



## **POLICY NOTE**

# **STRENGTHENING MECHANISMS FOR FAST TRACKING IMPLEMENTATION OF FISHERIES MANAGEMENT APPROACHES AND TOOLS**

### *Summary*

The fisheries management approaches and tools (co-management, marine protected areas (MPA), ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF), wealth-based fisheries (WBFM) and rights-based fisheries management (RBFM) have been and are being promoted in AU MS mainly the aegis of donor projects, with the assumption that national departments could take over the activities at the end of the projects. The overall results have been mixed.

When key socioeconomic, contextual and institutional conditions are in place, with good design and successful implementation, the rewards are many; the approaches and tools can help sustain fisheries and livelihoods of people that depend on the aquatic environment

The approaches and tools provide resource users with a greater say in making and enforcing rules for small-scale fisheries. However, the policy actions necessary to make these management approaches and tools improve people's livelihoods are a substantial departure from

familiar activities of many fisheries managers.

Mechanisms to fast track their implementation include:

- Awareness raising and public education
- Promotion of policy and legislative Frameworks
- Capacity building and training
- Improved communication, Information and Experience sharing
- Establishing durable funding mechanisms

Effective implementation requires forging partnerships with other services beyond the fisheries sector, social scientists, donors, financial institutions, and civil society.

### *Background*

Africa is endowed with huge marine and freshwater living resources that provide socio-economic benefits to the citizens of the continent. The conventional approach to manage these fisheries has consisted of a combination of input and output controls and technical measures. Presently, most commercially fish species are overexploited or fully exploited. The non-target species



are also affected. The health of the aquatic ecosystems is similarly affected due to unsustainable practices

Fisheries managers are still struggling to find ways to remove the incentives for destructive competition due to common property nature of fisheries resources. Centralized management of the fisheries by the state alone has been identified as one of the major contributing factors to the problems of fisheries management. Apart from increasing ineffectiveness, sole state management has generally become too costly. At the same time, it is thought that purely local level management might also prove to be ineffective in the complex modern world of multiple stakeholders.

In the last three decades, approaches to management and governance of fisheries resources are undergoing a significant transition. There is a shift towards conservation and ecosystem-based management, away from stock-and-species based management. There is also the emphasis on resource rent (wealth) as a central concept. In terms of governance interest has turned to models and management strategies which emphasize resource users' participation or involvement and decentralization of management authority and responsibility.

In this regard, some of the management approaches and tools including; Co-management, Marine Protected Area (MPA), Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) Right-based fisheries management (RBFM), and Wealth-based fisheries management, are being implemented, particularly in the small-scale fisheries sector, in several AU Member States (AU MS).

### *Fisheries Co-Management*

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

The general functions of co-management are the encouragement of partnership, the provision of local

incentives for sustainable use of resources and the sharing of power and responsibility for conservation. As a management approach, co-management is a compromise between government concerns for efficient resource utilization and protection, and resource users' concerns for equal opportunities, self-determination and self-control. The ingredients for effective function of co-management arrangements are a priori consultation between the central administration agency and user groups over the content of the management strategy and the delegation of specified management functions to user group organizations

Reasons that justify co-management include; rectifying basic flaws underpinning management systems, formalizing what is already occurring informally at the local level, to enhance legitimacy and hence compliance to fisheries rules and regulations, and is a cost-effective way of lowering ex-post transaction costs. Co-management is given different names in Africa. Examples include: Fishing committees (Comité de Pêche) in several countries, Beach Management Units (Lake Victoria and the on the coasts of Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania), and Village Liaison Committees (VLC). Co-management is practiced in lakes and reservoirs, lagoons and estuaries and on the coast.

There are different levels of involvement in management and decision-making: cooperative, advisory, and informative. Co-management is misnamed unless it involves the right to participate in decisions making about how, when, where, how much and by whom fishing will occur; therefore, it goes beyond merely access to resources to real power sharing. Genuine participation is only achieved when power is shared. In Africa, the co-management arrangements are led by the fisheries departments.

### *Wealth-Based Fisheries Approach*

The Wealth-Based Fisheries Management Approach (WBFM), which places resource rent ('wealth') as a central concept, is less problematic than biological management, and can fulfil efficiency, social and sustainability objectives at the same time. Wealth-

Based Fisheries Approach is premised on the following basic principles:

- Unlock the inherent wealth (resource rent) of fish stocks ;
- Macro-economic contribution of the sector is recognized ;
- Countries that have re-invested rents domestically ensure pro-poor growth ;
- Many of existing fishery management ingredients (tools) are used but in a different way;
- Relies on a fishery management planning process, with a focus on generation and equitable distribution of resource rent within each fishery;
- As governance and stakeholder capacity increases, government plays the enabling (oversight) role for private sector expansion ;
- The approach is about achieving goals, not setting new ones; it is consistent with existing goals: resource sustainability, economic growth and livelihoods enhancement;
- Not prescriptive ; provides an approach that can be tailored to the specific conditions and objectives of different countries and fisheries ;
- Important to develop the right institutions and incentives for successful fisheries.

Three categories of data are required to implement the Wealth-Based Fisheries Approach:

- Fisheries Management Information (Intrinsic growth rate, Catchability coefficient, Carrying Capacity, Initial population Biomass,
- Cost of Effort - Fixed and Variable (Salaries, Food, Fuel, Gear, Access/Harvest Fees, Insurance, Vessel Cost, Maintenance, Depreciation, Transaction Costs, marketing, etc.) and
- Returns (Quantity sold, Unit price of target species).

Wealth-based fisheries approach has been successfully applied in Mauritania and Namibia.

### *Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries*

The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) is a risk-based management planning process that covers the principles of sustainable development including the human and social elements of sustainability, not just

the ecological and environmental components. EAF is also an effective planning framework that facilitates the planning, coordination and prioritization of current and proposed activities, making them clearer by giving a “home” to the many strategies and monitoring programmes that are underway. In addition, EAF helps to develop comprehensive fishery management systems that seek the sustainability and equitable use of the whole system (ecological and human) to best meet the community’s needs and values.

However, the effectiveness of the EAF process and the contribution of EAF to long-term sustainable development of the resources are greatly enhanced by the conduct of an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) as an integral and essential part of the process. Ecological Risk Assessment is a means of identifying the ecological risks associated with the management of the major fisheries in a given region, and to prioritize appropriate management responses. As a tool, it is helpful in ensuring cost-effective decisions and actions are taken because it ensures that time, effort and resources are not wasted on pursuing issues, which may appear important but which are generally insignificant in the context of the broader fishery.

As a process, the conduct of the ERA is fundamentally participatory and seeks to build consensus among diverse stakeholders about identifying and prioritizing ecosystem issues and a programme of action. Secondly the ERA process sees the “ecosystem” in its broadest definition, including the biological, social, and economic as well as governance systems. This latter principle is of particular importance given the fact that in fisheries management, many biological recommendations are undermined by the lack of consideration of the social and economic implications or governance systems required to implement these recommendations. The conduct of an ERA also makes it clear that contrary to the concerns of those skeptical of the intentions of EAF, humans are seen as an integral component of the ecosystem in the approach.

The major product of an ERA is a Fisheries Management Plan (FFMP). A four-step process is used to develop FMP using EAF principles:

- a. Develop a clear description of the fishery, identify high policy goals and the relevant societal values attached to the fisheries;
  - b. Identify issues, assets, and challenges; and assess the risks associated with each issue and prioritize these issues and consider the key elements that will deliver successful outcomes. The process is facilitated by using an EAF Log-Frame to provide a snapshot version of all the important elements of the management system (plan). The elements are besides an identification of the issue number and its risk value:
    - i. Management objectives that provide a link between the principles, policy goals, major issues and what participants agreed the fishery should try to achieve.
    - ii. Operational objective(s) that is/are clear, measurable and directly linked to one or more of management objectives; noting that an operational objective could be applicable to more than one issue.
    - iii. Management measures, specific controls applied in the fishery to contribute to achieving the objectives.
    - iv. Indicators, variables that can be monitored to give a measure of the state of the fishery at a given time. Each indicator should be linked to one or more reference points and used to track the state of the fishery in relation to those reference points.
    - v. Reference points, benchmark against which to assess the performance of management in achieving an operational objective, corresponding to a state considered to be desirable (target reference point) or undesirable and requiring immediate action (limit reference point).
    - vi. Performance measure, a function that relates the value of an indicator to its reference point, and that guides the evaluation of fisheries management performance in relation to its stated operational objective.
    - vii. Means of verification, the sources of information used to indicate accomplishments, in other words sources of information on the indicators. They are usually recorded details such as publications, reports, databases, statistics, surveys, etc.
  - viii. Data requirements: the type of data/information that would need to be collected to ensure suggested measures could be implemented within the time-frame and in a cost-effective manner.
  - ix. Responsibility: who or what institution would be responsible for specific management actions or arrangements that will achieve the desired level of performance.
  - c. Identify and select key elements for the management systems and summarize the elements by component (ecological wellbeing, human wellbeing and governance) to fit into the management plan
  - d. Elaborate the Log-frame for the Management Plan
- The framework (EAF Log-Frame) which is a major product of the process can be considered an asset. It provides countries elements on which they can establish coherence between national plans and regional initiatives.
- Several countries have undertaken ERA of their fishery and management plans developed at both national and regional levels for some transboundary stocks, but these plans are yet to be implemented.

### *Marine Protected Area*

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are considered as an investment to rebuild or conserve stocks and improve environmental health by abstaining from exploitation. The value of such investment would be the value of harvested product without MPAs. Also mindful of the restriction to access imposed by MPAs warrants alternative livelihood considerations.

The process of instituting MPAs in Sierra Leone could be traced to efforts by the EU funded project 'Institutional Support for Fisheries Management (ISFM) in Sierra Leone (2009)'. The ISFM project developed a Framework that emphasized involvement of resource users. The World Bank supported West African Regional Fisheries Programme (WARFSL) adopted the framework.

The governance aspect of the WARFP-SL is aimed at guarding the Inshore Exclusion Zone (IEZ) against incursion and proposed allocating fishing community rights in order to regulate overexploited fisheries. Rights allocation in the artisanal fisheries is through MPAs based on a bottom-up approach; putting local community stakeholders at the fore, to work together with fisheries managers in combining both traditional and scientific knowledge to identify vulnerable habitats within major river systems, declare, establish and manage MPAs that will later evolve into territorial use rights in fisheries (TURFs).

The process entailed five key aspects:

- i. Development of Conceptual and Strategic Framework: A preparatory phase - MPAs were identified and extension service staff trained; A pilot project phase during which fishing communities were identified and organized, and alternative livelihoods were identified. This was followed by an expansion phase during which community stakeholders are engaged and participated in a series of exchange meetings. A declaration phase when MPA areas and boundaries are delineated and MPAs declared.
- ii. Declaration and organization of communities: Four (4) MPAs were declared namely: Yawri Bay; Sherbro River; Sierra Leone River and Scarcies River MPA.
- iii. Delineation of boundaries and territories: The MPA boundaries including Community Management Associations (CMAs) territories in each chiefdom were delineated in a team work combining skills of geographical information system (GIS) practitioners and community stakeholders.
- iv. Registration and institutionalization: Formation of CMAs was a crucial aspect of institutionalization process. Some 28 CMAs have been formed to manage the MPAs following the processes of clustering of Fishing Communities; sensitization and mobilization of Fishing Communities; election of Executives; Constitution Drafting for Registration of CMAs.
- v. Incentives for Change Incentive for change measure was employed to encourage stakeholders to fully participate in the enforcement of MPA regulations e.g. fishing nets and accessories were distributed

free of cost in fishing communities that voluntarily surrendered illegal fishing nets.

MPAs succeeded in reducing the use of illegal gears and capping boat entry in protected area. MPAs require political support at the highest level and sustained financing to effectively reduce effort and rebuild stocks. This should be accompanied by incentives and other ways and means of making a living.

### *Rights-Based Fisheries Management*

There is a suite of broad norms applicable to user rights discussions. A holistic approach is increasingly becoming the basis for discussions on fisheries management. Since the approval of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in 1995, several new complementary instruments have been approved: the Right to Food; the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VG Tenure); and the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines).

There will be regional, national, local differences driving adaptation, stakeholder design, as well as structural differences (small-scale or large-scale fisheries), cultural and social differences including differences in stakeholder composition and levels of organization and capacity; economic differences, including access to finance and accessibility to diversified livelihoods, political, technical differences as well as disparities in access to or the availability data.

Despite these challenges, it is quite possible to embark on the path towards appropriate rights-based approaches if one maintains an overall vision that is the use of appropriate rights-based approaches should fulfil three fundamental implications of doing so, namely: fisheries are sustainable, fishing jobs are generating revenues; and communities are empowered. Achieving rights-based approach is a step-by-step process that needs to slowly address stakeholder concerns and ensure a common understanding.

The 6 steps to achieve rights-based approach are:

- i. Find a pilot, a viable example which is simple, has charismatic champions, interested communities with progressive people including youth and elders, men and women all along the value chain, and to look for existing structures/entities that might be usable
- ii. Understand the context, including understanding and clarifying who is fishing through conversations with stakeholders, using lists of licensees, members of organizations and gaining an appreciation of what other opportunities exist or could exist as part of being prepared to address the “who” of who will be limited and the “how” whether by people, locations, the types of fish, local organizations, or groups of organizations. In short, develop a feeling of what sort of rights exist and could exist, so one begins to understand what rights-based approaches may be feasible - politically, economically, socially. In doing this one can begin to understand where along the path one is in terms of appropriate rights-based systems whether just starting out or somewhere along the way. Examples of this could be: BMUs (Beach Management Units), TURFs with co-management, strong catch share systems, or something else.

Steps 4 & 5 entail bringing all stakeholders together to create the (co-management) team comprised of various communities and to undertake a SWOT & GAP analysis to see both what is the end goal and where can one start. In doing so, the stakeholders can map out the steps of an implementation plan and agree on who, what, when, where and how to proceed.

The final step which could be occurring concurrently with the above steps is to find the financial resources for moving ahead and then creating a financial plan for subsequent self-sufficiency that doesn't create perverse incentives / pressures to overharvest

It should be noted that “No one size fits all”; that one cannot usually move to extreme Rights based approach (RBAs) in one step, and there is a need to have a shared goal and to then get there gradually, taking time to bring all stakeholders along the process together.

### *Lessons learned from the implementation of these approaches to African Fisheries*

These approaches were introduced into AU MS a couple of decades ago, mainly in the aegis of donor projects, with the assumption that national departments could take over the activities at the end of the projects. This has not been without its problems, since in many cases the assistance has been short-term, and the process has lacked flexibility, because of specific donor requirements that needed to be applied. While in some cases the results have been encouraging they have not always been sustainable. Institutional failures have been the main obstacles, rather than limited biological knowledge.

The main concerns include: limited legitimacy of the management process; inadequate institutional set up for management due to it having been imported from a different context; insufficient institutional linkages and communication between relevant stakeholders; the presence of policy and legislative frameworks that are not conducive of the approaches; and inadequate human capacity of many of the major stakeholders, including government and local organizations.

Additional obstacles are: conflicting objectives of conservation by the government and economics by communities, lack of inclusivity, transparency and trust; insufficient collaboration with other administrative services of government and civil society; a lack of awareness of the potential benefits of the approaches by policy-makers and absence of cost-effective and efficient support mechanisms for financing these approaches.

Despite these setbacks, there are several benefits associated with the use of the approaches in some countries, although they, for the most part, are not sustainable. They include: increased efficiency, improved data quality, revised attitudes, improved information sharing, enhanced transboundary synergies and regional collaboration especially for transboundary resources; increased skills and knowledge, improved management planning, increased benefits for those dependent on the fishery. Some projects across the continent have

also demonstrated that some of these approaches cannot be achieved without dealing with fisheries in a more holistic livelihoods approach to break the inter-connection between overfishing and the need to survive; and that addressing the linkages between ecosystems, local livelihoods, and markets will be critical for promoting sustainable fisheries using these approaches. These may include, for example, poverty reduction through promoting additional, alternative or more profitable livelihoods and by improving market governance through activities such as sustainable harvesting certifications.

### *Fast Tracking Mechanisms*

In view of the potential benefits associated with the use of these approaches, there is a need to not only improve but identify and implement mechanisms to fast track the implementation of these approaches. The key mechanisms include:

- Awareness raising and public education
- Promotion of policy and legislative Framework
- Capacity building and training
- Information and experience sharing and improved communication
- Establishing durable funding mechanisms

### *Awareness raising and public education*

Fisheries are about more than fish and both the human and biophysical aspects are complex and dynamic. In order to understand why it is necessary to use any of the approaches to fisheries and what it entails, it is important to inform and educate not only the fishers and those involved through out the value chain, but also the public in general and the local communities, using the appropriate system or extension technique for the country or locality.

A key role of government at all levels in supporting these approaches, is to provide an enabling environment in which the approach can take place at the local level. It is important therefore that the appropriate policy makers are aware and informed of the relevance of the approach and that they show commitment to the process.

Education for stakeholders in fisheries leads to a greater understanding of the needed measures and changes in resource use. And this together with participatory approaches to management, can lead to increased stakeholder involvement and a greater willingness to adjust and comply with new rules and regulations. Awareness raising and public education of stakeholders is further necessary for the following reasons:

- They can help to gather data or information, identify gaps in data or information, and identify those who might provide data or information in the future ;
- Accustoming stakeholders to the need for difficult choices in order to manage aquatic resources effectively;
- Ensuring that alternatives serving a broad range of interests are considered
- Providing transparency and accountability regarding the decisions taken and the process by which those decisions were reached ; and
- Building a broad base of commitment to chosen options, by creating an environment that rewards participation in discussion of benefits, risks and costs of various options, and that provides a meaningful base for informed consent to recommendations.

Informing the general public could, as well as increasing the understanding for the need for such an approach or tool, also help increase general support and add an inducement to the fisheries sector to implement the approach or tool.

Due to their wider scope of management, these approaches and tools require increased coordination, cooperation and communication between relevant sectors, such as agriculture, forestry, regulatory institutions, social scientists, regional economic communities, regional fishery bodies, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, donors, financial institutions, etc. Awareness raising and public education, will ensure meaningful widespread stakeholder, from all stages of the value chain, including women, involvement in the planning, development and/ or implementation of these approaches and tools.

The effective implementation of these approaches requires forging partnerships with other services

beyond the fisheries sector, social scientists, donors, financial institutions, and civil society

### *Promotion of policy and legislative framework*

Political will is the prerequisite to the establishment of these management approaches and tools. They must be reflected in policy, legislation and action specific to the fisheries sector, as well as more generally in government policy and legislative support. This is the only way the long-term prospects of applying these approaches can be enhanced. The policy actions necessary to make these management approaches and tools improve people's livelihoods are a substantial departure from familiar activities of many fisheries managers. A supporting legal framework can provide the legal basis for many of the required changes, among others things:

- Providing a framework for coordination and integration
- Defining roles and responsibilities
- Providing a framework for management processes, and
- Providing legal mechanisms for conflict resolution.

These approaches and tools are not an integral part of national fisheries policy and legislation in many AU MS. This leads to weak capability for cross-sectoral consultation and cooperation, the failure to consider, or a legal inability to act on, external influences such as encroachment and habitat deterioration, in current fishery management regimes. In addition, implementation of these approaches effectively requires not only a suitable fisheries legislation, but legal framework in other sectors. Hence, the legal instruments in fisheries, and in other sectors that interact with or impact on fisheries, need to be assessed and adjustments made to those instruments, where needed and were possible.

### *Capacity building and training*

The implementation of these approaches and tools require a holistic and integrated way of thinking about fisheries management, in order to take into consideration, the multiple needs and desires of societies, beyond conventional fishery aspects. Hence,

capacity building and training are vital elements in the implementation of these approaches and tools. An effective institution, accountable and representative institution for the implementation of these approaches particularly at local level will take time to develop and would need support.

Capacity building and training is an area that can be addressed by government agencies who are able to support or facilitate the provision of training and resources to strengthen the ability of stakeholder groups to take on the roles and responsibilities required to support the decisions made. In some cases, the private sector could also be very useful.

The different approaches and tools need to incorporate different systems of knowledge (i.e. scientific/economic and local/traditional) in a two-way learning process. Marine protected areas (MPA) and co-management efforts, for example, are often constrained by a poor understanding of the ecology of fish resources, and the interconnectedness of aquatic and land-based ecosystems. It can also be difficult to establish ways to integrate stakeholders, rather than polarize them. Capacity must be developed to translate the underlying principles of the approaches and tools into policy goals and then into operational goals that can be achieved by applying management measures.

Within the institutional framework, capacity building may be required in relation to:

- Improved institutional linkages within the fisheries management system : capacity is needed to build cross-sectoral skills and experience needed to smooth the way towards applying a holistic and participatory approach to fisheries management.
- Participation : capacity building is needed both to facilitate such a process (negotiation, mediation, conflict resolution, etc.) and in order for the participants to have sufficient information to be able to participate in a meaningful way.
- Monitoring, Control and Surveillance : enhancement of community/fisher awareness and understanding of management practices and MCS through seminars, public awareness and information education, and communication campaign. This can also include

participatory management development to promote ownership of the management regime and input into the regulatory/control aspect of management, in preparation for acceptance by the fishers of their joint stewardship role for the management of their resource in partnership with government.

- Research : capacity is needed to undertake new areas of research, such as cross-sectoral disciplines.

One of the reasons the implementation of these approaches and tools tends to be protracted is the importance placed on capacity development; which is a process and not a passive state; and there are four levels in which capacity development can take place. Addressing these four levels can be time consuming. These are in individuals, in sectors and networks, in organizations/institutions, and in the overall environment in which the first three function.

### *Definition of Capacity Development*

The process by which individuals, groups, organizations, institutions, and societies develop their abilities – both individually and collectively – to set and achieve objectives, perform functions, solve problems and develop the means and conditions required to enable the process.

Source: FAO. 2004. Report of the fifth session of the Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research, Rome, 12-15 October, 2004

At the individual level, the focus is on enabling individuals to embark on a continuous process of learning, building on existing knowledge and skills, and extending these in new directions.

At the sector/network level, there is a need for coherent sector policies and strategies, as well as coordination across sectors. Initiatives may focus on issues such as policy reform or service delivery as a way of increasing capacity at the sector level.

At the organizational/institutional level, organizational

structures, processes, resources and management issues are of great importance. Existing capacities should be sought out and allowed or encouraged to develop, considering the construction of new institutions only if this is not feasible.

In order to create an enabling environment, initiatives at the societal level tend to focus on the principles of good governance. High levels of commitment and mechanisms to resolve conflict support an enabling environment; where as low accountability and high levels of corruption contribute to disable the policy environment.

Universities, with fisheries science courses, should be encouraged to formulate tailor-made courses on these management tools.

### *Improved communication, Information and Experience Sharing*

The sharing of information and experiences on fisheries management approaches among stakeholder groups and between AU MS, together with improved communication should be preferred mechanisms to fast track the implementation of these approaches and tools.

Information sharing is a vital consideration. A lack of access to information in appropriate formats can be a constraint to the adoption of the approaches. Different stakeholder groups have different perspectives and may have different knowledge types. All these have to be valued and methods need to be developed that allow them to be included. Efforts should be made to move to a non-hierarchical structure for communicating. These should ensure that the sharing network enables all stakeholder groups to share their knowledge and experiences with each other.

Emphasis should be placed on the development of User-friendly Manual and Visual Aids, on the different approaches and tools and through adaptive learning processes, the production of Guidelines and Voluntary Codes. Equally, the use of these management approaches and tools in Africa should be reviewed,

assessed and documented

In terms of Communication, it will be advisable to adopt the “Communication for Development Approach”, which is based on the premise that successful rural development calls for the conscious and active participation of the intended beneficiaries at every stage of the development process. Effective adoption of the fisheries management approaches and tools cannot take place without changes in attitudes and behavior among the stakeholders concerned.

Communication for Development is defined as the planned and systematic use of communication, through inter-personal channels, ICTs, audio-visuals and mass media:

- To collect and exchange information among all those concerned in planning a development initiative with the aim of reaching a consensus on the development problems being faced and the options for their solution.
- Mobilize people for development action and to assist in solving problems and misunderstandings that may arise during development plan implementation.
- To enhance the pedagogical and communication skills of development agents (at all levels) so that they may have a more effective dialogue with their audience.
- To apply communication technology to training and extension programmes, particularly at the grassroots level, in order to improve their quality and impact

Communication is important in developing ownership and consensus, whereas, information as a passive commodity tends to polarize.

### *Establishing durable funding mechanisms*

An absolute requirement for the effective adoption of the fisheries management approaches and tools is political will of the state. Without this commitment there can not be any viable policy reform conducive to the adoption of these approaches. A durable funding mechanism, which in principle, would be seed money should be provided from the national Treasury.

Once the different organizations that would emanate from the adoption of these approaches become fully operational, the operational costs should be minimal. There is also the possibility of external funding, once it is evident there is the political will. Additional financial support can come from donors, financial institutions and civil society.

### *Conclusion*

The implementation of these approaches and tools may lead to higher costs of management. This can derive from, an increase in the number of stakeholders and their diversity, the number of meetings held during the planning process and a more developed information dissemination. The increased number of stakeholder groups, means an increased number of interests and objectives to be balanced. While the adoption of these approaches and tools require resources to ensure widespread engagement of stakeholders, with good design and successful implementation, the rewards are many. The present situation of the fisheries sector with declining fish stocks has consequences that are biological, economic and social.

There is no single management panacea for the problems Africa’s fisheries are facing, but these approaches that reflect local conditions, can help to sustain fisheries and people that depend on them, even where poverty is pervasive and governance weak. However, the likelihood of these approaches and tools becoming successful is higher when the fast-tracking mechanisms are applied in a consistent manner and long-term.

### *Further Reading*

1. Draft Report Expert Consultative Workshop on Fisheries Resources Management Approaches and Tools in Africa. “Enhancing Fisheries Management Capacity in Africa for Sustainability, Productivity and Profitability” 20-22 March 2017, Mombasa, Kenya
2. Report of the Interactive Workshop on Lessons Learnt and Best Practices for Enhancing Governance of African Large Marine Ecosystems, 17-19 December 2014, Douala, Cameroon

3. Towards Enhancing the contribution of Small-scale Fisheries to Food Security, Poverty Reduction and Economic Growth in Africa. The report of the Think tank Meeting on “Governance and Management of small-scale fisheries and its contribution to the objectives of accelerated Agricultural Transformation Agenda of Africa”, Held at The Ngor Diamara Hotel in Dakar, Senegal. 18-22 January, 2014
4. **Hara, M. and Nielsen, J. R. 2002.** A decade of fisheries co-management in Africa. Going back to the roots? Empowering fishing communities? Or just an illusion? Land reform and agrarian change in southern Africa, An Occasional Paper series, No. 20. School of Government, University of Western Cape, South Africa.
5. **FAO. 2012.** EAF Tool Box The ecosystem approach to fisheries
6. **Flewellling, P., Cullinan, C., Balton, D., Sautter, R.P. & Reynolds, J. E. 2002.** Recent trends in monitoring, control and surveillance system for capture fisheries. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper. No.413. Rome, FAO.200pp.

**Prepared by:**

**Professor Benedict P. Satia**

School of Marine and Environmental Affairs  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington, USA

**Note:** This Policy Note is a synthesis of series of reports based on activities conducted under the project ‘Strengthening Institutional Capacity to enhance governance of the fisheries sector in Africa’, Project number: DCI-FOOD 2013/331 -056’ funded by the EU.

**Citation:** AU-IBAR, 2018. Policy Note: Strengthening Mechanisms for Fast Tracking Implementation of Fisheries Management Approaches and Tools



African Union – Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR)  
Kenindia Business Park, Museum Hill, Westlands Road  
PO Box 30786-00100 Nairobi, Kenya.  
Tel: +254 (20) 3674 000  
Fax: +254 (20) 3674 341 / 3674 342  
Email: [ibar.office@au-ibar.org](mailto:ibar.office@au-ibar.org)  
Website: [www.au-ibar.org](http://www.au-ibar.org)