

Report of the

**EAF REGIONAL TASK GROUP MEETING AND ECOLOGICAL RISK
ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY WORKSHOP
(SOUTH WEST INDIAN OCEAN)**

Mombasa, Kenya, 27–30 January 2009



THE EAF-NANSEN PROJECT

FAO started the implementation of the project “Strengthening the Knowledge Base for and Implementing an Ecosystem Approach to Marine Fisheries in Developing Countries (EAF-Nansen GCP/INT/003/NOR)” in December 2006 with funding from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). The EAF-Nansen project is a follow-up to earlier projects/programmes in a partnership involving FAO, Norad and the Institute of Marine Research (IMR), Bergen, Norway on assessment and management of marine fishery resources in developing countries. The project works in partnership with governments and also Global Environment Facility (GEF)-supported Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) projects and other projects that have the potential to contribute to some components of the EAF-Nansen project.

The EAF-Nansen project offers an opportunity to coastal countries in sub-Saharan Africa, working in partnership with the project, to receive technical support from FAO for the development of national and regional frameworks for the implementation of Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management and to acquire additional knowledge on their marine ecosystems for their use in planning and monitoring. The project contributes to building the capacity of national fisheries management administrations in ecological risk assessment methods to identify critical management issues and in the preparation, operationalization and tracking the progress of implementation of fisheries management plans consistent with the ecosystem approach to fisheries.

STRENGTHENING THE KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR AND
IMPLEMENTING AN ECOSYSTEM APPROACH TO
MARINE FISHERIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
(EAF-NANSEN GCP/INT/003/NOR)

Report of the
EAF REGIONAL TASK GROUP MEETING AND ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT
METHODOLOGY WORKSHOP (SOUTH WEST INDIAN OCEAN)

Mombasa, Kenya, 27–30 January 2009

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

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

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

The first meeting of the South West Indian Ocean area EAF Regional Task Group (RTG) was held in Mombasa, Kenya from 27 to 30 January 2009. It was held together with an Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Workshop. This was a follow-up meeting to the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC) “Managers and Decision-Makers Workshop on the Implementation of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean” held in Durban, South Africa, in June 2008, and the EAF introductory workshop held in Maputo, Mozambique, in 2005.

The main objectives of the meeting and workshop were to discuss and facilitate key processes and activities for the implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries management in the South West Indian Ocean region including the modalities for the formation and functioning of the Regional Task Group and National Task Groups.

This document gives the record of the meeting including the major outcomes, the decisions taken and the roadmap for the work of the NTG in the implementation of the EAF-Nansen project in the South West Indian Ocean area.

The input and support given by Kwame Koranteng, Gabriella Bianchi, Aubrey Harris and Marie-Thérèse Magnan, all of FAO and also J.-C. Njock and Rennison Ruwa in the preparation, editing, translation and production of this document is gratefully acknowledged. The RTG members also contributed to drafting of materials for various sections of the document.

FAO EAF-Nansen Project/FAO, Projet EAF-Nansen.

Report of the EAF Regional Task Group Meeting and Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Workshop (South West Indian Ocean). Mombasa, Kenya, 27–30 January 2009/Rapport de la réunion du Groupe de travail régional AEP et de l'Atelier sur la méthodologie d'évaluation du risque écologique (sud-ouest de l'océan Indien). Mombasa, Kenya, 27-30 janvier 2009.

FAO EAF-Nansen Project Report/FAO, Rapport du Projet EAF-Nansen. No 4. Rome, FAO. 2009. 76p.

ABSTRACT

The first meeting of the South West Indian Ocean EAF Regional Task Group (RTG) was held in Mombasa, Kenya, from 27 to 30 January 2009, together with an ecological risk assessment methodology workshop. It was attended by 20 participants from the South West Indian Ocean (SWIO) countries, the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP), the Agulhas and Somali Currents Large Marine Ecosystems (ASCLME) project, the Scientific Committee of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)/Nairobi Convention Implementation Unit, the African Union Commission and FAO. The RTG is an implementation structure under the EAF-Nansen project GCP/INT/003/NOR and serves as the forum for training in ecological risk assessment that is the methodology used for the identification and prioritization of issues requiring management attention.

The main objectives of the meeting and workshop were to discuss and facilitate key processes and activities for the implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries management in the South West Indian Ocean region including the modalities for the formation and functioning of the RTG and National Task Groups (NTGs). It was explained that, to be able to achieve the objectives of implementing an ecosystem approach to fisheries at the national level, certain key structures have to be in place including the NTG with representatives of key stakeholders in a given fishery and that would take the lead in the process.

An overview of the key concepts and process of the ecological risk assessment methodology were clarified. Participants were also introduced to the preparation of EAF baseline reports to be used as initial input for the work on ecosystems approach to fisheries. It was explained that the preparation of the report is to be led by national and regional experts and overseen by the NTG.

For the exercises the participants worked in three subgroups formed during the meeting with each group selecting a chairman who moderated the discussions and a rapporteur.

The participants expressed satisfaction with the development of a communication strategy for the project and especially with the participatory approach used.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Opening	1
1.2 Workshop objectives and organization	1
1.3 Update on the EAF-Nansen project:	3
1.4 General discussion.....	3
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND WORKING GROUPS	3
2.1 Project management	3
2.2 Regional Task Groups.....	4
2.3 National Task Groups.....	4
3. INTRODUCTION TO THE EAF PRINCIPLES.....	5
3.1 Introduction	5
3.2 Report on Task 1	6
3.3 General discussion on Task 1	7
4. MAIN STEPS OF THE EAF PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS	8
4.1 Introduction	8
4.2 Report on Task 2	8
4.3 Summary of discussion of Task 2	11
5. EAF BASELINE REPORTS	11
5.1 Introduction to EAF Baseline reports	11
5.2 Report on Task 3.....	12
5.3 Summary of discussions on Task 3	14
6. ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT (ERA) METHODOLOGY.....	15
6.1 Issue identification, risk assessment and prioritization.....	15
6.2 Report on Task 4.....	15
6.3 Performance reports	16
6.4 Report on Task 5	17
7. PUTTING EAF INTO PRACTICE – THE BUILDING BLOCKS PROVIDED BY THE EAF–NANSEN PROJECT	19
8. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR THE EAF-NANSEN PROJECT	20
9. REGIONAL AND NATIONAL TASK GROUPS AND PLANNING OF FUTURE WORK.....	21
9.1 Terms of reference of the Task Groups	21
9.2 Facilitation of Task Groups	21
9.3 Election of officers.....	21
9.4 Planning of future work and allocation of responsibilities	21
10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22

APPENDIXES

1. List of participants	23
2. Agenda	26
3. Statements by partners	28
4. Outline of EAF Baseline report	31
5. EAF-Nansen Project communication channels	34
6. Draft terms of reference of the EAF Regional Task Group.....	35
7. Draft terms of reference of the EAF National Task Group	36

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Opening

Within the framework of the FAO project “Strengthening the Knowledge Base for and Implementing an Ecosystem Approach to Marine Fisheries in Developing Countries (EAF-Nansen GCP/INT/003/NOR)” an EAF Regional Task Group Meeting and Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Workshop was organized in Mombasa, Kenya, from 27 to 30 January 2009.

The workshop was attended by 20 participants from the South West Indian Ocean (SWIO) countries, the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP), the Agulhas and Somali Currents Large Marine Ecosystems (ASCLME) project, the Scientific Committee of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)/Nairobi Convention Implementation Unit, the African Union Commission and FAO. The list of participants and agenda for the meeting and workshop are presented in Appendixes 1 and 2 respectively.

The EAF-Nansen project Coordinator, Kwame Koranteng, welcomed the participants to Mombasa and to the meeting. He informed them about the untimely death of Mr Atle Sangolt who was the captain on R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN and was leading the operations of the vessel on a regional FAO-Benguela Current Commission survey. Kwame requested that one minute’s silence be observed in his memory.

Short opening statements were made by Mr Kaitira Katonda, Interim Executive Secretary of SWIOFP, Dr Magnus Ngoile, Policy and Governance Coordinator of the ASCLME project, Ms Nancy Gitonga, Coordinator of the Regional Advisory Committee of the Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund (African Union Commission) and Mr Aubrey Harris, Secretary of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission. The statements are summarized in Appendix 3.

1.2 Workshop objectives and organization

Gabriella Bianchi of FAO gave the objectives of the workshop as follows:

- Discuss and facilitate key processes and activities for the implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries management in the South West Indian Ocean region.
- To provide additional training to selected persons from Eastern African countries to become EAF National Task Group leaders in their respective countries. The training will include:
 - general concepts and principles relevant to EAF;
 - preparation of EAF-baseline reports;
 - concepts and principles relevant to the ecological risk assessment methodology (including issue identification and prioritization);
 - development of performance reports/management plans.
- Discuss modalities for the formation and functioning of the EAF Regional and National Task Groups.
- To inform participants on ways and means by which the EAF-Nansen project can assist African countries in planning and implementation of EAF.
- To develop a roadmap for future work on EAF in the Eastern Africa Region.
- To provide a forum for collaboration among the major regional programmes/projects on sustainable fisheries and in particular the application of the ecosystem approach to fisheries.

The participants were reminded that the Mombasa meeting is a direct follow-up to the SWIOFC “Managers and Decision-Makers Workshop on the Implementation of an Ecosystem Approach to

Fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean” that was held in Durban, South Africa from 22 to 26 June 2008.

It was recalled that at the Durban meeting the participants undertook trial identification of EAF issues and priorities in the South West Indian Ocean area specific to selected fisheries. Three groups were formed to undertake preliminary issue identification and risk assessment for: i) demersal artisanal fisheries; ii) prawn fisheries; and iii) tuna fisheries in the South West Indian Ocean. The generic component tree was used to structure the analysis and identification of the issues followed by a session on risk analysis to prioritize the issues. The results of this trial assessment can be found in the workshop report

In the Mombasa workshop, three groups were formed to undertake practical exercises (Tasks) relevant to EAF. Each group selected a chairman who moderated the discussions and a rapporteur. Each group was asked to prepare a report that was presented for discussion in the plenary. The composition of the groups and the chair and rapporteur selected by each group for specific tasks are shown in Table 1.

When it was realized that many of the participants were new to the process and that their understanding of the methodology was very poor the agenda was adapted to include a more in-depth session on the EAF planning steps (ERA methodology).

Table 1: Composition of groups formed for the exercises (Tasks). The countries of the group members are shown in brackets.

		Group		
		1	2	3
		Samueline Ranaivoson (Madagascar)	Elisa Socrate (Seychelles)	Martha Mukira (Kenya)
		Mardayven Nallee (Mauritius)	Elsa Patria (Mozambique)	Hassan Afsal (Maldives)
		Kamardine Boinali (Comoros)	Ahmed Iman (Somalia)	Andy Cockcroft (ASCLME Scientific Committee)
		Nancy Gitonga (AU Commission)	Yason Mndeme (Tanzania)	Kaitira Katonda (SWIOFP)
		Magnus Ngoile (ASCLME project)	Simon Warui (Kenya)	Renison Ruwa (SWIOFP)
			Johnson Kitheka (UNEP/Nairobi Convention)	Mwatete Mlewa (SWIOFP)
Task 1	Chair: Samueline Rapporteur: Mardayven	Chair: Elisa Rapporteur: Elsa	Chair: Andy Rapporteur: Mwatete	
Task 2	Chair: Samueline Rapporteur: Mardayven	Chair: Elisa Rapporteur: Simon	Chair: Renison Rapporteur: Hassan	
Task 3	Chair: Samueline Rapporteur: Mardayven	Chair: Simon Rapporteur: Elisa	Chair: Kaitira Rapporteur: Martha	
Task 4	Chair: Samueline Rapporteur: Mardayven	Chair: Yason Rapporteur: Elsa	Chair: Andy Rapporteur: Mwatete	
Task 5	Chair: Mardayven Rapporteur: Nancy	Chair: Johnson Rapporteur: Ahmed	Chair: Renison Rapporteur: Hassan	

1.3 Update on the EAF-Nansen Project

In a presentation made by the EAF-Nansen Coordinator, the participants were reminded of the main elements (history, objectives, structure and expected outcomes) of the EAF-Nansen project. They were also provided with an update on activities that had taken place under the various components of the project since the meeting in Durban in June 2008.

The project consists of five components, namely EAF-Policy and Management, Ecosystem Assessment and Monitoring, Support to regional research vessels, Capacity building and Dissemination of information. The project is executed by the Fisheries Management and Conservation Service (FIMF) of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department. The RTG was informed that the FAO Development Law Service (LEGN) is collaborating with the project to prepare an overview document on available instruments relevant to EAF in Africa. The objective of the study is to guide the development or amendment of country legislation relating to EAF and enable the EAF-Nansen project to assist countries to incorporate the EAF concept in relevant national legislations. EAF introductory seminars similar to the Workshop organized in Durban in June 2008 have been organized either under the project or in collaboration with partners (Durban, South Africa; Casablanca, Morocco; Mombasa, Kenya).

Ecosystem surveys with the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN have been carried out with partners in Eastern, Southern and Western Africa. The participants were also informed of the efforts being made to support the work of participating countries in the project area using their own research vessels and on the development of a training programme.

1.4 General discussion

It was noted that one of the timelines of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) is to have EAF implemented by 2010. There was a discussion on whether this would be met by the countries at that time and as to how it would be possible to assess to what extent countries had implemented EAF. It was felt that generally many countries would not have implemented the EAF by 2010. The possibility of obtaining guidance from FAO and the EAF Nansen project on this issue was discussed. It was noted that WSSD and Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) would be assessed for the marine environment in 2015 and 2017, respectively.

Further information was given on the 2009 cruise schedule of the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN. The representative of the African Union (AU) Commission requested that the schedule be availed to the AU Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund Regional Advisory Committee. The EAF Nansen coordinator elaborated on the ways that countries could have access to the data and noted that the survey data are useful only when they are actually used. He noted the need to undertake further analyses of the data collected for the management of fisheries in the region.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND WORKING GROUPS

2.1 Project management

The overall decision structure of the EAF-Nansen Project was presented as well as the functions and compositions of the various bodies in the project. The bodies are the Advisory Group, the Regional Steering Committees (for the four operational areas of the project) and the National and Regional Task Groups. There is also the Annual Forum.

It was explained that the Advisory Group is an independent body to advise the project management that would look across the regions and bring in experiences from outside the project area. The members of the Advisory Group include scientists vexed in the development of the EAF concept, EAF practitioners, an EAF Regional Task Group chair, the chair of Scientific Committee of one Regional

Fisheries Body in the project area and the Chairman and Secretary of CECAF (Fisheries Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic) and SWIOFC (South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission).

Each Regional Steering Committee is to have representatives of fisheries research and management institutions in the partner countries in the region, as well as Institute of Marine Research (IMR), FAO and representatives of the relevant LME Programmes or other partner Programmes/projects. The SC is responsible for assessing the project progress, and formulating recommendations to the project management regarding requirements and work-plans. It was explained that the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission would play the role of Regional Steering Committee for the ASCLME area, as is the case for the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP). Furthermore, close links would be maintained with the Nairobi Convention and the participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the Task Groups would be encouraged.

According to the EAF-Nansen project document, an Annual Forum is to meet once a year. Members of the forum will be *all* project partners involved in implementation of EAF related projects and partner countries of these projects. The Forum is for progress reporting, dissemination of experiences, identification of best practices and discussion of strategies.

2.2 Regional Task Groups

An EAF Regional Task Group (RTG) is to be established in each of the four operational regions of the EAF-Nansen project. Regional Task groups are to address issues at regional level. Each RTG will be composed of 1 member per country. Each country shall also appoint an Alternate RTG member to ensure the country's participation in all regional workshops and meetings. The RTGs will also have representatives from major projects operating in the region. The Chair of each RTGs will attend the Annual Forum of the EAF-Nansen project and will serve as resource person for the Steering Committee if and when required. The RTG will be a forum for learning and exchange of ideas and advice in relation to EAF in a given region.

It has been proposed that the RTG becomes a Working Group under the relevant Regional Fisheries Body (e.g. the SWIOFC and CECAF).

2.3 National Task Groups

A National Task Group (NTG) with representatives of key stakeholders in a given fishery that would take the lead in the process at the national level is to be formed in each country. The NTG will be responsible for overall coordination of the project in each country and is to ensure that the perspectives and expertise of the stakeholders are taken into account. The focal point of the NTG will be a member of the Regional Task Group. He/she must be confirmed for each country. It was clarified that each country member of the Regional Task Group would be responsible for the setting up of the NTG in his/her country.

The NTG will oversee the implementation of the various steps of EAF within the country and facilitate consultation with different stakeholders to ensure that stakeholder opinions are reflected in the work and results of the project. One important initial task would be to take lead in the preparation of the EAF-baseline report (see section 5). It would also take lead in issue identification and prioritization in consultation with stakeholders.

Membership of the NTG will include representatives of the fisheries management agency and key functional groups, representatives of the national fisheries research agency, representatives of selected stakeholder groups so as to provide coverage of the major fishery types and interests. Also to be included are representatives of national partner projects and experts on specialized issues may be co-opted to particular meetings or activities as necessary.

3. INTRODUCTION TO THE EAF PRINCIPLES

3.1 Introduction

Gabriela Bianchi of FAO gave an introduction to the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF). She said that EAF is motivated by the recognition of the broader impacts of fisheries on the marine ecosystem and of the broader uses and users of the marine environment (in addition to fishing) and builds on the experience gained through fishery management in the past 50 years.

Failures of conventional fisheries management are well known. Irresponsible fishing and inadequate management practices have led to overexploitation of fish stocks, deterioration of the marine environment, loss of livelihoods and missed opportunities for development. While recognizing that EAF builds on existing fisheries management institutions and mechanisms, some key differences between a conventional approach to fisheries management (CFM) and the EAF were summarized as in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Comparison of main features of conventional approach to fisheries management (CFM) and the ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAF)

CFM	EAF
Few fisheries management objectives.	<u>Expanded scope</u> of fisheries management objectives.
Sectoral (focusing mainly on the fisheries sector issues).	Dealing more explicitly with the interactions of the fishery sector with <u>other sectors</u> (e.g. petroleum industry, tourism, coastal development, etc.).
Deals mainly with target species.	Responds to concerns of the <u>broader impacts of fisheries</u> on the marine ecosystem, including impacts of the habitat, on vulnerable species, on biodiversity, etc.
Addresses fisheries management issues at the stock/fishery scale.	Addresses the key issues at the <u>appropriate spatial and temporal scales</u> , that are often nested (local, national, subregional, regional, global).
Predictive.	Given the uncertainty associated with the expanded range of issues to be dealt with, <u>adaptive strategies</u> are recognized as being more useful.
Scientific knowledge is considered the only valid knowledge as a basis for decision-making.	Recognizing that it is not possible to obtain scientific knowledge on all the issues to be dealt with, alternative knowledge (e.g. <u>traditional knowledge</u>) can be utilized as a basis for decision-making.
CFM has operated through prescriptions.	<u>Incentives</u> are recognized as a very valid complement to prescription.
Top-down (command and control) approaches typify CFM.	<u>Participatory approaches</u> , e.g. various forms of co-management are a key feature of the EAF.
Addresses mainly corporate (fisheries sector) interests.	Needs to take into account the interests and aspirations of a <u>broader stakeholder community</u> .

The key steps for the planning and implementation of EAF are very similar to those under the conventional approach. A key difference, however is the participation of stakeholders at all levels of planning and decision-making. Furthermore, formal processes and methodologies are utilized to identify the key issues to be dealt with by fisheries management as a matter of priority in order to achieve sustainability goals.

In the discussion that followed the presentation, some RTG members noted that comparison between conventional fisheries management and the ecosystem approach is extremely helpful. The message that had been clearly delivered was that “EAF builds on conventional fisheries management”. One of the characteristics of EAF which was raised was incentives and examples were provided of how these could be used to positively influence stakeholders. Examples were given such as participation in the decision-making process. Another example was the shift of fishing effort in Mauritius from the inshore seine fishery to offshore fishing around fish aggregating devices (FADs), with an incentive package.

On the introduction of EAF principles in countries of the region, a critical issue is governance and the administration of fisheries. Very often participants return home after this type of workshop to find that it is business as usual and that it is very difficult to initiate change. In the context of EAF, it was noted that the signatures of the project document by high level officials in the respective countries should be a good stepping stone for initiating the process of planning and management using the EAF approach.

3.2 Report on Task 1

Task: *On your return home, you are expected to initiate action to form the EAF National Task Group. How would you explain EAF to the fisheries administrators and stakeholder?*

Group 1

Actions

- Identify groups
- Administrators (Ministry responsible for fisheries)

Stakeholders

- Public
 - Ministry of Environment
 - Ministry of Tourism
 - Ministry of Planning and Finance
 - Ministries responsible for enforcement of fisheries/marine laws and regulations
 - Ministries responsible for research
- Private
 - Industrial fishing companies
 - NGOs
 - Communities
 - Artisanal fishers
 - Artisanal processors/traders

Approach

- Report to administrators highlighting the importance of EAF and recommending the setting up of the meeting with staff of the fisheries administration
- Presentation of EAF to senior officers of the fisheries administration

- Engagement with Minister responsible for fisheries (through PS)
- Convening meeting with stakeholders

Message

- Change in the management paradigm of fisheries
- Show reasons why previous fisheries management approaches failed and give reasons for the introduction of EAF.

Group 2

Definition

EAF is a concept that is aimed at improving management of fisheries resources. It is not a new concept but a rather a new way of approaching management. In this approach fishery is seen as a whole including biodiversity, environment, and socio-economic aspects. The application of the EAF may not necessarily require change of structure within the ministry or the implementing department. The application is incremental for the existing management framework.

Benefit

- Involves wide stakeholder participation and ensures their interests are factored into fisheries management thus enforcement and compliance level would be high;
- In addition to the fisheries sector, other sectors like tourism that depends on the health of the biodiversity will benefit;
- The approach minimizes duplication of effort and optimizes the use of human and financial resources;
- It ensures sustainable development of fisheries and other sectors like tourism, mining, etc.

Group 3

- Identify the fisheries administrators (high and middle level personnel) and stakeholders in the fisheries sector and invite them to a meeting at which EAF will be explained;
- Group stakeholders based on their interests for invitation to meetings to explain EAF;
- Prepare and make presentations tailored to meet the needs and interests of each group; presentations should explain the benefits of EAF and emphasize that EAF is an evolutionary process based on existing practice in the country;
- Presentation should discuss challenges inherent in development and implementation of EAF;
- Give additional sources of information on EAF and contacts to participants in each group.

3.3 General discussion on Task 1

Key messages emanating from the presentations are summarized below.

- EAF is not completely “new” but rather an integration or synthesis of existing well established and proven management protocols. EAF links closely with other integrated management approaches such as ICM.
- EAF is an evolutionary process and not a one-off, quick fix – it requires time and a nurturing (enabling) environment to succeed.
- Although EAF has a large number of stated aims and goals it is better to envisage it in “bite size chunks” or a step by step progress to the ultimate goal. Otherwise it may appear too daunting to attempt.
- The EAF approach is in most cases a continuation of what is already being done in fisheries management – continuation of these processes (with improvement where necessary) integrated with new information forms the step by step approach recommended above.

- v. EAF approach can be tailored to suit the needs and constraints of a country by prioritizing the needs and what can be achieved in a realistic time frame.
- vi. There is the need to emphasize the advantages of EAF but one must be realistic about cost (financial and manpower).
- vii. It is important to select the interest groups carefully and to tailor the presentations specifically to meet their needs.

4. MAIN STEPS OF THE EAF PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

4.1 Introduction

The main steps of the EAF planning and implementation process were presented by Gabriella Bianchi. She noted that to implement EAF it is necessary to translate broad management objectives into operational objectives and actions according to the following steps (and also summarized in Table 3):

- identify broad objectives relevant to the fishery (or area) in question;
- break these objectives down into smaller priority issues and sub-issues that can be addressed by management measures;
- set operational objectives;
- develop indicators and reference points;
- develop decision rules on how the management measures are to be applied; and
- monitor and evaluate performance.

It was noted that the principles of the EAF should be reflected in relevant policy documents. However, the process should not necessarily start from the policy level as this may cause delays. Where there is no provision in national policy for the EAF principles, introduction of the EAF management may still be possible.

It was explained that definition of the scope and broad objectives of fisheries management means identifying what “you are trying to manage and for what”. It was further explained that under EAF, objectives should reflect the goal of sustainable development. Issues that need to be evaluated in all dimensions of sustainable development are identified and the priority ones for management are identified through risk assessment. For each high priority issue, development of a management system with: i) operational objectives; ii) performance measures; iii) management responses, etc. is required.

4.2 Report on Task 2

Task: *Describe the fisheries management process/organization in your country and assess the possibility of adopting the EAF*

Group 1

The group looked at the management process in the three countries represented in the group.

Mauritius

The *Fisheries Act of 1998* did not make provisions for the protection of the marine ecosystem and subsequently in 2008 after wide consultation with stakeholders a new act (the Marine Resources Act) was proclaimed to cater for fisheries and the protection of the marine ecosystem. No fisheries management plan exists for the time being but there is a proposal to prepare the management plan soon.

Table 3: Main steps for EAF

Step	Comment
<i>1. Scoping/baseline report</i>	It consists in providing a basic description of the fishery/ies under consideration. This step should result in a document providing information on geographic scope, relevant stakeholders, fishing gears and methods, existing and past management measures, etc. (guidance provided on elements to be included). It is important that the result is <u>validated by the stakeholders</u> and that the document truly represents a shared understanding of the history and present situation of the fishery/ies.
<i>2. Setting broad objectives (consistent with overall goals)</i>	Sometimes the broad management objectives for a given fishery/fisheries are not explicitly set. In the context of EAF planning, it is essential that these are clearly identified and agreed upon. They are essential as a reference for determining the key fisheries issues and for the risk analysis process (see below).
<i>3. Identify the issues (e.g. using component trees)</i>	The use of component trees, or of a set of structured categories of issues related to the main three dimensions of a fishery system, i.e. the ecological, human and institutional ones, has many advantages. They can be used as the starting point for all assessments; their use enhances consistency of the approach; minimizes the risk of “missing issues”. Issues should be formulated as possible negative outcomes of present management in relation to stated broad objectives.
<i>4. Prioritize the issues using risk assessment technique</i>	Often many issues are identified, their importance varies and not all will require full reports and explicit management. risk assessment will help to determine the level of risk and the appropriate level of management response. Semi-quantitative risk assessment can be used and applied also in data poor situations. Risk should be measured in relation to stated broad objectives and present management.
<i>5. Management response identification (including setting operational objectives and indicators)</i>	For priority issues identified so far, appropriate management responses should be identified. Operational objectives, indicators, performance measures and decision rules should be determined.
<i>6. Cost-benefit analyses</i>	The efficiency of possible alternative management strategies can be assessed through cost-benefit analyses.
<i>7. Completing detailed reports on each fishery for each issue (including baseline information, objectives, indicators, performance measures), as a basis for fisheries management plans</i>	This step is the one where all the information, knowledge and decisions are compiled into a fisheries management plan. The plan will focus on the key issues that have been identified as being the source of highest risk of failure in relation to the broad objectives for the fishery.

Madagascar

There is a management plan for the shrimp fishery which has been prepared after consultation with all stakeholders. During the implementation phase, it was found that the production of shrimp decreased to half. marine protected areas were created as a means of reducing the fishing effort. This measure gave rise to conflict in resource use as the traditional fishermen continued to fish in the nursery grounds and in the MPAs.

Comoros

As a measure to protect the marine ecosystem, marine protected areas with zoning plans were created in 2001. Consultations with stakeholders were undertaken prior to formulating the plans. It was noted, however, that there was a depletion of the stock within the nearshore areas. In order to manage the existing stock, fish aggregating devices were introduced for fishing in the offshore areas and fishermen were given the opportunity to fish offshore near the FADS where the catch was better.

It was concluded that there is great potential for the application of EAF in the management of the fishery resources in all three countries.

Group 2

Fisheries management process

(i) Policy formulation, fisheries acts and legislation reviewed

- The governments of the region are changing from top-down approach in fisheries policy formulation which is strongly resisted by fisher communities.
- Policy formulation has involved engaging technical departments, research institutions, fishers and business community and is very inclusive.

(ii) Strategic plans and fisheries management plans

- All stakeholders are engaged in the drafting and implementation of such plans; the process is very inclusive.
- Fisheries co-management is adopted in fisheries management to ensure fisher community involvement.

Adopting EAF

- Structures of engagement with some key stakeholders exist;
- Consultation and collaborative forums are well established;
- It is possible to adopt EAF but initial sensitization is necessary.

Group 3

The group chose the Republic of Maldives for this task. Maldives being an Island nation, a lot of emphasis is given by the government for sustainable use of marine natural resources. Fisheries sector being the second highest provider to the GDP and highest provider of local jobs, sustainability of the fisheries resources is of utmost importance to the government of the Maldives.

The Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture is the organization responsible for formulating, regulating and enforcing policies and guidelines on fisheries management. A fisheries management unit under the wing of fisheries management and development section carries out the management of fisheries in the country.

Shark fishery is one of the fisheries carried out on some islands of the country. Shark fins, oil and salted shark meat are exported. Current management plan prohibits shark harvesting from different regions of the country. Data on the amount of shark harvested is not known, only what is exported is recorded. Conflicts occur among tourism sector, tuna fishers and those harvesting sharks. Tourism and tuna fishers see sharks as a friend. Currently, there is no organized way to assess the harvesting.

Benefits of implementing EAF

- The need to collect the necessary data will become ever more important.
- It could lead to identification of common ground for stake holders – tourism, tuna fishers and shark fishers.
- Long-term sustainability of shark fisheries can be achieved.

4.3 Summary of discussion of Task 2

The groups selected examples of some countries to describe the management process/organization. That Maldives provided a description of shark fishery monitoring and a recently adopted management plan. Mauritius briefly described the recent Marine Fisheries Resources Act. Madagascar has an elaborate management plan for shrimp fisheries. This was developed with full industry and other stakeholder support. Madagascar also established several MPAs but found that even in MPAs it was having difficulty in controlling artisanal fishing. Comoros had MPAs with a zoning plan for sections of the coast. Inshore resources were heavily exploited and there was need to shift fishing effort further offshore and on FADs. Seychelles was gradually changing its fisheries management approach from top-down to bottom-up with the formulation of management plans through an inclusive stakeholder consultative process. Some EAF measures have been included in a management plan for bêche-de-mer (sea cucumber) and there was need to further include EAF in the policy and legislation.

It was noted that the consultation process would have been broader if the Maldives management plan had followed EAF principles. It was nevertheless recognized that having an established management plan was itself a significant achievement and the importance was now to implement it. While there may be advantages in having a simple workable plan in the short term, in the medium term ecosystem implications would certainly arise.

The discussion also broached the issue of management of artisanal fisheries. While it is often said that these are not managed in the region, this is a generalization. All countries of the region with artisanal fisheries have fisheries departments, administration of licences, registration, roles in managing conflict or resource allocation, and established regulatory measures. While these were often ad hoc (in contrast to a management plan), and insufficiently enforced (as a result of the magnitude of the task in relation to the availability of human and financial resources), it implied that some management was taking place.

In all cases, some elements of EAF exist; what was considered useful would be to examine the current extent of planning and how it could be changed towards EAF.

A key issue/constraint that arose in the discussions was the importance of implementation and the willingness to take tough management decisions. It was noted that the EAF process in itself, because of the emphasis on stakeholder consultation and involvement of other sectors, made implementation of management measures easier.

If the NTGs could adequately explain the key attributes of the EAF, their fisheries administrators would readily recognize the framework as the most appropriate to address many of the region's existing and emerging fisheries management issues.

5. EAF-BASELINE REPORTS

5.1 Introduction to EAF-baseline reports

A proposed outline of an EAF-baseline (EAF-BL) report (also known as TROM reviews) was presented by FAO (Appendix 4). Preparation of the report is to be led by national and regional experts and overseen by the National Task Group (See section 5.2 below).

It was explained that the EAF-BL report gives an agreed status for the fishery before introducing EAF in the management of the resource in question. It should be a reference material for EAF planning and should provide reference points for monitoring and evaluation of EAF activities and management actions.

The report should contain relevant information on all aspects of the selected fishery and ecosystem, including human dimensions, and must be compiled and analysed to allow for the formulation of more

detailed objectives for the fishery. The report should provide an overview/description of the current situation of the fishery and must contain the following basic information:

- Policy, institutional and administrative frameworks within which the fishery is operating.
- Overview of the fishery and resources exploited.
- Available scientific and traditional knowledge on the resources.
- Annual catches and assessment of the importance of the fishery in the national economy.
- Full set of management measures/primary management tools in use in the fishery.
- Assessment the effectiveness of the current management measures in relation to the fishery itself, including effectiveness in ensuring sustainable utilization.
- MCS – availability, compliance and effectiveness.
- Existing forums for discussions on management.

Where a major fishery type includes different fleets or sectors (for example the bottom trawl, set nets and handline sectors of a demersal fishery) it will be necessary to provide the relevant information for each sector as well as any pertinent information on the fishery as a whole.

In the discussions following the presentation it was clarified that to complete the tables in the guideline is only part of the process. It was noted that although parts of the report could be completed by individuals it would need to be discussed by the NTG in order to get the buy-in and approval of the group. The aim is to develop a document that all key stakeholders are comfortable with, and thus representing the shared view of everybody and that can be used as the basis for the development of a management plan. It was further stressed that although the format includes the key elements, other special issues to add could emerge during the consultative process.

Some further information was seen as important to be included in the baseline report. These included further socio-economic data and analysis, the possibility of value-chain analysis, information on the environment and on other sectors that may interact with fisheries. Importantly it was recognized that the EAF-BL report is a national report and the NTGs should include whatever other information that may be considered relevant to that particular fishery. The secretariat agreed to include these aspects in the baseline reports and encouraged participants to examine any further modification of the report as part of their Task 3.

5.2 Report on Task 3

Task: *How would you prepare the EAF-baseline report for a fishery of your choice, considering the participation of stakeholders and other experts? How different is this report from other reports presented, for example, to the SWIOFC Scientific Committee?*

Group 1

Fisheries administrators will:

- commission the process for the preparation of the baseline report;
- solicit contribution from different sectors and stakeholders; and
- establish the NTG.

The Administration will also be involved in the identification of sectors, facilitation and preparation of the TOR for national working groups and consultants. The process will be a participatory one.

Difference

The basic difference between the EAF-BL report and other reports is the participatory approach in the preparation of the former and the endorsement by stakeholders.

Group 2

1) How to prepare EAF-baseline report:

Acquire information (e.g. data on landing trends, effort, markets) from various sources like fishery research institutions, fishers and processors (people involved in the fishery industry).

2) Invite all stakeholders to a forum to brainstorm on the fishery so as to get traditional and scientific information on the fishery.

3) Issues to look at in the drafting process:

- Is there a management plan in place and in its absence is there a *de facto* objective in managing the fishery?
- Administrative framework of managing the fisheries.
- Look at the data on catch and marketing, effort, gears and number of vessels.
- Species interaction.
- Biology of the fish species.
- Employment – direct and indirect and the socio-economics of the fishery.
- Value of the fisheries to National GDP.
- Management tools in place and their effectiveness in the formulation of management measures.
- Compliance or enforcement problem being experienced.
- Presence or absence of monitoring and evaluation mechanism.
- Presence of a forum for information exchange and feedback and progress evaluation.

Group 3

Preparation process

- Formation of National Task Group (NTG) comprising experts from research institutions, Universities, Fisheries Management, local development authorities, national environment agencies and NGOs, e.g. Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Coastal Oceans Research and Development in the Indian Ocean (CORDIO), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of the coastal zones of the countries of the Indian ocean (ReCoMap).
- Convene first meeting:
 - to introduce EAF concept and draw TOR for the NTG on Prawn Fishery;
 - to discuss the guidelines for EAF-baseline report;
 - to draw an action plan for collection and compilation of relevant data.
- Convene second meeting:
 - to prepare the EAF-baseline report for the prawn fishery.
- Call for final meeting of policy-makers, stakeholders and other experts:
 - to discuss and endorse the EAF-baseline report.

Differences with other reports

- BLR is more comprehensive and inclusive in content;
- BLR is done once whereas scientific reports to Commission are annual.

5.3 Summary of discussions on Task 3

Group 1

The fisheries administration will lead the process of the EAF planning. In setting up the NTG relevant stakeholders will be identified and included in the group.

Group 2

Desk work will be required to retrieve data and information on the fishery. Following this information will be presented at a stakeholder forum.

The South African experience was that there was rarely sufficient information gathered at the first meeting of the National Task Group to enable the compilation of a baseline report. Subsequent meetings would be required to complete the baseline report. It was also noted that it is important for the SWIOFP representatives in the various countries to participate in the task group. This is because SWIOFP is currently compiling data for several component groups (prawns, tuna, demersal fish, non-consumptive living resources) and can assist in the compiling of the information for the baseline reports.

Group 3

Membership of the NTG is to include researchers, representatives from fisheries administrations, other stakeholders, NGOs, university and others. One important initial task for the NTG would be to prepare an EAF-baseline report to be used as an initial input for the EAF work. During a second meeting the baseline report would be dealt with, followed by its acceptance by stakeholders.

It was agreed that the EAF-baseline report is more comprehensive and inclusive as compared to the reports submitted to the Commission's Scientific Committee.

Preparation and initiation, scope and issue identification

Sometimes objectives can appear conflicting, if not considered in the proper time scale. For example maintaining a sustainable resource and reducing poverty may appear contradictory in the short term when there is a need to reduce fishing effort (number of fishers) because of overexploitation. In the long term, however, a rehabilitated stock would provide for better livelihoods for the reduced numbers of fishers. Convincing the stakeholders to take short term loss for a long-term gain can often be difficult and that's where there is need for alternative livelihoods in conjunction with firm management.

There was a suggestion that there should be a list of possible challenges that the NTGs could encounter at the different phases of the ecological risk assessment methodology. During the discussions it was recognized that there may be some instances where risks could not be attributed to any failure of management because they were external (e.g. climate change).

The suitability of SWOT analysis for issue identification and prioritization was raised. Examined closely, the risk analysis of the ERA covers the weaknesses and threats in detail. The EAF process itself covers some of the opportunities and strengths and perhaps not as directly as in SWOT. The two analyses were not seen as inconsistent but could complement each other.

On the issue of which fishery to start with in undertaking the EAF, criteria which should be considered included that the fisheries is not too contentious, that an EAF management plan could be prepared in reasonable time, that the fishery had some economic significance and was of interest to the administration and to the stakeholders, and for which there was a reasonable amount of data.

Having a methodical process can be a very useful way of avoiding pressure from political angles. The importance of addressing issues of high priority for stakeholders was underscored. Often management failures arise from not addressing crucial stakeholder issues.

6. ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT (ERA) METHODOLOGY

6.1 Issue identification, risk assessment and prioritization

The methodology to identify and prioritize issues was presented and explained at the Durban workshop in June 2008. However, it was decided to provide an overview of the key concepts and process given that some of the participants did not attend the Durban workshop.

As an introduction, the overall fisheries planning and implementation process was illustrated. It was noted that the steps envisaged under the EAF approach are identical to those taken under conventional fisheries management. However, there are some key differences between the two approaches. These include the participatory nature of each step of the EAF approach, and the adaptive nature of the system with regular checks (typically on an annual basis for tactical management and every 5 to 10 years for more strategic considerations) of management performance. It was noted that in this phase of the work the project would concentrate on the planning phase leading to the formulation of fisheries management plans consistent with the EAF.

The main steps of the planning phase and their key characteristics are presented in Table 5. A more detailed description of the issue identification and risk assessment process can be found in relevant FAO publications and highlights are given in the report of the Durban workshop which was made available to the participants in Mombasa.

6.2 Report on Task 4

Task: *In the context of applying the EAF, how would you go about deciding on issues that need to be addressed by management?*

Group 1

- Issue identification by the identified stakeholders.
- Categorization of the issues in order to avoid oversight on some issues.
- National task group:
 - quality control process,
 - subject to risk assessment,
 - prioritization of issues and suggest management intervention and actors that will contribute the achievement of management plan.
- Presentation of results to stakeholders for verification, ownership and legitimacy.
- Proposed performance indicators.

Group 2

- Have a forum with managers, scientists, stakeholders who are involved in the fishery sector.
- Agree on the type of fisheries that need management.
- Look at the categories of issues: socio-economic, governance and ecological.
- Identify issues under each category as follows:
 - **Socio-economic**
 - 1) Indigenous benefit
 - 2) Community benefit

3) National benefit

○ **Governance**

- 1) Institutional and administrative framework
- 2) Policy and legislative framework
- 3) Any management plan that is in place

○ **Ecological**

- 1) What species should be retained
- 2) Non-retained species
- 3) General ecosystem issues

- Carry out risk analysis by calculating the risk value which is a product of impact value and the likelihood value
- Do risk categorization based on risk value
- All issues with higher risk value than low category need a management action and performance reporting.

Group 3

- Identify the fishery/area for which management decisions are required
- Organize a risk assessment workshop with representatives from all relevant sectors/expertise: fisheries policy makers, researchers, socio-economists, biologists, ecologists, conservation groups and NGOs.

At the workshop

- Identify and list all issues that are potential risks (biological, socio-economic, governance) to the fishery/area.
- Evaluate the likelihood of occurrence of each risk issue by assigning importance values on a scale of 0-5.
- Rate the impact of consequences of risk for each issue on a scale of 1-6.
- Make a table of likelihood of occurrence versus impact of consequence; compute risk value of each issue.
- Categorize the issues into low, medium and high priority issues based on their overall risk value i.e. 0–10 = low value; 11–19 = medium priority; 20–30 = high priority.
- Issues with high risk values need immediate attention from management.

6.3 Performance reports

An introduction to performance reporting was given by FAO. It was said that a performance report has to be prepared for each of the major issues identified through the issue identification and risk analysis process. The performance report gives an example of how this can be reported in a structured way and is a key element for the development of the fisheries management plan.

For each problem identified, the rationale for inclusion has to be spelt out explaining on what information was the decision of inclusion and ranking made. It is important to document the rationale of why the issue was prioritized, what will be the measures to be introduced to deal with the issue and how progress will be monitored. For each problem/issue, the operational objective, indicator, and performance measure have to be identified, including justification. It is necessary to be precise when setting operational objectives and concrete, measurable indicators have to be selected. Performance measures are needed to evaluate how well management is doing in relation to the given issue. The

direction of the indicator in relation to the operational objective is an example of measure of performance. In the case the direction of the indicator is not in line with the operational objective, it will be necessary to re-look at measures. Once a suitable indicator has been identified, it is important to consider data requirements and data availability. It is not useful to choose a complicated indicator if adequate information is not available.

Evaluation of performance is done at regular intervals (e.g. annually) to assess how successful the management scheme is (this will not be in the first report, but the type of performance measure will be determined). An example of performance measure is the trend of the indicator in relation to the operational objective. The management response describes what management action is needed to achieve the operational objective. This includes the current management arrangements, what is proposed for the future, and what the plan should be if performance levels are triggered. The types of management actions should take particular note of the level of information available and the reliability of the evaluation.

Also to be considered are external drivers (factors outside the control of the fisheries administration) that may influence performance and the ability to achieve the operational objectives. If these are considered serious, they are usually treated under separate performance report, although the type of action will be related to the need for interacting with the relevant administrations.

Participants were not sure of the difference between operational objectives, indicators and performance measures. It was noted that while these are strictly related, they represent different aspects: the indicator is the type of measure selected to monitor progress, the operational objective is the concrete, desirable target to be achieved while the performance measure would be the trend of the given indicator.

Another issue was related to the dilemma of using poor data for decision making as this would lead most probably to poor decision making. It is important that all available information is used i.e. complementing data available with other sources of information, including traditional knowledge. What is important is that decision making should not stop because of lack of accurate data and assessments. The implicit decision of not taking any action in relation to an issue, because of limited data, is equivalent to having taken the decision that the specific issue does not warrant any action i.e. no decision implies that the problem is not important. When information is limited, a very high level of precaution is needed. The better the knowledge the better the basis for decision making, but poor data and poor knowledge should not stop a manager from making a decision needed for an issue considered to be of priority.

6.4 Report on Task 5

Task: *Performance of fisheries management needs to be periodically assessed and reviewed to make sure that the system moves towards agreed management objectives. Describe the essential elements required to monitor the performance of the fisheries management system.*

Group 1

1. Management plan in place with objectives and targets.
2. Operational systems to achieve objectives with actors, inputs and time limes.
3. Performance indicators (categorized):
 - ecosystem performance (ecological, fisheries environment)
 - socio-economic (human)
 - governance (management, legislation)
4. Monitoring and evaluation
 - evaluation of outputs through data, interviews, etc to assist in assessment e.g. expected outcomes e.g. improved likelihood, fishery recovery, etc.

There was a comment that all this should be in line with WSSD and MDG targets, e.g. on recovery of depleted stocks, sustainable fishery management, and biodiversity improvement. From socio-economic point of view, diversification and improvement of livelihoods should be considered.

Group 2

Essential elements of performance of fisheries management and monitoring are as follows:

- Specific operational objectives (should be SMART).
- Smart indicators that are aligned to the specific operational objectives of the fisheries management system. May have output/outcome indicators.
- Performance measures:
 - set target for action and interventions;
 - set targets for output and outcomes;
 - target activities must be aligned to the set indicators.
- Stakeholders participation:
 - key stakeholders must be involved in the process of reviewing the performance of fisheries management system;
 - scheduled fora should be established and key stakeholders be brought on board.
- Establish a system of making sure that data is available for evaluating the performance of the fisheries management system:
 - the data should be from credible sources;
 - the data should be presented in a common/standard format so that stakeholders can understand;
 - established responsibilities for data collection among the stakeholders and time of data submission.
- A policy review mechanism needs to be in place:
 - the review mechanism should be based on fisheries management plan performance;
 - should examine the need for reviewing the management instrument (e.g. legislation, etc.);
 - stakeholder consultation should be part of the policy review process.
- External drivers:
 - need to have a process in place for determining the extent for which external drivers affect the performance of fisheries management system;
 - The external drivers to consider includes:
 - influence of other sector policies, Acts and Regulations;
 - international instrument;
 - budgetary allocations (finance availability);
 - Put in place risk management plan to address the external influences.

Group 3

The group agreed that there is a hypothetical management plan made with extensive consultation with the stakeholders. Elements that the group felt are important for performance monitoring are divided into two main categories:

1. Time frame:
 - This depends on the management objectives, for example if the management plan is made for 5 year time period, then it is important to have annual meeting to check the performance.
 - Annual performance check would also help in securing the budget for the following year.
 - A set time (month) should be allocated rather leaving time open for every year. This is because annual performance should be done when most of the required data are collected.

2. Indicators:

- *Biological/environment*
 - Total catch
 - Effort
 - CPUE
 - Bycatch
 - Value of the product(s)
 - Species composition of fish
 - Species composition of bycatch

- *Socio-economic*
 - No. of jobs
 - Income derived by fishers
 - Overall income
 - Income per fisher
 - Market chain
 - Percentage of catch retained by fishers for their own consumption

- *Management*
 - Certain management goals will be monitored using a scoring chart to see the performance.

The performance report will be circulated and shared with the stakeholders.

In the plenary discussions, many participants expressed the need to have a special training on EAF indicators. The EAF-Nansen Coordinator informed participants about the planned expert meeting on indicators to take place in Rome in March but noted that the meeting is for a selected group only. However, he indicated the possibility of organizing such training workshop after the expert meeting.

7. **PUTTING EAF INTO PRACTICE – THE BUILDING BLOCKS PROVIDED BY THE EAF-NANSEN PROJECT**

The EAF-Nansen project Coordinator made a short presentation on “the building blocks of EAF” as an introduction to some of the activities being carried out under the EAF-Nansen project. He made reference to Principles 11 and 12 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Principle 11 states that “the ecosystem approach should consider all forms of relevant information, including scientific and indigenous and local knowledge, innovations and practices”. Principle 12 states, *inter alia*, that “the ecosystem approach should involve all relevant sectors of society and scientific disciplines”.

He reminded the participants that EAF seeks to address both ecological well-being (conserving the structure, diversity and functioning of ecosystems) and human well-being (satisfying societal and human needs for food and economic benefits). Making reference to Gabriella Bianchi’s presentation on “Main steps of EAF” he noted that to implement EAF it is necessary to translate the principles into operational objectives and actions and highlighted the following steps:

- Identify broad objectives relevant to the fishery (or area) in question.
- Break these objectives down into smaller priority issues and sub-issues that can be addressed by management measures.
- Set operational objectives.
- Develop indicators and reference points.
- Develop decision rules on how the management measures are to be applied.
- Monitor and evaluate performance.

The Coordinator noted that the EAF-Nansen project is facilitating each of these steps through the various activities of the project and gave examples of the activities being undertaken under each step.

8. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR THE EAF-NANSEN PROJECT

The RTG was given an update on the development of a communication strategy for the project. Kwame Koranteng who introduced the agenda item said that the goal of the strategy is to market the EAF-Nansen project as widely as possible to ensure that all intended beneficiaries and stakeholders understand the project, its objectives, expected outcomes and benefits.

The objectives are as follows:

- To increase the awareness on the importance of the EAF application in promoting responsible fisheries and sustainable use of marine ecosystems.
- To raise public awareness and understanding of the EAF-Nansen project during its implementation.
- To create synergies and develop collaborations among research institutions, fisheries management administrations and other key stakeholders on EAF.
- To ensure information flow within project components and partners.

The draft strategy identifies the target audience and the communication channels and tools to use in the delivery (Appendix 5). The key messages are on management of fisheries, on fish stocks and the marine environment and the perception and attitudes of stakeholders and are summarized in Table 4. Also identified are communication channels, tools and methods of delivery (print document, Web site/list server, meetings and workshops, video, audio and theatre).

The EAF-Nansen Coordinator thanked the RTG members who responded to the enquiry on the subject and gave their views on how best to communicate the principles of EAF and on the implementation and outcome of the EAF-Nansen project to scientists, decision-makers and stakeholders.

Table 4: Summary of key messages for areas identified in the preparation of the communication strategy

MANAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of ecosystems approach to fisheries • Benefits of ecosystems approach to fisheries • Harmonization of regulations across sectors • Ecosystems approach to fisheries and better planning for resources management • Ecosystems approach to fisheries and participation of stakeholders • Management measures ideal for various fisheries
STOCKS/ ENVIRONMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing threats to the ecosystem integrity • The adverse effects of certain fishing practices on the ecosystem • The importance of large marine vertebrates in the ecosystem functioning, and the effect of their continuous removal on ecological balance • The urgency for stocks to recover • Ecological relationships between species
STAKEHOLDERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effect of irresponsible fishing practices on marine ecosystems • The role of stakeholders in maintaining a good ecosystem and healthy fish stocks • Benefits of abundance of fishery resources and good governance • The health of the ecosystem and wealth creation from fisheries • Importance of collaborative planning in the implementation of the ecosystems approach to fisheries

9. REGIONAL AND NATIONAL TASK GROUPS AND PLANNING OF FUTURE WORK

9.1 Terms of reference of the Task Groups

The draft terms of reference of the RTG and NTGs were discussed. The participants made some comments on the draft documents and suggested changes that are reflected in the TORs shown in Appendixes 6 and 7

9.2 Facilitation of Task Groups

The RTG members were informed that the EAF–Nansen project will facilitate the work of the RTG. They were also informed that the support to the countries for in-country activities including the work of the NTGs will be communicated to members in due course.

9.3 Election of officers

The Task Group elected Dr Renison Ruwa of Kenya and Mr Mardayven Nallee of Mauritius as the Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the RTG for the WIO area for a period of two (2) years.

9.4 Planning of future work and allocation of responsibilities

To help RTG members initiate actions back in their countries, the group came up with the activities and time-lines shown in Table 5 Each RTG member was asked to endeavour to follow up on the actions.

Table 5: Suggested actions to be taken before the next RTG Meeting

Step	Who	When
Establishment of NTGs		
1) Report to the national fisheries management authority on the outcome of this meeting underlying the need to set up a NTG.	RTG member	by 15.02.09
2) Ensure that EAF-Nansen project document has reached the national fisheries management authorities and that these have responded.	RTG member	by 07.02.09
3) Nomination of focal point (RTG member) by Fisheries authority.	National authority	by 15.02.09
4) Form the national task group.	National authority (in consultation with the RTG member)	by 28.02.09
5) Feedback on formation of NTG (including names of members and the institutions they come from) to FAO.	Focal person/ RTG member	by 01.03.09
6) Convene the first meeting of the NTG and develop a workplan and relative budget.	Focal person/ RTG member	by 15.04.09
EAF planning activities		
7) NTG meets and selects a fisheries (starting with fisheries for which FMP are under development).	NTG	by 15.04.09

Step	Who	When
8) Prepare supporting material on sensitizing on the EAF (brochures, videos, documents, etc.).	FAO/NTG	as soon as possible
9) Sensitization on EAF.	NTG	ongoing
10) Prepare draft baseline report on the selected fishery and validate.	NTG	01.08.09
11) Identify key issues for that fishery.	NTG	31.10.09
12) Participate in Regional Task Group Meeting and report on progress made.	FAO	31.01.10

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Some conclusions and recommendations were made at the end of the workshop including the following:

- National Task Groups to identify national training needs to feed into the identification of regional training needs.
- Ensure links between the Scientific Committee of the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission and the RTG.
- The Nairobi Convention is much interested in the application of the ecosystem approach and it would therefore like to participate in activities of the EAF-Nansen RTG.
- The African Union is to provide countries with eligibility criteria and requirements for applying to the Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund for projects relevant to the application of the EAF.
- While FAO will look into the possibility of providing some resources for the EAF activities at the national level, countries should try to move ahead with available resources within the country. This will show national commitment to EAF.
- There was a suggestion to create an on-line forum to exchange views and experiences and to ask for advice and help as the EAF planning and implementation proceeds.

Participants congratulated the Chair and Vice-Chair on their election and thanked the organisers for a very successful meeting. They looked forward to actively contributing to the EAF approach on their return back home.

APPENDIX 1**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****COMOROS**

Kamardine BOINALI
 Ministry of Fisheries
 Director of Fisheries
 Fomboni, Moheli
 Tel.: (269) 332 66 10
 Fax: (269) 772 0432
 E-mail: kamari58@yahoo.fr

KENYA

Simon WARUI
 Head of the Directorate of Marine and
 Coastal Fisheries
 Ministry of Fisheries Development
 PO Box 58187-00200
 Nairobi
 Tel.: +254 722 480 804
 E-mail: simonwarui@yahoo.com

Martha MUKIRA
 Fisheries Officer
 Fisheries Department
 PO Box 90423 -80100
 Mombasa
 Tel.: +254 722 579 117
 Fax: (254) 020 240 80 80
 E-mail: mwmukira2009@rocketmail.com

MADAGASCAR

Samueline RANAIVOSON
 Direction centrale de la pêche et des ressources
 halieutiques
 Antananarivo 101
 Tel.: 261 3240 612 96
 E-mail: samranaivo@gmail.com

MALDIVES

Hassan AFSAL
 Ministry of Fisheries & Agriculture
 Ghaazee Building, Ground Floor
 Ameeru Ahmed Magu
 Malé 20-25
 Tel.: (960) 332 2625
 E-mail: hassan.afsal@fishagri.gov.mv

MAURITIUS

Mardayven NALLEE
 Ministry of Agro Industry, Food Production
 and Security (Fisheries Division)
 Divisional Scientific Officer
 4th floor, L.I.C.I. Centre
 Port Louis
 Tel.: (230) 2112470
 Fax: (230) 2081929
 E-mail: mnallee@mail.gov.mu

MOZAMBIQUE

Elsa da Glória PATRIA
 Ministry of Fisheries
 National Direction of Fisheries Administration
 Department of Fishery Management
 Consaglieri Pedroso road, N. 347, 1st floor
 Maputo
 Tel.: +258 21 35 71 00
 Fax: +258 21 32 80 94
 E-mail: epatria@mozpesca.gov.mz
 elsapatria@yahoo.com.br

SEYCHELLES

Elisa SOCRATE
 Fisheries Administrator
 Seychelles Fishing Authority
 PO Box 449
 Victoria, Mahé
 Tel.: (+248) 670335
 Fax: (+248) 225957
 E-mail: esocrate@sfa.sc

SOMALIA

Ahmed Mohamed IMAN
 Director General
 Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
 Mogadishu
 Tel.: (252) 155 62766
 E-mail: dgeneral.fishery@yahoo.com

TANZANIA

Yason MNDEME
 Ministry of Livestock Development
 and Fisheries
 Principal Fisheries Officer
 PO Box 2462, Dar es Salaam
 Tel.: (255) 75-4271504
 E-mail: mndemem@yahoo.com

AFRICAN UNION COMMISSION

Nancy K. GITONGA
 Co-ordinator of Regional Advisory Committee
 on Strategic Partnership for Sustainable
 Fisheries Investment Fund in LMEs of Africa
 PO Box 30786-00100
 Nairobi, Kenya
 E-mail: nanisgitonga@yahoo.com

**AGULHAS AND SOMALI CURRENTS
LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS**

Magnus NGOILE
 Policy and Governance Coordinator
 UNDP/GEF ASCLME Project
 Private Bag 1015
 Grahamstown 6140
 South Africa
 Cel: +27 72 974 9192
 Tel.: +27 46 636 2984
 E-mail: magnus.ngoile@asclme.org
 makngoile@yahoo.com

**SOUTH WEST INDIAN OCEAN
FISHERIES COMMISSION SCIENTIFIC
COMMITTEE**

Andrew COCKCROFT
 Principal Specialist Scientist
 Marine and Coastal Management
 Department of Environmental Affairs &
 Tourism
 P Bag X2 Rogge Bay,
 Cape Town, South Africa
 E-mail: cockcrof@deat.gov.za
 Tel.: (27) 21 4023132
 Fax: (27) 21 4023034

**SOUTH WEST INDIAN OCEAN
FISHERIES PROJECT**

Renison RUWA
 SWIOFP Focal Point for Kenya
 Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute
 PO Box 81651-80100
 Mombasa, Kenya
 Tel.: +254 733 700 572
 E-mail: kruwa@kmfri.co.ke or
 reniruwa@yahoo.com

Kaitira Ibrahim KATONDA
 Interim Regional Executive Secretary –
 SWIOFP
 c/o Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research
 Institute
 PO Box 81651-80100
 Mombasa, Kenya
 Tel.: +254 736 30 30 30, +255 786 175 295
 E-mail: katonda.kaitira@gmail.com

Mwatete C. MLEWA
 SWIOFP Biodiversity Component Co-
 ordinator
 Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
 PO Box 1125
 Eldoret, Kenya
 E-mail: mlewa2001@yahoo.com

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME-GLOBAL
ENVIRONMENT FACILITY/LAND-
BASED ACTIVITIES IN THE WESTERN
INDIAN OCEAN (WIO-LAB)
PROJECT/NAIROBI CONVENTION**

Johnson U. KITHEKA
 Project Officer
 UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project/Nairobi
 Convention
 PO Box 47074-00100
 Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel.: +254 020 76 21 248
 +254 733 777 293
 E-mail: Johnson.Kitheka@unep.org

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED
NATIONS**

Gabriella BIANCHI
Fishery Resources Officer
Fisheries Management and Conservation
Service (FIMF)
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 0657053094
E-mail: Gabriella.Bianchi@fao.org

Aubrey HARRIS
Subregional Office for Southern Africa
PO Box 3730
Harare, Zimbabwe
Tel.: (263 4) 253655, 253657
Fax: (263 4) 700724, 703497
E-mail: aubrey.harris@fao.org

Kwame KORANTENG
EAF-Nansen Coordinator
Fisheries Management and Conservation
Service (FIMF)
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 0657056007
E-mail: Kwame.Koranteng@fao.org

SECRETARIAT

Umazi J. MUNYIKAH
Administrative Assistant – SWIOFP
Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute
PO Box 81651-80100
Mombasa, Kenya
Tel.: +254 020 243 40 91
+254 724 691 943
E-mail: umunyikah@kmfri.co.ke

APPENDIX 2**AGENDA**

Tuesday 27 January	
8.30	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Welcome ○ Agenda ○ Workshop objectives and organization ○ Update on the EAF-Nansen project: ○ General discussion
10.00	<i>Morning tea/coffee</i>
10.30	Introduction to the project management structure – Regional and National Task Groups General introduction to EAF principles Task 1
12.30	<i>Lunch</i>
14:00	Main steps of EAF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on anticipated concerns and opportunities for application of EAF Task 2
15.30	<i>Afternoon tea/coffee</i>
16.00	Task 2 (continued)
Wednesday 28 January	
8.30	Introduction to EAF-baseline (TROM) reports Task 3
10.00	<i>Morning tea/coffee</i>
10.30	Ecological risk assessment (ERA) methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Selection of stakeholders ○ The hierarchical tree and identification of EAF issues ○ Discussion
12.30	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00	ERA (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prioritization and risk analysis Task 4
15.30	<i>Afternoon tea/coffee</i>
16.00	Task 4 (continued)

Thursday 29 January	
8.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of management action and monitoring of performance (Performance reports)
10.00	<i>Morning tea/coffee</i>
10.30	Task 5
12.30	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00	Putting EAF into practice – The building blocks provided by the EAF-Nansen project Discussions
15.30	<i>Afternoon tea/coffee</i>
16.00	Update in the development of a Communication Strategy for the EAF-Nansen project
Friday 30 January	
08.30	Formation of Task Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional Task Groups ○ National Task Groups Facilitation of Task Groups
10.00	<i>Morning tea/coffee</i>
10.30	Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planning of future work and allocation of responsibilities ○ EAF Nansen Capacity building programme ○ Conclusion and recommendations ○ Discussions on workshop report ○ Closing
12.30	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00	Preparation of Workshop Report

APPENDIX 3

STATEMENTS BY PARTNERS

SWIOFP: Kaitira Katonda

I feel greatly honoured to be part of this EAF Regional Task Group Meeting and Ecological Risk Assessment Methodology Workshop. As the EAF-Nansen Project and SWIOFP have a Memorandum of Understanding for cooperation in many areas, including the organization of this meeting, SWIOFP is therefore your local hosts. The Meeting Secretariat Desk is, therefore, more than happy to assist you to make your stay comfortable and memorable.

Honourable Chairman, allow me to join Dr Kwame Koranteng, the EAF-Nansen Project Coordinator, to welcome you all to Mombasa, Kenya. Mombasa is a lovely City and I hope you will manage to get some time from your busy schedule to visit some places of interest in and around the city.

Honourable Chairman, the importance of ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) management cannot be overstated. The purpose of EAF is to plan, develop and manage fisheries in a manner that address the multiplicity of societal needs and desires, without jeopardising the options for future generations to benefit from a full range of goods and services provided by the ecosystem. An ecosystem approach to fisheries, therefore, strives to balance diverse societal objectives, by taking account of knowledge and uncertainties about biotic, abiotic and human components of ecosystems and their interactions and applying an integrated approach to fisheries within ecologically meaningful boundaries. Various countries in the world have adopted the EAF principles and they have noted the difference between the traditional fisheries management and the EAF. It is time now that our countries consider adopting the EAF principles in fisheries management. It is my hope, therefore, that the Country Representatives present in this meeting will be ambassadors of EAF in their countries.

Honourable Chairman, without taking anymore of your time as we have much to discuss in the next four days, please let me end by wishing you all a nice stay in Mombasa and fruitful deliberations in the EAF Task Group Meeting and the Ecological Assessment Methodology Workshop.

ASCLME: Magnus Ngoile

The Agulhas and Somali Large Marine Ecosystems (ASCLME) project is supporting eight countries bordering the western Indian Ocean in their efforts to collectively manage the marine resources on which their people and economies depend. The ASCLME together with the South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project (SWIOFP) and the Western Indian Ocean Land –Based Activities impacting on the Marine Ecosystem (WIOLaB) are developing a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) that will inform the Strategic Action Plan to be negotiated, agreed and implemented by the countries. Although each of the projects will develop their own TDAs and SAPs on the two LME systems, it is intended that the ASCLME project will support and facilitate the development of a joint and programmatic TDA and SAP for the WIO-LMEs. Already in the cruises conducted in the second half of 2008 has unveiled some interesting and significant scientific data and information that has led to the adjustment of the boundaries of the two LMEs as well as the nature of the current systems along the Mozambique coast. The current systems on Mascarene Bank are better understood now than before. This information can be accessed at the ASCLME website <www.asclme.org>.

Key to the success of the development of the TDAs and SAPS is the collation of data and information on the hydrodynamics and marine resources as well as the socioeconomic interactions of the region. Recognizing the paucity of oceanographic, resources and socio-economic data and information (the Western Indian Ocean is the least studied of the world oceans) the region through the support of the GEF (UNDP, WB and UNEP) and FAO EAF-Nansen Project is conducting oceanographic cruises by the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN to investigate the oceanographic and fisheries surveys. For example, the last scientific cruises were carried out in mid-eighties, about twenty five years ago. The

data and information from the cruises will supplement the existing information in the preparation of the TDA and SAP. Therefore, the current work by the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN is of paramount importance. In addition to the collaboration on the scientific cruises, the ASCLME will collaborate with the EAF-Nansen Project in capacity building specifically in the area of ecosystem approach to fisheries management. However, the work in capacity building in the ASCLME project extends beyond the EAF to include capacity in oceanographic research as well as in other fields such as socio economics.

The approach for the development of the regional TDA and SAP by ASCLME is through the preparation in each country of a Marine Environment Diagnostic Analysis (MEDA) which is a comprehensive collation and synthesis of all the existing data and information at national level. The data and information will be subjected to a causal chain analysis to identify the concerns and challenges confronting the governance of marine and coastal resources including the identification of transboundary issues. This approach ensures national level ownership and legitimacy of the Regional TDA and SAP. The Nansen Project will also translate the capacity building activities on ecosystem approach to fisheries management at national level where there will be a convergence with the MEDA processes.

The ASCLME fully appreciates the collaboration and cooperation with the FAO/EAF Nansen Project as well as the WB/SWIOFP and WIOLaB Projects.

SWIOFC: Aubrey Harris

Mr. Aubrey Harris noted that the Commission provided a high-level forum for Permanent Secretaries, fisheries Directors to cooperatively decide on regional management of fisheries in the SWIO. The Commission's scientific committee regularly examines the status of fishery resources and provides management recommendations to the Commission. There was much scope for EAF approaches advocated by the EAF Nansen project to be incorporated in the scientific committee process and forwarded to the Commission for consideration.

Need to harmonize, have a way of ensuring coordination in the representation at the EAF Nansen and the scientific committee

Commission provides a forum for collaborative fisheries management in the region. It is done in the context of conventional assessment and management need to incorporate an EAF in the work of the commission. This is a very interesting period with a number of activities going that will better inform senior managers and policy makers to make decisions. I am happy to note that the Scientific Committee of the Commission is represented in this workshop by its Vice-Chair, Dr Andy Cockroft.

Thank you.

African Union Commission: Mrs Nancy K. Gitonga (RAC Coordinator)

The African Union is committed to the development of fisheries in Africa to the highest levels and has started and implemented initiatives in the area of fisheries. The Strategic Partnership (SP) for a Sustainable Fisheries Investment Fund in the Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) for sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is a new initiative, whose aim is to assist governments of Coastal countries in SSA to manage fisheries resources and to protect ecosystems that support them.

The initiative includes:

- A financing mechanism to make available US\$60 million in GEF grants, (matched in a 1:3 ratio in loans and grants in the next 10 years to co-finance country-level projects and

- A strategic partnership of stakeholders, donors, RFMOs and LME programmes to advise the Fund and exchange lessons learned.

The SP project is led by AU and is based in Nairobi at the AU-IBAR offices. The Strategic Partners include GEF/WB, WWF and FAO.

The overall objective of the SP project is to promote sustainable management of fisheries resources in the LMEs of SSA in order to make countries make concrete progress towards achieving the fisheries and poverty reduction targets set by WSSD.

The Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) consisting of SP, Regional Fisheries Organizations and LME programmes is chaired by the AU Commission. The RAC's role is to ensure that the projects proposed for support by the SP, reflect the priorities of the region and compliment existing initiatives. The RAC Coordinator has been recruited and will endeavour to take the inventory of the ongoing marine fisheries programmes in SSA to guide countries on the development of Project concept notes for funding and to provide leadership in the coordination of the programmes. The Coordinator will therefore work very closely with EAF-Nansen Project and all the SSA LME programmes.

APPENDIX 4

OUTLINE OF EAF-BASELINE REPORT

Desk study on main fisheries, including their socio-economic significance

FAO: *“The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries strives to balance diverse societal objectives, by taking account of the knowledge and uncertainties about biotic, abiotic and human components of ecosystems and their interactions and applying an integrated approach to fisheries within meaningful boundaries”.*

Marine Stewardship Council: *“Fishing operations should allow for the maintenance of the structure, productivity, function and diversity of the ecosystem (including habitat and associated dependent and ecologically related species) on which the fishery depends.*

Introduction

One of the activities to be undertaken under the EAF-Nansen project is to conduct desk studies on the management of main fisheries, including their socio-economic significance, usually referred to as Target Resource Oriented Management (TROM) review. The TROM review is hereafter referred to as the EAF-Baseline (EAF-BL) report. For the areas under the project, a review will be undertaken for every major fishery type in each country and at the regional/subregional level. The EAF-BL is an agreed baseline for the fishery before introducing EAF in the management of the resource in question. It should be a reference material for EAF planning and should provide reference points for monitoring and evaluation of EAF activities and management actions.

Preparation of the EAF-BL report is to be led by national and regional experts with guidelines provided by FAO. Provided below are guidelines on how to prepare a EAF-BL report on any fishery type.

EAF-BL guidelines

Where a major fishery type includes different fleets or sectors (for example the bottom trawl, set nets and handline sectors of a demersal fishery) it will be necessary to provide the relevant information for each sector as well as any pertinent information for the fishery as a whole. Each review should contain information on the following:

1. Is there a Management Plan for the fishery?
2. Where there is no management plan, are there stated or de facto objectives for the fishery?
3. What is legal framework within which the fishery is operating?
4. What are the institutional and administrative frameworks for fisheries management in the country?
5. Overview of the fishery and resources exploited
 - 5.1 Details of fishing gear used and areas fished
 - 5.2 Give brief information on the resources exploited
 - 5.3 Number of fishers and land-based workers by sector. Indicate full-time and part-time
 - 5.4 Provide information on direct interactions with other fisheries, e.g. competing for same target species, target species taken as bycatch in another fishery, bycatch in this fishery affecting another fishery, etc.

6. Available scientific and traditional knowledge on the resources
 - 6.1 Brief biology of the major fish species
 - 6.2 Geographical distribution of the species
 - 6.3 Estimated status of the stocks (especially over the last 5 years)
 - 6.4 Provide information on any direct interactions with the ecosystem (impact on sea bottom, pollution caused by the fishery, affects of coastal zone development or land-based pollution, etc.)
 - 6.5 Summarize the traditional knowledge about the fishery and the resources exploited
7. Annual catches from the earliest time available (by species or lowest available taxonomic group where landings are multispecies)
8. Assessment of the importance of the fishery in the national economy
 - 8.1 Value of the catches from the fishery per year for the last 5 years (by species or lowest available taxonomic group where landings are multispecies). Also add time series of market prices for the landings
 - 8.2 Products, markets and quantitative assessment of the value and employment of activities in value-addition and linked to the sector
9. Full set of management measures/primary management tools currently being used in the fishery/sector including those indicated in table below. Please indicate use with a "√." and comment on the status of implement (track record of the management option)
10. From the table above, assess the effectiveness of the current management measures in relation to the fishery itself, including effectiveness in ensuring sustainable utilization. "Effectiveness" may be in terms of better status of the stocks (increasing cpue), decreasing conflicts, increasing value, level of compliance, etc. It is important to note that in the State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture (SOFIA) FAO defines fisheries governance as "the sum total of the legal, social, economic and political arrangements used to manage fisheries"
11. Any compliance or enforcement problems being experienced in the fishery, and any complaints or dissatisfaction amongst fishers/rights holders. You need to consider scientific monitoring (e.g. of catches against permitted exploitation) as well as MCS (monitoring, control and surveillance)
12. Is there a national or regional forum for discussions on management of this or other resource? If yes, please give a short description of the forum (nature, frequency, subject of discussions, outcomes, etc.)
13. Any other comments relevant to current management of the fishery and the way forward for the introduction of EAF

Type of management tool	Tick	Comments (e.g. when introduced, effectiveness, compliance, etc.)
Spatial (area) restrictions and closures such as:		
○ Marine protected areas where fishing is prohibited		
○ Nursery area closures		
○ No-take zones		
○ Marine reserves where fishing is sometimes allowed		
○ Other temporary areas closures for specific purpose (e.g. spawning aggregations)		
Temporal restrictions such as:		
○ Defined fishing season(s)		
○ Defined number of days fishing		
○ Defined number of hours per day fishing		
○ defined number of hours fishing		
Gear restrictions such as:		
○ Engine size restrictions		
○ Gear size restrictions		
○ Gear type restrictions		
Size/Age restrictions (i.e., minimum or maximum sizes)		
Participatory restrictions such as:		
○ Licences		
○ Limited entry		
Catch restrictions such as:		
○ Total allowable catch (TAC) limits		
○ Vessel catch limits		
○ Individual vessel quotas		
Rights-/incentive-adjusting regulations such as:		
○ Individual effort quotas		
○ Individual fishing quotas		
○ Individual transferable quotas		
○ Individual transferable share quotas		
○ Group fishing rights (including community development quotas)		
○ Territorial use rights		
○ Stock use rights		

APPENDIX 5
EAF-NANSEN PROJECT COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

Target audience	Documents	Web site/list server (LS)	Meetings/workshops	Video	Audio	Theatre
National, regional and local government officials, IGOs	EAF Nansen project activities reports, brochures, flyers	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Policy meetings, national workshop on EAF	TVs discussions on EAF	Radio programmes	
Regional fisheries organizations	Brochures, flyers, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Policy meetings, regional workshop on EAF	TVs discussions on EAF	Radio programmes	
Fisheries industry, fishing companies	Brochures, flyers	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Informative meetings		Radio programmes	
Artisanal fishermen, local communities	Posters		Sensitization meetings	Documentary films Cartoons	Radio programmes, local community leaders	Plays in local languages
Environment and conservation non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	Brochures, flyers, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Discussion meetings, policy meetings, national workshops	Documentary films		
Research institutes	EAF Nansen project activities reports, scientific publications, brochures, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Collaboration meetings, policy meetings, national workshops	Documentary films, TV discussions		
Teaching and training institutions	Technical manuals, guidelines	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Training workshop on EAF, collaboration meetings	Video training courses in local languages	Audio training courses in local languages	Didactic plays
Funding agencies	Brochures, flyers, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Donor meetings	Documentary films on EAF benefits		
Media	Brochures, flyers, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS	Sensitization meetings	Documentary films, cartoons	Radio programmes, sensitization campaign	Sensitization plays
General public	Brochures, flyers, posters	EAF Newsletter, Discussion forum, LS		Documentary films, cartoons	Radio programmes, sensitization campaign	Sensitization plays

APPENDIX 6

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EAF REGIONAL TASK GROUP

An EAF Regional Task Group (RTG) will be established in each of the four operational regions of the EAF-Nansen project. The regions coincide with the geographical coverage of the Canary, Guinea, Benguela and Agulhas and Somali Current large Marine Ecosystem projects. Each RTG will report through the EAF-Nansen Coordinator to the Steering Committee. The Chair of each the RTGs will attend the Annual Forum of the EAF-Nansen project and will serve as resource to the Project Steering Committee.

There shall be a Chair whose function shall be:

- chair the RTG meetings;
- represent the RTG in other fora as it may be required;
- work closely and assist the project coordinator;
- liaise with the chairs of the NTGs.

The Chair would be a member of the Scientific Committee of the relevant RFB. There shall be a Vice-Chair who will assume the functions of the chair in his/her absence. The tenure of office of the Chair (and Vice-Chair) will be for a period of two years.

The responsibilities of the RTG will include:

- coordinate and harmonize the work of National Task Groups, especially as regards technical issues and management recommendations at regional level;
- ensure consistency in the national EAF-baseline reports where necessary;
- provide input, comments and advice to the National Task Group (NTG);
- identify and prioritize the EAF issues requiring attention within the regional marine fisheries sector;
- assist in the development of regional goals and objectives for fisheries within an ecosystem approach, making use of input from the National Task Groups and other sources as appropriate;
- propose regional management measures and rules for the consideration of the scientific committee before proceeding to the Commission;
- propose suitable incentive measures to achieve EAF within the region, the barriers to implementation and appropriate means to overcome these;
- recommend appropriate institutional requirements (including capacity building) for successful implementation of EAF within the region;
- adapt and promote guidelines on EAF
- respond to requests from the Scientific Committee in relation to EAF.

Each RTG will consist of the following:

- 1 (or 2 depending on size of the region) representative (s) from each country in the region (the country must also designate an Alternate Task Group member who should be a member of the National Task Group);
- representatives of partner projects;
- representatives of regional non-governmental organizations with the required competency, so as to provide coverage of the major fishery types and interests;
- experts on specialized issues (e.g. economics, small-scale fisheries, community based management, legal) may be co-opted for particular meetings or activities as necessary.

The RTGs will meet as necessary but at least once per year. The first meeting of the RTG will familiarize itself with the EAF principles, consider its TORs and those of the national task groups and agree on a workplan and priority issues for implementation.

APPENDIX 7

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EAF NATIONAL TASK GROUP

A National Task Group (NTG) will be established in each country by the relevant Fisheries Management Authority as an advisory group on matters of EAF. The NTG will be responsible for overall coordination of the project in each country and will report to the RTG. The Chair of the NTG will be a member of the Regional Task Group.

There shall be a Chair whose function shall be:

- chair the NTG meetings;
- represent the NTG in other fora as it may be required;
- work closely and assist the project coordinator.

There shall be a Vice-Chair who will assume the functions of the chair in his/her absence. The tenure of office of the Chair (and Vice-Chair) will be for a period of two years.

The responsibilities of the NTG will include:

- oversee the implementation of the project within the country;
- liaise closely with the national fisheries management agency (Fisheries Department, Ministry of Fisheries) and other agencies as required;
- promote the incorporation and implementation of EAF principles and methodologies in national fisheries management;
- facilitate consultation with different stakeholders where required and ensure that stakeholder opinions are reflected in the work and results of the project;
- take lead in the preparation of the EAF-baseline report;
- seek input, comments and advice from the Regional Task Group (RTG) and contribute to the work of the RTG;
- identify and prioritize the EAF issues requiring attention within the national marine fisheries sector, in consultation with stakeholders;
- provide input for the development of national goals and objectives for fisheries within an ecosystem approach, making use of existing policy documents (e.g. national Fisheries Act or equivalent), the identified priority issues, input from the fisheries management agency and other sources as appropriate;
- propose national management measures and rules required to achieve the EAF objectives, based on input from the RTG and FAO and other sources as appropriate;
- consider suitable incentive measures to achieve EAF, the barriers to implementation and appropriate means to overcome these;
- recommend appropriate institutional arrangements (including capacity building) for successful implementation of EAF;
- contribute to the formulation of draft national management plans for selected fisheries.

Each NTG will consist of:

- representatives of the fisheries management agency and key functional groups (e.g. MCS, legal, liaison (communication), policy and planning, etc.);
- representatives of the national fisheries research agency and universities;
- representatives of selected stakeholder groups so as to provide coverage of the major fishery types and interests;
- representatives of other relevant sectors outside the fisheries and of NGOs;
- representatives of national partner projects;
- experts on specialized issues (e.g. economics, small-scale fisheries, community based management, legal) may be co-opted for particular meetings or activities as necessary.

The NTGs will meet as necessary but at least twice per year. The first meeting of the NTG will familiarize itself with the EAF principles, consider its TORs and agree on a workplan and priority issues for implementation.