentioned above, the European Eel Management Plan, which took effect in 2009, restricted the access of fishers to the eel resource by declaring a closure during the months of September to November. By lobbying for the introduction of a quota system, the union succeeded in amending the rule, while still ensuring long-term sustainability of the resource.

In concluding the presentation, Cornelia listed how the provisions of the SSF Guidelines would enable strengthening and empowering of the sector. It would create an opportunity to discuss and lobby with the government the need to (i) define professional small-scale fishers based on multiple criteria; (ii) protect and guarantee access rights of small-scale fishers to fish stocks, which would be shared with the industrial and recreational sector; and (iii) establish decentralized, participative and responsible fishery management, involving the knowledge, capacities and experiences of small-scale fishers. It would also escalate the social valuation of the small-scale fisheries sector as a reliable partner to the government, researchers and NGOs. The SSF Guidelines would also valorise the social, economic and cultural merit of the community, including at the household and family level—the primary unit of economic activity.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/presentatie%20%20Freerk%20%20and%20Cornelia%20for%20ICSF%20workshop%20India%2023%20July%202014%20%20Final.pptx>

## Costa Rica

### Fishermen Association of San Juanillo

*Presenter: Henry García Zamora  
(Asociación de pescadores de San Juanillo)*

Henry García Zamora, a fisherman and a member of the Fishermen's Association of San Juanillo in Costa Rica, presented issues faced by the local community in San Juanillo, placing them in the larger Latin American context. Costa Rica, which was home to a large number of small-scale and traditional fishers, he said, faced constant pressure from neoliberal forces to embrace a model of development

that undermined the practices and livelihoods of small-scale fishers. Citing the example of the old fishing market on the beach—a building now in a dilapidated state—Henry highlighted the issues the communities faced with land ownership and tenure. The market, conveniently located right next to the storage area, was built on land that was now not accessible to the community due to legal restrictions. The new market, which was more than 400 m away from the storage area, considerably increased the time and energy invested in transporting the fish, even though the facility was of better quality and provided security. The local town council had not co-operated with the community in ensuring better access to the resources by the community.

Emphasizing the key role that women played in the fishery, Henry listed the tasks that women were involved with (including preparing the lines) and that provided them with a secure enough income to earn a viable livelihood. This had empowered them and given them a sense of independence; they were now better able to raise and educate their children.

Semi-industrial trawl fishing had caused considerable problems for the Costa Rican small-scale fisher; lines often got caught in trawler fishing gear and often, both gear and fish were lost. In order to address and combat the issue, the community had proposed an initiative to a local institute which carried out research on responsible fisheries. Henry also pointed out that previous governments in Costa Rica had not provided adequate support and funding to the sector, and had been reluctant to engage with their Board. However, following the SSF Guidelines stipulated by the new law, the Board was in the process of a reconstitution and hoped to have closer ties and more meaningful engagement with the government.

A typical example of increasing and unsustainable development projects was the proposal for a marina for yachts in the area. The marina would considerably reduce the access to the sea by the fishers and occupy coastal area currently used for landing boats. While the community, Henry said, was not against development, it was imperative that the type of development (sustainable) and the beneficiaries of development (the local community) be given prime importance.

The SSF Guidelines were recognized as a key instrument in helping to promote and demand the rights of the community, and in addressing the pressing concerns regarding management of the fisheries. Henry maintained that only effective implementation of the SSF Guidelines would bring about positive changes. In keeping with the provisions of the SSF Guidelines, he said, the community was now involved in a participatory management initiative with the new government and looked for solutions that incorporated the knowledge and experience of the local fishers. A key aspect was to train and guide fishers, through capacity building and awareness raising of the issues. Towards this end, the association organized regular events and facilitated the sharing of experiences with other communities across Central America. Ensuring secure livelihoods to women and the youth, and providing alternative livelihood options was also important, which would allow them to continue to be integrated into the societal fabric. Within the community, unstable and insecure livelihoods had other unfortunate repercussions, such as drug abuse, especially among the youth.

In applying the principles of the SSF Guidelines, Henry hoped that the community and the government would be able to address pressing



issues, such as that of the marina, and ensure that any developmental activity went hand in hand with social and environmental sustainability. Henry concluded the presentation by showing an image of a sunrise—symbolising hope for the future. He acknowledged the support from ICSF in helping the community address these challenges and welcomed the SSF Guidelines as a potential instrument in shaping a secure and sustainable future.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Presentaci%C3%B3n%20Henri%20COSTA%20RICA.pdf>

## Honduras

### Culture and small-scale fisheries: The case of Honduras

*Presenter: Carmen Alyeda Mencías (Comunidad de La Rosita)*

Carmen Alyeda Mencías, a representative of the La Rosita community in Honduras, introduced the small-scale fishing communities of La Rosita, Boca Cerrada and Salado Barra (who share the Garifuna heritage), their fishing practices, and boats and gear. Carmen was a member of the association of fishers that brought these communities together. Among the various activities that the association organized were cultural events which, she said, were important in reinforcing and valorising a common cultural heritage and encouraging peaceful and mutually supportive co-existence. The association also facilitated the construction of a storage centre, which had brought about tremendous positive change, especially for the women who were involved in the post-harvest activities; greater quantities of fish could now be stored for longer periods of time.

One of the challenges faced by the community was the migration

of its people in search of better opportunities. But, Carmen emphasized, the inherent cultural identity of the Garifuna community as fishers underscored the efforts of the association in working towards securing sustainable livelihoods within the fisheries sector for members of the community. An important step was the inclusion of active participation of women on an equal footing in management and decisionmaking. Through funds received from a Canadian organization, the women were able to come together and set up finance and savings schemes, enabling greater empowerment and economic independence.

With reference to the SSF Guidelines, Carmen said that most members of the community were unaware of them, and it was, therefore, imperative that they gained knowledge of it. As one effort to kickstart the process, the text of the SSF Guidelines was translated (into Spanish and the Garifuna language) and used in training workshops for artisanal fishermen. The provisions of the SSF Guidelines, Carmen said, were particularly relevant in sustainable management of the fishery by regulating the use of harmful gear, in addressing loss of access and rights to land, and in addressing opportunities for secure and decent work, especially for women, along the fisheries value chain.

Carmen also reiterated the importance of recognizing and acknowledging the cultural identity of the Garifuna community by fishers around the world. Towards this end, material about the Garifuna community was published in Spanish and the Garifuna language and distributed.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/CARMEN%20MENCIAS%20Y%20LA%20ROSITA%20datos.docx>

## Caribbean

### Caribbean community fisherfolk: Disaster risk and climate change: Implications of the SSF Guidelines

*Presenter: Mitchell Addison Lay  
(Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organizations, CNFO)*

Diverging from a local community-based to a regional perspective, the presentation by Mitch of CNFO listed the issues faced by fishers of the Caribbean region, and focused on climate-change impacts and the relevance of the SSF Guidelines in this context. Outlining the organizational and functional roles of the various institutions and organizations that were part of a tiered system of networks, Mitch summarized the issues identified as pertinent to the small-scale fisheries sector and the application of the SSF Guidelines in addressing those issues.

CNFO, which consisted of fisherfolk organizations from within the Caribbean region, plays a key role, particularly within the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM).

The region had identified that small island states, particularly in the Caribbean region, were vulnerable to climate-change impacts and natural disasters. Several institutions within the region provided inputs and carried out research in the field. The concerted effort, therefore, was towards building regional strategic programmes for climate-change resistance. This was a broad high-level policy directive that addressed climate change and resilience. The strategies and policies were intended to impact national plans for climate-change adaptation and disaster-risk management in all member states.

The network had developed initiatives to train members in climate-change adaptation and ecosystem-based approaches to management. The approach used was to identify what the impacts of climate change on fisheries were, from a *fisherfolk perspective*. The impacts were then categorized based on (i) ecosystem impacts; (ii) socioeconomic impacts; and (iii) governance-based issues. The approach drew from on-the-ground experience of the fishers, and built upwards from tangible and identifiable impacts.

Equally important to ecosystem-related impacts were the considerations based on a socioeconomic perspective (perceived loss of fishing, tourism-based livelihoods, threats to food security, etc.), and implications on governance (social dislocation, conflict and piracy, etc.). The network perceived that adaptation measures would have to be consistent with the ecosystems approach (ecosystem impacts), address employment diversification and social adaptation measures (socioeconomic impacts) and include the development of cross-sectoral collaboration with community structures to aid in building resilience in governance structures (governance impacts).

Addressing the role of the SSF Guidelines and listing its relevant sections, Mitch said that having begun the process of long-term planning for adaptation to climate change, the next step would be to flag, within the SSF Guidelines, the issues that could be addressed and the arguments that could be strengthened based on what was identified.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Cnfo%20Lepondy.pptx>

## West Africa

### The role of women in artisanal fisheries in Africa

*Presenter: Micheline Somplehi Dion  
(Le Programme Femmes / CAOPA)*

Micheline Somplehi Dion, President of the fisherwomen's co-operative in Abidjan and a representative of the women's programme at the African Confederation of Artisanal Fisheries Professional Organizations (CAOPA), spoke about the role of women in the small-scale fisheries sector in West Africa. She described the active nature of the roles undertaken by women at all stages, from preparing meals for the fishermen to unloading landed catch, preparing boxes for the curing process, and negotiating prices for, and selling, fish. Micheline also described the important role that women played in managing finances, ensuring that gear, provisions, medicines, etc. were adequately available, and in collecting funds for fishing trips undertaken by the men. The role of women also extended to the family: they were responsible, among other things, for raising and educating their children.

The women in many West African fishing communities were now organized in co-operatives or associations. Being organized enabled them to sell the fish and better redistribute the revenues. Most women were fish processors and/or fish sellers. When the fish arrived, therefore, they bought and processed the fish themselves (curing, smoking, etc.) and then sold the processed product to other women who took it to the market. Within the co-operative, therefore, all components of the value chain were represented.

Briefly touching upon the structure of the organizations and their associated networks, Micheline said that 42 per cent of the members of the co-operative were members of the National Federation of Fisheries Co-operatives in Ivory Coast

(FENACOPECI), which was a member of CAOPA. Women are represented equally at the office and at meetings at CAOPA. At the General Assembly of CAOPA in 2013, the common priorities identified included access to credit, improved conditions for processing and marketing, improved family welfare (childcare, education and health), and the fight against violence against women.

The poor working conditions of the women was another issue of serious concern. Women, especially those who smoked fish in unhygienic conditions, faced a multitude of health problems. The lack of hygienic and efficient processing systems also inevitably reduced the quality of processed product. Deteriorating health conditions made it impossible for women to spend more than 10 to 15 years of their active lives in the profession. Once they were unable to work, they lost their vital source of income and, as a direct result, the household suffered.

An important step towards addressing these issues was taken on the International Day of Small-scale Fisheries in 2012 in Abidjan, when policymakers were sensitised to the issues. Topics of discussion ranged from how women could be assured a secure and sustainable livelihood to how their working conditions could be improved. Within a year, an FAO intervention supported the establishment of new facilities with modern furnaces in Abidjan. Training on the development of fishery products was also provided. The hope was for such a programme to be replicated and extended throughout Africa. The International Day in 2013 marked the first time that women from the fisheries sector convened to present their suggestions before African ministers.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/pr%C3%A9sentation%20micheline%20inde%20final.pdf>

## **Implementation of the SSF Guidelines for a Sustainable Artisanal Fishery: The Role of CAOPA**

*Presenter: Gaoussou Gueye  
(Secretary General, CAOPA)*

Gaoussou Gueye, the Secretary General of CAOPA, presented the envisioned role of CAOPA in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines. Gaoussou listed the 14 African national organizations that comprised its membership, and its African and international partners, highlighting the wide reach of the organization. He then traced the history of the formation of the organization, beginning in 1999 through a meeting facilitated by ICSF of professional artisanal fishers of Mauritania, Senegal and Guinea, leading up to a meeting in 2006 where members of the media engaged actively in the dialogue. This led to the creation of a Network of Journalists for Responsible Fisheries in West Africa (REJOPRAO), with a simultaneous commitment made to ensure sustainable fisheries and the provision of a common platform for men and women in the sector to voice their concerns. The Monitoring Committee of the African Confederation of Business Organizations of Artisanal Fisheries, which was subsequently established, met in 2009 in Dakar and drew up its charter, statutes and rules of procedure. This provided a formal structure to the organization which officially became CAOPA the following year in 2010 in Banjul and set up its headquarters in Senegal. The retracing of the history of the organization showed how, at various stages in the process, different stakeholders were involved, and their active engagement over the years leading up to the formalisation of the organization was reflected in the functioning of the organization and its extensive influence.

With reference to the SSF Guidelines, Gaoussou emphasized the role of CAOPA in their implementation. Having already initiated a number of activities in the region that were in line with what was prescribed in the SSF Guidelines, the network was well poised to be a key actor in the implementation process as well. Among the activities, an event based on the theme “Women in artisanal fisheries and trade in fishery products in West African fishing” in 2012 in Ivory Coast was organized in partnership with ICSF. Discussions were underway with the EU to ensure that development aid to fisheries would be in line with a set of principles derived from the SSF Guidelines. A charter would be developed by CAOPA in this regard and sent to other donor agencies in Africa. In a significant step, CAOPA participated in COFI in 2010 and 2011 under the aegis of the Coalition for Fair Fisheries Arrangements (CFFA); in 2012, CAOPA won observer status for the first time at an FAO event.

CAOPA also chaired the Steering Committee of an FAO-funded project that helped artisanal fishing communities in West Africa address issues of adaptation to climate-change impacts. The project included the West African nations of Senegal, Gambia and Sierra Leone.

The future activities of CAOPA would include: continued advocacy at the regional level; promoting dialogue between CAOPA members and their respective governments at the national level; continued dialogue with other actors for implementation (primarily, ICSF, African civil society and the media); and participation in implementation activities under FAO’s interventions.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Pr%C3%A9sentation%20CAOPA%20ICSF2.pdf>

## GROUP II

### India

#### Women fishworkers and the implementation of the SSF Guidelines

*Presenters: Ujwala Jaykisan Patil (Maharashtra Machimar Kruti Samite, MMKS, and Shuddhawati Peke, ICSF Secretariat)*

The presentation from India by Ujwala Jaykisan Patil of MMKS and Shuddhawati Peke of ICSF, both of whom come from fishing communities in Mumbai, Maharashtra, elaborated upon the particular challenges faced by women fishworkers in Mumbai and the efforts underway to address these challenges, including through effective implementation of the SSF Guidelines.

One of the concerns raised was the restricted access of women vendors to the first sale of fish at the harbour. The women were only allowed to buy fish from the wholesale markets and had access at the harbour, if any, only to damaged catch after the first sales had been completed. Arguing that women fish vendors already had established a good customer base, and were responsible for bringing a greater share of income back home, the women were demanding their right to first sale. Further, their contribution to ensuring food security and poverty eradication in the local community had been seriously undermined.

The last several years had seen an increase in public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the markets of Mumbai. The conditions were rather poor. Through lessons learned from the initiatives of the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA) in Gujarat, the women were now working towards a women's co-operative that would help them get organized and develop a stronger voice to address the issues they faced. It would also help them in their demand for equal representation

in decision-making bodies in which they are under-represented. What would follow from this initiative was the ensuring of social-security benefits (health insurance, education, etc.) and a formal recognition of the co-operative and hence greater impetus to their struggle.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Women%20Fish%20Vendors%20in%20Mumbai%20Pondy%20workshopI.ppt>

### Thailand

#### Situation and implementation of Thailand fisheries

*Presenter: Somboon Khamhang (Thailand Federation of Small-scale Fisherfolk Association and Andaman Foundation)*

Somboon Khamhang presented the pertinent issues facing the small-scale fishing communities of Thailand, and elaborated upon the work that was being carried out at the community level to address the issues, with a plan to scale up these activities to the national level. One of the main challenges to the Thai small-scale fisher was the increasing use of harmful gear such as push and trawl gear, and the rising conflict over common resources. Like in most other developing countries, the nature of conflict also extended to the government's intention to develop the coastline, by flagging off a number of development projects along the coast (like nuclear power plants and the construction of a canal to connect the Andaman Sea with the Gulf of Thailand). The small-scale fishing communities, who had thus far been the custodians of the resource, had been actively protesting against these developments.

At the community level, a series of meetings were held to ensure better communication with community members and develop means of participatory research, both within

the community and with outside research and support organizations. One of the main contentions was that the environmental impact assessment (EIA) studies for the projects were funded by the project proponents themselves, so the reports were often biased, and false reporting was common. The fisheries scientists were also regularly conducting studies without employing the correct means or knowledge, and were obliged to adhere to the government's demands. By proposing a 'people's EIA', which would be carried out through funds raised independently, the communities were working towards suggesting alternative use of the coastal spaces, including sustainable use of resources and safeguarding the environment. They have also proposed setting aside certain areas to be conserved as protected areas. Stressing that the intention is not to oppose the government, Somboon stated that the community realized the importance of working with the government. Through the national-level fisherfolk federation, and the women's association, they were pushing for a new environmental law to control developmental activities and safeguard their livelihoods. They were also making a case, he said, for maintaining the sustainability of Thailand's resources for the benefit of the population at large.

[http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Indonesia\\_Indiar.pdf](http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Indonesia_Indiar.pdf)

## **Indonesia**

### **Small-scale fisheries in Indonesia**

*Presenters: Muhammad Riza Adha Damanik (Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia, KNTI, Masnu'ah Su'ud and Iin Rohimin, KNTI)*

Riza of Kesatuan Nelayan Tradisional Indonesia (KNTI) introduced the fisheries of Indonesia and highlighted

the main challenges to the small-scale fisheries sector. He also introduced KNTI, which worked on behalf of traditional fishers in 19 districts in the country. Listing the issues that were of main concern, Riza noted that there was inequality in the use and access to fish resources. Around 90 per cent of the 2.8 mn fishers caught an average of 2 kg of fish per day, which earned them only between US\$2-3. This was due to the restrictive laws which limited permissible fishing to within 12 nm from the coast, increasing competitive use of the limited resources. Further, he said, the basic rights of fishers (to food, decent work and education) were not met. Nine of the 13 rivers in Jakarta were polluted. The other limitation was confining the definition of fishers within the fisheries law to only those who fished in the sea. This definition summarily excluded all those who were integral to other processes in the value chain. Women's participation was also limited, he added.

The Association of South East Asian Nations' (ASEAN) Economic Community (AEC) had proposed the institution of a single market for fisheries for all ASEAN member countries (including Indonesia) to liberalise capital, investment and labour. While some believe that this represented an opportunity to sell fish in other countries, others worried that the competition would only turn more fierce and would impact small-scale fisheries greatly, a sector that had not even been considered in these plans.

Masnu'ah Su'ud then introduced the initiatives taken at the community level, especially in addressing women's concerns. She highlighted education of women in fishing communities as of utmost importance, as their rights were not respected either within the community or by the government. Domestic violence was also a threat to the safety and well-being of women. Gender mainstreaming, combined with

economic initiatives was, therefore, imperative to empowering women. As a successful example of an alternative livelihoods initiative supported by the government, the women now processed lower-value fish (which were earlier discarded) and sold them in the local shops and markets. The product had passed all tests of health and sanitary norms and was gaining in popularity. Women's empowerment has had a direct impact on violence, with the frequency of such incidents having significantly reduced. The initiative is now proposed to be extended to other provinces as well.

Iin Rohimin from the Coastal Community Coalition, as a member of KNTI in East Java, elaborated upon a community-initiated environmental strategy. The community raised concerns about a crude oil company which had been set up along the coast and was responsible for polluting water along the 40-km stretch of coast, severely impacting the quality and amount of fish catch. The community's battle against the company saw through a compensation scheme from the company to the fishers, farmers and others. KNTI had also pressured the company into compensating for environmental damage, through a unique programme to restore the area by planting mangroves. The mangrove resources were sustainably used to produce syrup, soap and snacks. This initiative had also received government support in north Sumatra in a 200-ha coastal mangrove area. A significant achievement of community struggle was also the repeal of the law (Law No. 27) on promoting coastal development in the country in 2004. Drawing from the strength of these movements and the adoption of the SSF Guidelines, Rohimin said that the plan was to now push for a national law on protecting fishers.

[http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Indonesia\\_Indiar.pdf](http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Indonesia_Indiar.pdf)

## Brazil

The state of artisanal fisheries and the struggle for collective rights

*Presenters: Maria José Honorato Pacheco (Conselho Pastoral dos Pescadore, and Naína Pierri, Member, ICSF)*

Naína Pierri, Member, ICSF, began the presentation with a brief introduction to the situation in Brazil. There were about 1 mn professional registered fishers in Brazil, 99 per cent of whom were artisanal fishers. A majority of the fishing is sea-based, but freshwater aquaculture was also rapidly on the increase. The industrial fishing sector received considerable support from the government for fisheries development in the 1970s. However, since the government did not adequately manage the resources, the problems recurred and production rapidly decreased after 1990. Since then, it had increased but had been unable to reach the earlier levels. The new economic policies of the Lula government—with a focus on economic growth and redistribution of wealth—had brought about many adverse environmental and social impacts, but had also contributed to poverty alleviation by the redistribution of wealth. However, this meant an increase in privatization of natural resources, and opening up of previously limited access areas (for example, conservation areas) to industrial and exploitative use. The inevitable outcome of the adoption of these policies was the loss of land and rights to land by traditional communities and the poor.

Maria then provided specific examples of pressing issues related to aquaculture farming and the efforts made in addressing them. The government had carried out mapping exercises to demarcate areas to license out to (private) aquaculture farms.

Apart from the obvious consequences of fuelling conflict between the aquaculture companies and local communities, whose livelihoods depended on the aquatic resources, the environmental consequences also posed the threat of long-term and irreversible damage.

The National Articulation of Fisherwomen (ANP) and the Movement of Artisanal Fishermen and Fisherwomen (MPP), with support from many CSOs, were working towards resisting these moves, and had developed mobilisation strategies to defend their territories. A draft law (which was slated to be presented in the Brazilian Parliament) was developed to recognize fishers' rights. The law drew from existing legal documents such as the Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil (Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil), 1988, and the ILO Conventions (specifically, C. 169-Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989). It addressed the

absence of public policy in favour of small-scale fishers and called on the government to recognize fishers' rights and access to land and demanded that the definition of small-scale fisheries be based on the community's definition. It also rejected the idea of token representation at events organized by the Ministry of Fisheries. The fishers demanded preferential and permanent usufruct rights to fishing territory, taking into consideration private and public (including vacant) lands. A first step towards taking the draft law to Parliament was gathering signatures (1,403,000 signatures were needed). This effort marked an important transition from fishers being in a position of victims to being active agents of change, fighting for and demanding their rights, and proposing a new law. The SSF Guidelines, Maria said in conclusion, would bolster these efforts.

[http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Brazil\\_Workshop%20internacional%20%20ICSF-Julho%202014.pdf](http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Brazil_Workshop%20internacional%20%20ICSF-Julho%202014.pdf)

ROMAIN LE BLEIS



Participants discussing fisheries issues with the leaders of the *Ooru panchayat* at Nagapattinam, India. The *Ooru panchayat* is the local unit of governance in the district



## Feedback from Groups in Plenary

*Moderators: C M Muralidharan and Alain Le Sann*

Before the workshop participants could begin to discuss the issues brought up in the various presentations, a brief summary was provided by Jackie (for Group I) and Sumana Narayanan of the ICSF Secretariat (for Group II). While recounting the experiences, challenges and opportunities of the various contexts, it became apparent that across communities, countries and contexts, a number of key common challenges had emerged. At the same time, the diversity of the groups represented also made relevant the need to develop adaptive strategies that would address these common issues while, at the same time, accommodate and respect this diversity. The following issues emerged as cross-cutting and key themes that could potentially feed the discussions on developing a common plan of strategic action in light of the implementation of the SSF Guidelines:

- A close linkage between human rights and secure livelihoods, and the interdependence of safeguarding the environment to sustain fisheries was recognized across communities. The need to promote and demand rights (including rights of access to resources, land, education, decent work and gender equality, among others) was the thrust of numerous movements across contexts.
- Capacity building and raising awareness was recognized as key to strengthening movements and empowering communities, particularly vulnerable and marginalized groups.
- The escalating competition for use of resources posed similar threats across scales and contexts, although the degree of conflict and actors involved varied (from neoliberal pressures supporting privatization of resources in South America to government-supported development of the coastline in South East Asia). The promotion of economic growth in favour of (and often at the cost of) social well-being undermined the lives and livelihoods of small-scale fishers.
- The importance of organizing at all levels—local, national and regional—was made evident by the positive examples that emerged from actions taken by well-organized community organizations (from local organizations among inland fishers in the Netherlands to the regional mechanisms at the Caribbean, and CAOPA in West Africa).
- Reinforcing and valorising cultural identity and traditional and intergenerational knowledge played a crucial role in communities taking ownership of resource management.
- Gender mainstreaming, organization of women at the local level, education and livelihood opportunities for women, and ensuring adequate and just representation in governance and decisionmaking were identified as key priorities in addressing gender inequality across communities. Financial independence and economic empowerment, assuming greater charge at the household level, and safe and hygienic working conditions were seen as key steps in the process.
- The definition of small-scale fisheries, and implications of this

in legislation (for example, exclusion of principal actors in the value chain) also needed reflection. Community-held definitions often conflicted with those imposed from the outside.

- The need for examining existing legal mechanisms while considering the incorporation of new regulations (including those prompted by the adoption of the SSF Guidelines) was considered important.
- In many cases, it was felt, the SSF Guidelines served to bolster already-existing movements and interventions, providing them with greater legitimacy and visibility.

## Discussions

*Below is a summary of the discussions that followed the presentations, individually at the group discussions and at the plenary where all participants were present.*

René-Pierre Chever, Member, ICSF, observed that the diversity of contexts could only be experienced at events such as this Workshop. He wondered, from the experiences shared, how effective the SSF Guidelines would be in addressing and combating development-related issues (for example, the marina in Costa Rica). He also inquired whether the successful organization of the local inland fishers in the Netherlands could expand its model to include other European small-scale fisheries organizations. He pointed to the problem of the acidification of oceans as a serious threat that needed deliberation and concerted action.

In response to a question from Brian regarding the engagement of the Garifuna community in fisheries management and traditional ways of exploiting resources, Carmen of Honduras said that the Garifuna community did not necessarily organize themselves differently. However, due to the absence of

work, many young people from the community had given up this line of work. The efforts of the association were, therefore, geared towards rescuing and valorising their practices and providing opportunities to them to continue to be involved in fishing.

Brian also added to the points raised by Gaoussou of Senegal that CAOPA was a confederation of artisanal fisheries professional organizations that brought together all actors throughout the fisheries sector in the context of Africa.

Mamayawa of Guinea, expressing a concern similar to that raised by René-Pierre, asked to what extent the SSF Guidelines would improve the situation to make fisheries more sustainable and provide added value without undermining women's health in Africa, and promote the health and dignity of women in the sector. She suggested that the discussions in the following sessions take this particular context into consideration. She also emphasized the need for strengthening the role of the media to play a teaching role and reach out to a wider constituency.

Venkatesh, Member, ICSF, stressed that the issues of declining fish resources, climate change, poor working conditions, inadequate opportunities for women, etc. were issues that were identified and have been extensively discussed over the last 25 years. Citing a few examples of improved technology interventions, he asked whether the issue was not so much the lack of tools or instruments but their proper and effective application to ensure the change that they were designed for. This was a concern that could also be extended to the SSF Guidelines and their implementation. An examination of why the various programmes had failed, he said, would be an important starting point to ensure that during

the implementation processes the same mistakes were not repeated. He tasked the CSOs and organizations like ICSF with taking on that responsibility.

Katia of France raised the issue of local communities being involved in the setting up of MPAs, and the emphasis of this aspect in the SSF Guidelines. She also recommended that communities revisit the opportunities that arose from the promotion of tourism. Given that developmental priorities were gaining precedence, it would benefit the community to identify, at the start, the particular advantages and limitations. She also inquired about the possibility of the network in the Caribbean extending its partnership to the EU, to which Mitch of Antigua and Barbuda responded that although the potential existed and collaborations were welcome, the language barrier posed a communication problem.

Lamine of Senegal touched upon the need to revitalize traditional relationships between men and women that balanced and complemented each other's roles in the small-scale fisheries sector. Echoing Cornелиe's call for a detailed analysis of social relations, he highlighted the opportunity that the SSF Guidelines presented to strengthen this relationship.

Editrudith Lukanga of the Environmental Management and Economic Development Organization (EMEDO) and WWF suggested that the opportunities should be considered as equally important (if not more so) than the limitations or challenges. From across contexts, she said, there were numerous positive examples and interventions that had already passed muster. It remained now to integrate these examples into the process of the work carried out by member organizations and ICSF as a collective. She reiterated the need for a thorough social context analysis, followed by capacity-building measures, to let the

communities realize for themselves their potential role in the implementation process.

Alain, Honorary Member, ICSF, brought to the fore an issue that had emerged across the various presentations. He said that the threats represented from outside the sector had important implications for the future of small-scale fisheries. The ownership of the sea and its resources was in the process of being usurped by corporate and industrial interests; the conflicts were no longer restricted to access to fish resources—oil exploration, mining, aquaculture, etc. represented larger threats. Citing the example of France, where billions of Euros were being earmarked for various energy-related projects along the coast, he asked how the fishing community would be impacted. How would they be involved, if at all, in the projects? Alain also warned against the increasing trend of large environmental NGOs and funding agencies forming partnerships; their combined alliance gave them enough influence to take over ownership of the resources and project their own agenda for conservation, and development, overwhelming the role of the fisherman in managing and utilizing the resources. The definition of the small-scale fisheries sector, and its restriction to type of boat, gear, etc. brought on a host of new conflicts. He expressed his annoyance at repeatedly hearing from policymakers about the failure of the fishing community to manage the resource. How, he asked, were they supposed to manage the resource if they are not given the opportunity to do so?

Vivienne of Costa Rica expressed the intention of groups in Central America to work together to lobby their governments and pressure them into accepting the SSF Guidelines as compulsory. To work on a political level, she said, was crucial.

Reminding the CSOs of the long battle that ultimately ensured that gender issues and indigenous peoples issues were incorporated in the SSF Guidelines, Sherry of Canada recommended the use of a format similar to the note prepared for the workshop field trips while approaching implementation of the SSF Guidelines. She said it was important to identify key issues and how the SSF Guidelines could be referred to in addressing those issues. She stressed again the need to return to the local and community groups who had provided inputs during the preparatory phase of the SSF Guidelines and engage their inputs in the implementation process, including outreach work within their own communities and by the sharing of experiences. Returning to the point made by Nalini in the introductory section, Sherry said that the voluntary nature of the SSF Guidelines should not be looked upon as a setback: the 2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was also a voluntary instrument, but due to the continued work of the groups working with the communities and referring to this instrument, there were examples of court cases in Canada where a judge has passed a judgement by referring to the provisions of the instrument. In this way, the SSF Guidelines also need to be made visible, and it was important to escalate its application on the ground.

Zoila Bustamante, President of CONAPACH, Chile, cautioned against what were referred to as ‘speculators’ in Chile—organizations that wanted a stake in the process to gain greater control over resources. Given the high stakes, it was important what kind of alliances the CSOs set out to make, and with whom. Despite the many differences between communities and community organizations, she pointed out, the principles that guided their work were the same, and it was

important, during the implementation process, that the CSOs and FWOs learned to rely on each other and work together.

Rolf Willmann from Germany added that the strength of an organization determines its capacity. Citing the example of CAOPA, he pointed out that the growth and development of an organization is a long-term process. Adding also that the network of ICSF Members had evolved with its own strength and capacity, he emphasized that the SSF Guidelines provided a new impetus and a new commitment to various aspects, where previously most of the work has tended to have a narrower, sectoral approach. The onus of including a human-rights-based approach would drive ICSF’s work, and the work of CSOs much further, he added.

Brian pointed to the importance of linking fishing activity and marketing activity. Referring to the examples in Costa Rica (access to infrastructure for storage and transport), India (access of women to first sale of fish) and Africa (the changing nature of the relationship between men and women, where men now sought out better prices from actors outside the system), he called for a better structuring of the relationships and a structured solidarity so that the interests of the men and women throughout the value chain were protected.

Nalini while highlighting a common issue that ran through all presentations, said that the fishers were concerned about, and acknowledged, their *responsibilities* (in addition to their rights) as custodians of the resource. The precautionary principle, the polluter-pays principle, etc. were now being used across various contexts to safeguard the environment. The idea of *nurture* in fisheries, which has been

associated with, and promoted as, a feminist perspective, was seen in the mangrove restoration efforts of the communities in Indonesia. Nalini also brought attention to the linkage between food security and women's access. While referring to the Indian example, she said that it was the women who sold the fish and brought money home, and so denying them access to the first sale of fish would have implications at the household and community level.

Expressing a concern that was felt by many participants, Riza of Indonesia emphasized the importance of communicating the provisions of the instrument to the local communities. Having thus far worked with the 'draft' text, he wondered when the official text would be released by FAO, so that mobilisation of movements on all levels could begin and gain legitimacy. Echoing Mitch's concern, Riza also called for an analysis of existing national legislation to identify the gaps which could be addressed through the SSF Guidelines. He said that this activity should be carried out on a priority basis, and soon.

In line with the issues arising from integration of the SSF Guidelines in existing legislation, René-Pierre suggested that a clear framework be developed to know how and when the SSF Guidelines could be used in court,

and the possible need for legal and advocacy-based groups as potential partners to address this issue.

Pradip Chatterjee of DISHA, India, reminded the participants to include the inland sector in the discussions and interventions in light of the SSF Guidelines. Particularly in India, he said, the inland sector was larger than the coastal sector, but was fraught with problems of access to resources, procurement of funds, fish stock and feed, etc. and gender discrimination was widespread. It was important, he said, to take on the task of relating the SSF Guidelines to the inland small-scale fishers as well.

Responding to the concerns expressed by many regarding the potential partnerships and the need to be vigilant about large environmental and developmental NGOs and their agendas, Editrudith of Tanzania called for a different perspective to the approach. She saw the interests expressed by funding agencies as a positive sign, since the implementation process would depend on financial resources provided by these organizations. She cautioned, however, that it was very important at this time for CSOs—who have worked over many years to bring the SSF Guidelines to light—to be more organized than ever before and sit in the driver's seat to guide the implementation process. 3

## Implementing the SSF Guidelines: A Perspective from FAO

*Presenter:* Nicole Franz

*Moderators:* René Schärer and Beatriz Mesquita Pedrosa Ferreira

Nicole Franz, Fisheries Analyst, FAO, outlined the organization's strategy and expected outcomes during the next phase of implementation of the SSF Guidelines. She began her presentation by drawing attention to Part III of the text of the instrument, which was particularly relevant to their implementation.

***Ensuring an enabling environment and supporting implementation***

*10. Policy coherence, institutional co-ordination and collaboration*

*11. Information, research and communication*

*12. Capacity development*

*13. Implementation support and monitoring*

The proposal for a Global Assistance Programme (GAP) was introduced at the 29th session of COFI, but it was in 2013 that FAO started to consider the process more specifically: for example, a workshop on “Strengthening Organizations and Collective Action in Fisheries”, was held in March 2013 in Rome; an e-consultation on the implementation process solicited and received inputs from CSOs, individuals, community representatives and organizations in November - December 2013; and a regional symposium on “Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea” was held in November 2013 in Malta.

Based on the inputs, ideas for a strategic approach, which would build on the inclusiveness approach that was adopted during the development process, were presented to the 31st

COFI. It was imperative that the implementation be anchored at the local and national levels, but within a broader regional and international framework of collaboration. The overall purpose of the approach, Nicole said, was “to mainstream the SSF Guidelines in various policies and strategies across sectors and across levels...and anchor the small-scale fisheries agenda to the broader development agenda, food security, etc.” FAO was also committed to include small-scale fisheries perspectives in international issues and closely-related international instruments with which FAO was involved (for example, the FAO Guidelines on tenure).

The GAP comprised three interrelated components:

**Raising awareness** (knowledge products and outreach)

**Strengthening the science-policy interface** (sharing of knowledge and supporting policy reform)

**Empowering stakeholders** (capacity development and institutional strengthening)

These components were supported by an overarching component, **Supporting implementation** (programme management, collaboration and monitoring).

Nicole then elaborated upon the four components, their need for inclusion, examples of activities and expected outputs.

**Raising awareness**, she said, was vital to making the SSF Guidelines and their implementation relevant to the contexts in which they were to be

applied, and also important in forming strategic partnerships with local and national partners. The activities would include translation of the document, engagement with the media, and the development of implementation guides, among others. And the expected outputs would be the creation of awareness and understanding of the SSF Guidelines across regions and among different stakeholders. This was fundamental for continued action and would form the basis for other impact-oriented implementation support.

**Strengthening the science-policy interface** (where ‘science’, in its broadest interpretation, included traditional and local knowledge, and the social sciences) and the adoption of a holistic approach to include the full range of perspectives (for example, the entire value chain, gender equality, climate change, etc.) would enable policy reform and strengthen sustainable resource management and social and economic development. The activities under this component would include compiling and sharing best practices from the field, case studies on practical examples of the human-rights-based approach to fisheries management, collaboration and exchange between different research initiatives, and technical support for reviews of policy and legal frameworks. As an expected output, governments and organizations would develop a clearer understanding of the issues, challenges and opportunities in sustainable use of aquatic resources, which would result in an embedding of the SSF Guidelines in policy documents at national and regional levels.

**Empowering stakeholders** required attention to organizational structures and modalities for fair and effective representation. The activities would include identifying needs for organizational development strengthening and provision of

support, assistance to communities/their organizations to establish cross-sectoral linkages, and sensitisation and training of government officials/development partners in issues related to SSF Guidelines implementation. The expected outcome would be the creation of key building blocks for the long-term process of continuous improvement; governments and fishing communities would be enabled to work together and with other stakeholder groups to ensure secure and sustainable small-scale fisheries.

Referring to the organizational structure proposed by FAO (which had so far played the role of facilitator), Nicole said that the Programme Secretariat would plan and oversee programme activities in close collaboration with partners. A Programme Steering Committee would guide the Programme Secretariat, and would consist of partners, including representatives from various stakeholder groups. The finer aspects of the structure (for example, how many members would be part of the Committee, etc.) were yet to be worked out.

An important lesson learned from the implementation of other instruments was the need to constantly monitor and trace progress in implementation. To ensure that the monitoring process was not one-way, the Programme Secretariat would develop monitoring mechanisms that would also support the reporting of the implementation process along with the participation of stakeholders. The process would be based on FAO standards for results-based monitoring, and be compliant with major donor requirements.

Nicole emphasized that the ICSF workshop was timely in that the inputs from participants would feed into the GAP, which would be turned into a document that could be used to mobilize resources and set a plan of

action. The outcomes of the upcoming Congress on Small-scale Fisheries in Mexico in September 2014 and the Committee on World Food Security in Rome in October 2014, would also feed into the document. In order to solicit other partnerships and make the SSF Guidelines more visible, important upcoming events would serve as potential platforms for the purpose. FAO was also organizing a Workshop on Implementation in Rome in December 2014, and the GEF, which was organizing a workshop on coastal fisheries would, for the first time, include a specific programme on small-scale fisheries.

Before concluding the presentation, Nicole mentioned that FAO had already received country requests for assistance on the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, and others expressed their willingness to serve as pilot countries for implementation. The adoption of the SSF Guidelines by member states, she stated, was an important step and it was crucial that CSOs and FWOs hold their governments accountable. There were also donor organizations that had expressed their willingness to provide support. However, FAO could only play the role of facilitator and needed to rely on partners, and identify new synergies and partnerships. Nicole concluded the presentation with a question for the audience: What role can CSOs play in implementation?

### **Discussion**

René Schärer, Member, ICSF, responded to the presentation with a comment that from the experience with CCRF and how many governments were unaware of it, or unwilling to acknowledge it, FAO would need to pressure governments from the top down, in addition to the CSOs lobbying from the bottom up. His question to Nicole was regarding who will finance

the empowering of stakeholder processes, and how the programme to carry out implementation in voluntary pilot sites would be undertaken. In response, Nicole reaffirmed the support of FAO as a facilitator organization and its continued support to CSOs, who were the main partners. There were no hard commitments at this stage, she said, but adhering to the principles enshrined in the SSF Guidelines themselves, all stakeholders would need to be engaged and involved in the process. FAO itself would have to begin mobilising resources.

Murali suggested, as one of the first steps in raising awareness, the development of an abridged and/or simplified document highlighting the key aspects of the SSF Guidelines (similar to what was produced for CCRF). He also recommended capacity building on the ecosystem approach to fisheries management as one of the activities that could help in implementation.

Vivienne expressed her fears about how the SSF Guidelines would be implemented, and what the implications of the strong marine conservation lobby would be on realizing the actual objectives of the SSF Guidelines as they were linked to human rights. She asked how the FAO was engaging with these actors and how it was going to reconcile these different objectives. In response, Nicole confirmed that the marine protected area (MPA) movement was strong and gaining momentum. FAO was engaged with making a connection with the conservation world; one of the ways forward was to use platforms and opportunities at conservation events (for example, the World Parks Congress of IUCN in Australia) to emphasize the importance of small-scale fisheries and introduce the SSF Guidelines.

Mitch appreciated FAO's initiative to commence the implementation process and earmark dedicated funds for the



Programme Secretariat. He asked what the elements of an action plan from FAO's perspective were. Nicole responded that FAO had not developed a specific action plan, but was using opportunities like the workshop and upcoming events to gather inputs that could inform the action plan.

Cornelie's contention was the assumption of homogeneity of the small-scale fisheries sector in the presentation. She asked how FAO would ensure that small-scale fisheries would be treated as a heterogeneous and context-specific group, who will not be overruled by other, more powerful interests and their agendas. Given that the multi-stakeholder process would be a difficult power struggle, she also pointed out the lack of emphasis on *dialogue* between governments, NGOs and small-scale fishers (and their representatives). Nicole, in her response, said that FAO's perspective of the small-scale fisheries sector did, in fact, view them as a heterogeneous group, but also pointed out the futility at this stage to argue about a definition of the sector. Instead, she said, the stakeholder processes should be considered at different levels, and the national level was where a more homogenous group could be found, where implementation of the SSF Guidelines needed to be discussed. The actors at this level should be tasked with identifying the groups and stakeholders, Nicole said, adding that ICSF as a collective would now face this challenge—to present itself as a homogenous group with common priorities and objectives.

Nalini asked how FAO would use its 'worldview' (developed through its experience at various levels with international actors and intergovernmental organizations) to choose strategic points of entry. Given that the process would not be an easy one, it would be imperative, she said,

to ensure its success at every stage. What would be the process and strategic plan that FAO would develop? To this question, Nicole responded that it was the responsibilities of organizations at the national and regional levels to identify strategic priorities. Each country, she added, was at a different level (for example, some countries were already engaged in extensive awareness-raising activities), so the priorities would be different. One of the main objectives of the document was the ownership of the SSF Guidelines by the communities themselves, and FAO, in its role as facilitator, would have to ensure the inclusion of a flexible strategy to respond to different situations.

Riza was interested to know which countries had expressed their willingness to act as pilot sites. Nicole responded that when the GAP had been presented at COFI, while some countries were willing to be pilot countries, others wanted assistance with policy revision in light of the SSF Guidelines. The African Union and the Central American Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization (OSPESCA) were examples of partners who were interested in implementation in their region.

Sherry reiterated the importance of returning to the consultation workshops with community organizations. She also stressed the need to develop criteria to determine who the new partners in the process were going to be. WFF, WFFP, ICSF and IPC should not remain as four different groups, but must form one cohesive unit, she added. There was also some concern, she said, about what was meant by 'results-based' monitoring, which could, in some contexts, be detrimental to particular groups. Her other concern was about the inclusion of indigenous peoples explicitly. In response, Nicole confirmed that the CSOs were the key partners who would

be looked upon to take the process back to the community level—where FAO did not have the capacity to reach out. She confirmed that it was important for the transparency, accountability and credibility of the process to ensure that the implementation goal was reached. FAO also recognized the concern of the CSOs regarding new actors joining the process, she said, adding that it was important to maintain the spirit with which they were developed throughout the implementation process. Regarding the inclusion of indigenous peoples, Nicole stated that this was considered part of the principles of the SSF Guidelines, which would also adhere to the principles of the UN Declaration.

Naseegh extended an invitation to FAO to the upcoming National Assembly of WFFP, where, he said, grassroots representatives from 30 to 40 countries would be present.

Given the landmark achievement of the inclusion of human rights in the instrument, and the importance of their linkages at so many levels and contexts, Sebastian pointed out the need for close allies within the UN family and CSOs. He suggested that FAO could take the initiative to move the United Nations General Assembly to ask for greater buy-in from other countries and agencies. Citing the example of FAO assistance to fisheries development towards mechanization in the past—which was one of the reasons that necessitated the formation of a group like ICSF—he recommended the development of a donor policy, to avoid different interpretations of the SSF Guidelines. He also suggested that the Director General of FAO write to the various governments, stressing that the SSF Guidelines should be addressed across sectors, and were not the concern of the fisheries departments

alone. In response, Nicole stated that FAO had anticipated challenges where the ministries or departments were unwilling and considered it to be beyond their mandates. It was suggested that the Director General would sign the foreword of the document, and hand it over to government officials when he met them, ensuring as direct as possible an obligation to member countries.

Jackie pleaded the case for the awareness-raising process to be two-way. Just as it was important for the decisions taken at higher levels to be taken down to the grassroots level, it was equally vital, she said, that the cultural interpretations of rights of communities should inform the discussions and feed into the processes of the NGOs and academics, and the decisions of governments. Retracing the process that led to the formulation of the Zero Draft of the SSF Guidelines, she indicated that the attempt to put into legal language various interpretations led to some concepts getting lost in translation.

Juan Carlos asked how FAO was going to overcome the unwillingness of governments to implement the SSF Guidelines, given that in most countries neoliberal forces, with support from the governments, put tremendous pressure on the small-scale fisheries sector and endorsed policies that were against the principles of the SSF Guidelines. In response, Nicole pointed out that the fact that the SSF Guidelines were adopted at COFI implied their endorsement by governments. Now that political commitments had already been expressed, it was up to the CSOs to hold their governments accountable to these commitments. A key issue might be (the lack of) policy coherence and there might be a need to revise existing policies, she added.

## Group discussions

For the group discussions, the workshop was divided into six regional groups:

Group 1: Latin America

Group 2: Europe, Canada  
and the Caribbean

Group 3: Africa (Anglophone)

Group 4: Africa (Francophone)

Group 5: Asia: Thailand and Indonesia

Group 6: Asia: India

To help guide the discussions, the groups were presented with the following questions:

1. What process do you think should be followed to develop an implementation strategy/plan at the international, regional, national and local levels?
2. What are the priorities? What levels can they be identified at—regional, national and local?
3. Who should do what? Identify some actors—CSOs, NGOs, FWOs, community organizations.
4. How should the CSO platform work at the regional and national levels?

5. What capacity building is required for implementation?
6. How do you get your governments interested in implementing the SSF Guidelines—at the regional, national and local levels?
7. In your area, who do you think are the vulnerable and marginal groups? What steps should be taken to reach out to them?
8. What could be the strategic issues to build around a gender-just sector?
9. How do you see the linking up of the informal fishers sector in the labour discussions on formalisation and the ILO Work in Fishing Convention?

The groups continued their discussions through the evening and reported back in plenary the following day.

[http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/FAO\\_Nicole%20Franz\\_16%20July-%20for%20print%201.pdf](http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/FAO_Nicole%20Franz_16%20July-%20for%20print%201.pdf)



Participants at the Pondy Workshop were called on to provide inputs to feed into the Global Assistance Programme. The overall purpose of the approach is to mainstream the SSF Guidelines in various policies and strategies

## Day 4: Reporting of Group Discussions in Plenary

*Moderators: Venkatesh Salagrama and  
Rosemarie Nyigulila Mwaipopo*

**E**ach group summarized their discussions in 10-minute presentations, and a detailed discussion followed.

### **Group 1: Latin America**

*Rapporteurs: Vivienne Solis Rivera  
and Juan Carlos Cárdenas*

In response to Q1, the group felt that the space that civil society and CSOs occupied must be independent and separate from government and corporations in the context of decisionmaking. The processes would involve a review of the local and national consultation processes, and the involvement of other partner groups. The communities should be the centre of the process of empowerment and advocacy. Other sectors should also be included, and there would be the need for legitimising indigenous peoples' traditional practices and integrating the theme of the SSF Guidelines in important international conferences.

The priorities (Q2) identified included: (i) the need for fishing and land management to prioritise the interests of small-scale fisheries; (ii) community participation and governance; (iii) individual and collective human rights (recognizing that in Latin America there is a violation of human rights in the small-scale fishing sector); and (iv) identification of observers on the implementation of the SSF Guidelines for artisanal fishing. The key actors (Q3) would include central and local governments, civil society, international movements and agencies such as the UN who, in their individual and co-operative roles, would address the priorities.

The CSO platform would need to carry out the following activities (Q4) at the regional and national levels: informing the grassroots and local communities about the SSF Guidelines and their significance; revitalising/renewing common spaces by strengthening grassroots movements of artisanal fishermen and other allied movements; and strengthen local, national, regional participation and disseminate information for small-scale fishers.

Capacity-building measures (Q5) would include disseminating information about the SSF Guidelines in the local language and in an understandable form, highlighting the particular significance for the lives and livelihoods of the small-scale fisheries communities, in a way that could be adapted, based on the local context. Training, in the context of implementation, should be initiated at all levels and include artisanal fishermen, government officials, and also be carried out at the level of parliaments and congresses (especially those that dealt with fisheries issues).

In order to persuade the government (Q6) to implement the SSF Guidelines, public pressure on parliament should be solicited, issues of political significance should be highlighted to the government (for example, poverty reduction, food security, etc.) to enable initiation through mobilisation of existing government resources and frameworks, the insistence on the interlinking of issues and, therefore, multi-sectoral inclusion should be made clear (that is, involvement of government departments beyond fisheries), and the political environment should be made conducive at all levels to include the

implementation of the SSF Guidelines as a priority.

Given the diversity of contexts, societies and cultures, identification and prioritisation of vulnerable and marginal groups (Q7) would have to be led by CSOs who work with different communities in different countries.

Strategic issues to build around a gender-just sector (Q8) were linked to the issue of democratisation. The situation of women needed to be discussed and their roles and contributions clearly highlighted and given importance. Training and empowering of women should also be a top priority, and the participation of women in decisionmaking and resource management should be encouraged, through the process of organizing women. Working with the themes of prevention of violence, access to resources (including land), and working with young women should also be priorities.

In response to the question “Should we integrate the SSF Guidelines into components of the legislation? Is it advisable to move towards a specific policy?”, the group felt that even though this would be a desirable step, it should not hinder concrete actions that would fulfil other goals. Many national policies already reflected some of the key principles of the SSF Guidelines. The task lay in identifying and filling the gaps that existed.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Debate%20Grupos%20Latinoamerica.docx>

## **Group 2: Europe, Canada and the Caribbean**

*Rapporteur: René-Pierre Chever*

Group 2 identified common themes among the questions and addressed several questions together. For example, Questions 1 through 6 concerned the general process to reach effective

implementation of the SSF Guidelines, while Questions 7 and 8 dealt with vulnerable groups, including women. The group strongly believed that energy and resources should be invested at the local level. As inland fisherman Freerk exclaimed, “It starts with the fisherman”. They also identified awareness raising as a key activity by using everyday realities to emphasize the significance and rationale of the SSF Guidelines in addressing issues. Capacity development of small-scale fishers was also considered important, using traditional and modern means of communication. Strong arguments needed to be developed in order to “hardwire the concepts in the minds of policymakers”.

At the regional and international levels, disseminating information and creating awareness could use various platforms at meetings and conferences on related themes, using the concept of ‘piggy-backing’. The importance of returning to the regional and community workshops was underscored, along with creating awareness by the global society who can also pressure the governments.

In addressing the risk of the process being ‘hijacked’ by other groups with differing agendas, it was felt that CSOs and FWOs needed to draw on the strengths of their knowledge of the issues and of the sea and landscapes to push forward their common goals.

An issue that was brought up by the group was the phrasing in the text of the focus on developing countries, in what they referred to as “geographical discrimination”, which would allow governments of industrialized countries to ignore the principles of the SSF Guidelines, seriously undermining the issues faced by indigenous and marginalised communities in those countries.

While addressing the integration of the concepts of the SSF Guidelines into existing legal frameworks, it

was felt necessary to engage with, and invite the participation of, legal experts. This would further strengthen the place of human rights in existing laws. These efforts could also be channelled into lobbying for the adoption of the SSF Guidelines in the next Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) of the EU.

The use of the social sciences and social and context analyses was emphasized once again to identify where and in what manner the SSF Guidelines may be applied. This would also aid the search for appropriate and acceptable alliances with other organizations.

The idea of pilot or experimental areas had also emerged during the discussions at the workshop. However, the group felt that the CSOs who had been working on the field for several years were better placed to identify and recommend these sites to FAO and other agencies for implementation.

The group felt that the role of women in small-scale fisheries should be given importance. And importantly, the parity between men and women within FWOs themselves (for example, WFF and WWFP) should be scrutinised closely. The reflection of the gender policy upheld by the organizations translating into practice within their own organizational structures and functioning would be an important step in this direction. Referring to “positive discrimination” and taking the lead from Chandrika’s note on “Recasting the net: Defining a gender agenda for sustaining life and livelihoods in fishing communities”, the group felt that while the inclusion of women within governance and decision-making bodies was critical, the first step would be to build capacity and ensure that women were comfortable in their new roles and work environments.

Finally, learning from positive examples, it was suggested that the

process of “spiral learning” (that was practised by groups in Canada) be adopted, where at each step of the process, constant reflection would feed back into it and inform the next step, resulting in progress that was spiral instead of linear.

### **Group 3: Africa (Anglophone)**

*Rapporteur: Peter Linford Adjei*

The discussion in the Africa (Anglophone) group began with trying to understand the context. It was acknowledged that the African context was comprised of several groups and geographical areas. In response to Q1, the group decided that the approach should be participatory, and must begin at the level of the community organization. The feedback from the consultative processes would help prioritise the cross-sectoral nature of the SSF Guidelines. Capacity building to form credible, legitimate and democratically accountable FWOs was important in helping them gain recognition from their governments as representative bodies in the implementation process. An analysis of the social contexts, of the actors and their roles, and of existing legislation and policy was an important starting point. Raising awareness through the use of innovative and effective media would also take the process a long way in gaining support. A monitoring system would then need to be developed to assess progress. This would require an adaptive and participatory management approach.

The following priorities were identified to be linked to the SSF Guidelines (Q2): child labour; women’s life and livelihoods and gender equality; access to infrastructure across the value chain; access to resources; instituting a responsible, ethical fisheries and community life; and organizing and assuming ownership to create legitimate community

governance institutions and organizations to drive the work around these identified issues.

The cross-cutting issues and the multi-sectoral nature of the SSF Guidelines would imply the involvement of several actors, and across varying scales (Q3). CSOs would play an important part in creating awareness, bringing about mobilisation and looking for partners at the local level. At the national level, their role would be to develop an analysis to help link various government agencies (for example, employing the CCRF) and a reporting procedure to FAO. At this level, they would also need to lobby 'behind the scenes' and facilitate the meeting of various stakeholders on a common platform. In particular, at the local and national levels, those working with priority issues (like child labour, women's issues, etc.) would play the role of carrying out context analyses to identify indicators, empower communities and target groups, and carry out advocacy campaigns. The government at the local, national and regional levels would play an important role in supporting education and awareness raising, research and intelligence in key issues (for example, the social-relations drivers of child labour).

The CSO platform, as a global movement, must pressure the government from the top (Q4). Further, local-level organizations linked to national-level organizations should come together as a platform represented by international-level FWOs in the CSO co-ordinating committee. The CSOs must build tactical alliances with allies such as research and academic organizations. They must also work towards a long-term national-level platform of action to ensure the voice of the fishworker remains the dominant voice.

Capacity building (Q5) should take place at all levels: local (awareness

raising and training, making information accessible); national (using ministerial-level platforms to realize awareness and build capacity of other departments); and regional (capacity building by regional intergovernmental bodies for the states).

At the national level, governments could be initiated to begin the implementation process (Q6) with the development of a document that highlights the linkages with different departments. At the regional level, it will be important to engage with, and build, allies, using support from existing regional bodies (like the South African Development Community (SADC), FAO, etc.).

The vulnerable and marginalised groups (Q7) were identified as children and women, those who do not have access to rights, the youth who reside in remote rural areas and those living within MPAs.

Addressing the gender issue in light of the SSF Guidelines (Q8) would have to begin by organizing women and men around the issues, and enlisting other gender platforms to support women in fisheries.

The SSF Guidelines could also be used to promote dialogue and raise awareness of the impacts of formalisation of the informal sector (Q9) and the implications specific to each context. Formalisation should not lead to exclusion and loss of safety nets.

[http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Anglofone%20Africa\\_Priorities%20Issues%20and%20link%20to%20SSF%20Guidelines.docx](http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Anglofone%20Africa_Priorities%20Issues%20and%20link%20to%20SSF%20Guidelines.docx)

#### **Group 4: Africa (Francophone)**

*Rapporteur: Micheline Somplehi Dion*

Having acknowledged that the Anglophone-Africa group had already listed the key points for the region, the Francophone group proceeded to elaborate upon a few issues, especially

in the context of West Africa, where most of the participants of the group came from.

With respect to the approach to be adopted, national-level priorities were favoured as the starting point—food security, marketing and market supply were important issues. In particular, climate change was identified as a pressing issue.

Addressing the roles of different actors (Q3), the group focused on CSOs, whose primary task would be to raise awareness of the SSF Guidelines, using creative and effective means of communication (radio, television, presentations, etc.).

CSOs at the local, national and regional levels (Q6) would be the focus organizations like CAOPA, which brought together a number of co-operatives and federations and represented a united voice. Capacity building (Q5) would involve training for the trainers to ensure that the implementation process was carried out correctly, and outreach was carried out on a large scale among fisher communities. In order to engage the government in the implementation process (Q6), it was decided that the participation of all stakeholders would be vital. Dialogue and partnership with the government would drive the process forward. The FAO representatives on the local level would be asked to act as facilitators of the dialogue at each region at the local level, to mediate between the government and CSOs.

The vulnerable groups were identified as women, children and the elderly (Q7). The means to reach out to them was through awareness raising, community participation and outreach.

Gender equality (Q8) could be achieved through correct governance and decisionmaking, and by developing implementation projects within fisher communities. This equality would have to be set as a goal at all levels.

Regarding formalisation of the informal sector (Q9), the group wanted to initiate the discussion on how public schooling and learning and teaching on fisheries could be brought together at all levels. A long-term approach was needed for fishing communities, in this context.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Discussion%20de%20groupes%20desAfricains%20en%20Inde.doc>

## **Group 5: Asia: Thailand and Indonesia**

*Rapporteur: Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk*

The Thailand and Indonesia group, in addressing Questions 1 to 4, placed considerable emphasis on evaluating and strengthening the fisheries organisations and CSOs themselves in preparation for the implementation process. Echoing the concerns of other groups, they said that the process needed to be people-centred, and that the fishers take ownership of the instrument and use it along with other instruments to fight for their rights. But, in particular, the various CSOs and NGOs needed to be brought together to outline a common agenda and develop a common strategy that could draw from the strengths of individual organizations. From a common platform for people's organizations, a core group could be formed to strategise and ensure awareness among a wider network of organizations, through education, awareness raising and working with the government to realize action at the local community level, and to develop a "People's Agenda". This process would start at the local level, where local governments had the authority to make rules and regulations. The next step would be the scaling up to the national level in both countries, targeting working with the governments to develop an implementation plan and integrating



the SSF Guidelines into government policy.

At the regional level, the target would be ASEAN and AEC, to address the increasing trend of economically driven fisheries policies. The respective representatives of government at these forums must ensure that a policy framework on small-scale fisheries is given importance.

Human resources development would be a key component of capacity development (Q5). Skill development for lobbying and field-level work, and leadership development would enable the communities themselves to be watchdogs and advocate for, and monitor, progress.

Regarding initiating government action in the implementation process (Q6), the process would have to begin with existing networks with the government. Since the governments were present at COFI in Rome, a working relationship could be developed from this starting point and pursued thereon.

Having spent a considerable amount of time discussing and identifying vulnerable and marginalised groups (Q7), it was decided that data collection and mapping, and a specific plan targeting these groups, was needed. Similar considerations would be needed while addressing gender inequality (Q8): a separate programme with dedicated resources would need to be developed, and a measure to ensure a quota system to open up opportunities for women to access and participate in policymaking would need to be put in place. Further, gender budgeting in implementation programmes would need to be a priority.

Regarding the informal sector (Q9), the group felt that concerted lobbying efforts were needed to bring about a structural change and convince the government of the importance and relevance of the sector, which

included crew of commercial fishing boats, small-scale fishers, vendors and processors, among others. These efforts would draw references to the existing ILO Labour Conventions that enabled them to enjoy and access social welfare and benefits. Labour Conventions was not ratified by ASEAN countries, and so the lobbying for the ratification of this instrument would also be a priority action.

<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/ASEAN.pptx>

## **Group 6: Asia: India**

*Rapporteur: C M Muralidharan*

Elaborating upon the processes to develop the implementation strategy (Q1), the India group identified the following activities to be undertaken at the local level: translation and simplification of the SSF Guidelines and distribution to communities, organizations and government departments; encouraging the introspection by communities of the relevance of the SSF Guidelines in addressing their issues; bringing together stakeholders to address the operational dimensions of implementing the SSF Guidelines; and ensuring adequate budget allocations for identified priorities. At the national level, an examination of existing policies to address the priorities needed to be undertaken and awareness programmes for policymakers on SSF Guidelines were required.

The list of priorities (Q2) identified by the group included:

- efforts to document, establish legalese and protect tenure rights in marine waters, coastal resources, beach and land resources and inland water bodies
- safeguarding fishers' rights over publicly owned inland water bodies
- ensuring preferential access to fishery resources under national jurisdiction and protection of

conditions to enable small-scale fishers to benefit from such arrangements

- according importance to customary and traditional rights (for example, within the Koliwada community, Khoti community, caste *panchayat*, *Nyat panchayat*) that promote sustainable fisheries and equitable development, for those rights to be conferred as legal rights, and documentation and making visible of tribal communities and their management practices
- ensuring development projects (like Special Economic Zones (SEZ), ports, power plants, sand mining, etc.) are undertaken in a transparent manner, with meaningful and informed participation and consent of the *Gram sabha*
- ensuring an equitable balance between resource conservation and fishers' livelihoods in protected areas
- regulation of all destructive fishing methods and overfishing both by the mechanized and small-scale sector at all levels
- elimination of child labour in the fishing sector
- introduction of social-security and social-protection measures
- implementation of ILO Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No. 188)
- addressing of occupational and health hazards related to fishing activities
- provision of safe drinking water and sanitation facilities

In response to the roles of different actors (Q3), NGOs and CSOs would need to take a proactive role in awareness building and information dissemination. Village *panchayats* and other local bodies would need to assume the responsibility for local-level awareness, and customary organizations would need to examine

tenural arrangements in light of the SSF Guidelines.

The group decided that capacity-building approaches (Q5) would need more detailed review. In order to get the government interested (Q6), the priorities would need to be identified and communicated to government departments, and awareness-raising programmes would need to be conducted.

Clarifying that the list was not comprehensive, the group identified the following vulnerable and marginalised groups (Q7): fishers/fish harvesters/seaweed gatherers/shellfish collectors; small fish traders; fishers on board vessels as wage/share labourers; migrant fishers and fishworkers; single women in fish trade; tribal groups; and shore-based fishers and fishworkers

Building greater gender justice in the small-scale fisheries sector (Q8) would require the protection and maintenance of fish sale and processing space for women, and ensuring preferential access to the first sale of fish. Support was needed to set up independent women's co-operatives and for need-based allocations of resources to women in the fish value chain. Gender budgeting and skill development and awareness generation were also identified as priorities.

Drawing from, and sensitising government bodies to the provisions of the ILO Work in Fishing Convention, 2007, organizing fishers and fishworkers, and ensuring formal identity to them would enable linking of the informal fisheries sector in labour considerations (Q9).

(<http://igssf.icsf.net/images/ssf/Group%20discussion%20India.pptx>)

## Discussion

The questions and comments that followed the presentation brought out

a number of common themes, challenges and priorities that were highlighted by the various groups. A large part of the discussion, however, focused on defining and identifying vulnerable and marginalised groups (see Q7). Prompted by Sebastian's observation regarding the various dimensions in which such terms were used and the need, perhaps, to come to an agreement on their usage, many participants felt that it was highly context-dependent. Sebastian also noted that while some groups (like India) had restricted the definition to within the fisheries sector, others had included groups from other sectors as well.

Ravadee pointed out that the identification of vulnerable and marginalised groups followed from first identifying objectives and the type of programme of application for a particular context. Providing an example from Thailand, she said that the labour force on commercial boats, who often worked in exploitative conditions and frequently took to using drugs, would be a priority group in that context. Adli clarified that 'vulnerable' could be categorized based on economic, environmental and political considerations. Listing examples from Indonesia, he identified the vulnerable groups as widows, drug addicts, poor families, the disabled, and women in poor households who were forced into prostitution.

Providing a context relevant to Africa, Mamayawa stressed that because of the role women play in the small-scale fisheries sector, their dependence for income and stability on being able to recover their investments made them particularly vulnerable. Regarding marginalised groups, Mamayawa provided the example of fishers who had to seek out alternative occupations during the low fishing season, who were often marginalised on account of their lack of access to land and other resources.

Returning to the issue of child labour, Naseegh cited the example of children from fishing communities who were exploited as labour, and children who were drafted on syndicated poaching vessels, demonstrating the direct link with child labour and the fisheries sector.

On a related note, Lamine recognized the vulnerable groups as women, the elderly and children. Particularly in the context of children in the fisheries sector, he said, the introduction of official schools, while providing an education to the children, deprived them of the important knowledge they would need to develop to one day take the place of their parents as fishers. Given that it was not always easy to find a secure job in other sectors, it was important to ensure that children from the fishing communities had access to this line of work should they choose it.

Reacting to the deliberations on defining vulnerable and marginalised groups, Cornelia expressed concern about categorising and negatively labelling groups, thereby imposing and propagating discourse stereotypes. The first step towards ensuring equal partnership in society amongst these groups, she reiterated, would be to carry out a detailed context analysis to understand, expose and address existing power relations.

Mitch, in agreeing with Cornelia's suggestion also reiterated the need to return to the local communities and initiate action at that level with their ensured participation.

Another point that was brought up by Ravadee, and related to the need to respect context-based processes, was that a forum such as the ICSF workshop would only help begin discussions to be developed into a general idea. Individual work at the country level would have to derive from the local context, and take off

and strengthen from existing and new programmes and partnerships, respectively.

In the Indian context, the issue of sustainable use of resources in MPAs was challenged by N Venugopalan of the ICSF Secretariat, who questioned how the ‘inclusive exclusion’ by law by the Indian government regarding resources in protected areas would enable any extraction of resources, whether in an equitable fashion or otherwise. In response, Murali provided examples of seaweed collectors in areas like the Gulf of Mannar and the use of turtle excluder device (TED) in protected waters in Odisha. Venugopalan pointed out, however, that such extraction was only made possible due to the government not having enforced the law in a strict manner.

Addressing a question to Nicole, the FAO representative, about when the final official text of the SSF Guidelines would be released, Editrudith voiced a concern that had arisen repeatedly during the workshop discussions. Nicole reassured the workshop participants that the final version, with the foreword translated in all six international languages, was expected to be ready in September.

Summing up the session, Rose and Venkatesh briefly listed the common priorities and themes that

had emerged through the presentations and discussions that followed:

- Implementation of the SSF Guidelines could only be successful if the CSOs themselves were clear about how the issues were conceptualised in their particular contexts.
- A context analysis was imperative to the implementation process, and the results of such an analysis needed to be aligned with, and related to, the SSF Guidelines and the objectives of particular programmes.
- The process would need to be initiated at, and driven by, a community-level approach. It was vital that the deliberations and discussions from various forums be taken back to the communities who were instrumental during the SSF Guidelines development process, and their inputs and interpretations sought to develop a strategic plan for implementation.
- The multi-sectoral nature of the approach must also be given due recognition.
- The terms used in the guiding principles, such as ‘vulnerable’, ‘marginalised’, etc. were often loaded and should not be used as a portmanteau to accommodate other meanings. A context-dependent understanding, instead of a one-size-fits-all-approach, was essential.

## Panel Discussion: What is the Role of CSOs in Implementation?

*Moderators:* Jackie Sunde and V. Vivekanandan

*Panellists:* Vivienne Solis Rivera, Mogamad Naseegh Jaffer, Rolf Willmann, Editrudith Lukanga and John Kurien

The panel discussion on the role of CSOs in the implementation included the perspectives of a diverse panel of five speakers who presented a variety of contexts while highlighting common objectives and roles of CSOs at various levels.

Vivienne, while addressing the role of CSOs in the implementation of the SSF Guidelines, touched upon the experience of Latin America, South America and Central America. Civil society and CSOs, she said, was a 'diverse creature'. This diversity was a great source of potential that should be drawn upon while looking at all of the aspects in the implementation process. The role of CSOs was not just restricted to how they would help in the implementation but also how they could drill down to the key topics and debating areas, from where the principles of the SSF Guidelines took shape, and engage with this role with other stakeholders and actors.

Vivienne highlighted four key topics that were identified for Latin America and Central America, and had undoubted relevance for other contexts as well: (i) **Representativeness**, which ensured the link between the constituencies that were working on artisanal fisheries on the ground and the leaders of the sector; (ii) **Transparency**, ensuring that the key topics reached the debating forums where governments were present and which informed decisionmaking; (iii) **Information dissemination**, as was already highlighted several times during the workshop, to provide feedback to

the communities who contributed to the development process; and (iv) **Equality and equity in gender**, which was of utmost importance in Latin America, to ensure the participation of women in fisheries and in decisionmaking.

Emphasizing the need to understand how power was wielded in practice and how resources were actually managed, Vivienne tasked the CSOs with deepening and strengthening partnerships with other movements, and with those who had different insights into the management processes. It was in this way that the participatory governance by communities of their resources could be strengthened. Vivienne also urged CSOs not to lose sight of the social struggles, which were everyday human-rights struggles of these communities.

In terms of implementation, she said, an important strength that CSOs had was collective action. This aspect could be enhanced by developing more synergies, which could, in turn, accelerate the implementation processes. A unified voice, which needed to draw upon this diversity, would have to be identified and would need to stand out.

Vivienne also stressed the need to bring together the long-term approaches needed for the communities. While the immediate need would be to ensure the well-being of fishers, many of whom lived in situations of poverty, a long-term vision of resource use would enable the long-term well-being of these

communities. A structure that reflected civil society and which enabled democratic representation at the grassroots level was needed to realize this long-term approach. The youth, she stressed, was a particularly important constituency, and they should take on a key role in their societies.

Adding a word of caution regarding the alliances that CSOs would make with new players, Vivienne expressed the need for the development of specific criteria that could guide and inform the striking up of such alliances.

Although the SSF Guidelines were voluntary, the values they represented should be taken seriously, she said. The principles should be maintained and kept alive throughout the period. Even if the resources available were few, she said, it was important that the alliances CSOs build amongst themselves and with other actors be done in an ethical and clear way. This transparency and ethical adherence in the alliance with other movements of social resistance would strengthen the overall movement to face down unjust and destructive models of development, and would ensure the achievement of reaching the goals in the area of small-scale fisheries.

Naseegh began by pointing out that the SSF Guidelines' importance and relevance did not stem from its inclusion of fishing alone, which was but a small ingredient, but recognized that we lived in an unjust world, where the corporate sector and the political agenda were driven by capital, privatization and private ownership. It addressed as just as important, life and living conditions, health, housing and education, safety and security, and well-being. These were issues that cut across all sectors, and were not restricted to the fisheries sector alone. However, he said, the small-scale fisheries sector was important in its contribution to food

security and sustainable resource use the world over. The implementation of the SSF Guidelines, therefore, was envisioned to ensure participation, democracy and sovereignty. Globalization and capitalism, on the other hand, denied fishers and fishworkers the role to participate, to have democratic involvement and the ability to rule as equal partners in the sector.

The role the CSOs must play, Naseegh said, started with recognizing the innate and unique power as communities who constitute this collective (through their representatives), and the strength of the collective itself, a power that was different from that of capital and governments. This power needed to be harnessed to demand the rights for better living conditions, access to resources to make a living to supply food, and the right to democratic participation. Although they were deemed rights, they were needed to be fought for. Given that unequal power relations existed, it was vital that organizations worked together with a shared responsibility.

Likening the fight for human rights to a strategy for battle, Naseegh stressed that the 'frontline' or first line of attack would have to come from the fisher organizations themselves, since it was the fishers, not civil society, whose lives were directly impacted. Change, he emphasized, could only be brought about if it came from those who were most immediately affected. The frontline would need to be mass-organized, and done so in a transparent and accountable fashion. The support for these organizations would come from the second tier—civil society and CSOs. The third tier would consist of people and organizations who would act as alliances (for example, those in the agricultural sector, the trade union movement, etc.). It could not be the responsibility, he reiterated,

of the second and third tiers to bring about change, but it would be their responsibility to provide the support needed.

Returning to the relevance of the SSF Guidelines, Naseegh said that, although it was not a perfect document, having lost out on much of what was intended to be included, it was still important in having included a set of ideals and principles—what CSOs and FWOs had to fight for, and expected to continue to fight over for a long period of time.

He also foresaw that within the struggle to have the SSF Guidelines implemented, there would be various smaller struggles that would present themselves.

The focus of the struggle, therefore, was not to have the SSF Guidelines implemented, but was, instead, the fight for justice, fairness and equity. The SSF Guidelines represented one of many tools to fuel and support the struggle.

Rolf elaborated upon the roles of CSOs in legal empowerment and influencing funding policies for implementation. While alluding to the three layers that Naseegh had previously mentioned, Rolf clarified that he had always worked with the second and third layers of CSOs and support organizations, but that his inspiration and learning had always drawn from the communities themselves.

A key area of work that CSOs should take up, he said, was the fulfilment of human rights, and legal empowerment to fight against human-rights violations. For CSOs, he believed there were far more opportunities than had been taken up.

Referring to a recent lecture he was asked to deliver at the Centre for Maritime Research (MARE) Conference in Amsterdam, a paper prepared by a legal expert in preparation for the

lecture had brought to light a range of concrete legal struggles.

There were various positive and significant examples around the world, Rolf said. For example, the struggles of the fishing communities in South Africa, the Supreme Court-imposed ban on trawl fishing during the monsoon in India, and the challenges addressed by the coastal and small island fisheries law in Indonesia.

These struggles addressed the rights of indigenous peoples and their rights to their territories and resources. The struggles, while often beginning at the local scale, were taken up to the highest courts in the land, and here Rolf foresaw an important role for CSOs.

There was a great potential, he added, for CSOs to work on human-rights committees at the national level, to express their grievances.

In light of the SSF Guidelines, taking up litigation strategies with lawyers in their countries could provide the opportunity to highlight the responsibility of governments and hold them to account for the commitments made by them through various international legal and policy instruments.

Rolf also suggested that institutions like the Documentation Centre at ICSF could take on the role of documenting and compiling relevant legal cases to develop a repository of human-rights issues.

Where CSOs also had an advantage and could assume responsibility was in the building of alliances at the national level. Many countries, Rolf said, had legal empowerment groups in other sectors, not necessarily fisheries, but they had the expertise and the technical skills to address cross-cutting issues that were not restricted to a particular sector, and could be well applied to the fisheries sector.

The other aspect that was not sufficiently deliberated, Rolf added, was in addressing funding and how CSOs could influence funding decisions. What had emerged was the potential risk of large funding organizations like the World Bank and their close alliances, such as large environmental NGOs, taking over the process and leaving little control by the CSO community. Recent years had seen the increasing involvement of philanthropic organizations, GEF and the World Bank. A large volume of the funding for the implementation was likely to come from such sources. Although resources from conventional organizations like FAO and governments such as the Scandinavian countries would continue, they would be significantly less, and would, therefore, influence the process significantly less than the new players. It was crucial, therefore, that CSOs engaged, and interacted actively, with their governments early enough in the process to ensure proper use of funds, and demand transparency in these programmes. If they waited until after the programmes had been initiated, it would be too late.

Editrudith, who represented WFF and a local NGO in Tanzania that works with fishers on Ukerewe Island in lake Victoria, restated the objective of the SSF Guidelines to support the enhancement of the important role of small-scale fisheries in its contribution to the global, regional and national efforts towards eradication of hunger and poverty. She pointed out that the principles enshrined in the SSF Guidelines were intended to enable small-scale fishers to improve their governance and provide livelihood security for current and future generations. Echoing Naseegh's observation, she said that the SSF Guidelines in themselves were but one tool and not an end in themselves. Editrudith also affirmed WFF's support

to, and agreement with, the aspects brought up in the discussions at the workshop, in its position as a global social movement.

Identifying capacity building as a key component to achieving socially just and sustainable fisheries, Editrudith emphasized its importance across different *issues* (human resource, skill building, leadership and monitoring) and across different *levels*, and to different *actors*. But first, she said, a contextual analysis in each country was needed to identify the issues related to small-scale fisheries and inland fisheries, and to identify and map the actors to determine who they were and what roles they would play in the implementation process. The mapping process itself should be as participatory as possible, to allow for bringing on board all those who could provide support during implementation. The deliberation process undertaken at the workshop, she added, could be replicated within countries, and it was important that the discussions and decisions made here be taken back to the communities with whom CSOs have been engaged with, to acknowledge that their contributions to the document have been respected. Pointing out that the participants present at the workshop represented the leaders of global and national organizations and did not involve all of the members of these organizations, she underscored the importance of ensuring that information was provided as feedback in a sincere and transparent manner. Without this process, she said, the efforts towards implementation would be in vain.

Drawing from positive examples in Africa, Editrudith confirmed her belief in community-driven change. Restating Naseegh's conviction, she said that once communities were empowered, they were able to identify themselves with the challenges they



faced and use this instrument as a tool to help them bridge the gap towards having a socially just and sustainable fishery. The small achievements that dot the progress of the process needed to be celebrated, she added. Returning to the importance of a social analysis at the local level, she said that the analysis also needed to involve the local community, for example, with the use of cultural mentors, to analyze the situation and practices and their implications over time. This would enable the community to set for themselves a vision for their future, and then use these instruments to guide them towards that vision. The analysis at the local and national levels would also accommodate the differences (for example, differences in administrative and governance structures) across continents. Once local governing bodies were empowered, they would be enabled to take charge of the process, and, at the same time, gain the trust of their communities.

In her concluding remarks, Editrudith emphasized that, from the WFF perspective, it was important to build capacities of national organizations (comprised of member organizations) who facilitated the country consultations. This empowerment would enable the trickling down to the community level. Throughout the process, it was important that the organizations engaged with the government, in a co-operative fashion and as partners. Editrudith ended her presentation by prompting the CSO community to get set for implementation.

John Kurien, Member, ICSF, presented three approaches in the potential role of CSOs in the implementation process: (i) the need to use the legal approach; (ii) the need to recognize the role of politics and the State; and (iii) the need to create a cadre of youth who were enthused about the issues.

Endorsing Rolf's recommendation to engage in legal empowerment, John stressed the importance of using already existing legislations to empower communities to recognize their rights and to ensure that they obtained and enjoyed their rights. CSOs, who were largely preoccupied by community organizing, research and documentation, etc. needed to assume this role and solicit the support and partnership of people and organizations who were competent in legal issues. Citing the example of the case of small-scale fishers' struggles against trawl boat owners in Kerala, India, in the 1980s, he explained how the Supreme Court of India favoured the *right to life* of the small-scale fishers over the *right to business* of trawl boat owners (both being non-negotiable constitutional rights).

John also emphasized the importance of *creating* legislation. CSOs, with the help of lawyers, should create legislation when the need arose, as in the Aceh case in Indonesia, where legislation was created to recognize customary institutions and give them a place in modern law.

Touching upon the importance of politics and the State, John drew attention to the need to view the process of implementation of the SSF Guidelines in a more political way. The political importance of coastal communities could provide significant mileage in many contexts to the acceptance and implementation of the SSF Guidelines by governments. Drawing again from the Indonesian example of a military dictatorship imposing a ban on trawling, he pointed to how the means to reach the desired end could not always be relied upon to follow the ideal approach of democratic participation. The freedom of democracy, he insisted, was not available to all countries. Similarly, in Kerala, when the State realized the threat of how a united front of

fishing communities could imperil the representative democratic process, financial support was prioritised and 80 per cent of the funds were diverted from the industrial fishery to small-scale fisheries. In another example, in Cambodia, the fishing community was conferred rights to resources without them having demanded them. Having bypassed the democratic process, the government had realized the importance of this political constituency and had granted community rights in the hopeful exchange for votes. Acknowledging the many routes to empowerment, John asked how CSOs might be able to use such situations in their favour.

The importance of creating a cadre of youth who understood the issues being discussed was also important, he added. A conscious effort towards this end was needed at every level. There was concern that fishermen, who were now growing old, did not wish their children to return to fishing, except in countries where other jobs were unavailable or where fishing was still profitable. Simultaneously, there was a need to educate the youth about the issues of the oceans, lakes, interface realms and coastal and marine areas. Often, these issues were not given due importance in traditional university courses, and there was a need to alter this trend. The platform needed new faces, new knowledge and fresh perspectives, John urged, so they could support CSOs in the fishing sector when they took up issues like the implementation of the SSF Guidelines.

### **Discussion**

The comments and questions that followed the panel discussion centred around a few key themes, including, primarily, the intervention of new organizations such as conservation and development organizations and the engagement and alliances

created with CSOs and FWOs; the roles of support organizations at various levels; the responsibility of CSOs in highlighting the valuable role and presence of the small-scale fisheries sector and in bringing into deliberations and country agendas these priorities; and the strengths of CSOs in collective action and as holders of knowledge.

Alain traced the nature of the first collective struggles three decades ago when, he said, the States were the major players and were pushing for an industrial model in fisheries. The resistance, which came from organizations who would eventually come together to form ICSF, saw the governments as formidable opponents to the small-scale model. Today, however, the influence of the States had weakened, but there was potential to engage with them as allies of fishing communities. The big players who had assumed influence in the coastal and marine realm now were large fishing corporations, and others whose vested interests lay in other resources of the sea (oil and gas, minerals, sand, etc.), and who created strong alliances with large environmental NGOs (for example, through providing funding support for establishment of MPAs). The broad objective of these new actors, he warned, was to weaken the fisheries sector in order to make way for access to other resources. Privatization of the oceans was already a reality that was being witnessed in certain parts of France. It was important to remember, therefore, he urged, to strengthen the legal basis in the context of community rights. There was an urgent need to empower communities so they could resist the growing pressure and competition over resources. The large corporations, he added, also acted at the level of policy, where they wielded considerable influence and were imposing their own legislation.

This was, therefore, the other, and equally important, area where CSO intervention was critical to insist on legislation based on the principles of the SSF Guidelines.

Mitch commented on the roles at the national level regarding implementation, particularly with support from the other levels. While acknowledging Alain's concern about players at various levels, Mitch also pointed out that there were levels of players at all levels. At the national level, many governments already had in place policies and laws that reflected the objectives and principles outlined in the SSF Guidelines. For example, food security and poverty eradication were identified as major goals for most, if not all, countries. This aspect was not discussed in sufficient detail, he said. There was a need for CSOs to engage with the governments and become familiar with these existing legislations to ensure that the implementation of the SSF Guidelines tied in with those goals. These links, he pointed out, were powerful and critical. Placing these priorities into context and creating alliances with other sectors in dealing with these issues directly were areas that the CSO community needed to be cognizant of. Although CSOs and fisheries organizations were low in the power hierarchy, the strength of human capital and collective action could wield great influence.

Maria stressed the importance of the SSF Guidelines in providing more power to the struggles of small-scale fishers. In the context of Latin America, she highlighted the range of struggles, from the resistance against the elements of destruction to the imposed consumer-model of development on fishing communities. What was important, however, was the recognition by the communities themselves of their sustainable way of living and use of resources. It was

important, therefore, for CSOs to assist them in valorising their cultures and practices, and making them and their added value in society visible to the global community.

Continuing from Alain's concern regarding the takeover of control by other actors, Naína urged CSOs to take ownership of the SSF Guidelines on a political level. The terms of the fight for artisanal fisheries had to be redefined in light of the increasing number and diversity of external actors with differing agendas. The objective of safeguarding the environment as indicated within the objectives of the SSF Guidelines, she highlighted, served as an entry point for large conservation organizations, who were supported by large corporations. And although they advocated a participatory approach, in more practical terms, the participation of fishers was limited to providing knowledge and expertise. It was, therefore, imperative, she added, that the concerns and priorities of fishers be represented and included in all management plans, and their role as conservationists (and not predators) be acknowledged.

Speaking on behalf of FAO, Nicole thanked the workshop organizers and participants for providing valuable inputs that would help outline FAO's role as a facilitator and supporter through the implementation process. Referring to the role of CSOs in the process, she implored them to recognize, and act from their strengths of collective action and knowledge, the challenges and the opportunities in the sector, and the capacities and the potential, as was evident in the various presentations made through the workshop. A particularly important role for CSOs, Nicole added, was to bring these issues into the political agenda, not only on small-scale fisheries, but on food security and developmental agendas as well. Having

already come far in the process (CSOs were now regular participants at COFI, at the FAO Technical Consultations, Rio +20, etc.), it was important for CSOs to recognize their influential power.

She added that although the meetings and consultations at international forums could seem abstract or high-level, they were important in creating an enabling environment, which was necessary to realize concrete action at the community level.

She called for ICSF to continue this work and to expand the spaces and capacities, bringing in the youth and connecting different levels from the bottom up to the highest level. FAO also called upon CSOs, she said, to help continue the dialogue and bring the SSF Guidelines to life.

Having clarified that ICSF's role was that of a support organization and the organization did not claim to represent fishing communities, Sebastian asked in what way organizations like WFF and WFFP could benefit from ICSF's continued association in assisting the agenda to take the SSF Guidelines forward.

In addition to the key priorities highlighted in the text of the SSF Guidelines, he said, highlighting and according importance to aspects such as the contribution by the sector to food security and awareness raising should be taken up by organizations like FAO and other UN bodies to help small-scale fishers gain recognition.

Towards this end, Sebastian called upon global representative organizations like WFF and WFFP to create an enabling macro-space to valorise and bring greater attention to aspects that were not recognized in public debate. He added that the main struggle of small-scale fishing communities was protecting the space they occupied in relation to their

fisheries and livelihoods, a struggle which was increasing with new challenges arising both on land and at sea. While, at one level, the space for small-scale fisheries organizations needed to be created, at the other level, fisheries organizations, of their own volition, would need to try to resort to legal and political mechanisms, raising the profile of small-scale fisheries, as John had earlier highlighted.

Sebastian's final comment concerned the inclusion of three distinct communities in the process: local communities, migrant communities and indigenous peoples. He also pointed out the growing nature and diversity within the small-scale fisheries sector itself.

While the effort to be aware of the many dimensions of globalization was now acknowledged, it was equally important to be aware of the many dimensions of small-scale fisheries, and keep their interests in mind and include all nature of work or occupations.

Drawing inspiration from the dialogue at the workshop, Sebastian declared that he felt a tremendous positive energy and expected that by optimising the collective strength and relying on the complementarity between groups, a lot more than what the SSF Guidelines had stipulated could be achieved. It was possible, he said, to transcend the SSF Guidelines and expand the vision for small-scale fisheries.

René Schärer urged the CSO community to overcome the 'inferiority complex' and face and challenge the big powers. These organizations, he said, would rely heavily on the dialogue with CSOs and artisanal fishers, and here was the opportunity to help them change their minds by challenging their views and priorities. He pointed out that the two workshops of the GEF that were

slated for December would provide the right opportunity for this type of engagement, and he hoped that many CSOs would be present.

Naseegh responded to the comments on behalf of the panel. He confirmed Nicole's observation that the CSOs should draw from their collective strength and extensive knowledge, and nurture this capacity in order to strengthen their position and fight for greater rights and just development.

He also clarified, on behalf of WFFP, that ICSF had always been the greatest supporter of small-scale fisheries, and its role had never been misconstrued to that of representing fishing communities. What was of

particular concern to the fishing organizations, Naseegh said, was the influence of other organizations who were keen to use the opportunities the SSF Guidelines presented to further their own agendas. Although they claimed that their interests concerned the fishing community and that they intended to invest resources and energies in the sector, their priorities differed greatly.

Often, Naseegh claimed, certain marginalised sections of fisher societies were incentivised into accepting lucrative offers that did not hold their long-term interests at heart. It was, therefore, increasingly important that the distinction between the real supporters and others be made. 3

ICSF



A panel discussion at the ICSF Pondy Workshop on the role of civil society organizations in the implementation of the FAO SSF Guidelines

## Conclusion of the Workshop

In the concluding session of the Workshop, Jackie urged the participants to continue the important dialogue that had begun. She briefly summed up the events and discussions that had taken place over the course of the Workshop. The CSOs present at the Workshop, she said, would continue to be involved in various national and regional-level discussions, which would be crucial platforms to refine the plan of action towards implementation, and would include addressing the important processes and methodological issues. A constant endeavour, Jackie added, as was raised many times during the discussions at the Workshop, was to “take the global back to the local” and seek continued involvement and partnership at the local and community levels.

### Vote of thanks

Presenting the vote of thanks, Jackie began by thanking the staff of ICSF, in particular, Ramya Rajagopalan, Sebastian and Brian, who had given leadership to the vision they shared with Chandrika for the workshop to take the implementation of the SSF Guidelines forward. Together with the other staff at ICSF, especially with the support and hard work of Venugopalan, they had ensured that this meeting was a success.

Jackie thanked Vishnu, Sumana, Seema, Shuddhawati and Karthik, for investing their time and effort in the logistical planning for the workshop, and KG, Sudhakar and Siva for ensuring that issues of *SAMUDRA for Pondy*, dedicated to the workshop, were made available daily. She also

thanked Deepak, Sangeetha, Ganga, Gnanasekhar, Andal, Saras and Vasantha for their hard work in preparation for the workshop.


On behalf of the Animation Team, Jackie expressed her gratitude for the dedicated work of the ICSF staff in the four months leading up to the workshop, especially given the difficult and emotionally challenging circumstances that followed Chandrika’s disappearance.

Introducing the interpreters as a unique team, some of whom had been associated with ICSF for over 20 years, Jackie thanked them for their patience and hard work, and expressed her appreciation for them having provided the opportunity to the participants to communicate with each other and experience their shared humanity.

Jackie also thanked the technical audiovisual team and the staff at Le Pondy Hotel.

Finally, she thanked her colleagues on the Animation Team at ICSF who had contributed to the development and conceptualisation of the programme, and who would continue to work through the upcoming General Body meeting in shaping ICSF’s implementation plan.

On behalf of the social movement at WFF and WFFP, Naseegh thanked Chandrika for her dedication, hard work and support through the years.

On behalf of the participants of the workshop, René-Pierre extended his gratitude to Jackie for taking on the role of facilitator and working hard to ensure the success of the workshop. 

# Annexure 1

International Workshop on  
Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries:  
ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for  
Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the context of Food  
Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)

21 - 24 July 2014

## Programme

Day 1	Monday, 21 July 2014
12:30 – 13:00	<b>Introductory Session</b>
14:30 – 15:30	<b>Welcome and Introduction to the Workshop: Dedication of the Workshop to Chandrika Sharma</b> <i>Moderators: Vivienne Solis Rivera and Juan Carlos Cárdenas</i>
	<b>Tribute to Thomas Kocherry</b> <i>V Vivekanandan</i>
15:30 – 16:30	<b>Introduction to the SSF Guidelines: Objectives of the Workshop</b> <i>Presenters: Nalini Nayak and Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk</i>
	<b>The Road to Pondicherry: The Milestones Achieved by the CSOs on the Way to the SSF Guidelines: Setting the Stage for Implementation</b> <i>Presenter: Brian O’Riordan</i>
16:30 – 17:00	Tea
17:00 – 18:00	<b>Developing a Transformative Agenda towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: Opportunities and Limitations of the SSF Guidelines</b> <i>Presenter: Cornelia Quist</i> <i>Moderators: Jackie Sunde and Vivienne Solis Rivera</i>
18:00 – 18:30	<b>Group Discussion: What Will a Transformative Agenda Require of Us? Sharing amongst CSOs and brainstorming the key requirements that will make the implementation of the SSF Guidelines realize human rights and social justice</b>
19:30	Dinner
Day 2	Tuesday, 22 July 2014
	<b>Field Trips: Puducherry and Nagapattinam</b>
06:00	Good practices in fisheries governance and management, disaster risk mitigation and post-harvest fish trade: An exposure to examples in and around Puducherry and Nagapattinam, India: (i) Fisheries governance and traditional coastal communities; (ii) beach reclamation and protection of coastal communities; and (iii) post-harvest fish trade and women in fishing communities.
19:30	Dinner

**Day 3 Wednesday, 23 July 2014**

09:00 – 10:30	<p><b>Fishing Communities and Implementation of the SSF Guidelines: Issues Arising from Local, National and Regional Contexts</b></p> <p><i>1. Presentations from Netherlands, Central America (Honduras and Costa Rica), Caribbean, and West Africa.</i></p> <p><i>2. Presentations from India, Thailand and Brazil, and Indonesia</i></p>
10:30 – 11:00	Tea
11:00 – 12:00	<b>Group discussions and presentations</b> (continued)
12:00 – 14:00	<p><b>Feedback from groups in plenary</b></p> <p><i>Moderators: C M Muralidharan and Alain Marie Le Sann</i></p> <p><b>Questions, Responses, Discussions</b></p>
14:00 – 15:00	Lunch
15:00 – 16:00	<p><b>Implementing SSF Guidelines: A Perspective from FAO</b></p> <p><i>Presenter: Nicole Franz, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)</i></p> <p><i>Moderators: René Schärer and Beatriz Mesquita Pedrosa Ferreira</i></p>
16:00 – 16:30	Tea
16:30 – 18:00	<b>Group discussions</b>
19:30	Dinner

**Day 4 Thursday, 24 July 2014**

09:00 – 11:00	<b>Group discussions</b> (continued)
11:00 – 11:30	Tea
11:30 – 13:30	<p><b>Reporting of groups and discussions in plenary</b></p> <p><i>Moderators: Venkatesh Salagrama and Rosemarie Nyigulila Mwaipopo</i></p>
13:30 – 14:30	Lunch
14:30 – 16:00	<p><b>Panel Discussion: What is the Role of CSOs in Implementation?</b></p> <p><i>Vivienne Solis Rivera (Member, ICSF); Mogamad Naseegh Jaffer (WFFP and Masifundise Development Trust); Rolf Willmann (former Senior Fishery Planning Officer, FAO); Editrudith Lukanga (WFF and Environmental Management and Economic Development Organization (EMEDO)); and John Kurien (Member, ICSF)</i></p> <p><i>Moderators: Jackie Sunde and V. Vivekanandan</i></p>
16:00 – 16:30	Tea
16:30 – 17:30	<b>Panel Discussion and Plenary</b>
17:30 – 18:00	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p><b>Vote of Thanks</b></p>



# Annexure 2

---

## List of Participants

### ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

1. Mitchell Addison Lay

### BELGIUM

2. Brian O' Riordan

### BRAZIL

3. Beatriz Mesquita Pedrosa Ferreira
4. Maria José Honorato Pacheco
5. Náina Pierri
6. René Schärer

### CANADA

7. Sherry Mae Pictou

### CHILE

8. Juan Carlos Cárdenas
9. Zoila Soledad Bustamante Cardenas

### COSTA RICA

10. Henry García Zamora
11. Vivienne Solis Rivera

### FRANCE

12. Alain Marie Le Sann
13. Katia Frangoudes
14. Rene-Pierre Chever
15. Romain Le Bleis

### GERMANY

16. Rolf Willmann

### GHANA

17. Peter Linford Adjei

### HONDURAS

18. Carmen Alyeda Mencias

### INDIA

19. Debasis Shyamol
20. Harinarayan Mohanty
21. Ilango M
22. Jesu Rethinam
23. John Kurien
24. Muralidharan C M
25. Nalini Nayak
26. Nilanjana Biswas
27. Pradip Chatterjee
28. Probir Banerjee

29. Ujwala Jaykisan Patil

30. Venkatesh Salagrama

31. Vivekanandan V

### INDONESIA

32. Iin Rohimin
33. Masnu'ah Su'ud
34. Muhammad Adli Abdullah
35. Muhammad Riza Adha Damanik

### ITALY

36. Mauro Conti

### IVORY COAST

37. Micheline Somplehi Dion

### PERU

38. Juan Carlos Sueiro Cabredo

### REPUBLIC OF GUINEA

39. Mamayawa Sandouno

### SENEGAL

40. Gaoussou Gueye
41. Mamadou Niasse Lamine

### SOUTH AFRICA

42. Mogamad Naseegh Jaffer

### TANZANIA

43. Editrudith Lukanga
44. Rosemarie Nyigulila Mwaipopo

### THAILAND

45. Jinda Jittanang
46. Nitima Bintammangong
47. Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk
48. Somboon Khamhang

### THE NETHERLANDS

49. Cornelia Quist
50. Freerk Visserman

### VENEZUELA

51. Leo Walter González Cabellos

### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

52. Nicole Franz
53. Rebecca Metzner

**INTERPRETERS**

- 54. Joseph Burbidge
- 55. Rodrigo Gines Salguero
- 56. Audrey Christelle Mouysset
- 57. Tom Viart
- 58. Maria Sofia Dos Santos Alvares
- 59. Maria de La Merced De Rafael Ramos

**FACILITATOR**

- 60. Jackie Sunde

**ICSF SECRETARIAT**

- 61. Karthegheyan K

- 62. Kumar K G
- 63. Ramya Rajagopalan
- 64. Sebastian Mathew
- 65. Shuddhawati Peke
- 66. Sivasakthivel P
- 67. Sudakar T
- 68. Venugopalan N
- 69. Vishnu Narendran

**WORKSHOP DOCUMENTATION**

- 70. Seema Shenoy
- 71. Sumana Narayanan



COOPESOLIDAR R.L.  
Don Trino from Cabuya, Costa Rica,  
bringing home his daily catch

## Annexure 3

### Report on Puducherry and Nagapattinam Field Trips: Coastal Commons and Fish Marketing

The field trip to Puducherry was organized around the theme of “coastal commons and fish marketing”. The 20 participants started out at 5:45 a.m. from the workshop venue to the mouth of the Ariyankuppam River. On the way, Aurofilio Schiavina from the NGO PondyCAN joined the participants. Standing on the beach to the south of the river, Aurofilio explained that in 1986 a commercial harbour was built at the river mouth, in spite of the findings of a Central Water Power and Research Station (CWPRS) study carried out at the time noting that the harbour’s breakwaters would disrupt the natural movement of sand (the longshore littoral drift) along the coast and thereby cause erosion of the coast. The commercial harbour was never functional however, and therefore served as a fishing harbour. In the years since, as predicted, large-scale erosion was seen north of the harbour, depriving Puducherry town of its beach. A sand-bypass system was installed wherein sand would be pumped via a pipe to the north side of the river mouth. This was seldom used. Only rusted pipes and broken walls remained to indicate such a system existed.

The participants then headed into town to see the ‘beach’ in Puducherry town. Here a seawall had been constructed to protect the town from erosion. In spite of this, erosion continued. The last stop before breakfast was in a village to the north of the town where erosion had meant that the fishing community had no space to beach their boats, dry fish, mend nets, etc. In an attempt to recover

the lost beach, the governments of Puducherry and the neighbouring state of Tamil Nadu constructed groynes which led to some sand accumulation to the south of the groyne, but caused drastic erosion to the north of the groyne. The other measure has been construction of seawalls, which also blocked the fishing communities’ access to the sea.

After breakfast at Hotel Athiti, participants went to the French quarter of Puducherry to see the redesigned fish market on Gingee Road. Probir Banerjee of PondyCAN joined the group to explain how the fish market came about. The Puducherry government had planned a fish market in what was an open space on Gingee Road. There were many shortcomings to the design, which included little ventilation, no sustainable waste disposal system, no parking space, etc. After a prolonged standoff with the state, PondyCAN and the Indian National Trust for Architecture and Cultural Heritage (INTACH) were able to convince the government to build the market by incorporating their suggestions of a redesign. The market, redesigned after consultations with vendors and other stakeholders, had many windows to ensure ventilation, space for waste disposal, parking space, and so on. There was also a separate space for meat and fish vendors and those selling fruits, vegetables and flowers. However, as Probir Banerjee noted, due to some disagreement among the vendors, currently only a few fish vendors use the space. The vegetable vendors continued to sit outside in the open area.

After this visit, the participants returned to Hotel Athiti to hear in detail why the harbour had caused such extensive erosion. Aurofilio's excellent presentation spoke of how, along the east coast of India, sand is moved naturally and when a hard engineering structure is built, it changes this flow of sand. The harbour had caused accretion of sand to the south and erosion to the north. Today, the problem had spread to the neighbouring state of Tamil Nadu. And both state governments, instead of looking into beach nourishment options (wherein sand is moved from the south to the north of the harbour), were building seawalls and groynes in a misguided attempt to stem the erosion. Aurofilio also pointed out that this move had other environmental impacts. The seawalls and groynes consisted of boulders that were trucked from inland. So somewhere, mountains were getting destroyed, along with the forests that covered the mountains and a lot of fuel was spent in bringing these boulders. And over time, the boulders would sink into the sea floor, requiring more boulders to be brought to bulwark the groynes/seawalls.

The field trip highlighted to the participants the need to address how coastal development was pushing fishing communities to the brink. They were facing pressures from the sea and land; on the one hand, coastal development, and on the other, climate change, marine protected areas, and reduced fish catch, to name a few.

PondyCAN also gave a brief presentation of its work relating to environmental education in government schools.

After a late lunch, the participants returned to Le Pondy Hotel.

## **Field Trip Background Note: Puducherry**

Participants will get to interact with PondyCAN (Pondicherry—Citizens' Action Network) members who have been working since 2007 on the impact of development projects on the east coast of India, particularly in Puducherry (formerly called Pondicherry) and Tamil Nadu. Participants will get a chance to see the impact of one such development project—a harbour executed some time in the 1980s, which has deprived Puducherry town of its beach. Participants will also visit recently renovated fish markets in Puducherry.

### **Background**

The Union Territory of Puducherry comprises four regions, namely, Puducherry, Karaikal, Mahe and Yanam, with a total coastline of 45 km and 1,000 sq km of continental shelf that is rich in marine fisheries potential. It has a fisher population of 95,467 of which 29,383 are actively engaged in fishing. The fisher population is spread over 27 marine fishing villages and 23 inland fishing village/hamlets.

### **Coastal Erosion**

Puducherry is well-known for its beaches. In recent decades, human-induced erosion of the coast has increasingly become a problem due to poorly planned and executed development projects along the coast.

This erosion has badly affected fishing communities who have used the beach for various activities from drying fish, repairing nets, as a community space, to park their boats, etc. The problem is not limited to Puducherry alone. All along the east coast of India, coastal land is much in demand for various development

projects such as tourism, coal-powered plants, ports and various industries. In several areas, the erosion has been so drastic that the beach ends abruptly, forming a sandy cliff of several feet. In some villages, houses have caved in and playgrounds built on the beach have been lost.

India's Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) Notification (issued in 1991, and reissued in 2011) designates the area 500 m landward from the high-tide line as a space where activities are restricted. Activities that do not require waterfront are prohibited. Under the Notification, each state must prepare a Coastal Zone Management Plan where the different CRZ categories would be mapped. However, basic data such as high-tide line is yet to be defined for the entire coast, making such plans difficult to execute.

Simultaneously, large-scale development activities on the coast have increased. Ports and related activities have grown in number with the state allocating land (including community lands) through special economic zones, etc. To provide energy for the growing coastal development projects, coal-based power plants are dotting the coast. The seawater is used as a coolant and each power plant is meant to have a captive jetty to obtain imported coal. As identified by a virtual survey of the country's coast, there are 27 power plants and 59 more in the offing.

The impact of such development activities is becoming visible. The breakwaters and other structures constructed for ports and harbours have resulted in erosion, which has been aggravated by illegal sand mining in rivers and beaches, reduction in sediments and water reaching the coast, due to construction of dams, etc.

In 2004, according to government data, 1,214.75 km of the 5,422.6-km coastline was affected by sea erosion.

In 2012, it has gone up to 1,624.435 km, that is, almost one-third of the Indian coast is affected by erosion.

In Puducherry, some of the first coastal structures built were during the time when the region was a French colony. In the 1800s, the fortified town (what is now the French Quarter) was built on sand dunes. Between 1862 and 1965, a 250-m long pier was constructed, which was largely destroyed by a cyclone in 1952. Following this, a New Pier was constructed in 1962. However, the coast seems to have been fairly stable till the 1980s when a commercial harbour was built at the mouth of the Ariankuppam River to the south of Puducherry town. The harbour, with two breakwaters, it was recognized, would disrupt the natural movement of sand. For this reason, a sand by-passing and beach nourishment plan was envisaged but never really came to pass. Since the harbour came into being, erosion on the northern side of the harbour and steadily stretching north into neighbouring Tamil Nadu has been seen. The Puducherry government has been constructing seawalls, strengthening existing seawalls, and building groynes (stone walls extending into the sea) to mitigate erosion. Currently about 7 km of Puducherry's coast is armoured with seawalls. However, these have accelerated erosion, and blocked fishers' access to the sea. The groynes just push the erosion northwards; while sand accretes to the south of the groyne, the beach is eroded to the north. And the erosion is far greater than the accretion. For every square metre of beach gained from groyne construction, about 3.6 sq m of beach is lost.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ahana Lakshmi, Aurofilio Schiavina, Probir Banerjee, Ajit Reddu, Sunaina Mandeen, Sudarshan Rodriguez and Deepak Apte. The Challenged Coast of India. A report prepared by PondyCAN in collaboration with BNHS and TISS. October 2012.

### **Puducherry fish markets**

Puducherry has at least 20 fish markets—wholesale and retail. Recently, some of these markets were upgraded under the World Bank Project Tamil Nadu and Puducherry Coastal Disaster Risk Reduction Project. As part of the project, it was suggested to move the Goubert market to Gingee Road. The 27-year-old market covers an area of 1,576 sq km, with a built-up area of 1,180 sq ft. As per the municipal records, there are 339 fish vendors in the Goubert market with 16 cutters, where daily 4 to 5 tonnes of fish are sold every day. As part of the project, repair work was undertaken. This included repairing the existing roof, raising the floor level, building new benches and shelves for vendors and cutters, and regularization of water supply. Besides this, there is a wastewater treatment facility, and medical aid is available.

Another move was to construct a fully air-conditioned two-storey fish market in Lawspet on the East Coast Road. Spread across 37,886 sq ft and built at a cost of Rs 13 crore, this market was completed in 2014. There are as many as 110 stalls in the market with modern amenities and cold storage facilities. There is an auction hall for the fishermen too.

An effluent treatment plant is one of the biggest attractions of the market. It will treat effluents collected from the market and has been fitted with a 10-kv solar power plant to meet the requirements of the market. An ice plant with 10-tonne capacity has also been provided. This market has not been officially opened yet, and there are still modalities to be discussed for allocation of stalls to vendors. ❧

ICSF



The multilingual interpreters at the workshop, some of whom have been associated with ICSF for over 20 years, provided participants the opportunity to share their experiences

## Puducherry fisheries demographics

Source: Ministry of Agriculture, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi and CMFRI, Kochi (2012)

Marine Fisheries Census 2010 Part II. 5 Puducherry. CMFRI; Kochi.

District	Landing Centres	Fishing Villages	Fishermen Families	Traditional Fishermen Families	BPL (below-poverty-line) Families	Fisherfolk Population
Puducherry	16	17	7,088	7,086	5,193	25,892

District	Male			Female			Total	Average Family Size	Sex Ratio (Female per 1000 Males)
	Adult	Children		Adult	Children				
		Upto 5 yrs	Above 5 yrs		Upto 5 yrs	Above 5 yrs			
Puducherry	8,253	1,505	3,404	8,559	1,274	2,897	25,892	3.65	967

District	Primary		Higher Secondary		Above Higher Secondary		Unschoolled*	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Puducherry	2,916	3,045	4,595	3,963	1,200	791	2,946	3,657

\*Children below 5 years excluded

District	Actual Fishing		Fish Seed Collection				Total
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time		Part-time		
			Male	Female	Male	Female	
Puducherry	5,247	233	0	0	1	0	5,481

District	Active Fishermen	No. of members involved in fishing allied activities						Other than Fishing	Total Occupied
		Marketing of fish	Making/Repairing Net	Curing/Processing	Peeling	Labourer	Others		
Puducherry	5,481	2,625	3	68	18	471	232	821	9,719

District	Marketing of fish		Making/Repairing Net		Curing/Processing		Peeling		Labourer		Others*	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Puducherry	7	2618	1	2	1	67	0	18	448	23	113	119

\*Includes persons engaged in auctioning, ice breaking, collection of bivalves, collection of other shells, collection of seaweed, collection of ornamental fish etc.

<b>Table 7. Religion and Community (No. of Families)</b>					
District	Religion				Community
	Hinduism	Islam	Christianity	Total	SC/ST
Puducherry	7,077	0	11	7,088	6

<b>Table 8. Membership in Co-operatives</b>			
District	Members in		
	Fisheries Co-operatives	Other Co-operatives	Total
Puducherry	13,946	587	14,533

<b>Table 9. Fishermen Families Engaged in Aquaculture</b>		
District	Type of aquaculture	Acquired training
	Prawn	
Puducherry	0	159

<b>Table 10. Life Saving Equipment and Electronic Equipment (No. of Families)</b>				
District	Life Saving Equip-ment	Electronic/Communication Gadgets		
		Mobile Phone	GPS	Others
Puducherry	725	1,307	31	13

<b>Table 11. Fishing Craft in the Fishery</b>						
District	Trawlers	Gillnetters	Total Mechanized	Motorized	Non-Motorized	Total
Puducherry	242	2	244	1,139	531	1,914

<b>Table 16. Infrastructure - Housing and Education (in the Villages)</b>								
District	No. of Villages	No. of Families	Housing		Education			
			Kutchu Houses	Pucca houses	Primary	Secondary	College	Technical Institutions
Puducherry	17	7,088	2,817	4,271	15	3	1	1

No. of fishing villages	Villages having						
	Electricity	Bus Stop/ Stand	Hospitals	Police Station	Post Offices	Mobile Phone Coverage	Internet Facility
17	15	15	4	0	3	11	1
	Banks	Fishworkers Co-operative Societies	Other Co-operative Societies	Community Centres	Cinema Theatres	Liquor Shops	
	1	15	1	9	1	5	

<b>Table 18. Infrastructure - Fishery-related (in the Villages)</b>			
District	Boat Yards	Ice Factories	Cold Storages
Puducherry	16	8	7



## Tentative Field Trip Programme

- 5.30 Leave hotel
- 6.00 – 7.00 Visit harbour at Ariyankuppam
- 7.00 – 8.30 Visit fish markets
- 9.00 – 10.30 Breakfast
- 10.45 – 13.00 Interaction with PondyCAN members
- 13.00 – 14.00 Lunch

## Further Reading

1. AhanaLakshmi, Aurofilio Schiavina, Probir Banerjee, Ajit Reddu, Sunaina Mandeem, Sudarshan Rodriguez and Deepak Apte. The Challenged Coast of India. A report prepared by PondyCan in collaboration with BNHS and TISS. October 2012.
2. The World Bank. Environmental Assessment and Management Plan for the Proposed Improvements to the Existing Fish Markets at Puducherry. 2013.

## List of Participants

1. Sumana Narayanan
2. Shuddhawati Peke
3. Brian O’Riordan
4. Rene-Pierre Chever
5. Rodrigo Gines Salguero
6. Ravadee Prasertcharoensuk
7. Ekaterini Frangoudes
8. Juan Carlos Sueiro
9. Juan Carlos Cardenas
10. René Schärer
11. Muralidharan C M
12. Leo Walter González Cabellos
13. Joseph Burbidge
14. Mogamad Naseegh Jaffer
15. Sherry Pictou
16. Nalini Nayak
17. Pradip Chatterjee
18. Debasis Shyamol
19. Jinda Jittanang
20. Ilango M
21. Probir Bannerjee (PondyCAN)
22. Aurofilio Schiavina (PondyCAN)
23. Sunaina Mandeem (PondyCAN)



The concluding session of the ICSF Pondy Workshop. The meeting has unleashed a tremendous positive energy, which can be expected to take forward the process of implementation of the SSF Guidelines.

## Annexure 4

### **Report on Nagapattinam Field Trip: Traditional Governance Systems: Good Practices in Fisheries Management, Governance and Women's Role in Governance and Post-harvest Fish Trade**

The field visit began at 7 a.m. on the beach at Tharangambadi village in Nagapattinam district, a three-and-a-half hour bus ride away from the workshop venue. The group first visited the auction site to witness the auction of the day's catch. What particularly impressed the participants was the manner in which the auction was being carried out, as did the presence of many women who were the principal buyers of fish at the auction. After breakfast at the community hall in the village, the participants were taken to a hotel in Karaikal (the nearest town) to freshen up and were brought back to the community hall for a meeting with members of the *ooru panchayat* (the local unit of governance).

#### **Interactions with the *ooru panchayat***

Ten members of the *ooru panchayat*, including the head of the *panchayat*, were present at the meeting. Vivek who played the role of facilitator and translator of the session, introduced ICSF and the members to the *ooru panchayat*. He also provided a brief introduction to the SSF Guidelines in setting the context for the discussions that were to follow. The dialogue commenced with a brief round of introductions on both sides, before the *panchayat* members suggested that the participants ask them specific questions regarding issues they wanted to discuss. The head of the *panchayat*, Ganesan, answered most of the questions, with occasional

inputs from other members. The absence of the representation of women in the *panchayat*, as noted by the workshop participants, was in seeming contradiction to the fact that the district included the highest number of women involved in fish marketing in Tamil Nadu.

In response to questions from the participants regarding the election of the *panchayat* and its structure and functioning, Ganesan explained that the village elected the *ooru panchayat*, which comprised of around 15–20 members. The primary responsibility of the *panchayat* was to maintain peace and order in the village (*gramakattupadu*), resolve conflicts, manage village funds and oversee general administration. When asked about whether their authority was recognized by external agencies and the government, they responded that because of the responsibility entrusted to them by the community members themselves, almost all of the disputes were internally resolved. There were occasional instances where people were dissatisfied with the decision and had sought outside intervention through the police. However, since the functioning of the *panchayat* closely resembled that of a formal court, the decisions were generally accepted, even by the government: as long as the community members were happy and there was peace in the village, the administrative burden on the government was reduced, so they respected the *panchayat's* authority. When asked what were the most

common types of conflict, and if fisheries-based conflicts were frequent, they replied that fisheries-related conflicts mostly arose from conflict over fishing grounds, where one fisherman's gear would get entangled in another's gear, etc. The most common type of conflict came from boundary disputes between neighbours. Inability to repay debts to moneylenders was another cause of dispute that arose frequently. The *ooru panchayat's* role also extended to resolving conflicts within the family, for example, between husband and wife.

While the members of the *panchayat* deferred questions regarding unsustainable fishing practices, they were also unwilling to comment on the issue of the absence of women in the *panchayat*. The group decided, on Vivek's recommendation, to reserve questions regarding declining fish resources and fisheries management to the fishermen's federation, members of whom would meet the group after lunch.

He also offered the explanation that the *ooru panchayat's* stand at this forum would constitute an official statement, and their reluctance to answer questions on the absence of women was in deference to the traditional norms of the community, and did not necessarily reflect their individual opinions on the issue.

The *panchayat*, however, was forthcoming in responding to questions regarding lessons learned from the December 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. The district of Nagapattinam was the most severely affected, and the *ooru panchayat* played a pivotal role in ensuring fair and efficient distribution of relief material. In the long-term recovery process, they also ensured that the education of their children was given prime importance.

The session concluded with Zoila of CONAPACH and Adli from

Indonesia presenting the members of the *ooru panchayat* with a gift as a token of appreciation on behalf of the workshop participants. Zoila also presented them with the flag of the International Conference on Women in Fisheries, which took place in Chile the previous year. The leader of the *ooru panchayat* then presented the vote of thanks. He thanked the group for their visit.

### ***Interactions with Members of the Fisheries Co-operative***

In the following session, Vivek introduced the fishing co-operative and provided a brief background of the co-operative and the model that it operated on. Touching upon the important milestones that punctuated the long history of the network of co-operatives across Tamil Nadu and Kerala, he highlighted how the three-tier system—the village-level co-operative society, the district-level federation and the apex body, which is the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS)—came to be a viable model. Currently, he said, SIFFS comprised of around 40,000 members (and accounted for about 10,000 boats). He also outlined the other functions assumed by SIFFS (for example, distribution of outboard motors). Pre-empting concerns about the absence of women at the meeting, he explained that the co-operative was also a male-dominated organization since its membership was primarily sea-going fishermen.

In response to questions from the participants regarding the benefits from the co-operative, they explained that a key and empowering benefit was that the fishermen were liberated from the cycle of borrowing and repaying loans to moneylenders, and that they were now able to better manage and track their finances. A democratic model of functioning also enabled the participation of

all members and ensured that the decisions taken were reflective of common demands and did not favour vested interests. All members were expected to express their solidarity and give back to the co-operative, and action was taken against members who exploited the system for personal gain.

The participants were also eager to learn about how they perceived the changing nature of the fisheries resources. The co-operative members mentioned an observed decline in fish catch, which was a serious issue. They identified certain methods of fishing (especially trawling and the use of ring-seines, night fishing, etc.), which were contributing to the declining trend.

While they expressed the need to impose restrictions on the more exploitative forms of fishing, they said that the responsibility lay with the *panchayat*, since the co-operative had no authority. On certain issues the local *panchayat* was keen to take action, but decisionmaking was always hindered by the fact that all 64 villages in the district needed to come to a consensus before a rule was passed.

Another concern that was raised was regarding the mechanization of boats. The members of the co-operative pointed out that the new nets and fibre boats enabled with GPS devices allowed them to fish in deeper waters and for longer periods of time. Vivek helpfully pointed out that the mechanization within the small-scale sector could not be examined in isolation; across the country, the small-scale sector was in constant competition with the large-scale boats.

The session concluded with the presentation of a gift from the ICSF Trust and workshop participants to the members of the co-operative.

### ***Interactions with Members of SNEHA and the Women's Federation***

After having lunch at the community hall, the participants met with members of Social Need Education and Human Awareness (SNEHA), a women's organization in Karaikal. The group of women that met with the workshop participants also included members of the district Women's Federation in Karaikal and Nagapattinam. They welcomed the participants and expressed their appreciation of the work that was being carried out in support of fishworkers around the world. They then sang a Tamil song, which was later translated into English by Jesu Rethinam of SNEHA; it was a call to all women to unite and fight. The opening lines "*We will break open the door which has been closed for so long/ We will come together and fight for our rights...*" embodied the true spirit and message of their struggle. Vivek then introduced the participants to the group. He briefly talked about the workshop and the SSF Guidelines and the objectives and principles of the SSF Guidelines that made this particular meeting relevant and important to the participants.

Jesu Rethinam then made a presentation to introduce SNEHA, its history and its activities, and emphasized the inclusive vision of working with gender (through gender-responsive action, by trying to include women in governance structures) and caste issues, sustainable environmental development, protection of livelihood rights and common resources, disaster management, good governance, etc. Their strategies included mobilizing and organizing the community, especially women. She also briefly talked about the producer company that was established and is being run completely by women from fishing communities.

Through various efforts of the collective, the women now had an undeniable presence and voice in many decision-making processes in the community. Vanaja, Secretary of SNEHA, facilitated the discussions that followed.

The interaction began with an exchange of the traditional African applause that Mamayawa heartily offered to teach the gathering.

In response to questions regarding their role in governance structures, and whether their empowerment had impacts on their domestic lives, the women responded that although they now only enjoyed a 33 per cent reservation in the local governing body, the struggle to demand greater representation was ongoing. A positive result of this struggle had been the unofficial, yet increasing, requests from the traditional *panchayats* to call upon their strength for public action. Their opinions on important matters were being considered. This also meant that the women, who were earlier restricted to the confines of their homes, now shared a platform and negotiated with the men. Directly linked to this changing role was the increasing confidence with which women participated in community affairs, which had positive implications for how they were treated at home, and how they perceived their own roles in the household. A committee to prevent violence against women was instituted in each village, to mediate where necessary and offer assistance in resolving disputes. The women felt that although domestic violence was still a serious issue within the community, the frequency and intensity of incidents had reduced considerably.

Drawing similarities with the situation in some communities in Africa, some participants expressed concern regarding the working conditions for women, especially in the

post-harvest processes. In response, the women mentioned that there had been considerable improvements in the sector: Tharangambadi now had a hygienic handling centre, ice boxes were provided in the boats, the site was cleaned after each auction, and so on.

Many participants asked about prevailing patterns of patriarchy (dowry, polygamy, etc.) and if the women saw any perceived changes with the process of coming together and getting organized. Jesu cited the example of what was commonly known as ‘dowry of death’, obligatory gifts that were given to members of a family where a death had occurred. There was a departure of meaning and significance of what was presented as a ‘gift’, with the growing pressure to establish one’s status in society, and therefore present more and more expensive gifts. The women’s collective successfully convinced the *panchayats* to take a decision to ban the practice. They also took up the issue of child marriages, which saw a steady rise in the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami. By demanding age certificates before marriage, the *panchayat* successfully stopped the practice.

Responding to a question on how the women collectively influence decisionmaking, Jesu said that the women were organized not to consciously come together and exercise dominance, but to find a way to address their common struggles. The Federation also supported a women-only producer company based on a model where they found that finances are better managed when the women have access and control over them.

The session ended with an exchange of gifts and embraces, and Mamayawa’s cheers. A few of the women and participants danced and sang together, and the participants made their way back to Le Pondy Hotel.

## Field Trip Background

### Note: Nagapattinam

*Traditional Governance Systems: Good practices in fisheries management, governance and women's role in governance and post-harvest fish trade*

The field trip will be to the coastal district of Nagapattinam in Tamil Nadu state, South India. The participants will get to interact with members of the traditional fishing community governance body, the *ooru panchayat* (traditional unit of local governance), along with the staff of the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS), and also to interact with a local organization, Social Need Education and Human Awareness (SNEHA), which has been working with fisherwomen in the area since 1984. Participants will also get an opportunity to visit the local fishing harbour.

## Background

In India, the fisheries sector provides direct employment to over 1.5 mn people, besides those who are involved in allied activities. The total fish production of India in 2012 stood at 8.67 mn tonnes. Production from marine capture fisheries was 3.37 mn tonnes, with the rest coming from inland fisheries. The fisheries sector accounts for 4.15 per cent of agriculture and allied sectors' share of the country's gross domestic product (GDP).<sup>1</sup>

According to the Marine Fisheries Census 2010, there are 3,288 fishing villages in the maritime states and two Union Territories. The total fisherfolk population of the country is 3,999,214, with the southern state of Tamil Nadu accounting for 20.1 per cent.

In the marine fisheries sector there are 194,490 craft in India, out of

which 37.3 per cent are mechanized, 36.7 per cent are motorized and 26 per cent non-motorized. In Tamil Nadu, 77.5 per cent of the fishing fleet is mechanized and the rest are non-motorized.<sup>2</sup>

In India, fisheries are under the Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries (DAHDF), of the Ministry of Agriculture. Each state has a department of fisheries through which state schemes for fishermen/fisherwomen are implemented. Fisheries up to the limit of the territorial sea (12 nautical miles from the base line) are a state subject and therefore each state may legislate on this sector. Most of the nine coastal states (and two Union Territories) have enacted the Marine Fisheries Regulation Act (MFRA).

## Nagapattinam: fisheries management, governance

Nagapattinam has a coastline of 187.9 km across the Coramandel coast and Palk Bay. The district has nearly 20,800 traditional fishermen families, in 57 fishing villages. There are 22,229 active fishermen fishing full time. Women are involved in marketing fish, repairing nets, curing and processing fish, and also work as daily wage labourers at landing sites. There are nearly 6,300 women involved in marketing of fish, making Nagapattinam the district with the highest number of women involved in marketing in Tamil Nadu. There are over 900 trawlers, 4,000 motorized fishing vessels, and 1,146 non-motorized fishing craft in the district.

The fishing community in this coastal district belong to the Pattinavar caste though they go by several names in different areas. While the community's oral history claims various origins, there is little in terms

<sup>1</sup> Annual Report 2012-13, DAHDF <http://dahd.nic.in/dahd/WriteReadData/Annual%20Report%202012-13%20EFG.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Marine Fisheries Census 2010. Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, Cochin: India.

of historical accounts. The earliest accounts date to about 600 years ago. The villagers are typically from the same caste and related through kinship groupings, making for a strong sense of community.

The fishing communities in Nagapattinam, like many others on this coast, have internal governance structures that have been used to resolve fishing and non-fishing conflicts. These structures not only mediate on fishing-related matters, but also on social and religious issues. An important traditional governance structure is the *ooru panchayat*—a village governing body. The basic role of the *ooru panchayat* is to maintain *grama kattupadu*, that is, the peace and order in the village. The *ooru panchayat* also mediates on a variety of issues with other villages, *panchayats* and government bodies.

The *ooru panchayat* makes pronouncements on several contentious issues, be they within the village or between villages. The severity of the pronouncements will depend on the nature of dispute; the *ooru panchayat* might provide counselling to resolve an issue between people amicably, failing which there might be public reprimands, fines or, in more extreme cases, severing of ties with the community. The last option could be an economic boycott or combined with social boycott and public humiliation.

However, today public humiliation is not considered appropriate anymore.<sup>3</sup> The *ooru panchayat* is traditionally dominated by men; the women have their own market and shop organizations run on similar lines.

<sup>3</sup> Gomathy, N.B. "The Role of Traditional Panchayats in Coastal Fishing Communities in Tamil Nadu, with Special Reference to their Role in Mediating Tsunami Relief and Rehabilitation." In *Proceedings-Regional Workshop on Post-Tsunami Rehabilitation of Fishing Communities & Fisheries Based Livelihoods 2006*, 211-244, Chennai: ICSF, 2006.

The *ooru panchayat* is a part of a tiered governance system; every eight or 16 villages will have a head village; these will be a part of a 64-village network with a head village. Within each village, all married men above the age of 20 years are members of the *panchayat*. This traditional governance structure is currently in various stages of breakdown. The state has contributed to this breakdown in the last several decades with its promotion of rapid expansion of the fisheries sector and by taking over all governance powers on behalf of the sector. This has led to an 'open-access' regime with an influx of 'outsiders' into fishing. The resulting heterogeneity has changed the social, economic and political community structure.

Nagapattinam had one of the highest death tolls in the state from the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. In the post-tsunami scenario, the *ooru panchayats* showed their mettle. There were various organizations bringing relief materials and money: state organizations, religious charities, and development organizations. The *ooru panchayats* assessed the damage within days of the tsunami and organized distribution of relief. Relief material was deposited either in the temple, the *panchayat* office, or the school. Once enough relief material to distribute to all had accumulated, the distribution commenced. If relief organizations were not willing to follow this model, the aid was refused. The arrival of relief material was announced over a microphone so all in the village could bear witness. Accounts were meticulously maintained by the *panchayat*. The *panchayat* had to enumerate all community members and allot/distribute relief.

While the initial relief efforts saw some confusion—not all in the village were counted, or the State's records varied from that of the *panchayat*,



and some, as a result, missed out on receiving relief—in many villages, the *panchayats* quickly evolved relief distribution methods, which were presented to the larger community and agreed upon. Villages also set up new processes to ensure greater transparency such as monthly meetings to review community accounts. Evaluation studies indicate there was greater equity in distribution of relief in the artisanal fishing subsector than in the mechanized subsector due to the *panchayat's* involvement and power. Where this system was not effective was in providing compensation for women who had suffered losses. Women (such as widows with no male heir) got a smaller share. *Panchayats* only passed on any monies specifically earmarked by the relief agency for women; otherwise they did not see their role as one of reaching out to the vulnerable.

Post-tsunami, most of the *panchayats* have changed—some as part of normal procedure, but others because of insufficient competence and accountability issues. In villages which had long-standing internal conflicts, for example, the relief distribution aggravated these conflicts.

Nagapattinam has the strongest traditional institutions in the state of Tamil Nadu in terms of the fishing community acknowledging these bodies.<sup>4</sup> In fact, only in this district are the *ooru panchayats* so strong that they have ensured that no other group (based on gear or mechanized boats) can form an organization. This is true of both Hindu and Christian fishing communities, though this does not hold true at the larger level of fisheries resource management. ❧

---

<sup>4</sup> Vivekanandan, V. "Nagai-Karai Fisheries Management Council." In *Common Voices Issue 5*, 16-17, India: FES, 2011.  
<http://iasc2011.fes.org.in/>

**SSF Guidelines and Traditional Governance**

5.4 ...Local norms and practices, as well as customary or otherwise preferential access to fishery resources and land by small-scale fishing communities, including indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities, should be recognized, respected and protected in ways that are consistent with international human rights law.

10.2 ...Where appropriate, formal planning systems should consider methods of planning and territorial development used by small-scale fishing and other communities with customary tenure systems, and decision-making processes within those communities.

**CCRF:**

7.6.6 When deciding on the use, conservation and management of fisheries resources, due recognition should be given, as appropriate, in accordance with national laws and regulations, to the traditional practices, needs and interests of indigenous people and local fishing communities which are highly dependent on fishery resources for their livelihood.

10.1.3 States should develop, as appropriate, institutional and legal frameworks in order to determine the possible uses of coastal resources and to govern access to them taking into account the rights of coastal fishing communities and their customary practices to the extent compatible with sustainable development.

**Nagapattinam:  
Post-harvest Fish Trade**

As mentioned earlier, Nagapattinam has the maximum number of women involved in marketing and other post-harvest activities in the state of Tamil Nadu. Women from fishing communities have been organized into different types of organizations (self-help groups, federations, etc.). SNEHA has been working with women’s federations and training has been provided to them, to establish people’s markets to sell products directly. There are village co-ordination *sangams* (VCS) where women participate and there are cluster-level meetings, as well, where women

leaders participate. Increasingly, the women have been focusing on participating in local governance mechanisms, combating violence against women at the community level and availing benefits under basic entitlements. These women have sought drinking water and drainage facilities, primary health centres, common toilets, repair of roads, and adequate public transport facilities. They have been petitioning local administrations to address these demands. The women have also formed committees to protect women against violence, and have been active in discussing with the traditional *panchayat* leaders to put an end to such practices.

***SSF Guidelines and Women in Post-harvest Trade***

Paragraph 6.5: 5. States should recognize as economic and professional operations the full range of activities along the small-scale fisheries value chain – both pre- and post-harvest; whether in an aquatic environment or on land; undertaken by men or by women. All activities should be considered: part-time, occasional and/or for subsistence. Professional and organizational development opportunities should be promoted, in particular for more vulnerable groups of post-harvest fish workers and women in small-scale fisheries.

Paragraph 7.2. All parties should recognize the role women often play in the post-harvest subsector and support improvements to facilitate women's participation in work. States should ensure that amenities and services appropriate for women are available as required in order to enable women to retain and enhance their livelihoods in the post-harvest subsector.

ICSF



Gender mainstreaming, organization of women at the local level, and their education and livelihood opportunities were discussed at the Pondy Workshop on SSF Guidelines

## Nagapattinam fisheries demographics

Source: Ministry of Agriculture, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi and CMFRI, Kochi (2012)

Marine Fisheries Census 2010 Part II. 4 Tamil Nadu. CMFRI; Kochi.

**Table 1. District Profile**

Landing Centres	Fishing Villages	Fishermen Families	Traditional Fishermen Families	BPL Families	Fisherfolk Population
41	57	21,122	20,854	13,927	84,369

**Table 2. Population Distribution Structure**

Male			Female			Total	Avg Family Size	Sex Ratio (Females per 1000 Males)
Adult	Children		Adult	Children				
	Upto 5 years	Above 5 years		Upto 5 years	Above 5 years			
28,738	4,277	10,652	26,984	4,019	9,699	84,369	3.99	932

**Table 3. Educational Status**

Primary		Higher Secondary		Above Higher Secondary		Unschooler*	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
11,822	10,434	10,753	9,043	2,174	1,593	14,641	15,613

\* Children below 5 Years excluded

**Table 4. Active Fisherfolk**

Actual Fishing		Fish Seed Collection				Total
Full Time	Part Time	Full Time		Part Time		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
22,229	804	172	62	4	18	23,289

**Table 5. Occupational Profile**

Active Fishermen	No. of members involved in fishing-allied activities							Total Occupied
	Marketing of fish	Making/Repairing Net	Curing/Processing	Peeling	Labourer	Others	Other than Fishing	
23,289	6,718	696	1,965	63	1,385	388	370	34,874

**Table 6. Gender-wise Fishing Allied Activities**

Market-ing of fish		Making/Repair-ing Net		Curing/Process-ing		Peeling		Labourer		Others*	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
415	6,303	426	270	138	1,827	21	42	915	470	43	345

\*Includes persons engaged in auctioning, ice breaking, collection of bivalves collection of other shells, collection of seaweed, collection of ornamental fish etc.

**Table 7. Religion and Community (No. of Families)**

Religion					Community
Hinduism	Islam	Christianity	Others	Total	SC/ST
20,659	122	341	0	21,122	257

**Table 8. Membership in Co-operatives**

Members in		
Fisheries Co-operatives	Other Co-operatives	Total
34,452	838	35,290

**Table 9. Fishermen Families Engaged in Aquaculture**

Type of Aquaculture						Acquired Training
Fish	Prawn	Crab	Lobster	Seaweed	Total	
2	7	0	0	0	9	42

**Table 10. Life Saving Equipment and Electronic Equipment (No. of Families)**

Life Saving Equipment	Electronic/Communication Gadgets		
	Mobile Phone	GPS	Others
9,531	9,118	189	20

**Table 11. Fishing Craft in the Fishery**

Trawlers	Gillnetters	Liners	Ring Seiners	Others	Total Mechanized	Motorized	Non-Motorized	Total
927	0	0	0	0	927	4,016	1,146	6,089

**Table 16. Infrastructure - Housing and Education (in the Villages)**

No. of vil-lages	No. of Fami-lies	Housing		Education			
		Kutcha houses	Pucca houses	Primary	Secondary	College	Technical Institutions
57	21,122	5,067	16,055	63	27	2	0

**Table 17. Infrastructure/Facilities (in the Villages)**

No. of fish-ing vil-lages	No. of Villages having						
	Electricity	Bus Stop/ Stand	Hospitals	Police Station	Post Office	Mobile Phone Coverage	Internet Facility
57	57	49	16	6	33	57	1
	Banks	Fishworker Cooperative Societies	Other Cooperative Societies	Community Centres	Cinema Theatre	Liquor Shops	
	7	48	7	51	2	11	

**Table 18. Infrastructure - Fishery related (in the Villages)**

Boat Yards	Ice Factories	Cold Stor-ages	Freezing plants	Curing yards	Peeling sheds	Processing plants	Extraction plants
7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Tentative Field Trip Programme

4.00	Leave for Nagapattinam
7.00	Reach Nagapattinam
7.30 – 8.30	Visit landing centre and auction hall
8:30 – 10.00	Breakfast
10.00 – 11.00	Meet <i>ooru panchayat</i>
11.00 – 12.00	Presentation by <i>ooru panchayat</i> followed by interaction with <i>ooru panchayat</i>
12.00 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.45	Presentation by SNEHA members and an interaction with sangam members
15.45 – 16.00	Tea break
16.00	Leave for Puducherry
19.00	Reach hotel

## Further reading

1. [indianfisheries.icsf.net](http://indianfisheries.icsf.net)
2. <https://sites.google.com/site/fimsul/home/work-packages/work-package-1/district-reports>
3. Pattinavars of Tamil Nadu: <http://indianfisheries.icsf.net/images/stories/indian/pattanavar.pdf>
4. Women's welfare schemes in Tamil Nadu
5. <http://indianfisheries.icsf.net/images/stories/indian/01-Tamil-Nadu.pdf>
6. <http://indianfisheries.icsf.net/en/page/617-Women%20in%20fisheries.html>

## List of participants

1. Peter Linford Adjei
2. Harinarayan Mohanty
3. Beatriz Mesquita
4. Maria José
5. Naína Pierri
6. Ujwala Jaykisan Patil
7. Alain Marie Le Sann
8. Mamadou Niasse Lamine
9. Romain Le Bleis
10. Mamayawa Sandouno
11. Zoila Bustamente
12. Vivienne Solis Rivera
13. Henry García Zamora
14. Carmen Alyeda Mencias
15. Micheline Somplehi Dion
16. Freerk Visserman
17. Rebecca Metzner
18. Rosemarie Nyigulila Mwaipopo
19. Rolf Willmann
20. Mauro Conti
21. Editrudith Lukanga
22. Muhammad Adli Abdullah
23. Muhammad Riza Adha Damanik
24. Masnu'ah Su'ud
25. Iin Rohimin
26. Somboon Khamhang
27. Nitima Bintammangong
28. Maria Sofia Dos Santos Alvares
29. Audrey Christelle Mouysset
30. Maria de La Merced De Rafael
31. Tom Viart
32. Nicole Franz
33. Mitchell Lay
34. Venugopalan N
35. Cornelie Quist
36. Seema Shenoy
37. Jesu Rethinam
38. Vivekanandan V

# Annexure 5

## Feedback from Participants

The participants of the workshop were asked the following questions and their responses combined.

### Relevance of the Workshop

#### 1. Overall relevance of the workshop to your area of work

Participants were unanimous in noting that overall, the workshop was very relevant to their work.

#### 2. Presentations made in the workshop

Overall the presentations were interesting and enlightening but some participants felt they needed a stronger connection to the Guidelines. However, they noted that the presentations gave the broad picture of small-scale fisheries issues in different contexts and highlighted the long process ahead of us. A few participants felt that some presentations were too long, and that more time for discussion was needed.

#### 3. Field Trip to Nagapattinam

Participants felt the field trip was excellent, well organized and very interesting even if the trip was rather long.

#### 4. Field Trip to Pondicherry

The field trip, participants, noted was excellent and that several of them learnt quite a bit from the interactions.

#### 5. Group discussions

Participants found the discussions to be diverse but rich, helping to build the bigger picture of national and regional contexts. There were some problems in terms of equipment (the spiders and microphones) and that sometimes with the varied accents of speakers, translation/understanding was difficult. Participants also wanted more discussion time.

### Structure of the Workshop

#### 1. Participatory

An unanimous yes

#### 2. Time for discussions and reflections

Many participants felt more time was needed or at least better organized.

#### 3. Any other comments/suggestions:

Well-organized, great logistics support.

Perhaps small group workshops could be organized for deeper discussions (and it would be less tiring).

Translation equipment issues need to be sorted.

Must take forward the ideas expressed here. No clear follow up plan was made.

Since time was so tight, more information sharing before the workshop might have helped.

LePondy staff were very hospitable and friendly.



The ICSF Pondy Workshop was dedicated to Chandrika Sharma, who made various contributions in the fight to protect the rights of marginalized people, especially those in small-scale fisheries





SHILPI SHARMA

Woman seaweed diver in  
Ramanathapuram, India

## INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON

### Towards Socially Just and Sustainable Fisheries: ICSF Workshop on Implementing the FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines)

# Report

This publication is a report of the proceedings of the ICSF Pondy Workshop, which focused on the FAO's Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines). The workshop brought together 71 participants from 20 countries representing civil society organizations, governments, FAO, academia and fishworker organizations from both the marine and inland fisheries sectors.

This report will be found useful for fishworker organizations, researchers, policymakers, members of civil society and anyone interested in small-scale fisheries, food security and poverty eradication.



ICSF is an international NGO working on issues that concern fishworkers the world over. It is in status with the Economic and Social Council of the UN and is on ILO's Special List of Non-Governmental International Organizations. It also has Liaison Status with FAO. As a global network of community organizers, teachers, technicians, researchers and scientists, ICSF's activities encompass monitoring and research, exchange and training, campaigns and action, as well as communications.