AFRICAN UNION

FINAL REPORT

EXPERT CONSULTATIVE WORKSHOP ON FISHERIES RESOURCES MANAGEMENT APPROACHES AND TOOLS IN AFRICA

"Enhancing Fisheries Management Capacity in Africa for Sustainability, Productiivty and Profitability"

20 - 22 MARCH 2017
MOMBASA, KENYA

AFRICAN UNION
INTERAFRICAN BUREAU FOR ANIMAL RESOURCES

NEPAD
TRANSFORMING AFRICA

EUROPEAN UNION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The African Union Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) and the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA) in collaboration with the government of Kenya with support from the European Union organised an "Expert Consultative Workshop on Fisheries Resources Management Options and/or Approaches in African Context" from 20th to 22nd March 2017 in Mombasa, Kenya.

The overall objective of the meeting was to create awareness and broaden the knowledge of African Union member states in various fisheries management options, tools and approaches to ensure informed and rational decisions are taken on the applications of appropriate management systems for national and regional fisheries in African context.

The meeting was attended by experts from African Union Member states including Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Tunisia. FAO and AU-IBAR were also represented.

Awareness was created among member states on the concepts, principles and the processes of implementation for Ecosystem Approaches to Fisheries (EAF), Rights-Based Fisheries Management (RBFM), Co-management, Community-Based Management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Wealth Based Fisheries Management (WBFM).

An important recommendation from the meeting was that appropriate guidelines on the fisheries management approaches and tools - EAF, MPA, Co-management and RBFM - should be developed/piloted and existing cases on experiences. Lessons and practices documented for continued education of AU member states. AU member states should fully integrate and align management approaches/tools within their fisheries management programmes.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Policy Framework and Reform Strategy for fisheries and aquaculture in Africa (PFRS) identified the conservation and sustainable uses of fisheries resources as an important policy arena. However, the PFRS recognized that capacity is limited in several areas in many Member States. Capacity development is, therefore, a high priority, especially with respect to effective implementation of reforms highlighted in the PFRS. Therefore the human capacity development policy arena in the PFRS envisaged that, capacity can be strengthened based on a mutual learning process, so that information and knowledge could be shared more efficiently and effectively by all involved.

Due to dwindling effects witnessed in capture fisheries, on an earlier note, the FAO in 1995 developed a Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) which recommends new approaches to fisheries management that encompasses all elements of conservation, environmental, social and economic considerations.The Code elaborate on how these reforms on responsible fishing can be achieved. Generally, fisheries management aims to achieve optimal and sustainable utilization of the fishery resource for the benefit of people at the same time safeguarding the ecosystem.

Owing to the nature and complexity of the fisheries management, several approaches and tools have been developed as options for management of fisheries, all with the singular objective of promoting sustainable management of the fishery. These include but not limited to (1) setting catch limits or a total allowable catch (TAC), (2) Fishing effort limits and/or Access controls (regulating fishing capacity), (3) Allocation of rights in a fishery – Rights-Based Fisheries Management (RBFM)/ Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries (TURFs); (4) Spatial and temporal closures (for e.g. MPA's, (5) Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) and/or Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management, (6) Co-management or community-based Management, (7) Wealth-based fisheries management, (8) Minimum Terms of conditions for shared fisheries resources management, etc. These options complement each other thus achieving best results when integrated during the implementation.

In advancing the sustainable management and development of fisheries resources agenda on the African continent, the AU-IBAR sought to bring together experts to discuss and identify issues regarding particularly implementation challenges and mechanisms of some of approaches and tools as well as reinforce amongst the AU member states their underlying theories. In summary this is the basis of the "Expert Consultative Workshop on Fisheries Resources Management Options and/or Approaches in African Context" that was held from 20th to 22nd March 2017 in Mombasa, Kenya.

The overall objective of the meeting was to create awareness and broaden the knowledge of AU member states in various fisheries management options, tools and approaches to ensure informed and rational decisions are taken on the applications of appropriate management systems for national and regional fisheries in African context.

The specific objectives on the meeting were to: (i) Elaborate the concept and principles of various fisheries management options and tools and their appropriateness in the context of Africa fisheries, (ii) Share experiences and lessons learnt on the successes of implementing fisheries management options such as Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, territorial use rights in fisheries or rights-based fisheries management, MPAs, co-management and other technical measures, (iii) Identify key constraints for effective implementation of fisheries management options on the continent, (iv) Develop a guideline or actions on the implementation of fisheries management options in order to facilitate their application in African fisheries.

1.1. Participants

The meeting was attended by seventeen (17) participants composed of experts from African Union Member states including Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Tunisia. AU-IBAR and FAO were also represented. (List of participants is annexed)

2. OPENING SESSION

2.1. Opening Remarks

The opening ceremony was marked by statements by Dr. Mohamed Seisay on behalf of the Director of AU-IBAR, and Dr. Rebecca Metzner representing the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department. The meeting was officially opened by Ms. Jane Njeri Kinya, Deputy Director of Fisheries at the State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy, Kenya, representing the Hon Minister of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries of the Republic of Kenya.

Dr. Mohamed Seisay, Senior fisheries officer at AU-IBAR

On behalf Director of AU-IBAR, Dr. Seisay expressed gratitude to Peoples and the Republic of Kenya for their support to AU-IBAR which was an exemplary display of magnanimity towards African Union. He paid glowing tribute and special recognition to Mr Willy Bett, Honourable Minister for Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, who has been a champion in the facilitation of African Union organized events on Fisheries and Aquaculture in Kenya. Dr. Seisay welcomed the participants and appreciated their endeavor to participate to in the meeting despite their demanding schedules.

Dr. Seisay reminded the participants of the relevant the pan African fisheries policy (PFRS) areas and emphasized in particular on the importance of improving and strengthening the contribution of small scale fisheries to poverty alleviation, food and nutrition security and socio-economic growth especially for the fishing communities in Africa. It is in this regard, he noted, that the African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) is implementing the PFRS through the project "Strengthening institutional capacity to enhance governance of the fisheries sector in Africa" with support from the European Union. The overall objective of the project is to enhance the contribution of fisheries resources to food security and economic growth in Africa. In this regard, he acknowledged the support of the European Union to the fisheries and aquaculture sector on the continent. He also appreciated the collaboration between AU-IBAR and FAO in the sector of the sector.

He informed the audience that it is crucial that the capacity of the continent is developed for effective management of the fisheries resources to ensure their sustainability, exploitation and continued contribution to socio-economic development of the continent. He continued that in the context of Africa continent, there is a need to create awareness on the basic principles, pros and cons and more importantly tailor these fisheries management instruments to the needs of Africa.

Dr Rebecca Metzner delivered warm greetings from Assistant Director General Mathiesen of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, noting he was pleased that AU-IBAR was convening this work on fisheries resources management options and/or approaches in the African context. She noted that African countries are doing a lot to address advancing knowledge about and implementation of rights-based approaches to fisheries management.

She noted that with the update of the Sunken Billions Report, it is clear that we are losing billions from our fisheries around the world and that such lost revenues could help economies with jobs, revenues for

infrastructure development, improved health, education, and access to fundamental services that make communities stronger. She also noted, however, that we need to ensure that our desire for economic development from fisheries is tempered with on-the-ground development of our small-scale fishing communities and fisherfolk. She mentioned that building upwards takes time, capacity and patience and that it can be achieved if one takes small, steady steps that is when the results are shared and understood can lead to bigger results.

Ms. Jane Njeri Kinya, on behalf of the Hon Minister of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries of the Republic of Kenya appreciated the AU-IBAR and NPCA for organizing this important meeting and bringing together experts from Africa involved in management of fish resources to discuss how to achieve sustainable management of our fishery resources. Nothing the importance of the fisheries sector for livelihood and development African countries, she recognised in line with SOFIA (2016) that sustainable management of these fishery resources still remain a global challenge despite the progress achieve in some areas. Majority of the fish stocks are still harvested in unsustainable manner and approximately 58.1% fishes are fully fished with little confidence for increased production. Hence the justification for bringing the African expert together to discuss and deliberate on how to achieve sustainability our African fisheries by examining the different management approaches.

Ms. Kinya further noted that the meeting was in line with one of the objective of the Policy Framework and Reform Strategy for Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa that is to improve and strengthen the contribution of fisheries and aquaculture to poverty alleviation, food and nutrition security and socio-economic growth especially for the fishing communities in Africa. She concluded her statement calling on the expert to ensure productive discussions and appropriate action that would be suitable for the African context.

2.2. Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was presented to participant and it was adopted after some few amendments (see annexe 2)

3. TECHNICAL SESSION

The meeting was organized in four sessions each of which was informed by a number of presentations as follows;

A. Background and objectives of the meeting-Setting the scene by Dr Mohamed Seisay, Senior Fisheries Officer of AU-IBAR

Dr. Seisay noted that Africa is endowed with huge marine and freshwater living resources that provide socio-economic benefits to the citizens of the continent. These benefits are however under threat due primarily to weak governance systems, institutional frameworks and capacity. 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. To restore the depleted resources, recover depleted habitat and maintain healthy ecosystems, there is a need to identify appropriate fisheries management scenarios that suit the 'African systems'. Successful fisheries management objective should have three dimensions: (1) Biological which focusses on conservations e.g. Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY), technical measures, etc. (2) Economics: targeting economic efficiency such as Maximum Economic Yield (MEY), revenue and cost increasing wealth; and resource rent sustainably; (3) Social: equity, participation and access fish should contribute to social welfare in an equitable manner.

Successful fisheries management thus requires institutional capacity to define appropriate balance of or tradeoff between these parameters.

Dr. Seisay further gave a brief review of some the management approaches and tools including; Co-management, MPA, Right-based fisheries management, EAF and Wealth-based fisheries management. He noted that these concepts have been introduced in Africa years back- and asked the participants 'what visible or practical effects have they had on sustainable fisheries?' Hence, the reason for such a meeting of expert is to dissect the problem and identify appropriate mechanisms or actions that would assist the AU member states in the implementation of these management options. This is in line with the vision of AU Head of States and Government who requested AU, RECs and Member States to promote the implementation of international and regional best practices across Africa.

B. Experts' experiences in implementing various fisheries management (concept/ principles, processes and implementation mechanism)

a) Progress made towards implementation of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (AEF): Example of Small and Medium Pelagic fishery in Kenya by Ms. Elizabeth Mueni from the Kenya Fisheries Service, The State Department of Fisheries and the Blue Economy

A major challenge for fisheries management in Kenya has been in the establishment of an integrated management approach that simultaneously deals with both the ecological needs of depleted fish stocks and the economic needs of diverse stakeholders. The consequence of the failure to put in place effective management strategies has been repeated resource use conflicts, declining fish stocks, and degraded habitats. Some countries have managed to address these issues, other countries are addressing them and some have yet to put in place measures to address such conflicts. EAF is the appropriate approach for the management of fisheries and recognises all the ecological consequences of fishing, hence geared towards increasing benefits to communities and to protecting vulnerable habitats and species

Kenya developed the small and medium pelagic fisheries management plan through an EAF process with funding support from the SWIOFP project in collaboration with EAF Nansen Project a ("Strengthening the Knowledge Base for and implementing an Ecosystem Approach to Marine Fisheries in Developing Countries") and the government of Kenya in 2011-2012. The development of the Small and Medium pelagic fishery management plan was a one year process implemented through an EAF process. A consultative stakeholder meeting was used to identify ecological and socioeconomic issues affecting the fishery as well as factors constraining effective monitoring control and surveillance. The EAF planning process is mainly in three steps; i) scoping stage; ii) issues identification and issue prioritization; iii) develop management system -operational objectives; indicators and management options. The final stage is implementation, monitoring and reviews which is achieved through a logframe.

In Kenya a National task group (NTG) was constituted to steer the process with representatives from the Industry, Scientists, Management, NGOs and Beach management units. The EAF recommends proper stakeholder analysis and involvement and in Kenya through stakeholder consultations and the fishery was selected and the area of the plan was defined. During scoping and planning phase, a baseline report for the fishery was prepared following the EAF guidelines to capture the issues facing a fishery, the species involved and what management arrangements are already in place. In this case, the target species were categorized as small or medium with the rest of species as bycatch. The values and objectives of the management were identified and they should directly reflect relevant community and national values, resource sustainability

etc. with specific values relevant to each fishery, and their order of importance, vary between fisheries and among countries.

All issues were identified and prioritised based on EAF guidelines for Africa (FAO 2011) and experiences from the stakeholders on the fishery used in the Ecological Risk Assessment. For small and medium pelagic plan in Kenya, this process was participatory through stakeholder forums and all issues in the fishery were listed. Prioritization of the issues is through a risk assessment and the risk associated with each issue is assigned to one of three categories – high, medium or low which forms the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) in the EAF process. The plan was developed and finalized in 2014 with clearly defined objectives and indicators. A suite of management measures have been implemented for the SMPF, lobster and aquarium fishery and some of achievement include;

- Improved MCS capacity including a 10 year MCS plan with a well-defined institutional arrangement
- Lack of data was one of the key issues of the SMPF and data collection and monitoring improved by introduction of catch assessment surveys
- Stock assessment for small and medium pelagic fishery and results contributed to a gear based plan targeting the small and medium pelagics
- Long-term monitoring plan for the fisheries
- EAF process applied in the planning and development of lobster and aquarium plan. Further this approach has been applied in area management under the co-management area plans. Three co-management area plans already developed and one endorsed for management.

FAO EAF Nansen project played in a great role in building capacity to countries in order to steer the EAF planning process. The involvement of NTG in the EAF planning process is an opportunity to train others on the EAF and the number has increased overtime. Some key lessons include;

- Good baseline on the fishery forms the basis for future monitoring and management
- Identification and prioritization of management issues for intervention helps identify where to focus in terms of resource allocation
- Stakeholder involvement throughout the EAF process help create awareness of EAF tools and improve understanding of the process
- EAF process enhances trans-boundary synergies and regional collaboration especially for transboundary resources e.g. the small and medium pelagic fishery
- Management measures may not be included directly

b) Co-management: Meaning, History and practice by Dr. Paul Onyango, University of Dar es Salaam

The following highlights were presented by Dr. Onyango:
Capture fisheries is declining due to among others Illegal fishing practices, degraded fish habitats' Climate change and variability (anthropogenic factors), Governance issues.

Co-management has relatively short history in fisheries, but as a practice it has existed for a long time (Pomeroy and Viswanathan 2003); Examples include: Spanish Cofradias, French Prud'homie, Lofoten management system, Polish Mazoperias, Indian Panchayat system, Indonesian Sasi and Japanese community co-operatives. This concept started appearing in literature in early 1970s and took root due to conflicts in Natural Resource Management, Reported in the US 1974 i.e. the Boldt decision exercising tribal rights (American Indian tribes).

Reasons that justify co-management include; rectifying basic flaws underpinning management systems, formalizing what is already occurring informally at the local level, in fisheries the main reasons has been to enhance legitimacy and hence compliance to fisheries rules and regulations, is a cost effective way of lowering ex-post transaction costs.

Berkes (1991) defines co-management as "A **partnership** in which the government, the community of local resource users (fishers), external agents (non-governmental organizations, academic, and research institutions), and other fisheries and coastal resource stakeholders (boat owners, fish traders, money lenders, tourism establishments, etc.) share the **responsibility and authority** for making decisions and **participating** in actual management of a fishery/common resources". There are different levels of involvement in management and decision-making: cooperative, advisory, and informative.

Examples of current co-management in Africa include: Fishing committees (Comité de Pêche) in several countries, Beach Management Units (Lake Victoria), Village Liaison Committees (VLC).

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 (Pinkerton p63:2003); therefore it goes beyond merely access to resources to real power sharing. Genuine participation is only achieved when power is shared (Hildebrand p2:2003)

c) Experiences with Community-Based Management of MPAs in the Artisanal Fisheries of Sierra Leone by Dr. Andrew Baio, University of Sierra Leone

The following key message was delivered:
MPAs 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.

Process of instituting MPAs in Sierra Leone could be traced to efforts by the EU fund project 'Institutional Support for Fisheries Management (ISFM) in Sierra Leone (2009)'. The ISFM project developed framework that emphasised involvement of Resource Users. The World Bank supported West African Regional Fisheries Programme (WARFSL) adopted the framework and the governance aspect of the WARFP-SL (West African Regional Fisheries Programme- Sierra Leone) 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 Marine Protected Areas (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 TURFs.

The process entailed five key aspects: 1. Development of Conceptual and Strategic Framework (A preparatory phase - MPAs were identified and extension service staff trained; A pilot project phase where: fishing communities were identified and organized, alternative livelihoods identified; An expansion phase where community stakeholders are engaged and exchange meetings held; A declaration phase where MPA areas and boundaries are delineated and MPAs declared) 2. Declaration and organization of communities (4 MPAs declared i.e. Yawri Bay; Sherbro River; Sierra Leone River and Scarcies River MPA) 3. 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.) 4. Registration and institutionalisation (Formation of Community Management Associations (CMAs) was a crucial aspect of institutionalisation process. Some 28 CMAs have been forged 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) 5. 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)

MPA 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.

d) Experiences in implementing rights-based fisheries - Management Options: Concepts/ Principles & Implementation Mechanisms.by Dr Rebecca Metzner, FAO

Dr Rebecca began with an overview she called the "Big Picture" and outlined the common principles - behind resources, methodologies such as the human rights approach, key international instruments such as the CFS Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGT), the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Securing Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries (SSF Guidelines). She reviewed the recognized inclusive approaches including use of the ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF), co-management, and the need to build on existing structures instead of imposing new ones, when appropriate.

In discussing implementation of rights-based approaches, she highlighted that 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, she noted that 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 and that has 3 fundamental implications of doing so, namely: fisheries are sustainable, fishing jobs are generating revenues; and communities are empowered. That said, achieving this is a step-by-step process that needs to slowly address stakeholder concerns and ensure a common understanding.

The 6 steps pragmatically described were:

1. 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.
2. 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 once 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

Her talk concluded with the reminders that "No one size fits all", that one cannot usually move to extreme 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.

e) Discussions and Key Issues Arising

Following presentations discussions were opened where a number of issues were raised and clarification made. Some of these issues discussed include;

- It was noted that the following experiences and lessons learnt accrued from EAF process; there is need for prioritisation of identified issues during scoping or situation analysis; stakeholders are able to participate and give their inputs in the management; traditional or local knowledge is considered in decision making, ensuring that management and protection of the ecosystem is more effective and compliance made easy.
- The EAF processes have been able to highlight transboundary issues in shared fisheries (e.g.: Kenya and Tanzania developed a similar management plan because of shared stock between the two countries).
- In the case of Right Based Fisheries management, the protection of small scale fishers (SSF) was raised as a concern for effectiveness of the approach. It was clarified that the process of implementing the approach required Participatory co-management looking at the ecosystem as a whole. Protection of SSF are provided for within the following documents: Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests; PFRS, Guidelines for Securing Small-Scale Fisheries; and the UN human right considers the right of indigenous people. What needed are policies that are coherent with these previsions.
- There is also a need for empowering the indigenous people and build their capacity to fulfill their own responsibility in managing their fishery resources
- Co-management practices have been implemented in Mozambique, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda with relative success. National BMU guideline has been developed by Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania; these countries have a regional guideline for the management of Lake Victoria. The BMUs in the three countries are involved in the implementation the harmonized management guidelines of their fisheries. The BMUs can develop bylaws that are endorsed by the local authorities and implemented/ enforced by the BMUs members.
- There are some challenges in implementation of MPA at community level in Sierra Leone because the process of gazetting the identified MPAs went too fast with limited community involvement or consultations. However, good progress is being made now with their implementation and many of these challenges are being addressed for effective community participation and compliance. For example: there is gradual reduction in use of illegal fishing gears in small scale fisheries of Sierra Leone.
- It was also noted that the implementation of these approaches are often done through a project (e.g.: EAF NANSEN) which weakens the long term sustenance of the management effort as the project is time

bound. AU MS were therefore encouraged to make provisions in their national budget allocations for the fisheries management effort that could allow for sustainable implementation of these management approaches and tools.

C. Countries experiences, lessons learnt and best practices from Member states

Representatives of selected African Union member states gave highlights and shared experience on fisheries management in their respective countries as show below.

a) **Angola** by Ms Maria de Lourdes Sardinha

Angola economy relies mainly on natural resources exploitation (oil, gold, diamonds, forests, agriculture and fisheries). The oil sector contributes about 45% of the GDP and more than half of exports. The fishing sector is the third most important economic sector in the country after oil and the diamond industry, contributing about 3.5% to the GDP.

Species distribution and abundance depends on the two main current systems: the Guinea and the Benguela. The main species are the small pelagics, various demersal species, crabs, deep water shrimps and the tuna and tuna like species. The main fishing grounds are located in the south, from 140So due the high produtivity of the upweling system.

Angola has a complete legislative framework that includes the Fisheries Law, containning several laws and decrees, the law of the Biological resources, 2004 and the 5 year National development plan.

The management measures for the next calendar year are set out in an annual presidential decree after discussions in two consultative meetings with scientists, managers and the industry. Research Institute provides advise through a scientific report on the state of the resources, and measures are discussed and agreed in a Scientific council meeting and two Stakeholders' consultative meetings with the participation of the fishing industry and representatives of the community: the main measures includes: TAC, Quota allocation by vessel, Closed areas and seasons Vessel capacity and number limitations Minimum sizes, Regulation on the bycatch and MSC. The Government is putting in place steps for implementation of MPA's by 2018.

b) **Benin** by Mr. S. Ahouandjogbe

Benin has more than 257 species of fish, 10 species of crustaceans and 4 species of cephalopods. Artisanal fishing is practiced by 5,722 fishermen, 54% of whom are Beninese, 43% are Ghanaians and 3% are Togolese; With a fleet of about 900 boats. Inland fishing is practiced by 30,954 fishermen, including 530 women with a fleet of 52,537 boats. Industrial fishing (2016): 15 authorized vessels, including 13 tuna vessels flying the Ghanaian flag and 02 trawlers flying the Nigerian flag.

Since 2006, Benin has been included in Annex II Decision 2076/2005 / EC drawing up the list of third countries and territories from which imports of fishery products for human consumption may be authorized (ex: List II countries) under certain conditions.

Fisheries management options that are implemented in Benin include:
Right Based fisheries management - The law No. 2014-19 of 7 August 2014 on Fisheries and Aquaculture in the Republic of Benin in its Articles 22, 25, 32, 51: makes compulsory: (1) Permits for artisanal inland and marine fisheries; (2) Industrial fishing license.

Co-management - Artisanal Fishing Port in Cotonou, which is managed by the fisheries administration and Fishers' Union, the Vigilance and Surveillance Committee (CVS) within the framework of the participatory surveillance of fisheries.

EAF- A management plan validated and will be implemented jointly by FAO / EAF Nansen Program and the Government of Benin.

Major issues and challenges identified include the establishment of mechanisms for the restoration and conservation of degraded fisheries, which requires: Legal framework and Institutional strengthening for fisheries management; ratification of international instruments on fisheries; Staff training or recruitment of fisheries managers and lawyers, effective implementation of regulatory frameworks and enforcement, development of management plans for water bodies, professionalization of fishers; promoting fisher cooperatives and development of fisheries infrastructure .

Lessons learned and opportunities are Political will and the strong membership of the fishers' Union. Recommendations are expressed in terms of support needed, mainly for: the preparation of guideline for implementing the law, specialization of young staff; development and implementation of management plans, establishment of an effective fisheries Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) system.

c) Cameroon by Dr Belal Emma

Cameroon is a country of Central Africa, located in the Gulf of Guinea. It covers an area of 475,440 km² and has an estimated population of 22.8 million inhabitants (2014). It has a maritime frontage of 402 km, an EEZ of 15,400 km² and a continental shelf of 10,400 km². Its inland waters cover an area of 40,000 km².

The fisheries sub-sector has a strategic framework (Vision 2035, DSCE, DSDSR), an institutional framework (MINEPIA, DPAIH) and a legislative and regulatory framework (laws, decrees, etc.). The fishery comprises three branches: industrial and semi-industrial (maritime) and artisanal (maritime and continental). It mainly targets fish (pelagic and demersal) and shrimp. Annual fish production is estimated at 216,176.7 tones.

Fisheries management incorporates several options / approaches, including the ecosystem approach to fisheries and co-management. Thus, in the framework for the implementation of the "Project to improve the management of Cameroon's industrial shrimp fishery ", the management plan for the industrial shrimp fishery has been developed, with technical and financial support of the FAO (EAF-NANSEN Project). This process, which started in 2008, lasted five years and provided a baseline report, an ecological risk assessment report, a management and implementation plan for this fishery.

Co-management was carried out as part of the implementation of the "Program for Sustainable Livelihoods in Fisheries (SFLP) in West Africa", which was financed by DFID and implemented by the FAO. Four inland water reservoirs were involved (Mapé, Maga, Mbakaou, Lagdo) and a fish market (Garoua).

The impacts achieved from the implementation of co-management include, among others, the concerted development of management agreements, the involvement of stakeholders in monitoring fishing activities, awareness raised among stakeholders and improvement of their income.

Issues and challenges experienced include among other; ensuring the participation of all stakeholders, diversification of income-generating activities, compliance with the Management Agreement, Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) of fisheries activities and support to communities during closing season

for biological rest.

Lessons learned from the implementation of this process include: strengthening MCS activities in the fishery, stakeholder participation, and stakeholders awareness on the importance of sustainable management resources, compliance with management plan and enforcement of penalties against offenders.

Opportunities for improving the process relates among other to strengthening the managerial capacities of the Management Committee, the creation of Development Committees, construction of infrastructures (landing sites, ice factories and cold rooms, Markets, etc.), and the creation of basic social infrastructures (schools, health centers, drinking water, etc.)

Recommendations include extending these approaches to major fisheries in the country, supporting Management Committees and MCS Committees in the implementation of their activities and diversifying income-generating activities.

d) Gabon by Ms. Alda Prudence MALEMBA

Gabon is located in the west of Central Africa and has an area of 267,667 km2, 700km of coastline, a plateau of 40,600km and 231300km of EEZ. This country abounds with a diversity of fish of high economic interest.

The following fisheries management options are being implemented;
As an ecosystem approach, Gabon uses, among other things, the precautionary approach. For example, since 2013, the industrial fleet has had 24 vessels (21 fishers and 3 shrimp vessels), while the artisanal fishery is 1,000 boats.

As for Right based approach Gabon to this day put emphasis on customary user rights which is open access and free inside zones reserved for this purpose.

Co-management is limited to consultation with stakeholders in the sector for decision-making.

Regarding marine protected areas (MPAs), Gabon has just drafted a proposal that has been submitted to the competent authorities for review and potential approval.

As impacts achieved, Gabon has adopted biological rest or closure of shrimp and sardine fisheries; this has resulted in stocks renewal and increase in fish sizes.

Challenges include the establishment of fishmongers' management plans, reducing imports of fishery products.

Lessons learned and Opportunities are among others awareness-raising among fishing communities, organization of a coastal surveillance system to ensure fisheries regulation, stakeholder involvement in the management process.

In conclusions, there is a need to put in place a system for monitoring implementation of measures taken, a financing system, capacity building, and improving landings.

e) Kenya by Ms. Elizabeth Mueni

The Kenyan marine waters support a wide variety of fish species namely finfish (pelagic such as king fish, barracuda, mullets, queen fish etc and demersals e.g. rabbit fish, snapper, rock cod, scavenger etc.), crustaceans such as prawns, lobsters, crabs etc, and molluscs such as squids, octopus and sea cucumber. However, most of the reef fisheries are declining with increased fishing effort and low capacity and technological capability to access offshore resources. The marine fisheries is multi-species-multi gear and most fishing within the nearshore fishing grounds as fishers lack adequate capacity to fish offshore and this has brought increased conflict between different resource users. The capacity for government institutions to fully monitor and implement management measures is limited.

The fisheries management measures are drawn from the Fisheries Management and Development Act of 2016. These management measures apply to all fisheries in Kenya and the regulations apply to specific species and fishery types. The management measures provide for closed seasons, prohibitions, gear limitation, size or age limitation and landing of the catches. There are other national legal frameworks that guide fisheries management including fishing within marine protected area and environmental management. There are fishery specific management plans that are managing the Prawn fishery; lobster fishery, small and medium pelagics and the aquarium fishery. A gear specific plan has been developed to manage the small and medium pelagics.

The concept of co-management was introduced in 2006 and being implemented through the Beach Management Units (BMUs) hence the involvement of fisheries stakeholders in the resource management, conservation and sustainable utilization. In Kenya the beach management units (BMUs) is composed of fishers, boat owners, traders, processors and service providers. One of the mandate of BMUs is to participate in vetting of boat owners and fishers for licensing purposes. The BMUs have formed networks at varying levels including water bodies and the highest level being the national BMU network. The management of the co-management area under the BMUs is through co-management plans and by-laws. The development of some of the co-management plans followed the EAF approach hence adequate consultations

From the experience it is clear that consultations at all level contribute to change of attitude and sense in resource ownership and sustainability. This has been evident in voluntary compliance is gear use. Community involvement in research and monitoring has increased the understanding of resources and decision making. Also BMUs are now getting involved in restoration of degraded ecosystem restoration a case of Wasini south coast of Kenya. EAF is a holistic approach hence all stakeholders are involved and able to share roles in implementation

However, there are challenges in management and especially planning process. Some of these include; the communities still have low understanding leading to lack of support to co-management especially the fishermen. Previous experiences with fishermen co-operatives and leadership is a challenge for the co-management. There is high dependency on external support (eg projects) to conduct co-management activities by the communities after projects close hence sustainability. There is still limited capacity to implement management measures due to cultural ties. Limited support to implement by-laws due to community social structures. Overall, BMUs capacity to monitor resources and implement management plans need to be enhanced. Most fishing is within the reefs hence fisher's capacity to access offshore fishing grounds is limited. Development of management plans is sometimes lengthy process with many consultations rendering it costly.

There is therefore a need to strengthen fishermen involvement in co-management, build capacity of BMUs to play a great role in development of co-management plans and bylaws, develop guidelines that integrate different approaches e.g. right based management and co-management, empower communities to participate in monitoring of the fishery, strengthen understanding on EAF principles/tools- simple guidelines for communities

f) Madagascar by Mr Tiana RANDRIAMBOLA

Fisheries and aquaculture are now managed under the new Law no° 2015 * 053 of 02 December 2015 establishing the Code of Fisheries and Aquaculture and highlighting the co-management of fisheries resources, and the setting up of a Fisheries Management Advisory committee.

Madagascar has 5000 km of coastline and small scale fishing is dispersed all along this coast. The management of both continental and marine fisheries is done by means of fisheries management plans, local governance, the establishment of marine protected areas and permanent or temporary reserves. The last census in 2012 estimates the artisanal fishing to about 100,000 fishermen.

Implementation of this type of management requires funding, the SWIOFish 2 project financed by the World Bank will contribute through component 2: "improving the governance of priority fisheries" and, inter alia, the development of an information system and the sustainable management of fisheries and preservation of fishery resources. The main challenges are to open up villages of the small-scale fishers and to professionalize them, and to resolve the conflicts between small-scale fishers and industrial fishers.

g) Mauritania by Dr. SIDI Mohamed Ould

The fisheries sector generates major socio-economic benefits for Mauritania and plays a strategic role in the national economy through its significant contribution to revenue, employment, macroeconomic balances and food security.

The country's coastline is spread over a distance of 720 km, EEZ is 234 km2, an Upwelling system that leads to a high fish productivity, in addition to the protected area of the Banc d'Arguin. The Canary and Guinea Current favors temperate and tropical species. Areas are still untouched by pollution, with a great biodiversity and fish species richness.

Some historical strategies with regards to fisheries resources management include the preservation and diversification of the resource, renovation and rehabilitation of farming systems, strengthening of processing system and exploitation of fishery products, improvement management of maritime affairs, and finally capacity building in governance.

The new regulatory framework for the implementation of the 2015-2019 strategy include; a concession contract setting a quota expressed as a percentage of Total Allowable Catch (TAC). We arrived at a system based on catch control after having been an effort control system. This will make it possible to contribute effectively to the management of fisheries capacity and to meet the requirements of management plans (4-month biological rest period, yearly closures of areas of high concentration of juveniles, prohibition of fishing with non-selectively fishing gear or at depths of less than 20 m, promotion of selective gear, and quota management) in relation to the TAC.

h) Senegal by Dr. Moustapha DEME

For a long time, the public administrations exclusively ensured the management of Senegalese fishery resources. This lack of participatory procedures led to the lack of ownership by the fishing communities of the decisions taken. The immediate consequences are overcapacity in fisheries and overexploitation of most fisheries resources.

In order to cope with the acute crisis in the fisheries sector, the local authorities have set up Local Artisanal Fisheries Councils (CLPA). These institutions are perceived by fisheries managers as framework for local governance of artisanal fisheries. From the point of view of a delegation of power to the basic actors, the CLPAs are supposed to institute the consultation and the promotion of local initiatives in fisheries resource management.

The presentation highlighted the economic and social importance of the Senegalese fishery and the context of emerging CLPA in Senegalese artisanal fisheries before conceptualizing the term and defining the mandate and its organizational framework. The bioecological and economic scope of CLPAs has been developed. The sustainability of CLPAs has been questioned in terms of funding for their activities and empowerment and the skills of professionals to assume their new roles in the fisheries management process.

i) Tunisia by Mr. RAFIK NOUAILI

The fisheries sector is one of the pillars of Tunisian agriculture. It has an important socio-economic dimension. In addition to its contribution to the agricultural export, the sector directly provides about 52,000 jobs and sources of income to 20,000 other household heads. The fisheries sector has benefited from a large public investment devoted essentially to the setting up and equipping of a port chain along the Tunisian coast. At present, more than 41 fishing ports are emerging along the 1,300 km of the Tunisian coast. State support for fisheries in various forms to private sector has allowed for the development of a fishing fleet that has been increasing in number and power and tonnage over the last few decades, to about 13,000 units. The fisheries sector, with an average annual production during the last 5 years of 120,000 tons, at a value of 360 million dinars, contributes to self-sufficiency and food security by an average annual contribution of 11 Kg per capita.

Several management measures have been initiated by Tunisia during the last 20 years, with the overall objective of preserving fishery resources such as the stopping of fishing effort (essentially units targeting benthic resource), the adoption of Fishing campaign/seasons for a wide range of species with a strong commercial interest, alignment with a common policy for the management of the sector (CGPM-ACCOBAMS .... ect.), adoption of a 3-month biological rest in the Gulf of Gabès for trawlers (since 2009), the creation of Marine Protected Areas (the regulatory and institutional framework for this component was established during the period 2009-2014), or the establishment of a program of artificial reefs installation in the Gulf of Gabes (2006-2020). Overall, all the management processes mentioned above are based on a quasi-perfect participatory approach involving both the profession, civil society, the administration and research.

The impact of such an approach, as well as of some cooperative projects, in particular with JICA-FAO, has resulted in the creation of various forms of professional organizations, namely the Fishers' group, associations or Platform for artisanal fisheries and whose awareness in the interest of preserving and sustainably managing the resource is increasingly visible.

Concerning challenges, we can essentially note the importance of professional organizations' efficiency, the perfect adoption of participatory and inclusive approach in fisheries management, strengthening the capacity of all stakeholders in the sector, the promotion of extension component, initiative spirit and leadership, and valorisation and support of research results as well as the lessons and good practices from cooperation projects.

As a recommendation, it is worth noting (i) the importance of mastering the participatory and inclusive approach in all fisheries management plans; (ii) sustained support and guidance to fisheries organisation (iii) the promotion of research and the establishment of a decision-making Informatics System (SID-Strong analysis of fishing effort) as well as a perfect institutional base; (iv) the importance of the stability in the country.

j) Discussions and Key Issues Arising

- In Angola fisheries management, different stakeholders have the opportunity of fully participate in meetings and bring forward their view, bring some proposals, hence have a crucial role to play in decision making;
- Co-management in the Cameroon is mainly practiced in inland fisheries
- There are plans to establish regional management of shrimp fisheries in the gulf of Guinea involving three countries (Cameroon, Nigeria and Gabon) being shared stocks. Arrangements are underway for a meeting of the three countries in this regard.
- The management plan that resulted from the EAF-NANSEN project in Cameroon is already being implemented. As part of this, an MoU was signed between the ministry of fishery and the ministry of Defence on MCS in Cameroon's waters. Accordingly, there have been banning of some licences.
- In Kenya, fisheries management plans are developed by the government in close collaboration with the BMUs
- Most of the management approaches implemented in countries were funded by projects, hence, after the closure of the project activities implementation also ends; so jeopardising the sustainability. It is therefore important to negotiate for a project funding to end progressively and ensure transfer of responsibilities for sustainability.
- It is important that all the management approaches and tools are incorporated in legal and regulatory frameworks; this will allow implementation by the by Directors of fisheries.
- Fishers are encouraged to do other activities (eg: farming) during the closing season as an alternative livelihood. It is also important to provide other alternative if possible by the government or NGOs.
- Banc d' arguin MPA in Mauritania is managed by the local competent authority as a way to ensure community participation in decision making and the management of the area.

4. WORKING GROUP

The group work was guided by Dr. Mohamed Seisay who presented the ToRs and scope of work for the working group session session as shown in the below table.

Fisheries management approaches/tools	Formulating Mechanism for implementation, lessons learnt
EAF, RBFM, Co-management, MPA, Wealth-based	Status of implementation
	Issues and Challenges in Implementation
	Lessons learnt
	Actions for improving implementations
	Way forward-

The results of the group work are attached as annex 1.

Pictures: *Participants during the group work*

5. OUTCOMES OF THE MEETING

Following the technical sessions, group work and discussions, the following outcomes were reached:

- Awareness was created among member states on the concepts, principles and the processes of implementation for EAF, RBFM, Co-management, MPAs and Wealth Based Management.
- The participants assessed the status of implementation of each management tool or approach and identified key challenges, lessons learnt and proposed actions to enhance their implementation.
- The experts observed that the application of these management tools has largely been through donor support, and member states have not fully integrated the approaches within their fisheries management programmes.
- Experts noted that issues of capacity building, institutional arrangements, appropriate legal frameworks and financial mechanisms are critical for the successful implementation of these management approaches and tools.
- The experts noted that the wealth based approach has had very limited application in member states due to insufficient knowledge on the tool and methodology.
- The experts further noted that data required (biological, social and economic) for effective application of the management tools is still a major challenge.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Participants commended AU-IBAR for successfully organizing the expert consultative workshop on fisheries resources management approaches and tools in the African context and recommend that:
- Capacity building should be strengthened and provided for the different stakeholders at each level of management and in communities, universities and centres of excellence;
- Universities, with fisheries science courses, should be encouraged to formulate tailor-made courses on these management tools.
- Funding mechanism should be established by member states to sustain effective application of the different management approaches and tools;
- Management approaches and tools used should be reviewed, assessed and documented;
- Experience sharing on the fisheries management approaches should be encouraged among AU member states;
- Appropriate guidelines on the management approaches - EAF, MPA, Co-management and RBFM - should be developed/piloted and existing cases documented for AU member states;

- Awareness needs to be created and capacity of member states be developed in the wealth based management approach
- AU member states should strongly consider availing adequate resources for data acquisition and management;
- AU member states should fully integrate and align management approaches/tools within their fisheries management programmes.

7. CLOSURE:

The participants thanked the Government of Kenya for hosting this important event and the enabling conducive atmosphere.

Closing statements were made by Dr. Mohamed Seisay on behalf of the Director of AU-IBAR and Ms. Jane Njeri Kinya, Deputy Director of Fisheries at the State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy, Kenya, on behalf of the Hon Minister of Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries of the Republic of Kenya

ANNEXURES

ANNEX 1: GROUP WORKS
GROUP 1: Francophone

Status of Implementation	Issues and Challenges	Opportunities	Lessons Learned	Actions for Improvement	Recommandations
Fisheries Management Approaches/Tools: EAF					
Adopted holistic Approach: Fisheries Management Plan	• Human Resources (Stakeholders) • Information system • Sharing of responsibilities (conflicts of competencies) • Institutional frame • Sustainable endogenous financing in priority	• Crisis in the sector • Technical and financial partnership	• Limits of the sectoral approach • Unsustainable exogenous financing	• Capacity building of stakeholders • -Have the required profiles • -Integrate the ecosystem approach into training curricula	• Organize thematic training workshops (R, SR, N). • Develop training modules • Institutionalize the approach
Fisheries Management Approaches/Tools: RBFM					
Subsistence fisheries (customary rights)	• Drift to a commercial fishery	• Food and nutrition security	• Need for regulation	• Regulate and implement participatory monitoring	• Develop appropriate tools
Licenses, Authorization, Fishing permits	• Overcapacity in some resources	• Possibility of combining licensing with other management measures	• Better governance • Taking into account the fishery potential	• Establishment of a Fisheries Licensing Board • Evaluate the impact of management measures to be combined to licensing	• Define the mandate of the commission (national, FCWC, CPCO, COREP...).- • Develop evaluation tools
Cooperative (Senegal)	• Sustainable use of resources	• Quota corresponding to the MSY	• Greater accountability of stakeholders • Greater transparency	• Evaluate the perspective of generalization of the approach	• Inform / disseminate the approach
Territorial rights	• Institutionalization • Monitoring and evaluation	• National preference and sustainability of resources	• Greater ownership of resources	• Provide guidance and support to FOs for sustainability of the fisheries	• Disseminate the concept
Fisheries Management Approaches/Tools: Co-management					
Adopted holistic approach	• Ensuring sustainable funding • Empowering professionals • Define an appropriate legal and institutional framework	• Crisis in the sector • Technical and financial partnership • In line with the decentralization policy	• Limits of centralized management • Failure to meet deadlines for the implementation of the process	• Developer income • generating activities for empowering management and vigilance committees • Stakeholders' capacity building	• Institutionalize and Disseminate information on the approach • Establish an appropriate legal framework
Fisheries Management Approaches/Tools: MPAs					
Approach adopted	• conflict between Institutions • Appropriate legal framework • Low level of funding for activities	• Potential improvement in fisheries biodiversity, yields and incomes in the medium and long term	• Low participation of professionals in the management of MPAs	• -Identify stakeholders and build capacity	• Disseminate the approach • Periodically assess the impacts of MPAs

Status of Implementation	Issues and Challenges	Opportunities	Lessons Learned	Actions for Improvement	Recommandations
		• Capitalizing on other management options' achievements	• Disconnect between actions and expected results	• Create a multi-sectoral MPA management framework • Develop tools for assessing the bio-ecological, economic and social performance of MPAs.	
Fisheries Management Approaches/Tools: Wealth Based Fisheries Management					
Embryonic	• Periodic assessment of fishery resources • Management of fishing capacity • Initial quota allocation • Quota control	• Fishery exploitation at MEY	• Very little experience	• Training of stakeholders in bio-economic modelling • Regular stock assessment	• Dissemination the approach • Organizing training workshops

GROUP 2: Anglophone

Fisheries Management Approaches/ Tools	Application and Implementations					
	Status	**Opportunities**	**Challenges**	**Lessons Learnt**	**Actions for Improvement**	**Way Forward**
EAF	• Concept widely accepted in African Countries and incorporated in fisheries policies and laws to various degrees • Supported by Norway through FAO / EAF –Nansen project. Implementation; • Training, • developed fisheries management plan, • improved legal frameworks, • Improved consultations • Application of EAF in countries at different levels	• Fisheries management plans • Knowledge on EAF for fisheries management	• Capacity building did not cover all the stakeholders • Funding mechanisms • Coordination of the EAF process since it overs different stakeholder and issues • Conflicting policies and institutional priorities • Data and data quality • The Application of EAF is context based	• Demonstrated benefits e.g. improved management planning • Enhanced consultations and voluntary compliance • Common approach application specific to countries • Need to identify champions for implementation e.g. NFO	• Capacity building to target different stakeholders • Internalise EAF process in countries budgets	• Mainstream the EAF tool in overall fisheries management • Initiatives supported by FAO –EAF Nansen project should be completed
RBFM	• Implementation of RBFM is underway at different levels in the countries • In some countries RBFM is still a 'free' access (since its based on licenses to fish with no property rights) • Rights allocation depends on the location (e.g rivers, lake marine) , nearshore or offshore or artisanal or commercial fisheries	• When rights are clearly defined there is incentive to invest	• Elite capture • Different fisheries involved eg inland and marine, artisanal or commercial • Rights not clearly defined (not property right or territorial • Definition of a fishermen since it involves individuals and families • Legislations does not take into account the user rights • Weak user rights • Cultural and perceptions • Landing sites not centralised	• Communities are good in enforcement • Recognised value of the fishery • Culturally contextualized	• Review the fisheries regulations to accommodate right based management • Stepwise process – start with industrial , commercial and them move to artisanal fisheries • Capacity building on RBFM eg include exchange programs	• Raise awareness on the importance of RBFM • Align fisheries management to incorporate RBFM

Fisheries Management Approaches/ Tools	Application and Implementations					
	Status	Opportunities	Challenges	Lessons Learnt	Actions for Improvement	Way Forward
			• Complexity in allocating in user rights and the issue of the stock			
Co-Management	• Concept widely accepted in African Countries and incorporated in policies and laws to various degrees • Application of co-management in countries at different levels • Champions in Co-management through Beach Management Units (BMU)	• Sense of ownership/ responsibility over the resource • Participation and decision making • Sustained outcomes • Collective security • Rapid and clear decision making • Capacity building	• Misunderstanding of co-management concept and process • Institutionalising co-management in tandem with local communities' institutional fabric. (setting up of units under co-management have seldom considered institutional opportunities existing within communities) • Government official afraid of losing power to fisher communities • Capacity of fishers to assume responsibilities in co-management • Differences in culture, perceptions and expectations • Differences in interests (Elite capture) • Inadequate leadership skills in co-management • Responsibility transfer with no rights	• Enhances voluntary compliance • Consultations improves Participation and shared responsibilities • Promotes equity • Prevent and resolve conflict • Reduces the fisheries management costs over long-term • Empowerment of stakeholders in co-management • All stakeholder must be identified before the co-management planning	• Capacity development across all stakeholders levels • Establish for mechanisms for co-funding co-management activities e.g. the transaction costs	• Call for review and assessment on the efficacy of existing co-management modalities • Continuous capacity building of co-management participants
			• Inadequate funding resources and mechanism to fund co-management			

Fisheries Management Approaches/ Tools	Application and Implementations					
	Status	Opportunities	Challenges	Lessons Learnt	Actions for Improvement	Way Forward
			• limted knowledge in co-management • Political economic considerations (political ladders)			
MPA	• Countries have identified marine areas for protection	• Mechanism of reducing fishing effort	• Institutional framework to implement MPAs • Reduces access to resources with alternative livelihood • Lack high level of political commitments • Establishment of MPA is not based Science • High initial costs • User conflicts • Understanding of stock status; biomass • Climate change and variability	• Improvement of research and monitoring • Enhances participation of local communities • If community managed it improves the ecosystem	• Enhance dialogue within government to address the institutional challenge • Involve resource users in research, identification and management of MPAs	• FAO to assess the efficacy of MPAs • Develop well defined objectives with full participation of all stakeholders • Incorporate ecosystem approach in MPAS
Wealth Based	• Being resisted from lack of understanding	• Optimises the total wealth derivable from resource by reduction of wastage and being efficient	• Inadequate capacity among managers in the economic perspective of fisheries management	• Evidence rent maximization and improved resource health (not in the African countries)	• Develop human capacity for popularisation of the concept	• Raise awareness and embark on applicability of the management tool

Annex 2: Agenda

Time	Event	Presenter/Facilitator
	Day 1: 20 March 2017	
08:30 – 09:00	Registration	AU-IBAR Secretariat
09:00 – 09:45	• Welcome remarks by Director AU-IBAR • Welcome remarks by FAO • Welcome and opening statement (Kenya) • Background, objective and expected outcomes of the meeting	AU-IBAR Rebecca M. Jane K. AU-IBAR
09:45 – 10:15	**Group Photo session and Coffee & Tea-Break**	
10:15 – 10:30	• Adoption of the Agenda	AU-IBAR
10:30 – 11:30	Experts experience in implementing various fisheries management options (concept/principles, processes and implementation mechanism): 1. Progress made towards implementation of FAO Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries and other management options - Ms Elizabeth Mueni 2. Co-management- Dr. Paul Onyango 3. Community-based MPA - Dr. Andrew Baio 4. User-Right based fisheries- Dr Rebecca Metzner	Experts
11:30-12:30	Countries presentation on lesson learnt and best practices during implementation of fisheries management options (EAF, MPA, RBFM, Co-management): 1. Angola 2. Benin 3. Cameroun 4. Kenya	Representatives from Members States
12:30 – 13:00	Countries presentation on lesson learnt and best practices during implementation of fisheries management options (EAF, MPA, RBFM, Co-management): 1. Madagascar 2. Gabon	
13:00 – 14:00	**Lunch**	
14:00-15:00	Countries presentation on lesson learnt and best practices during implementation of fisheries management options (EAF, MPA, RBFM, Co-management): 1. Senegal 2. Mauritania 3. Tanzania 4. Tunisia	
15:00- 15:45	Discussions from country presentations and experts	All Participants
15:45-16:00	Presentation of ToRs of Working Group	AU-IBAR
16:00 – 17:00	Working Group Session: Identification of Priority Actions Identifying the (Issues, constraints, opportunities and actions/implementation mechanism) for each priority actions for various fisheries management options in terms of: • Governance • Ease of implementation	Four WGs: 1. EAF 2. RBFM 3. MPA 4. Co-management
17:00-	**Coffee & Tea-Break and End of Day 1**	
	Day 2: 21 March 2017	
09:00 – 10:30	Working Group Session continue on Priority and Action Plan	Working groups
10:45 – 11:00	**Coffee & Tea-Break**	
11:00 – 13:00	Working Group Session continue	Working groups
13:00 – 14:00	**Lunch**	
14:00 – 16:00	Working Group Session continue	Working groups
16:00 – 17:00	Plenary session	
17:00-	**Coffee & Tea-Break and End of Day 2**	

Time	Event	Presenter/Facilitator
Day 3: 22 March 2017		
09:00 – 10:30	Plenary session (Working group 1 & 2)	Working groups
10:30 – 11:00	**Coffee & Tea-Break**	
11:00 – 13:00	Plenary session (Working group 3 & 4)	Working groups
13:00 – 14:00	**Lunch**	
14:00 -14:30	Closing Ceremony	AU-IBAR

Annex 3: List of Participants

ANGOLA

Ms Maria de Lourdes sardinha
National Director
Caixa postal83
Luanda, Angola
Tel: +244917487687
E-mail: mdlsardinha@gmail.com

FAO

Dr. Rebecca Metzner
Head, Fishery, Policy Economics and Institutions Team
FAO
Viale Terme di Caracalla
Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06 57056718
E-mail: Rebecca.Metzner@fao.org

SENEGAL

Mr. Moustapha DEME Economist Researche CRODT
BP 2241
Dakar, Senegal
Tel: 00 221 77 632 50 27
E-mail: moustapha.deme@gmail.com

SIERRA LEONE

Dr. Andrew Baio
Senior Research Fellow
(Natural Resource Economics)
Institute of Marine Biology and Oceanography Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone Mount Aureol, Freetown, Sierra Leone Freetown, Sierra Leone
Tel: +232 78825548/+232 88425151
E-mail: acimbaio@gmail.com

MADAGASCAR

Mr Tiana RANDRIAMBOLA
Head of Industrial Fisheries Department Ministry of Halieutics Resources and Fishery P. o. Box 1699 ANTANANARIVO 101 – MADAGASCAR Tel: +261 33 12 900 06
E-mail: trce2708@gmail.com

TUNISIA

RAFIK NOUAILI Deputy Director
General-directorate of fisheries and aquaculture
30 Rue Alain Savary 1002 Tunis Tunisie
TUNISIA – Tunis
Tel:+21625110378
E-mail: nouailirafik@yahoo.fr

CAMEROON

NGOANDE SALVADOR
Executive Secretary
Development Fund for Maritime Fisheries
Po Box 1864
Douala - Cameroon
Tel: + 237 699 99 0472
E-mail: sango_cam@yahoo.fr

Dr BELAL EMMA
DIRECTEUR DES PECHES, DE L'AQUACULTURE ET DES INDUSTRIES HALIEUTIQUES
MINISTERE DE L'ELEVAGE, DES PECHES ET DES INDUSTRIES ANIMALES
MINEPIA, YAOUNDE CAMEROUN YAOUNDE, CAMEROUN
Tel: +237699595689/+237675492197
E-mail: belalemma@yahoo.fr

BENIN

Sébastien AHOUANDJOGBE
Chef du Service Contrôle ET Suivi des Produits et des Filières Halieutiques, Police des Pêches.
Direction de la Production Halieutiques/ Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage et de la Pêche.
01 BP 383 Cotonou
République du Bénin
Tel: + 229 97 57 33 64
E-mail: sebastienahouandjogbe@gmail.com

KENYA

Ms. Elizabeth Mueni
Assistant Director of Fisheries
Kenya Fisheries Service
State Department for Fisheries & Blue Economy
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
P. O. Box 90423-80100
Mombasa, Kenya
Tel +254722326826
Email: emuenibf@yahoo.com

Mrs. Kinya Jane
Deputy Director of Fisheries
Kenya Fisheries Service
State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy
Ministry of Agriculture , Livestock and Fisheries
P.O. BOX 58187 – 00200
NAIROBI, KENYA Tel: 0727674861
E-mail: njeri.kinya@gmail.com

TANZANIA

Paul Onyango
University of Dar Es Salaam P. O. Box 35064
Dar Es Salaam,Tanzania Tel: +255 784 908802
E-mail: Onyango_paul@Udsm.ac.tz

GABON

Alda Prudence MALEMBA
Directeur Général Adjoint 1 des pêches et de l'Aquaculture
Direction Générale des Pêches et de l'Aquaculture
B.P: 9498
Libreville (GABON)
Tel: 00241 06 19 91 80
E-mail: prudencepro2015@gmail.com

MAURITANIA

Sidi Mohamed Ould SIDI Chargé de mission
Ministère des
Pêches et de l'économie maritime
Mauritanie
Nouakchott –MAURITANIE Tel: (00222) 36341095
E-mail: ouldsidisidimohamed@yahoo.fr

AU-IBAR

Mohamed Seisay
Snr. Fisheries Officer

Obinna Anozie
Policy Analyst- Fisheries

Joseph Mbane
Project Assistant- Fish Trade

Daniel Alifaki
Finance and Admin Officer

Eyob Assegedew
Admin Assistant

Kayitesi Hashil
Admin Assistant

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
Website: www.au-ibar.org