



IMPROVEMENT OF THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR FISHERIES COOPERATION, MANAGEMENT
AND DEVELOPMENT OF COASTAL STATES OF WEST AFRICA

AMÉLIORATION DU CADRE JURIDIQUE POUR LA COOPÉRATION, L'AMÉNAGEMENT ET LE
DÉVELOPPEMENT HALIEUTIQUE DES ÉTATS CÔTIERS DE L'AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST

GCP/RAF/302/EEC

Document N° 7

December 1994

**Report of the first seminar on the harmonization of
fisheries legislation of the States members
of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission
(Dakar, Senegal, 29 November-2 December 1994)**



CONFÉRENCE MINISTÉRIELLE SUR LA COOPÉRATION HALIEUTIQUE
ENTRE LES ÉTATS AFRICAINS RIVERAINS DE L'OCÉAN ATLANTIQUE



COMMUNAUTÉS EUROPÉENNES



ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES
POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE

Document N° 7

December 1994

**Report of the first seminar on the harmonization of
fisheries legislation of the States members
of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission
(Dakar, Senegal, 29 November-2 December 1994)**

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF
THE UNITED NATIONS
Dakar, December 1994

This document was prepared by project GCP/RAF/302/EEC - Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal States of West Africa. Its conclusions and recommendations were deemed appropriate at the time of publication and have not been necessarily cleared prior to publication by the concerned Governments or by FAO. They may be modified in the light of further knowledge gained at subsequent stages of the project.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

For bibliographic purposes this document should be quoted as follows:

Report of the first seminar on the harmonization of the fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, Dakar, Senegal, 29 November-2 December 1994, Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa, 51 pages, Document 7.

Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC
Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation,
management and development of coastal States
of West Africa
Immeuble Les Niayes
boulevard El Hadj Djily Mbaye
Dakar, Senegal
Tel: (221) 23-58-91; facsimile: (221) 23-58-97; P.O.Box 3300
Telex: FOODAGRI SG 61138; e-mail: <name of officer>@fao-dakar.rio.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
SUMMARY	(ii)
GENERAL REPORT	1
PROPOSALS FOR THE HARMONIZATION OF FISHERIES LEGISLATION OF THE STATES MEMBERS OF THE SUB-REGIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION	4
APPENDIX I AGENDA	27
APPENDIX II LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	28
APPENDIX III OPENING SESSION	33
APPENDIX IV CLOSING SESSION	46
APPENDIX V LIST OF DOCUMENTS	51

SUMMARY

The first seminar on the harmonization of fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission was held in Dakar, Senegal, from 29 November to 2 December 1994. The seminar was organized in accordance with the programme of activities of project GCP/RAF/302/EEC - Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa, that requires the project to support a process of harmonization of the fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. The seminar, which brought together the highest ranking officers of the fisheries administrations of the concerned States, examined a document on the matter. On the basis of this document, the seminar identified normative sectors where harmonization measures appear necessary and proposed general guidelines for a work programme that could be progressively implemented in the sub-region with support from the project and the partners associated with the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

GENERAL REPORT

1. The first seminar on the harmonization of fisheries legislation of the Member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission organized by project GCP/RAF/302/EEC - Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa, in accordance with its programme of activities, was held in Dakar from 29 November to 2 December 1994.
2. Participated in the seminar delegations of the Member states of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, namely Cape Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Senegal. Participated also in the seminar, in addition to an observer from Angola, representatives of the following partners of the Commission: the Canadian Agency for International Development (CIDA), Brazil, the European Community, GTZ, Lux-Development, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as well as the maritime counsellor at the Embassy of France in Senegal. The full list of delegates is set out in Appendix II.
3. The opening ceremony was chaired by His Excellency Mr. Adbourahmane Sow, Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal, who made a welcome statement. Intervened also at this opening session Mr. Boubakary N'Diaye, Permanent Secretary of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, Mr. Carlos Evora Rocha, Director-General of Fisheries of Cape Verde and Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission and Mr. M. T. Mukendi, Representative of FAO in Senegal. These opening statements are reproduced in Appendix III.
4. The chairmanship of the seminar was held by Mr. Carlos Evora Rocha, Director General of Fisheries of Cape Verde and chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.
5. The seminar approved the agenda as reproduced in Appendix I.
6. The proceedings of the seminar were conducted on the basis of the document entitled "proposals for the harmonization of the fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission" which was examined and discussed at length. The document reviews the harmonization work conducted so far in the sub-region. It identifies normative sectors where harmonization actions would seem necessary and proposes general guidelines for a programme of work that could be implemented in the sub-region in the course of the forthcoming years. When reviewing and discussing the document, the seminar proposed various amendments thereto. A revised version of this document, reflecting the content of the opinions

expressed, forms an integral part of this report.

7. The seminar requested that, given its importance and the complex nature of some issues, the report be submitted to the Coordinating Committee and to the Conference of Ministers of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission for formal approval.

8. However, without prejudice to the foregoing procedure, the seminar requested that the project take all necessary steps for the progressive implementation of the proposed work programme, taking into account the priorities that it shall define in close consultation with the Permanent Secretariat and the Presidency of the Commission. The seminar stressed the importance of a definition of those priorities. Officials and experts of the sub-region should continue to be closely associated with this work. In addition, throughout the process, the project should maintain close consultations with other partners of the Commission, and to the greatest extent possible, involve them in its activities.

9. The seminar requested also that a number of specific issues be the subject of careful review.

10. The first of these issues concerns the search for alternative criteria to the use of the tonnage of fishing vessels for the determination of important access conditions, such as the level of fees, access to fishing zones, or the level of fines. The seminar noted that the countries had difficulties to know in a precise manner the tonnage of some fishing vessels.

11. Another issue with respect to which the seminar called for an in-depth study was that of the administrative and judicial proceedings for the imposition of penalties in the Member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, including the modalities for the compounding of offenses. It requested that a comparative study be carried out on the matter in order to clarify the harmonization work that has to be done.

12. Given the fact that the highest ranking officers of the national fisheries administrations, normally represented at the sessions of the Coordinating Committee, participated in the seminar together with representatives of the partners of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, the seminar proposed that the state of execution of the main projects in the process of being implemented of interest to the Commission be reviewed in parallel to the work of the seminar. A separate report gives an account of these discussions.

13. The delegation of Brazil made a statement on its fisheries management policy and legislation and on the possibilities of cooperation with the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

14. The closing session was chaired by His Excellency Mr. Abdourhamane Sow, Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports Senegal. The closing statements are reproduced in Appendix IV.

**PROPOSALS FOR THE HARMONIZATION OF THE FISHERIES LEGISLATION
OF THE STATES MEMBERS OF THE SUB-REGIONAL FISHERIES
COMMISSION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paragraphs

INTRODUCTION

Objectives and Working Arrangements of Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC	1
Purpose and Scope of the Harmonization of Fisheries	
Laws and Regulations	3

ASSESSMENT OF INITIATIVES TAKEN IN THE SUB-REGION IN ORDER TO HARMONIZE FISHERIES LEGISLATION

Background	6
Present Situation	12

IDENTIFICATION OF POSSIBLE AREAS OF HARMONIZATION

Resources Management	17
Resources Management Planning	17
Control of Fishing Effort	19
Licensing Systems	20
Control of National Harvesting Capacity	21
Mesh Sizes	23
Minimum Sizes of Fish	24
Fishing Gear	25
Prohibited Forms of Fishing	26
Streamlining of Conservations Measures	28
Types of Fishing and Fishing Vessels	29
Types of Fishing	29
Classification of Fishing Vessels	31
Nationality of Fishing Vessels	32
Safety of Artisanal Fishing Vessels	34
Conflicts between Fishermen Using Different Types of Gear	38

Surveillance	40
Information on Catches	40
Observers	40
Logbooks and Declarations of Catch	44
Marking of vessels	46
Self-Reporting of Position and Catches	49
Procedures	
Records of Offences	52
Fishing Offences	53
Penalties	54
Administrative and Judicial Proceedings	56
Territorial Competence of Surveillance Officials	58
Evidence of Fishing Offences	60
Surveillance Handdbook	61
Negotiation of Access Agreements	62

PROPOSAL FOR A WORK PROGRAMME

General Considerations	65
Working Group	71
Role of the Permanent Secretariat	76
Support and Follow-Up Activities within the States	79
Budgetary Considerations	80

INTRODUCTION

Objectives and Working Arrangements of Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC

1. Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC entitled "Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal States of West Africa" aims, inter alia, at supporting, at a bilateral and sub-regional level, a process of harmonization of fisheries laws and regulations of member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. Member States of the Commission¹, whose permanent secretariat is based in Dakar, are Cape Verde, the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Senegal. The project document describes the methodological guidelines to be implemented in this connection as follows :

1. comparative analysis of the fisheries laws at a sub-regional and bilateral level and systematic identification of harmonization needs ;
2. study and identification of harmonization methods and objectives ;
3. preparation of harmonized provisions ;
4. organization of sub-regional seminars for the implementation of tasks referred to under items 2 and 3 above ;
5. follow-up activities in the States concerned in order to ensure the adoption of the harmonized laws and regulations recommended.

2. This document is a preparatory reference document. It gives an overview of the harmonization efforts carried out in the sub-region. It identifies normative sectors where harmonization actions are to be conducted taking into account specific problems and puts forward the general guidelines of a work programme that could be implemented in the years to come. The document will be examined by a first sub-regional seminar. It should be studied in the light of the two information documents equally prepared within the framework of project GCP/RAF/302/EEC (a synopsis of the main provisions of the fisheries laws and a compendium of fisheries laws of member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission).

¹ References to the Commission concern the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

Purpose and Scope of the Harmonization of Fisheries Laws and Regulations

3. An important point needs to be clarified as far as harmonization of fisheries laws and regulations is concerned. Harmonization of legislations does not, in the least, imply that States have to enact similar fisheries laws and regulations. It would not be realistic to adopt such an approach in the sense that political, linguistic, economic, geographical differences and legal traditions of the respective States would then be overlooked. The experience of the sub-region shows that, notwithstanding obvious solidarity requirements that make cooperation in fisheries essential, the effects of those differences induce great diversity. The harmonization of fisheries laws and regulations aims at ensuring that legal provisions in force are made compatible, especially when such compatibility is required to assure that fisheries resources are properly managed or that management problems encountered at the sub-regional level are solved. In certain instances, in view of the difficulties arising and the nature of the provisions in question, uniform rules can be adopted. Thus, as regards the marking of vessels, harmonization may amount to uniformity of rules applied. In other instances, rules drawn from common principles would do. For example, while implementing a number of common principles, licensing processes, are marked by the specific characteristics of the respective States' institutional organization.

4. In practice, it was realized that the term "harmonization" eventually gained, in the sub-region and elsewhere, a meaning that do not necessarily correspond to the above-mentioned approach. Consequently, harmonization implies, at times, cooperation initiatives in the fields of resources development or surveillance, coordination of fishing policy measures or communication, or data exchange, not necessarily embodied in legal texts. This wide approach is reflected in this study.

5. Another preliminary remark should be made concerning the decision not to present, except in very limited cases, specific examples drawn from national experience. The information documents available contain all factual information on the laws and regulations in force in the countries of the sub-region.

ASSESSMENT OF INITIATIVES TAKEN IN THE SUB-REGION IN ORDER TO HARMONIZE FISHERIES LEGISLATIONS

Background

6. The first efforts aimed at harmonizing fisheries laws in the sub-region were initiated in 1976, when the first meeting of the Sub-Regional Conference on Fisheries was held. One of the common objectives of the Ministers responsible for Fisheries was the harmonization of fisheries laws and regulations. Subsequently, the Sub-Regional Conference on Fisheries studied the issue in depth in cooperation with FAO. During the first sessions of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Conference, Ministers examined compendia of fisheries laws prepared by

FAO in collaboration with the permanent secretariat of the Conference. These compendia were intended to apprise the Ministers of the efforts needed in this field. Approximately at the same time, towards 1980, the different States of the sub-region launched individual processes for the revision of their fishing laws in the light of the new Law of the Sea. Within the context of those processes, they very often drew inspiration from legislations applied in neighbouring States and tried to find concerted solutions to some specific problems. In the same way, in view of the many contacts initiated at the sub-regional level amongst officials concerned, amendments tended to establish closer connections between the different legislations. For these reasons, there are great similarities in a number of legal and institutional solutions to specific problems.

7. The creation of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission in 1985 coincided with a strengthening of efforts made with a view to harmonizing certain provisions. According to Article 2 of the Convention establishing it, the Commission was given the mandate to harmonize, in the long run, members States' policies in the fields of protection, conservation and development of fishery resources. From 1987 onwards, several legal documents were prepared and then adopted by the Ministers, including a convention on the conditions of access to resources, a convention relating to sub-regional cooperation in the exercise of the right of maritime hot pursuit and a protocol relating to certain practical measures for the coordination of supervision operations and various reference documents on the status of observers and the marking of fishing vessels.

8. The 1993 Convention on the harmonization of conditions of access to and exploitation of fishery resources off the coasts of member States is an attempt to identify minimum access conditions applicable to all vessels fishing in the maritime waters of the Commission member States. It makes provision for the States to adopt several measures relating, in particular, to the maximum duration of fishing agreements, to the institution of harmonized statements of catches forms, to the placement of observers on board and to penalties for fishing offences. In fact, from the time of its adoption, the Convention appeared to be inadequate both practically and with regard to its approach. From a practical point of view, it confined itself to recommending the harmonization of provisions relating to fields that were already nearly similar in the member States. Thus, it aimed at constituting the lowest common denominator for some provisions but that objective had already been attained in the practice of the States. As regards the approach taken, conventions are unlikely to represent the best legal instruments for harmonizing legislations. As a matter of fact, the harmonization of legislations is mainly a process which implies the progressive review and adoption of different administrative and legal measures. Once a convention is adopted, it is still necessary that internal harmonized texts be adopted.

9. Member States of the Commission adopted in 1993 a convention relating to cooperation in the exercise of the right of hot pursuit and a protocol relating to certain practical measures for coordinating surveillance operations. These instruments evolved from

a long process of discussions launched in 1986 between the States. The convention delineates the framework of cooperation between "the pursuing State" and "the State of refuge" on the basis of a distinction between vessels registered in non-member countries of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission and non-member countries of the Commission. The systems of cooperation determined by the convention are immediately applicable to vessels registered in a foreign country that are not licensed to carry out fishing activities in the sub-region. Other cases are to be addressed by protocols to be negotiated by the States concerned. A general protocol defines the modalities for broader cooperation among the states the way surveillance bodies shall strengthen their cooperation, in particular as regards the periodic joint operations, communications, data exchange, training, installation of equipment in line with common standards, port facilities.

10. A working group of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission also prepared sub-regional "statutes" for observers, to be later submitted to the Conference of Ministers for approval. Likewise, a document relating to the marking of fishing vessels and partially based on FAO recommendations, has been prepared. Both are reference documents recommended for adoption by member States. It does not seem that any significant measures have been taken for the integration of these documents in the national legislations of the countries.

11. The FAO Fisheries Committee for the Eastern and Central Atlantic (CECAF) also supported harmonization initiatives pertaining to certain provisions of fisheries laws and regulations, particularly at the time when this institution was assisted by an operational unit. Several studies and activities focused on specific problems and helped develop an awareness of the need to adopt certain provisions. For example, as early as the mid-seventies, the Committee contributed to rendering statements of catches more systematic, and this obligation was translated into internal laws and international agreements.

Present Situation

12. The above-mentioned developments show that a systematic and general effort still needs to be done for the harmonization of fisheries laws and regulations of the sub-regional States. However, this does not mean that some kind of harmonization was not carried out as far as legislations are concerned. In actual fact, as a consequence of the diverse and empirical actions cited above, there is some convergence among laws and regulations presently in force. Thus, licensing systems are similar and based on common procedures. Conservation measures are not very different. Fishing agreements are almost identical. There are slight differences in some of the conservation measures that they prescribe, in the level of the authorized fishing effort and, consequently, in the payments to coastal States. Surveillance procedures are similar and in some instances, one can note that there is a great parallelism among many legal measures. Besides the initiatives mentioned earlier, the dense network of relations developed between member States of the Commission also contributed towards the reduction of divergences. Regular contacts are organized amongst managers,

researchers and businessmen who have initiated an informal but effective process aiming at establishing connections between legislations.

13. Still, this reality coexists with extreme differences and a great deal of divergences. Some of these disparities evolve from objective realities. Thus, English, French, and Portuguese legal systems do not only result in linguistic differences in the texts. These systems are different and have an impact on legislations as proved by certain examples related to fishing surveillance. In the English legal system, the activities of surveillance officials are limited by restrictive rules that limit their freedom of action more considerably than in countries with a French legal tradition. French and Portuguese legal systems favour administrative prosecution procedures while jurisdictional procedures are more widely followed in countries of common law tradition. The way evidence is produced varies and depends on the various legal systems.

14. Moreover, imbalances do exist between management targets of the fishery sector and means of fishery departments and they result in considerable discrepancies in the implementation of these provisions. One department would strictly apply a particular provision while another one would be more flexible, as a result either of a policy option or of inadequate resources. Even when fishing laws and regulations are identical in actual practice, major differences exist in their implementation. Sometimes, measures adopted by these departments in the course of their normal operations are disparate.

15. Finally, as States in the Sub-region improve their fisheries management systems, new harmonization needs are appear. It might be necessary to harmonize fishing surveillance procedures which, usually, are part of the "hard core" of the competence of the States. It might be necessary to study in depth issues such as the nationality of fishing vessels or the chartering of fishing vessels. It might also be necessary to examine issues that could at first seem unimportant as far as resources management is concerned. Thus, it is being realized that it could be useful to identify common standards for fishing vessels safety. It could be deemed expedient to strengthen inter-States cooperation in extremely important matters such as the negotiation of access agreements with foreign fishermen.

16. By way of assessment, it has to be acknowledged that substantial progress has been achieved but further harmonization needs have arisen. This phenomenon shows that sub-regional harmonization needs of legislations are of a progressive nature which depends on the vitality of national fishery management systems. In view of this national context, an attempt was made to identify systematically normative sectors whose harmonization possibilities need to be studied.

IDENTIFICATION OF POSSIBLE AREAS OF HARMONIZATION

Resources Management

Resources Management Planning

17. Within the framework of the present Law of the Sea system which bestows on coastal States the main responsibility as regards fishery resources management, States "must" see to it that fishery resources are adequately managed. This explains why countries of the sub-region have included in their legislations provisions stating that fishery departments shall prepare fishery resources management plans within the context of a process associating research institutes and the profession. These management plans are supposed to identify major options relating to both the development of main stocks and of areas under national jurisdiction, on the basis of which a number of decisions can be taken, such as the issuance of licenses and of authorizations to build vessels, and the adoption of certain regulatory measures. Besides, they are an integration instrument for all the biological, social and economic factors into the management process. As a general rule, these planning documents are yet to be prepared even if there are a few exceptions in countries of the sub-region. A systematic study of this important issue could be undertaken.

18. Special considerations should also be taken into account, such as the necessity to define management objectives, to take into consideration the specific situation of research institutes in the various countries, to note that the available information on the different stocks varies and that close coordination in management planning implies previous harmonization of other management concepts.

Control of Fishing Effort

19. An organized dialogue is still to be initiated between States in connection with the adoption of management decisions, especially of decisions related to authorized fishing effort. It should be noted that this issue was one of the first objectives of the first session of the 1976 Sub-Regional Fisheries Conference. Fishery departments regret that the issue has not been accorded the attention it deserves. It would be desirable that, with the help of all skills available, possibilities to reactivate concertation in that field be studied. This cooperation could possibly focus primarily on pelagic stocks of a more transboundary nature and with a lower commercial value. A concerted approach towards the management of these stocks could perhaps be easily implemented.

Licensing Systems

20. States have established licensing systems based on similar procedures. It could be expedient to examine these procedures in order to facilitate, if necessary, their systematic

harmonization. In this connection, it would be proper to keep in mind that a Canada sponsored project for the creation of a sub-regional register of fishing vessels is due to be launched very soon. The creation of the register will imply, among other consequences, the preparation of standardized licence application forms. This standardization will also facilitate data entry in the register. However, in this process, one should not lose sight of institutional features peculiar to each country. The convention concerning the determination of conditions of access and exploitation of fisheries resources off the coasts of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission of 14 July 1993 contains in its annex I a form for the registration of fishing vessels that could be used to establish a unique licence application form. The establishment of various categories of licences on the basis of the resources, fishing vessels and fishing gear seems thus necessary.

Control of the National Harvesting Capacity

21. The need to control the fishing effort applies both to national and foreign vessels. Nevertheless, foreign vessels are, at least in theory, in a precarious situation : if needs be, the decision may be taken to reduce their fishing efforts levels. This does not apply to local vessels. Even if fishery departments are legally entitled to turn down licence applications submitted by local fishermen, various political, social and economic reasons make this principle very difficult to implement. Consequently, national overcapacity may tend to built up, available resources may be overstretched and, therefore, put in jeopardy. Recent developments observed in countries of the sub-region tend to confirm this assertion.

22. Certain States of the sub-region have been examining legal means likely to avoid the build up of excessive national fishing capacity, which, if not checked in time, may have negative effects. It is still very difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these measures, particularly when they relate to artisanal fishing crafts. It is highly probable that this issue will gain importance, although it has not, so far, been paid much attention. Consequently, it is recommended that the matter be carefully examined in order to determine whether it is necessary to adopt provisions aimed at strenghtening the capacity to control the evolution of the national fishing capacity.

Mesh Sizes

23. In the sub-region, mesh sizes are relatively uniform. This is due to factors like proposals submitted by scientific research institutions or CECAF recommendations and to the influence of some fishing agreements, in particular fishing agreements signed with the EEC. Minimum mesh sizes are not too different and several sizes are used in accordance with fishing techniques used and species fished. However, this diversity in mesh sizes is deplored by members of the scientific community. Methods used to measure meshes are still to be defined in a number of countries. It would be advisable to reconsider the issue, making use, as appropriate, of the biological, technological, and administrative expertise available in the

sub-region. New proposals could be introduced, as required.

Minimum Sizes of Fish

24. Most countries in the sub-region have adopted measures relating to minimum sizes of fish. Nonetheless, conservation measures of the sort are not systematically controlled due to difficulties inherent in the matter. Besides, fishery administrators and scientists do not hold the same views as far as the necessity and conditions of implementation of these measures are concerned. It could be expedient to examine the whole matter with the help of the necessary expertise.

Fishing Gear

25. A certain number of countries in the sub-region have adopted regulatory provisions relating to authorized fishing gear and, in some cases, to the deployment of fishing gear. It might be necessary to standardize these provisions.

Prohibited Forms of Fishing

26. Prohibited forms of fishing which constitute a hazard for the ecosystem have been developing in the sub-region for a few years. This phenomenon has been, at times, reported by the media. Fishing with explosives has become a curse which ought to be fought. To a lesser degree, underwater fishing using instruments offering considerable autonomy and capacity of action that free fishermen from usual limitations to fishing activities also constitute a growing danger. The adverse effects of this fishing technique offer some striking examples.

27. A certain number of countries in the sub-region have adopted provisions banning this form of fishing. It is suggested that the issue be examined so that harmonization measures be proposed.

Streamlining of Conservation Measures

28. Conservation measures are usually adopted through regulatory provisions in accordance with enabling clauses enshrined in the basic legislation. These measures are often adopted through an order of the Ministers responsible for fisheries, especially those measures of a detailed nature. This is all the more justified since the conditions that make necessary the adoption of certain conservation measures may, sometimes, change rapidly. Certain countries' legislations take account of these flexibility requirements as they sometimes make provision for special conditions to appear in certain types of licences or even in individual licences. In any case, it would be useful to keep in mind that the control of surveillance measures can raise considerable difficulties and it is important to make sure, from the inception, that they are easy to control from a practical point of view. In the course of the

examination of harmonized measures likely to be adopted, it would be proper to keep that in mind.

Types of Fishing and Fishing Vessels

Types of Fishing

29. All the countries in the sub-region have adopted criteria to differentiate between several types of fishing, taking into account fishing gears and, sometimes, catch distribution. It would be desirable that efforts be made for the harmonization of these fishing categories, in particular in transborder areas where intensive artisanal fishing activities are carried out. Thus, criteria used to determine what, in Guinea-Bissau, is considered as artisanal fishing activities should not be too different from criteria used in Senegal.

30. The issue of the classification of the types of fishing (and boats) has gained a new dimension in Senegal, following the devaluation of the CFA franc. The artisanal fishing sector has considerably benefited from this measure ; its productivity is increasing and it accounts for a significant percentage of catches destined to exportation. In certain instances, basic characteristics of artisanal fishing tend to undergo profound changes. Therefore, one may wonder if current categories are still appropriate. The transboundary nature of the activities seems to suggest that the issue should be dealt with at a sub-regional level. It is essential that a boat belonging to a category in a country could fall into the same category in another country of the sub-region. This matters is closely linked to the following.

Classification of Fishing Vessels

31. In the same vein, fishery management implies necessarily distinctions between fishing units according to their fishing capacity and technical characteristics. That explains why States in the sub-region often make distinctions between artisanal, semi-industrial or industrial fishing boats or distinguish them according to their tonnage or total length. These distinctions are not academic, as they determine for each kind of boats, a specific set of rights and obligations, a different legal system liable to change substantially, for example, in terms of fishing rights, access to certain zones, use of a particular type of equipment, etc. Differences noted between systems can be very important because they may include considerable price variations for inputs like fuel, access to credit, wages of fishermen, port facilities. This explains why various types of boats and fishing have been established by the legislations of many countries. At the sub-regional level, other concerns may be attached to this categorization, especially when systems governing access to waters placed under the jurisdiction of other countries are organized. It could then be necessary to assure that the categories of fishing vessels in the sub-region are compatible. The involvement of the services of the merchant marine seems to be indispensable.

Nationality of Fishing Vessels

32. The issue of the nationality criteria for fishing vessels remains very important in the sub-region. On the one hand, countries have adopted access systems more favourable for national fishing vessels. Under these conditions, there is a risk that foreign fishing vessels owners might try to register their vessels in the country in order to enjoy more favourable conditions of access. Subsidies to the lay-off of fishing vessels in certain European countries have encourage this tendency. On the other hand, the identification of foreign vessels is even more important when mutually preferential access regimes are in force in the coastal States of the sub-region. It is essential that these vessels be effectively the property of nationals of one of the countries. Otherwise, the States, or one of them, will in fact authorize foreigners to enjoy more favourable access to the sub-region.

33. Nationality criteria for fishing vessels are, at first, dependent on whether the countries have French, Portuguese, or English legal traditions. In the first group of countries, the nationality of the shareholders of a shipping company determines the nationality of the vessels. On the other hand, in the countries with an English legal tradition, a ship owned by a company registered in a given country is normally a ship of that country, irrespective of any consideration relating to the ownership of the capital of the company and the nationality of its managers.

34. Over the past few years, a clear evolution has been noted in the sub-region, as well as in all West-African countries, in favour of the harmonization of the definition of the nationality of vessels, even for countries with an Anglo-Saxon legal tradition. Some international instruments encouraged this tendency. Thus, in the case of shipowning companies, it is necessary that the majority of the capital belong to nationals so that the ship can fly the national flag. However, this trend did not come up to expectations. Through fictitious records, it is always possible to set up "bogus companies" whose vessels are eligible for national flags. The only way to prevent that is to engage in comprehensive research that countries are not often in a position to carry out. Furthermore, there are countries that authorize the temporary granting of national flags to foreign ships. Consequently, the idea of a more resolute effort towards harmonization, or even uniformization, of the conditions for the attribution of a flag is re-emerging as something indispensable in the sub-region. But, given its complexity and links with the competence and prerogatives of the merchant marine administration, the issue deserves careful consideration and should involve the services of this department.

Safety of Artisanal Fishing Vessels

35. One of the problems that is mobilizing the attention of sub-regional authorities is that of the security of fishing vessels. Motorization of canoes has given more autonomy to small-scale fishermen who can now spend several days at sea, far from base. Motorized canoes

often return with the same fishes as those caught, in the same waters, by deep sea industrial fishing vessels. Yet, they do not have the same stability and the same security conditions. It is now frequent to see the media reporting about various wrecks and accidents. Fishing authorities were not traditionally interested in this area because they considered that the issue was marginal. However, the problem has gained an important dimension in certain regions. It is worth mentioning again the case of Senegal where the recent devaluation of the CFA Franc has encouraged the export of fish caught by artisanal fishermen. Fishing authorities working closely with fishermen are the ones confronted with the practical problems of security and the ones who seem to have a greater intervention capacity, contrary to the maritime authorities which, confronted with other priorities, would tend to discard security issues.

36. The Senegalese experience in this area is interesting. It has emphasized the urgent need to set out rules governing the navigation of manual, wind-driven or motorized fishing canoes. After a technical visit bearing on all aspects of security, canoes are directly registered by the Fisheries Department. They must bear appropriate registration marks clearly indicating their regions of registration. Before taking to sea, they must have on board all safety equipment required by the regulations. In the case of canoes exceeding a certain length, a second outboard motor is required. Canoes and other vessels must be brightly painted : in orange, white, yellow, or red. The recent Senegalese experience, with several accidents over the past few years, seems to be a good case in point.

37. A review of the issue at sub-regional level could be done to get to the root of the matter, to identify the areas that need a harmonized approach, and to propose appropriate rules. It should be noted that practical measures, such as improved training in order to prevent accidents, would reinforce the effectiveness of these regulations.

Conflicts between fishermen using different fishing gear

38. Measures destined to prevent and to settle conflicts between fishermen using different fishing gear could be studied and proposed at the sub-regional level.

39. The DIPA project has expressed its willingness to support the Sub-Regional Commission in the field of the safety of boats and conflicts between fishermen.

Surveillance

Information on Catches

Observers

40. The fisheries legislations of the countries in the sub-region provide for the possibility

for the coastal States to send observers onboard ships, generally foreign vessels. Normally, it is the duty of the observers to control the activities of fishing vessels. The system suffers from numerous insufficiencies such as pressures that can be put on observers or, simply, the environment and living conditions onboard that do not help them to carry out their tasks. Besides, as fishing vessels operate successively in the waters of several countries, it is not rare to notice onboard one given vessel the presence of two or three observers often working with different methods. Thus, in Senegal, for example, the observer is often one of the seamen onboard a foreign vessel; his observation activities are carried out alongside his fishing activities. In other countries, observers limit their activities to checking various aspects of fishing activities.

41. Harmonization efforts, or even standardization of the status of observers, could be effected in two directions. On the one hand, these efforts could tend towards a more precise definition of the status and prerogatives of observers and, correlatively, observers and captains of vessels. Thus, observers should be granted large prerogatives to carry out verifications on vessels, fishing equipment and catches on board. Similarly, observers should be able to have access, at any given time, to communication and navigation instruments. They should also be able to benefit from a treatment similar to that accorded to officers of a fishing vessel. This status could, of course, be adjusted to the particular situations of certain vessels. A particularly important point relates to the value of the findings of observers. In this respect, it is worth underlining that no country has given observers the status of judiciary police agents with the power to report infringements and to prepare records or statements of offences. All they can do is to inform the authorities of the coastal State about offences observed in order to facilitate the intervention of members of the competent surveillance officials. Similarly, the information given by observers is often used in support of the findings of competent officials, particularly within the framework of administrative and legal proceedings initiated to sanction offences.

42. In addition, observers are ordinarily paid by foreign shipowners. Aware of the negative effects of a great financial dependence of observers vis-à-vis shipowners, certain countries prefer to pay observers directly.

43. The standardization effort to be made should be based on the numerous reflections and preparatory documents already done within the Commission, in particular the proposals from a working groupe which recommended a sub-regional status for observers. The document is deprived of any binding force but could constitute a useful reference. Certain texts available in the sub-region could also serve as sources of inspiration. Account should also be taken of the vital need to distinguish carefully the roles of scientific observer and observer in charge of the monitoring of the implementation of regulations.

Logbooks and Declarations of Catch

44. A considerable effort has been made in the sub-region to ensure standardization of documents relating to declarations of catches and fishing activities. It is worth mentioning, in this regard, that CECAF tried to ensure the uniformity of the forms for the declarations of catch. Despite that, one continues, in practice, to note a great difference in the records of catches, whereas this document is the basic element for the comparison and the sub-regional exploitation of data on fishing activities which constitutes the basis for the future concerted management of resources. The disparity of data contained in the documents does not as yet allow for their efficient utilization.

45. Harmonization could be based on the use of an existing model that would be adapted to better take into account the needs and realities of the sub-region. Such harmonization would concern the structure and frequency of forms, instructions on how those forms are to be filled in and conditions for their transmission to authorities of coastal States. Given the nature of the work, the active participation of resources experts would be sought.

Marking of Vessels

46. Marking of fishing vessels to facilitate their identification, especially during surveillance or rescue operations is generally recognized as being of great importance because the marks are essential in order that patrol boats and aircrafts can identify ships. This is the reason why fishing legislations traditionally required the marking of vessels in accordance with certain criteria and specifications. However, in general those prescriptions were not effectively implemented because of a basic weaknesses that limited their scope : these measures were generally of a strictly national nature, with sometimes considerable differences between neighbouring countries. Yet, fishing vessels, particularly foreign ones, were operating successively in the waters of several States. It was rather difficult for those ships to change their marks whenever they were crossing a maritime border. It was therefore indispensable to set out criteria and specifications susceptible of being generalized.

47. To meet those needs, FAO organized, in conjunction with the Canadian Government, a series of technical meetings which led to the definition of criteria and specifications that could be generalized for the marking of vessels. Experts deemed that the radio calling code of the International Telecommunication Union could be the basis of a standardized identification system for fishing vessels. They also made recommendations on the dimensions and places of characters. The Commission endorsed the recommendations, subject to some proposals regarding minor adjustments on character dimensions.

48. Two States of the sub-region have adopted these specifications in their internal organization and others could do so in the near future. However, not all the countries impose effectively an obligation to mark their vessels which is particularly importante for

surveillance and rescue operations. It is therefore suggested that the issue be examined in the light of its various technical, practical and legal aspects. This review should help explain why the marking of vessels is not effectively implemented. It should also lead to recommendations permitting to correct the situation.

Self-Reporting of Position and Catches

49. Several States in the sub-region have instituted obligations of position declaration and, to a lesser degree, declaration of catches by radio or through any other means of communication at a certain frequency. The idea was that through such mechanisms of self-reporting, one should be able to have a global view of the evolution of fishing activities. Authorities of coastal States could thus obtain information on the daily activities of ships and on the location of the fishing stocks, which, once processed, would lead to a better knowledge of fishing activities or even, as in the case of migratory species, of the localization of stocks. In addition, one was hoping to reduce the need for air or sea surveillance. It is not certain that those objectives have been reached or are likely to be reached. The experience gained, as far as implementation of these obligations is concerned, has sometimes revealed considerable practical difficulties. In fact, shipowners do not like to communicate their positions for fear of competition in fishing areas. They are even more reluctant when it comes to communicating their catches. Several solutions such as the use of grids or the sending of reports by telex or fax, are likely to obviate some of those inconveniences.

50. The experience in implementing these procedures at the level of the sub-region should be reviewed further and, if needs be, standardized measures could be proposed.

Procedures

51. Surveillance of fishing activities and prosecution of fishing offences are areas that are closely associated with the exercise of States' sovereign rights ; all the more so since they involve or call for the recourse to aerial and naval surveillance means and to paramilitary means of communication. Yet, curiously enough, considerable progress has been made in the sub-region in this field and work has been carried out on the surveillance and protection of resources and prosecution of offences. One of the reasons is that experience has proved that it is easier to harmonize measures regarding the surveillance of foreign ships than to develop cooperation in the field of resources management. (However, this consideration is less and less true given the fact that shipping fleets tend to be more and more sub-regional, either because they are permanently based in the sub-region, or because vessels belong to shipowners of the sub-region). Another reason for that is that there has always been close cooperation between surveillance structures.

Records of Offences

52. A move towards harmonization of the records of offences has been taken by certain member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, at the initiative of the heads of surveillance structures. It remains that there are countries where no definite form is required for the recording of fishing offences, which consequently leads to serious difficulties. The matter could be explored further along two complementary orientations. On the one hand, it would be proper to tend towards a generalization of statements of offences; on the other hand, standard forms should in all probability be improved to include all relevant data in anticipation of possible legal procedures.

Fishing Offences

53. There is a similarity among the legislations of the countries in the sub-region as regards the definition of acts constituting a fishing offence. It would be useful to examine the issue in order to tend towards a greater convergence of offences and, as required, propose amendments to the texts.

Penalties

54. The countries of the sub-region have established fines for fishing offences. The level of these fines is sometimes extremely high and, indeed, in certain countries it ranks amongst the highest in the world. This situation was perfectly understandable at a certain period. In fact, several countries in the sub-region were deprived of surveillance means and, to tackle illegal fishing activities, had to resort to particularly dissuasive penalties. However, the situation has changed and all the countries in the sub-region have, at least, some surveillance means. Furthermore, the most "spectacular" offence, the lack of a licence which commended the great rigour of legislations, tends to become rarer and rarer. Within this context, the experience of some countries in the sub-region shows that very heavy fines affect the credibility and the adequate operation of control systems, in so far as, according to a recurrent scenario, the State whose flag is flown tends to intervene and negotiate the amount of the fine with the coastal State. These negotiations sometimes bring forth in the presence of the coastal State, an important external partner; which can lead to considerable diplomatic consequences.

55. A confrontation of the experiences of the various countries in this field, which would, as appropriate, lead to proposals, would be welcome.

Administrative and Judicial Proceedings

56. The situation concerning the authority to impose penalties in the sub-region remains quite heterogenous. There is nothing astonishing in that, given the nature of the issue and

the differences between the legal systems. One can say that the most common rule here is that a fishing offence can lead to the payment of a fine imposed administratively. If there is no agreement on the part of a presumed offender, the latter can always take the matter before tribunals. In fact, from this general framework, one can notice varying developments. Thus, there are countries where penalties are always administratively imposed, even though provision is made for interventions of legal bodies. But, there are also countries where tribunals - which are not always fit to deal with this specialized issue - intervene to impose the penalties for fishing offences. One should note that there could be possibilities, limited but real, to improve the existing systems.

57. It would be interesting to confront the experiences of the various countries in order to determine whether the existing solutions could be improved.

Territorial Competence of Surveillance Officials

58. Foreign partners are examining the possibility of funding an aerial surveillance project in the sub-region and are proposing that surveillance officials of a given country be mandated to record offences occurring in fishing zones of other countries. In fact, that proposal is daring and has even a certain level of delicateness. A less ambitious proposal, that appears to respond to the needs of this project, would consist in recognizing the possibility for observers and/or inspectors of some countries to overfly the waters under the jurisdiction of other countries of the sub-region. However, only inspector of the country in which waters a boat is, would have the possibility of recording offenses.

59. It remains that, given the proposals made by foreign partners, the issue could be further investigated with due caution, particularly in the light of a review of relevant experiences in other regions of the world for information gathering purposes.

Evidence of Fishing Offences

60. An issue whose examination is very topical is that of the legal value as evidence of data gathered through instruments such as aerial photographs, GPS data, etc. There are certain proposals that tend to give those elements a absolute legal value. Some of the proposals also originate from foreign partners. From the standpoint of the legal principles generally accepted by States, answers to these proposals can only be cautious. The evidence referred to above should, in no way, have an absolute value. However, the issue could be studied further in order to enable the States of the sub-region to know the solutions existing in other countries of the world, to keep them informed of the experience gained by certain countries in the sub-region and define, as appropriate, a common position with regard to the issue.

Surveillance Officials Handbook

61. A handbook should be prepared for surveillance officials in the sub-region. It would be a reference document covering the provisions of the main national legislations, introducing surveillance procedures, identification data cards for the various species, main gear, engines, measurement procedures for mesh sizes, etc. There are examples of similar handbooks that could be useful references, in other regions of the world.

Negotiation of Access Agreements

62. In the sub-region, the idea that closer coordination of negotiations for international agreements is indispensable, is gradually emerging. In fact, because the countries in the sub-region continue to negotiate and sign fishing agreements separately with foreign countries on the basis of their own criteria, it has become easy for foreign shipowners to take advantage of the isolation of the States. For example, if the conditions offered by a given State do not seem satisfactory, a foreign State can go somewhere else. It can, during the negotiations, more easily make the coastal State make concessions because the authorities of the latter know that the shipowner can send its vessels to operate within the waters of another State. There are several examples of this.

63. Fishing authorities of the countries in the sub-region are aware of the inconveniences resulting from this situation and it is enlightening to note that, within the framework of the rehabilitation process of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, administrations unanimously agreed to the fact that it is necessary to tend towards closer cooperation between coastal States during the negotiation of fishing agreements. However, it remains that the issue is sensitive, for the coastal countries can have different views and diverging interests, and coordinated negotiations could rapidly stumble on an incompatibility of interests of individual States.

64. Three directions could be explored to strengthen the bargaining power of coastal States. To begin with, national legislations could define a set of conditions that owners of deep sea fishing vessels should respect. In a way, countries have, in practice, gone beyond that solution. At the moment, there is a high level of harmonization of the provisions of international access agreements; the points that create problems are first and foremost those related to payments and certain provisions that are not effectively adhered to. A second way could consist in negotiating access agreements within a multilateral framework. Such a solution would naturally require careful preparatory work and, at any rate, should be implemented very carefully. However, one must note that there has been a precedent of multilateral access agreement negotiations in the South Pacific. A third possibility, intermediate, could be explored. It would consist in assuring that negotiations take place separately but at the same time. The States could thus undertake consultations and attempt to reach progressively a common position.

PROPOSAL FOR A WORK PROGRAMME

General considerations

65. The sub-regional context seems favourable to the strengthening of cooperation initiatives between countries in the sub-region. In fact, there still is an intense cooperation in the implementation of many common or harmonized legal provisions. There are even organized and systematic contacts and data exchange procedures between administrations of certain countries (e.g. communications between radio surveillance units at certain periods of the week). Similarly, joint fishing surveillance operations have often been carried out and this is an effort remarkable enough to be noted here. In addition, there are several quasi daily informal contacts between fishing authorities in the sub-region. Finally, one can note a considerable asset that cannot be overemphasized : in the minds of high level fishing authorities of the countries concerned, there is a sharp awareness that it is essential to work with a view to setting up common policies and documents for the management of fisheries in the sub-region.

66. However, things will not be easy just because of this favourable context. In fact, any harmonized initiative in the field of standardization must be carefully undertaken. It has to be gradual and bear the imprint of a compromise between realities of various countries. It should take care of the sensibilities of certain countries and make the necessary compromises. Thus, it is proposed not to seek to standardize any provisions radically and rapidly. The resort to very stringent methods - such as international agreements - must be carefully considered, because once the instruments are adopted, their provisions are integrated in internal legislations. The project should not naturally seek to legislate in the place of States. The project should act on the basis of the expertise available in the sub-region through seminars and working groups composed of officials of countries whose conclusions will gradually be put before the higher bodies of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission and member countries.

67. As a first step, high ranking officials of the countries concerned should approve the general work plan contained in this document. Thus, they should also take a stand on certain legal general issues. What should be the legal approach to be taken and which are the fields that need interventions?

68. As regards the issue of the best legal method to apply in order to achieve standardization, a certain freedom of action must be given to experts and administrators in the sub-region. For certain matters, they could propose uniform or harmonized texts that could then be submitted to the relevant bodies of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission and Governments for an integration of rules and regulations. For other matters, they could propose the adoption of international conventions. For some others, they could propose guidelines, without legally binding force. These documents would be a reference that could

gradually be imposed upon member States. For example, it could be decided on the opportunity to tend towards a standardization of penalties for fishing offences. But, in this field which is by definition associated with the sovereignty of States, it might be wiser to act through recommendations. In fact, it is important to show some flexibility in the standardization process because States and administrations would not like to find themselves faced with the need to radically change certain clauses. A constant explanation effort should be made in relation to researches and proposals. At any rate, work would have to be submitted to the Coordination Committee and the Conference of Ministers.

69. This document identifies some of the fields in which harmonization could intervene. However, it does not have the pretention to be comprehensive; any possible field of harmonization can be examined.

70. The first seminar would be very important because it will offer the opportunity to bring any necessary clarification and/or additional information to this work programme and to define future methodological orientations.

Working Group

71. In the preparation of this document, it was envisaged to suggest that several working groups address the identified problems further and gradually propose harmonized clauses and methods to ensure adequate standardization. The approach proved successful in the sub-region.

72. However, the assessment of activities carried out by sub-regional working groups, as well as other considerations, suggests that a single working group be established. The scattering of groups entails a risk of dispersion and dillution of efforts, resources and activities. There is also a risk that the conclusions and recommendations of working groups be less effective. Furthermore, all problems and aspects of fisheries management are closely interlinked and, what is more, lawyers and fisheries administrators of the sub-region are, often, polyvalent. Depending on the nature of issues to be addressed, it would always be possible to allow for the adjunction to the group of experts in the fields where they would be needed. Depending on the importance of the issues, it would be also possible to provide for the participation of high level officials, or even the organization of meetings with the members of the Coordinating Committee. Therefore, it is suggested that the principle of a single working group be retained for the sub-regional harmonization of fisheries legislations.

73. The meetings of the working group would be prepared by consultants from the sub-region with support from the permanent secretariat of the Commission and, as appropriate, for certain specific matters, by foreign consultants. It would be advisable to ensure as far as possible a balance between experts from the sub-region; the project as well as the permanent secretariat should particularly see to that.

74. Given the wide range of issues to be addressed, a certain progressivity of the work to be carried out should be assured. A tentative distribution and schedule of the work should be proposed by the Project and the Permanent Secretariat of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

75. As far as possible, and depending on the specific nature of the issues to be addressed, it is suggested to involve foreign partners concerned in the meetings of the working group.

Role of the Presidency and of the Permanent Secretariat

76. The Project should rely on the Presidency and on the Permanent Secretariat of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. In turn, they secretariat should, as far as possible, constitute leading element in the harmonization process. The Presidency and the Secretariat would be closely associated with the technical work of the project and of the consultants, and should participate actively in the elaboration of preparatory documents. They would have an important role to play in order to propose the best working methods and make suggestions for the recruitment of the most qualified consultants for the job.

77. The Presidency and the Permanent Secretariat should participate as far as possible in the sensitization and organization of the seminars.

78. Subsequently, the Presidency and the Secretariat would have an important follow-up role to play in the implementation of the recommendations of the working group in the member States of the Commission.

Support and Follow-up Activities within Member States

79. It is likely that as the work and the meetings of the working group progress, follow-up and technical support activities at the level of member States will be needed. In this case, without any prejudice to this work programme and these guidelines, the project should be in a position to support, as a matter of priority, these actions. The possibility of identifying national correspondents for these activities would be considered.

Budgetary Considerations

80. The project should be in a position to support the activities mentioned in this document and earmark the necessary financial resources to that effect. It could also resort to the financial and technical help of foreign partners who are particularly interested in certain subject matters. In order to reduce costs, it is highly recommended to hold informal working sessions in conditions likely to limit expenses related to the organization of meetings.

AGENDA OF THE SEMINAR ON THE HARMONIZATION OF
FISHERIES LEGISLATION OF THE STATES MEMBERS
OF THE SUB-REGIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

1. Opening session
2. Approval of the agenda
3. Review, discussion and approval of the document "proposals for the harmonization of the fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission"
4. Other matters
5. Adoption of the report
6. Closing session

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBER STATES

CAPE VERT

Carlos Evora Rocha
Directeur général des pêches
Ministère des pêches, de l'agriculture
et de l'animation rurale
Boîte postale N. 206
Praia

Aulanio Eugénio Pereira
Directeur du service juridique,
inspection et surveillance
Ministère des pêches, de l'agriculture
et de l'animation rurale
Boîte postale N. 206
Praia

Capitaine César Augusto Lélis Fortes
Commande de la garde côtière nationale
Boîte postale N. 29
Praia

Madame Yolanda Brites
Chef de la division du service pêche
Bureau d'études et planification
Ministère des pêches, de l'agriculture
et de l'animation rurale
Boîte Postale N. 206
Praia

THE GAMBIA

Ousman K.L. Drammeh
Director of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural
Resources
6, Marina Parade
Banjul

Austin Jones
Senior Fisheries Officer
Fisheries Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Natural
Resources
6, Marina Parade
Banjul

Capitaine M.B. Sarr
Officer commanding
Marine Unit
Banjul
PMB 49, Banjul

Moustapha Marong
Senior State Counsel
Ministry of Justice
Banjul

GUINEA

Yaya Camara
Secrétaire général
Ministère de la pêche maritime et de
l'aquaculture
Conakry

Naby Souleymane Bangoura
Directeur national des pêches
et de l'aquaculture
Ministère de la pêche maritime et de
l'aquaculture
Conakry

Madame Aissatou Sacko
Juriste
Direction nationale de la pêche et de
l'aquaculture
Conakry

Mamadou Kaly Bah
Ingénieur halieute
Chargé de la gestion de la ressource
Centre national de surveillance
des pêches (CNSP)
Conakry

Madame Margo Fraling
Expert en protection et surveillance
Centre national de surveillance
des pêches (CNSP)
Conakry

GUINEA-BISSAU

Malal Sané
Conseiller juridique
Ministère des pêches
Boîte postale N. 102
Bissau

Souleymane Djassi
Directeur du bureau d'études
Ministère des pêches
Boîte postale N. 102
Bissau

Domingos Barros
Directeur de la Surveillance
Ministère des pêches
Boîte postale N. 102
Bissau

Commandant Quintino Nhanqué
Marine nationale
Ministère de la défense
Boîte postale N. 10
Bissau

MAURITANIA

Kane Ciré Amadou
Ingénieur halieute
Ministère des pêches et de
l'économie maritime
Boîte postale N. 137
Nouakchott

El Hafed ould Ejiwen
Chef du service d'aménagement
et réglementation
Ministère des pêches et de
l'économie maritime
Boîte postale N. 137
Nouakchott

Ba Almamy Samboly
Conseiller chargé de la surveillance
Ministère des pêches et de l'économie
maritime
Boîte postale N. 137
Nouakchott

SENEGAL

Bernard Codou Dioh
Conseiller
Ministère de la pêche et des
transports maritimes
Dakar

Ndiaga Gueye
Directeur des pêches
Ministère de la pêche et des
transports maritimes
1, rue Joris
Dakar

Commandant Makane N'Diaye
Directeur de la protection et de la
surveillance de la pêche
Ministère de la pêche et des
transports maritimes
1, rue Joris
Dakar

Madame Mariama Barry-Gérard
Biologiste - chercheur
Centre des recherches océanographiques de
Dakar-Thiaroye
Institut sénégalais de recherches agricoles
(ISRA)
Dakar

Lieutenant de vaisseau Issa Diara
Marine nationale
Boîte postale N. 349
Dakar

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

ANGOLA

Eurico Paz Costa
Directeur du service juridique
Ministère des pêches
Boîte postale N. 160
Luanda

BRAZIL

Joao Inácio Padilha
Chargé d'affaires
Ambassade du Brésil
Boîte postale N. 136
Dakar

Jose Ubirajara Timm
Gérant
Chambre sectorielle de
pêche et d'aquaculture
Ministère de l'agriculture, du
ravitaillement et de la réforme agraire
Brasilia

Sebastiao Saldanha Neto
Chef du Département de la pêche
et de l'aquaculture, IBAMA
Ministère de l'agriculture, du
ravitaillement et de la réforme agraire
Brasilia

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Jacques Laberge
Conseiller
Ambassade du Canada
Dakar

Armand Lachance
Coopérant ACDI
440 Chemin des Pères
Canton Magog (Québec)
J1X5R9 Canada

Babacar Diop
Conseiller (Ressources Naturelles et
Environnement)
BACC
Immeuble Fahad (8°)
Dakar

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Cornelia Nauen
Fonctionnaire principal (coopération en
matière de pêches)
Direction générale VIII
Commission européenne
200, rue de la Loi
Bruxelles

Gilles Desesquelles
Conseiller
Délégation de la Communauté
européenne
Dakar

LUX-DEVELOPMENT

Marc Riehl
Chargé des programmes
Lux-Development
7, avenue Alcide de Gasperi
Boîte postale N. 1503
L-1015-Luxembourg

GERMAN OFFICE FOR TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Uwe Buschmann
Chef de mission
Projet GOPA/GTZ assistance conseil
auprès du Ministère des pêches et de
l'économie maritime de Mauritanie
Nouakchott

Ulf Lowenberg
Biologiste
Projet GOPA/GTZ assistance
conseil auprès du Ministère
des pêches et de l'économie
maritime de Mauritanie
Nouakchott

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Djilali Benamrane
Programme des Nations Unies pour le
développement (PNUD)
Praia
Cap Vert

MARITIME ADVISER (FRANCE)

Bernard Doussot
Conseiller Maritime
Ambassade de France
Dakar

PERMANENT SECRETARIAT OF THE SUB-REGIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

Boubakary N'Diaye
Secrétaire permanent
Boîte postale N. 289
Dakar

FAO

A. Tavares de Pinho
Regional Fisheries Law Adviser
Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC
P.O. Box N. 3300
Dakar

Annick Van Houtte
Legal Officer
Development Law Service
FAO-Rome

Jean-Michel Kandé
Associate-expert
Project GCP/RAF/302/EEC
P.O. Box N. 3300
Dakar

SECRETARIAT

Mrs. Begay Jagne
Miss Fatou Ndiaye

INTERPRETERS

El Hadj Malick Sy
Ebou Khan
Jacques Coly
Charles Faye

OPENING SESSION

**Address by Mr. Boubakary N'Diaye
Permanent Secretary of the Sub-Regional
Fisheries Commission**

Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transport of Senegal,

Distinguished FAO Representative,

Mr. Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Distinguished Experts,

Distinguished Guests,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of Her Excellency Mrs. Maria Helena Semedo, Minister of Fisheries, Agriculture and Rural Development of the Republic of Cape Verde, current President of the Conference of Ministers, as well as on behalf of all member States represented here, I would like, first of all, to thank Mr. Abdourahmane Sow, Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of the Republic of Senegal, for accepting to honour us with his presence to preside over the opening of this seminar.

The uniform character of our sub-region's marine environment should be taken into account for the definition of any national planning, management and development of fishery resources policy. We do, indeed, share common fishing areas and our stocks are common and/or interdependent. That is why our countries decided, nearly a decade ago, to set up the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission as an instrument responsible for the implementation of a process of harmonization of fisheries policies for an improved development of activities carried out in this important sector of their respective economies.

The Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission has reached a crucial point in its development and it is comforting to note that, on the one hand, all member States are really determined to work towards its strengthening and, on the other hand, our present or potential external partners

Please allow me to seize this opportunity to pay tribute to our sub-regional experts who, over the last few years, worked with faith, competence and dedication in order to submit to the Conference of Ministers concrete and realistic proposals in line with our organization's objectives. In this regard, suffice it to consider achievements such as :

- a common status for national observers working essentially on foreign vessels;
- a harmonized system for the marking of vessels ;
- a convention on conditions of access to and exploitation of the region's fishery resources signed in Praia, on 14 July 1993 ;
- a convention on the right of maritime hot pursuit and a protocol on practical measures relating to the coordination of surveillance operations, signed in Conakry, on 1 September 1993. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the Republic of Cape Verde and the Republic of Senegal have signed recently a bilateral protocol in the area of fisheries surveillance, based on article 9 of the Conakry Convention providing for the adoption of specific bilateral and multilateral protocols.

In addition to the foregoing texts, various project proposals concerning the establishment of common structures have been submitted to external partners. The study and programming phase of most of them is well-advanced.

Honourable Minister,

Mr. Representative of FAO,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In pursuance of a decision taken by the Conference of Ministers of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, a process was launched for the rehabilitation of the Commission's activities and an institutional reform. This process included the adoption of an amendment to the Convention of 29 March 1985 establishing the Commission, to adoption of a budget, to the signing of a Headquarters Agreement with the Republic of Senegal and the provision of new premises for the Permanent Secretariat. Several external partners have been supporting us and continue to do so in the implementation of these activities. These partners include FAO, involved in a support project being implemented at present UNDP, involved in the imminent convening of a donors round table conference for the benefit of the Commission, CIDA, involved in a project for the establishment of a register of fishing vessels, extended recently to other fields (research, training, etc.) and Lux-Development involved in an aerial surveillance project. We have also initiated discussions with other partners that have

expressed their willingness to assist us.

I would like, on behalf of member States, to renew our sincere gratitude to all those organizations and I wish to assure them of our determination to work towards the consolidation of this cooperation.

The seminar which is starting today deals with a very important aspect of the objective of harmonization of policies set out in the Convention establishing the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. In fact, once our organization has succeeded in harmonizing some essential elements of our legislations and regulations it will have gone a long way towards the achievement of the general objective of harmonization of policies for a rational and concerted management of fishery resources in the sub-region. I am convinced that, once again, that the officers responsible for fisheries and experts of the sub-region will live up to their reputation by submitting concrete and realistic proposals to the Conference of Ministers.

Thank you.

Address by Mr. Carlos Evora Rocha
Director-General of Fisheries of Cape Verde
Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the
Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission

Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal,

Distinguished Representative of FAO,

Representatives of the partners of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I consider it a great honour to be offered the opportunity to take the floor at the opening session of the seminar on the harmonization of fisheries legislations of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, in the presence of the Senegalese Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transport, Mr. Abdourahmane Sow.

The Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission has initiated, with the active and unconditional support of its member States and its Secretariat, a process aimed at rehabilitating its structures and activities. I do not intend to engage in a detailed review of this process as this has been done elsewhere. However, with your permission, I should like to just point out that various actions have been carried out in order to re-examine some aspects of the Commission's institutional structure and to develop operational activities. These activities have benefited from support provided by external partners like FAO, CIDA, and UNDP. Most luckily, other partners, in increasing number, are willing to support our efforts. The establishment of a sub-regional register of fishing vessels, to be sponsored by CIDA, and the launching of a process for a sub-regional round table of donors, to be sponsored by UNDP, are among the actions already initiated. We have taken good note of the fact that GTZ is prepared to finance a project aimed at providing a long-term institutional support to the Commission. We also hope that an agreement will be signed with regard to an air surveillance project sponsored by Lux-Development that would respond to the expectations of the countries of the sub-region. Besides the register, CIDA has pledged to extend its support to the fields of research, training and surveillance. In a word, without going further into details, the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, now in full motion, is more and more asserting itself as the natural framework for fisheries cooperation between the States of our sub-region.

At the same time, we have learned with great satisfaction, that, in pursuance of the

Headquarters Agreement recently signed, the Senegalese Government has put at the Commission's disposal, premises for the Secretariat. On behalf of Her Excellency, Mrs. Maria Helena Semedo, current President of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, I wish, at this juncture, to thank, through His Excellency Mr. Abdourahmane Sow, Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal, the Senegalese Government for this decision and I hope that the transfer of the Secretariat to its new premises will materialize without delay. My Minister has instructed me to inform you that, if her proposal is agreeable to you, she is ready to convene, in Dakar, a special session of the Conference of Ministers so that this important event be given the splendour it deserves.

Honourable Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, please allow me now to come to our meeting's central subject.

It should be recalled, and this is often forgotten, that when the Ministers of the sub-region in charge of fisheries started to meet regularly, in 1976, within the framework of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Conference, they gave the utmost priority to the harmonization of policies and legislations relating to fishery resources management and to the coordination of their policies, especially in the fields of resources management and protection. Thus, preparatory work providing for the harmonization of certain management decisions and legal provisions were submitted to the Ministers. Subsequently, the Commission's activities in this field of resources management and protection were more discreet.

However, over the last few years, some aspects of the issue seen in light of the harmonization process of national fisheries legislations attracted the undivided attention of the countries of the sub-region. Firstly, efforts were made to harmonize some specific provisions concerning the status of observers and the marking of fishing vessels. At the same time, conventional instruments were developed. The first one was the protocol setting out minimum conditions of access to the resources of the States of the sub-region. The purpose of this important agreement was to define a common denominator for the conditions for foreign fishing vessels. The agreement is now somewhat outmoded if compared to what is considered as usual practice by the States ; this is essentially due to the fact that its objectives have been fulfilled. Two major agreements relating to cooperation in the exercise of the right of hot pursuit and to certain practical measures for the coordination of surveillance operations were signed in 1993 after difficult negotiations. Please allow me to recall that on the occasion of the visit made two weeks ago, in Dakar, by the Prime Minister of Cape Verde, a bilateral protocol was signed between Senegal and Cape Verde for the implementation of some provisions of these instruments.

There is a momentum at the level of our sub-region in which we have common resources separated by maritime boundaries. Thus, the need that surveillance and resource protection activities extend beyond national boundaries is greater than ever. Today there is a greater need for a joint management of resources. Foreign partners represented here are

urging us, to ensure that projects are successful, to develop new and more advanced forms of cooperation with far-reaching institutional and legal implications. The entire fishing surveillance sector calls for closer cooperation and harmonization of a great number of measures. At present, there is, at the global level, a clear understanding, relayed by the media, of the necessity to manage and protect fishing resources. It is imperative that our sub-region, whose economies are largely dependent on fishing activities, be in the vanguard of the fight for resources preservation. In this regard, we and our partners are convinced that it is essential that sub-regional discussions on resources management be revived, and that efforts be made for resources protection through the adoption of harmonized and concerted conservation measures.

It is against this background that the FAO project entitled "Improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa, whose principal sponsor is the European Economic Community but which also receives contributions from Canada and France, is being implemented. At this juncture, I would like our partners to accept the expression of our gratitude. The project is conducted under the framework of the Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States Bordering the Atlantic Ocean chaired, on behalf of the Senegalese Government, by His Excellency the Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports. The project aims, among other things, at supporting a harmonization process of the legislations of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. We are then assembled here for the launching of these activities. For that reason, the project management decided quite appropriately that the seminar should be attended by the top ranking officials of the fisheries administrations of the States of the sub-region.

The objective of the seminar is to examine the proposed actions to be carried out, in the years to come, in the field of harmonization of fisheries legislations of the sub-regional States, with regard both to normative issues needing cooperation actions or and to the work programme to be implemented. The proposals submitted, that were prepared by officials of the sub-region and by the project, are included in the working document to be examined by the seminar. Other information documents are also available. I should like to invite all the delegates to study the working document in detail for further possible amendments.

Thus, without losing its general character, it could provide a reference framework for our activities during the next few years. My invitation extends also to international agencies represented here that we wished to have with us. We wish to thank them for trusting us. As some of these agencies have expressed, at various degrees and according to their particular sensitivity, their desire to participate in our efforts in the legal and institutional aspects of sub-regional fisheries management, we have to make sure that they feel at ease with the guidelines that we will be formulating.

Of course, we are so used to FAO being present and assisting us that we tend to forget

the technical and material support it has been providing us for several years. Now that our Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission is becoming an inescapable reality as the central mechanism for the management of fishery resources in the sub-region and that a large movement of support to the Commission and its activities is, day after day, gaining momentum, simple justice commands that we recall that FAO has always supported our efforts. Consequently, I would like you, Mr. Representative, to convey our sincere gratitude to the FAO Director General.

In conclusion, please allow me, Honourable Minister, to point out that the countries of the sub-region are always happy to enjoy Senegal's warm hospitality. We hope to combine our pleasant stay with the comforting feeling that we have worked well and laid the foundations for an important work to be carried out later.

I thank you for your attention.

Address by Mr. M. T. Mukendi
FAO Representative in Senegal

Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports,

Mr. Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Mr. Permanent Secretary of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Representatives of the Partners of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The organization that I have the honour to represent here has been conducting, for many years, in close cooperation with the States of the region, activities of support to the rational management and protection of fisheries resources. Given the transboundary nature of resources management, these actions were, from the onset, focused on regional and sub-regional cooperation.

Thus, the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) was established in 1967 with a mandate to support national and regional research and development programmes aiming at assuring an adequate use of fishery resources and to provide a scientific basis for the adoption of regulatory measures by the countries. During a period of twelve years, starting in 1973, the Committee benefited from the assistance of a technical operational unit and was, therefore, able to contribute decisively to an improved knowledge of resources and to the management of fisheries in the region. In parallel, other national programmes for fisheries development and capacity building were implemented by the organization.

In 1976, when the Ministers in charge of fisheries in the States of the sub-region decided to establish the Sub-Regional Fisheries Conference, the ancestor of the present Commission, the FAO assisted the countries concerned in the definition of the institutional options more adapted to the type of cooperation envisaged. In fact, for several years, the Conference functioned on the basis of arrangements proposed by our organization until the need to strengthen its status was felt. Subsequently, we helped doing preparatory work for the harmonization of management systems and fisheries legislations of the States members of the Commission. We participated also in the organization of some meetings of the Coordinating Committee and the Conference of Ministers.

Since 1993, FAO supported in a more resolute manner the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, when the Commission launched a process of rehabilitation of its structures and activities. Its current President formulated a request for assistance with the FAO Director General. The latter approved a project of assistance to the Commission financed by resources of the Technical Cooperation Programme. The project provided for technical assistance in the definition of a strategy for the activities of the Commission, the preparation of a long-term assistance project for the Secretariat of the Commission, the strengthening of the role of the Commission in the fields of resources management and the supply of material support to the Secretariat in the form of equipment and documentation. Some of these activities are under way, others are being finalized. Henceforth, we are delighted to know that the project sustained in a profitable manner the efforts of the Commission and its member States and that it contributed significantly to the mobilization of new partners.

Although it was organized by another project of ours, this meeting takes place in the general context of our activities of assistance to management and protection of fisheries resources in the region. In 1992, the current chairman of the Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean, the Senegalese Minister of Fisheries, submitted a request to the Director-General of FAO with a view to ascertaining the possibility of setting up of a project designed to assist the countries and sub-regional and regional bodies in legal and institutional aspects of fisheries management. It was possible to formulate the project "improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa" and secure its financing by the European Community. The project is also supported by two important donors, Canada and France.

The work programme of the project requires it to launch and to support a process for the harmonization of the fisheries legislations and regulations of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. Its objective is to support the efforts countries concerned have been making for years in a context of extensive sub-regional cooperation. We hope that, in the course of this first seminar, we will be able to identify guidelines for the work to be carried out in the forthcoming years and, consequently, to contribute, if only in a modest way, to the achievement of the objective of establishing a real common sub-regional space for resources management and protection.

We are pleased to note the presence here of some of the partners of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission with whom we have collaborated regularly, sometimes for a long period of time, and we appreciate the fact that the activities of the Commission contribute, in such a way, to bringing together all partners concerned by the fisheries sector.

Similarly, we are delighted by the interest shown by the States members of the Commission towards the first initiative of the project, as demonstrated by the presence of the highest ranking officials of the fisheries departments of countries concerned.

Finally, we are deeply honoured by the fact that His Excellency the Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports, Mr. Abdourahmane Sow, accepted to open the seminar, demonstrating, once again, how he values the activities of our organization as well as the development and management of fisheries in the region.

Thank you for your attention.

**Address by His Excellency Mr. Abdourahmane Sow
Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal**

Distinguished Representative of FAO,

Distinguished representatives of international institutions,

Mr. Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Mr. Permanent Secretary of the Sub-Regional Commission for Fisheries,

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to open the present seminar on the harmonization of the fisheries laws and regulations of member States of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, organized with financial support from project "improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of fishing resources of Coastal States of West Africa".

I would therefore like to seize this opportunity to welcome all the participants, especially our partners representing the member countries of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

My pleasure in doing so is all the greater as our country is strongly involved in sub-regional cooperation within the Commission. In fact, it is at the initiative of the Senegalese Government that the Sub-Regional Fisheries Conference was convened for the first time in 1976 here in Dakar. Since the setting up of the Commission, Senegal, pending the effective implementation of its budget, has resolutely supported it by paying for the operating expenditures of the Secretariat and by taking an active part in its work.

The States of the sub-region rightly consider that the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission has, all along its 15 years of existence, brought irrefutable evidence of being a particularly adequate framework for cooperation between our countries in the field of fisheries development and management. We fully share this feeling. That is why when the extraordinary session of the Conference of Ministers held in July 1993, in Praia, decided to embark on a programme for the revitalization of the Commission's structures and activities, we very strongly supported the initiative. Witness the signing in September 1993, at

Conakry, of a Sub-Regional Convention on the exercise of the right of hot pursuit and the related protocol concerning the practical modalities for the coordination of fisheries surveillance activities.

Mr. Chairman of the Coordinating Committee, you have summarized the various actions being taken. Yet, I would like to make two observations.

First, to note the dynamism of the Commission. The results of its activities widely surpass the most optimistic expectations that we had a year and a half ago. It is time for me to address our partners and guests represented here and express to them our profound gratitude for their resolute involvement at our side and to indicate our strong will to pursue, with them, this successful sectorial integration experience.

Second, to point to the impetus given by the Presidency and the Secretariat of the Commission, and most particularly by Her Excellency the Minister for Fisheries, Agriculture and Rural Development of Cape Verde, Mrs. Maria Helena Semedo, who has engaged all her strength and devotion to the rehabilitation process of our Commission. Let her be thanked here for her involvement in this exalting project and for the remarkable results made possible by her work. We reiterate our confidence in her and assure her, once more, of our total support.

As has already been pointed out here, a headquarters agreement has been signed between the Presidency of the Commission and the Republic of Senegal. The agreement provides, in addition to the granting of operational privileges and immunities to the Commission and its staff, for the allocation of suitable premises to the Secretariat. I am glad to be able to recall here that the premises have just been put at the Secretariat's disposal and that they are in the process of being rehabilitated. I am personally seeing to it that this work should be completed as quickly as possible and I hope that I will have the honour and the pleasure to welcome here, in Dakar, all my colleagues of the sub-region to show them round the premises.

I also wish to assure you that Senegal will efficiently support the Secretariat within the limits of its means until it becomes fully autonomous. The efforts that we are making so that the Secretariat of the Commission can operate under the best conditions possible are a sign of our determination to reinforce sub-regional fisheries cooperation.

The theme the seminar will address has, for a long time, been among the priorities of sub-regional cooperation. As early as the seventies, our countries became aware of the need to go beyond the purely national framework for the management of fisheries by harmonizing their laws and regulations for a better management of our fisheries. Various actions taken over the past few years have yielded mitigated results. However, progress has been achieved and, at present, there are similarities between the fishing laws and regulations

of our States and I hope we will see more of them in future.

Moreover, other areas of cooperation could be explored. I am thinking of sectors such as resources management, the formulation and adoption of concerted measures for the conservation and safety of fishing vessels, and surveillance. In the particular field of surveillance, Cape Verde and Senegal have already implemented the cooperation agreement of 1993 by signing, on 17 November 1994, a protocol on the practical modalities for the coordination of fishery surveillance and maritime hot pursuit activities in conformity with the convention on sub-regional cooperation in the exercise of the right of maritime hot pursuit signed at Conakry, on 1 September 1993.

Complementary training for all officers responsible for the implementation of government policies and measures is also indispensable. In addition, several sub-regional projects which have considerable legal and institutional implications require the harmonization of fisheries policies and management measures. This is why, a series of actions, in this field, are among the priorities of the project for the improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of Coastal States of West Africa.

This project, which is conducted under the framework of the Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean, which Senegal has the honour to chair, is implemented by FAO and largely financed by the European Union, and also Canada and France. We wish to express our profound gratitude to these partners.

We are particularly glad that FAO and the project management have favourably reacted to the requests of the Commission for a series of interventions in the field of harmonization of our sub-regional fisheries laws. Likewise, we wish to note the remarkable effort made to associate all the partners of the Commission to this work.

Finally, in my capacity as current Chairman of the Ministerial Conference, I note with satisfaction that, while giving priority to our sub-region, as is stipulated in its relevant documents, the project is currently carrying out other activities for the benefit of other West-African countries and organizations.

I wish all participants a pleasant stay in Senegal and a successful seminar. I am sure the results of your works will contribute to boosting the integration process between our States.

I declare open the seminar on the harmonization of the fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

Thank you for your kind attention.

CLOSING SESSION

**Address by Mr. Carlos Evora Rocha,
Director-General of Fisheries of Cape Verde,
Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional
Fisheries Commission**

Honourable Minister for Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal,

Distinguished Representative of FAO,

Distinguished Delegates,

Distinguished Guests,

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen,

Mrs Maria Helena Semedo, Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Rural Development of Cape Verde was supposed to be here with us. Unfortunately, she has not been able to attend this seminar due to last-minute hitches. Therefore, she has asked me to convey to you her regrets for not being here. It will be for another time. We all know that we will have several other opportunities to meet and I am sure we will very soon get together again.

The seminar has enabled us to identify the fields in which concerted actions and management and surveillance measures for fisheries are required, and to propose a work programme that will be implemented progressively. This programme will, in due time, be submitted, for official approval to the Coordinating Committee and to the Conference of Ministers of the Commission. Indeed, we are not really surprised that the seminar went so well, for we know that cooperation and concertation habits have taken root in our sub-region. It is our desire that the implementation of this work programme, to which we would like to associate all our partners who so desire, would show that the sectorial integration of fishing policies in our sub-region is not only a necessity but also something that is perfectly within

our reach.

We would particularly like to thank FAO and the the Project Management for the quality of the work accomplished, and ask the FAO Representative to convey our gratitude to the FAO Director General. Her Excellency the Minister asked me to inform you that during the Capverdean presidency, she will personally see to it that all the measures intended to ensure the effective implementation of the programme are taken. We would also like to thank the European Union, represented here and sponsor of the project, for showing a great interest in the development of fisheries in our sub-region. We sincerely hope that its interest will increase over time. We are favourably disposed to examine the possibilities of extending this fruitful cooperation to other areas.

Honourable Minister,

This meeting has also been the occasion for us to assess the situation of some activities and programmes.

Decisive progress has been noted in the negotiation of the Lux-Development project of aerial surveillance which should start soon. An agreement has been reached on three points that were still open to discussion. Thus, Senegal will be involved in all aspects of the project. A substantial use of sub-regional surveillance means will be made. Finally, a supplementary support to national surveillance facilities will be envisaged. I think that we can take pride in this agreement. Let me express our gratitude to Lux-Development, notwithstanding the absence of its delegate who had to leave us before the end of this seminar. Let him rest assured that we will personally see to it that this important project, which is now perfectly adapted to our sub-regional needs, will be a total success.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is currently working in the preparation of a project in support to the management of our sub-regional resources. The sub-regional register that has already been approved is part of this project. Furthermore, the preparation, by UNDP, of a sub-regional round table of donors will start very soon. We also count on GTZ, which has indicated its willingness to finance a long-term support project to our Commission.

We are delighted to welcome a new partner, Brazil. Our countries, especially the Portuguese speaking ones, are closely linked to this great nation across the Atlantic. We hope that this seminar will mark the beginning of a long and fruitful cooperation.

Honourable Minister,

We appreciate the staunch support that the Republic of Senegal, through your dynamic action and your Department have been providing to our Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission.

Friendship and cooperation links unite us. Witness the recent signing of the headquarters agreement for the Secretariat of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission. We have learned, to our great pleasure, that premises have been allocated to the Commission. We have taken very good note of your plan to have your sub-regional colleagues visiting the premises. Her Excellency the Minister also told me that it will be her pleasure to convene a special session of the Conference of Ministers and that the forthcoming tenth anniversary of the signing of the Convention establishing the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission, on 19 March 1995, could be a particularly adequate occasion for that event.

I should like to wish the delegates, who have so efficiently contributed to the success of this seminar, a safe return to their countries. By personal experience, I know that they will take home good memories of the city of Dakar.

Thank you.

**Address by H.E. Mr. Abdourahmane Sow,
Minister of Fisheries and Maritime Transports of Senegal**

Distinguished Representative of FAO,

Distinguished representatives of international institutions,

Mr. Chairman of the Coordinating Committee of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission

Mr. Permanent Secretary of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission,

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am very pleased to preside over the closing ceremony of the seminar on the harmonization of fisheries policies and regulations of States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission that the project "improvement of the legal framework for fisheries cooperation, management and development of coastal states of West Africa" organized from 29 November to 2 December 1994.

Judging by the account given to me, I retain that the seminar was very successful. This result is the fruit of its good preparation and perfect organization.

In fact, the document entitled "proposals for the harmonization of fisheries legislations of States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission" has been well prepared and has, therefore, greatly facilitated your proceedings. Let me, at this juncture, seize this opportunity to congratulate the project manager and all those who contributed to the preparation of this seminar.

You have reviewed the various fields in which the harmonization of fishing laws of States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (SRCF) is needed and feasible.

Thus, in the field of resources management, the need was felt to elaborate fisheries resources management plans in cooperation with scientists, surveillance officials and professionals and, as regards shared stocks, in consultation with neighbouring countries. It is also necessary to take some decisions, including those related to the control of the level of authorized fishing effort. Harmonization is also possible as concerns regulation of minimum sizes of catches, mesh sizes, fishing gear and prohibited forms of fishing. The same applies to the definition of fishing types and vessels and, especially, to conditions for the granting

of flags which should be the same in all member States of the Commission.

The proposal to set up a single working group which work would be prepared by sub-regional consultants and, if necessary, by external experts, is perfectly suitable for us.

We would therefore like to express our full satisfaction at the results achieved. This is why, I wish to congratulate the President of the Coordinating Committee who led the proceedings successfully and all the experts for their decisive contribution to the success of this seminar. All our partners have reiterated their readiness to work at our sides for the development of sub-regional fisheries.

As regards the round table of donors to be organized by the UNDP Office of Projects and Services (OPS), our countries are urged to appoint their national consultants to avoid delays in the implementation of this important project.

Besides, an agreement has been reached with Lux-Development regarding the aerial surveillance project. The amended project will integrate Senegal among the beneficiaries, surveillance structures will be supported and existing sub-regional means will be used.

I should like, at this juncture, to reiterate our gratitude to the donors who, each in its specific area, have done their best to render the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission as performing as always expected.

However, our partners' commitment does not exclude our own efforts. On the contrary, we must also bring our contribution. In this regard, Senegal will, within the limits of the resources at its disposal, continue to support the secretariat until it becomes fully autonomous. This is how my country demonstrates its profound commitment and determination to reinforce sub-regional fishing cooperation, by the sides of the Commission.

Finally, I should like to stress that the presence of the Senegalese Minister for African Economic Integration shows how much we want this integration to materialize in conformity with the directives of our various Heads of State.

The Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission is a privileged framework in which integration is a reality. Given the fact that our countries cannot develop in isolation, I strongly wish that its example be followed by other organizations for the benefit and welfare of our populations.

I declare this seminar on the harmonization of fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission closed.

Thank you for your kind attention.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Information note for the participants

Provisional agenda

Proposals for the harmonization of fisheries legislation of the States members of the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (for review and decision)

Compendium des législations des pêches des Etats membres de la Commission sous-régionale des pêches (Cap Vert, Gambie, Guinée, Guinée-Bissau, Mauritanie, Sénégal), projet GCP/RAF/302/EEC Amélioration du cadre juridique pour la coopération, l'aménagement et le développement halieutique des Etats côtiers d'Afrique de l'ouest, 399 p., Document 2 (for information).

N'Diaye, B., - Synopsis des législations des pêches du Cap Vert, de la Gambie, de la Guinée, de la Guinée-Bissau, de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal, projet GCP/RAF/302/EEC Amélioration du cadre juridique pour la coopération, l'aménagement et le développement halieutique des Etats côtiers d'Afrique de l'ouest, 91 p., Document 3 (for information).

