

EUROPEAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT ADVISORS NETWORK MEETING  
- GÖTEBORG, 17-18 SEPTEMBER 2009 -  
INFORMAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Johan Sundberg from the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (Sida), Chair of the meeting, welcomed the participants to Göteborg, after which there was a round of introductions. A list of participants is attached as Annex I. Mr. Sundberg introduced the draft agenda, attached as Annex II, which the participants agreed upon. It was further agreed to collect all the power point presentations and to distribute a link to these along with the proceedings of the meeting, through the Co-Fish website<sup>1</sup> – informal proceedings would be drafted by the Swedish Board of Fisheries.

### ***Coherence policy in practice***

*Mr. Vincent Ringenberg, European Commission*, gave a presentation on  
**Policy Coherence for Development: EU Fisheries policy & development objectives** (ppp)

Mr. Ringenberg defined policy coherence as minimising negative effects, avoid undermining the impact of aid, and maximising positive effects, for better aid effectiveness. Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) should be an additional contribution towards the Millenium Development Goals. The European Consensus on Development was agreed in December 2005. Fisheries is one of 12 areas where the EU has made commitments in terms of PCD.

Within the European Commission, PCD work is manifested through inter-service consultations, impact assessments, a dedicated PCD unit within DG Development, as well as an Inter-Service Group. The 2005 Council Conclusions mandated the Commission to assess progress towards the PCD commitments through biennial reports – these were elaborated by the Inter-Service Group and presented in 2007 and 2009 respectively<sup>2</sup>.

The PCD report is used *inter alia* for raising awareness beyond those directly involved in development issues. The 2009 report includes case studies illustrating the impact EU policies have had on MDG 1 (fight against hunger). In terms of fisheries, the report covers Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPA), IUU fishing and Regional Fisheries Management and International Agreements. For FPAs, it concludes that there are still concerns with regard to sustainability but that they benefit countries through financial contributions and the promotion of investments. The report points to the following outstanding issues:

- Need for improved fish stock assessments
- Need for improved developing country market access (including the role of EPAs)
- Support needed for the formulation and implementation of DC fisheries policies
- Support needed for developing countries in the fight against IUU fishing
- Strengthening of the regional dimension

In the *discussion* that followed, the issues raised included:

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.cofish.org](http://www.cofish.org)

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/policy\\_coherence\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/policy_coherence_en.cfm)

1. That the governance and policy dialogue is still ineffective is recognised in the 2007 report – is this still regarded as a shortcoming?
2. There is no focal point for fisheries in DG Development – how to ensure a good dialogue?
3. The IUU regulation will have impacts for DC in terms of trade barriers – will EU support for DC only be linked to FPAs? Trade-related sanitary rules were also mentioned in this context.
4. How does the Commission strengthen the regional dimension?

The Commission representatives (Mr. Ringenberg and Ms. Focquet) commented that:

1. Sectoral dialogue is a problem but at least FPAs give a legal framework for EU vessel activities and a framework for dialogue. In practice, however, it is sometimes difficult to establish a constructive dialogue with countries facing political and/or financial difficulties, not only in the fisheries sector. Also, it is premature to assess the full impact of the current FPAs – the first agreement was implemented in 2005 and the latest in 2008.

2. There is a post that should function as focal point for fisheries at DG DEV but this is currently vacant. There is, however, a focal point in DG AIDCO. ***The group concluded that it would be valuable for the Network to make contacts with the respective focal points.***

3. There is no link between FPAs and EU development co-operation tools. Several programmes support fisheries policy in the ACP countries, including the AAP-ENRTP (Annual Action Plan – Environment and Natural Resources Thematic Programme) implemented by DG AIDCO; EURO 1m is proposed for assisting ACP countries to conform with the new EU IUU regulation.

As for EC sanitary regulations, the EU support ACP countries through the SFP programme (Strengthening Fisheries Products) in order to improve sanitary trade-related standards. The fact that there is an inbuilt incoherence in the DG SANCO rules was touched upon (they do not apply to EU vessels that land into the EU as this is not classified as import).

4. The approach taken in the Indian Ocean is given as an example of a strengthened regional dimension, where the EU has supported the development of a regional plan for surveillance in the South Indian ocean, in addition to the FPAs negotiated with some countries (Mozambique, the Comoros, the Seychelles, Madagascar and Mauritius).

As regards the agreement with Mauretania more specifically, one issue concerns the fact that there is not much dialogue at the political level but payments are still issued. The Commission representatives explained that COM had to pay as the payment was not linked to the Article 96 deliberations<sup>3</sup> and that if payments had not been made, the EU would have breached the agreement.

Another issue raised concerned the basis for the agreements, that they are based on an assessed biological surplus only, while no assessment is made of any economic surplus; every fish that a foreign vessel takes is not available to help a movement towards an economic surplus and none of the assessments address this issue. Also, continuing with this kind of agreement may indirectly have hindered the EU industry from investing in these countries.

---

<sup>3</sup> Article 96 in the Cotonou agreement

Morocco was given as an example, where a different form of co-operation, e.g. joint ventures, might have been preferable instead of pushing for paying for access. It is felt that while the FPAs arguably provide substantial macroeconomic support, it is debatable how they support the fishing industry. It is further argued that they undermine the local fishing industry and to some extent also food security in a wider perspective.

The Commission representatives commented that in their view, much has been achieved through the FPAs compared to the old agreements. The new generation agreements aim to integrate sectoral policy with other economic sectors in the country. Also, the agreements are not development agreements - there is a development aspect but they are fundamentally commercial agreements (although this point was debated by the audience as they are country to country agreements).

***Following a proposal from DFID, it was agreed that it would be useful for this group to come together to discuss these aspects in the forthcoming CFP reform.***

*Mr. Staffan Larsson, the Swedish Board of Fisheries, gave a presentation on a*  
**Proposed Swedish Strategy for Policy Coherence for Development (ppp)**

Mr. Larsson briefly explained the role of the Swedish Board of Fisheries (SBF) in terms of PCD, acting both as an institutional consultant and an advisor for Sida, and being heavily involved in the day-to day EU work within the Council Working Groups. Against this background, the SBF has elaborated a draft framework for a Swedish Strategy for Policy Coherence for Development, which has been sent to the Ministry for further deliberations. The proposal includes five focal areas:

- Food security and trade,
- Small-scale fisheries, including local food security, employment, poverty reduction and human rights,
- EU Fisheries Partnership Agreements,
- IUU fishing, and
- National and regional fisheries management.

Swedish interests and priorities as well as a Strategy for Swedish positions are outlined for each of these areas.

In the ***discussion*** that followed, reference was made to a study on PCD commissioned by the OECD three years ago, which IDDRA had conducted. It had turned out to be a challenging study. The ToRs had included case studies outlining where there was either good or lack of policy coherence. The report had been presented to OECD members. Among the factors relevant to understanding policy coherence which had been examined, four appeared to be particularly important:

- Adequate information about coherence or incoherence,
- Appropriate decision-making processes to process that information and what to do about it,
- Co-ordination mechanisms – could be simply ministries talking to each other on a day to day basis, and
- Key-factor political will – if that was not there, things tended to drift despite all of the above.

The study concluded that there is a difference in government structures in OECD vs developing countries and comments received had included that it was meaningless to try to analyse these frameworks in a structured way when it is all about politics. Developing countries tend to lack efficient management systems and strong fisheries policies, which makes policy coherence very difficult. It also means that FPA negotiations will always be problematic. Another conclusion was that policy coherence issues had not been researched effectively, something that had not been picked up by donors.

### ***Review of the Common Fisheries Policy – the external dimension***

*Ms. Barbara Focquet, European Commission*, introduced the issue by referring to the analysis in the Green Paper<sup>4</sup>. In the current CFP, two of the objectives for the external policy are to employ EU vessels and to supply the EC market. One question posed in the Green Paper, is whether these two objectives should remain.

Currently, about three percent (by volume) of the total supply to the EC market is sourced through the FPAs (400,000 tonnes) and they employ 0.4% of the total EC fleet. This means that the two objectives were not achieved. Perhaps one objective for a reformed CFP should be to promote sustainable and responsible policy by promoting good governance at sea. The FPAs is the most intensely discussed issue but there are also the international (e.g. the FAO) and regional (RFMO) aspects.

A number of questions are raised in the Green Paper: Perhaps the legal framework could be kept but without the EU financial contribution? Or the financial contribution could be channelled through the development policy, perhaps covered by EDF, and the fishermen pay their access in total? Some of the aspects in the FPAs could be better tackled at the regional level, e.g. Monitoring, Control and Surveillance, and improvement of policy frameworks – e.g. when working on tuna – and also the scientific aspects.

The ensuing ***discussion*** touched upon the following issues:

1. If there is a shift in focus towards the regional dimension, how does this fit in with support to individual states and has there been any discussions on regional tuna agreements
2. The relationship between the economic partnership agreements and the FPAs

The Commission representatives commented that a regional dimension does not necessarily mean negotiating regional FPAs. The EU could negotiate bilateral fisheries agreement in parallel with a regional co-operation framework. However, one issue is whether the EU should only negotiate FPAs with those countries in which the EU have an interest to fish, or with all countries where the EU have an interest to improve governance. In the case of combatting IUU fishing, for example, a regional approach adds value. It would be inefficient to focus only on certain countries, as IUU activities would move to countries which lack control means. This is the case in West Africa for example.

As regards the relationship between FPAs and EPAs, the Commission explained that the issues that could be better tackled at the regional level (MCS, scientific information etc.)

---

<sup>4</sup> Published on 21 April 2009

would be introduced in a fisheries chapter in the EPA. What is supported through the FPAs could also be supported through the EPAs, with the exception of access to resources - the EPA is a development and trade tool, not about fisheries access.

Additional comments from the audience included that EDF funding going into more effective fisheries governance (and trade) would be most welcome and that EU vessels could contribute in this context (perhaps on what is NOT working in terms of fisheries management). Also, it needs to be borne in mind that if we do not have the EU FPAs, we would most certainly have another foreign fleet fishing in those waters instead.

### ***A programmatic approach to aid & donor harmonisation***

*Mr. Sundberg* gave a presentation on  
**Aid Effectiveness & Programme-Based Approaches** (ppp)

Mr. Sundberg reminded the audience of the Paris Declaration and its five main principles:

- Ownership – partners set the agenda
- Alignment – donors aligning with partners’ agenda and using their systems
- Harmonisation – donors establishing common arrangements, simplifying procedures and sharing information
- Managing for development results – focus on results
- Mutual accountability – results depend on both donors and partners

Programme-based approaches (PBA) involve co-ordinated support and locally owned programmes and feature: leadership, comprehensive programmes, a formalised process for donor co-ordination and efforts to increase the use of local systems. The purpose of PBA is to strengthen partner countries’ systems, to facilitate transparency and accountability, and to enable a higher-level dialogue.

There was a brief *discussion* on how to combine results-based management and a programme-based approach with, often bilateral, budget support.

### ***Development approaches in Africa***

*Mr. Tim Bostock, DFID*, gave a presentation, on behalf of Mr. Sloans Chimatiro from the NEPAD secretariat, on the  
**International Partnership for African Fisheries Governance and Trade (PAF)** (ppp)

The Partnership builds on SADC<sup>5</sup> and a Ministerial Statement of Commitment from Windhoek, Namibia in July 2008, responding to a bilateral meeting between the UK and Namibian ministers under the High Seas Task Force. PAF is created in support of NEPAD/AU challenges to deliver fisheries commitments under the CAADP<sup>6</sup> and to define the contribution fisheries can make to NEPAD’s overall objectives. The programme was approved in January 2009, started up in April and is currently due to run over five years

---

<sup>5</sup> Southern African Development Community

<sup>6</sup> The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

although it is expected that the Partnership will continue for as long as it is producing results. On behalf of NEPAD, Mr. Bostock welcomed additional donors. PAF will:

- support emerging political commitment to strengthen Africa's capacity to consider, determine and implement responsive reforms in fisheries governance and trade – reforms are needed, not only to ensure that benefits are sustained, but also to generate and sustain wealth from fisheries.

Mr. Bostock described PAF's inputs, processes & programmes and outcomes, its implementation phases and its (existing and planned) working groups (see ppp), and invites the audience to the Conference of African Ministers on Fisheries and Aquaculture, scheduled for 1-4 December 2009<sup>7</sup>. Themes for the Conference are: Progress since Abuja 2005; Defining the role of African fisheries and aquaculture in the CAADP; Options and context for fisheries policy and governance reform, and Wealth dissipation of African fisheries.

There is a brief *discussion* about the setup of the Partnership, relating to *inter alia* the representation of the private sector (represented in the Steering Committee) and the relationship with the FAO (a partner although not a financial partner).

*Mr. Stephen Hall, WorldFish Center*, gave a presentation on **Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa: investing for development impact** (ppp)

Mr. Hall focuses his talk around three main points:

- 1) If we care about development impact, a balanced portfolio is required (and not just fish to solve fisheries)
- 2) In that context, and in the context of Africa, inland fisheries deserve more attention
- 3) Food security and the prominence that this is getting on the political agenda is not just fashion - aquaculture has an important part to play

A multisectoral dialogue is missing and so we need to involve other people from other sectors. Entry points for new solutions include biodiversity, CC, human rights, HIV/Aids.

Key intervention areas in order to reduce exposure risk and build adaptive capacity without increasing fishing effort are:

- Social exclusion – organisational development, labour rights, migrants' rights, gender equity
- Vulnerability – improve access to health services, secure land rights, aquatic property rights
- Income and asset poverty – diversification, microfinance, education & skills

Also, interregional trade in Africa is an important area to investigate along with infrastructure in this context.

The gap between supply and demand is increasing. In addition, small-scale fisheries represent around 90% of fish supply while aquaculture currently only represents 2% of fish production

---

<sup>7</sup> The Conference has since had to be postponed until early 2010.

in Africa - aquaculture would need to grow considerably over a sustained period. Focus should be on small and medium-sized enterprises - integration of small-scale aquaculture with small farm holdings would increase food security.

The talk gave rise to an animated *discussion*. While there was support for emphasis on small-scale aquaculture and inland fisheries, on the basis that its produce often stays where it is produced, it was also recognised that aquaculture is very high-risk and not easy in terms of pro-poor solutions. It was also pointed out that one should not have to be a fisherman to benefit from fisheries – it was argued that generating wealth for the economy as a whole is needed, but that small-scale fisheries would of course also play a role in this.

Reference was made to those who believe that fisheries is unmanageable and that efforts should therefore turn to aquaculture. However, the audience was reminded that over the last 30 years, millions of dollars have been invested in aquaculture and progress has been very limited. It was argued that subsistence aquaculture is not enough but that access to urban markets is needed, and that economies of scale are necessary to be profitable and also for feed production.

*Arthur Neiland, IDRA* gave a talk on  
**Wealth-Based Fisheries Management and Fisheries Reform** (ppp)

Mr. Neiland picked up on the above discussion that fisheries policy often emphasises direct participation to access benefits, but that one should not have to be a fisherman to have access to these benefits - well-managed fisheries can also produce significant economic returns (resource rent).

Wealth can be defined as having assets that can generate benefits into the future<sup>8</sup> and countries with a broad portfolio of assets (natural and man-made) have the potential to increase the welfare of citizens (and reduce poverty). However, the value of fisheries is often overlooked by policy, and economic rent is often not realised at all.

Necessary conditions to realise the true value of fisheries include favourable governance conditions (policy, institutions and process), and that management arrangements are in place – small-scale fisheries often operate under open-access conditions and generate low benefits and almost no resource rent; good and accurate assessments of the SSF sector is needed.

Wealth-based fisheries management is based on some key principles, including recognising the macro-economic contribution of the sector and relying on a planning process with a focus on the generation and equitable distribution of resource rent within each fishery.

A key message was that the failure to generate sustainable resource rent from fish resources means that not only is the potential contribution to economic growth and social welfare lost but the rents serve to drive the overexploitation that undermine ecological objectives.

The *discussion* that followed raised the risks involved in moving towards the above arrangement and how to assess the risk of not reaching the objectives. It was recognised that as a well-managed fishery becomes valuable, there is always a risk that external and/or big

---

<sup>8</sup> See also [www.worldmapper.org](http://www.worldmapper.org) (on wealth growth-rate and poverty links)

operators will want to reap its benefits, but that this risk needs to be balanced against a non-profitable/ ill-managed fishery. Also, mitigating the downsides needs to be an integral part of the design processes. In addition, goals need to be not only defined, but bought into (accepted) and so communication is important.

It was emphasised that it is important to separate the distribution of benefits from harvest rights and that strong legal systems are important. In this context, it was pointed out that governments in Africa are often in place for shorter periods. It was argued, however, that this should not prevent partners from working with those African states that are prepared to take the concept forward.

An additional issue that was raised was how to ensure that the small-holders do not lose out and whether there can be a big SSF sector.

### ***Evaluations of Development Co-operation***

*Mr. Arthur Neiland, IDDRA, gave a presentation on African Fisheries Development Aid (ppp)*

Mr. Neiland's presentation was based on a project linking "PAF" with the PERC Forum<sup>9</sup>, examining the role and impact of development aid in African fisheries; the project will test its tentative conclusions through five country case-studies, and a workshop in Africa to validate results.

The project's starting point is that African countries have not realised their fisheries potential, that there is a robust fisheries economics theoretical framework, and that African fisheries have received significant aid. Tentative conclusions include:

- There is a disconnect between project-level success and sectoral failure
- It is important to pre-evaluate projects against likely economic outcomes
- Fisheries aid focus has been narrow although the portfolio has recently been somewhat redirected towards addressing underlying constraints
- Fisheries policy projects show weaknesses and are not built on theoretical frameworks provided by fisheries economics
- Fisheries policy has addressed the wrong issues, or key issues have been addressed in the wrong order

In the following ***discussion*** one question touched upon any possible comparisons with investments in western, developed countries, and whether failures had been attributable to intra- or inter-sectoral factors. These types of factors would be considered in the follow-on analysis. Reference was made to a study undertaken by Poseidon, assessing the impact of development assistance in fisheries and aquaculture<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> The Property and Environment Research Center

<sup>10</sup> Assessing the Impact of Development Assistance in Fisheries and Aquaculture, by Graeme Macfadyen, Poseidon Aquatic Resource Management Ltd, for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. May 2008. Study funding provided through the World Bank's PROFISH Global Program on Fisheries.

*Ms. Brit Fisknes, NORAD*, then presented an **Evaluation of Norwegian Development Co-operation in the Fisheries Sector** (ppp)

The evaluation had been undertaken by MRAG and was published in February 2009. Norwegian development aid has focussed on fisheries research, stock assessment, resource management, training and institutional capacity building, and small-scale fisheries. More recently there has been increased emphasis on IUU fishing, aquaculture and private-sector development. Production is gradually handed over to the private sector and aid focuses on institutional capacity and framing conditions for commercial activities.

Core findings of the study include:

- The recipient country owns the project and Norway assists based on their needs
- There is a protracted development phase and close partner dialogue
- The approach is long-term
- Often, there is no break between project development and project implementation – the same people involved and so often not out for tender

As for the last point, Ms. Fisknes points out that institutions have often had unique skills which has rendered it difficult to put projects out to tender.

Some recommendations/questions came out of the evaluation:

- How has development aid contributed to poverty reduction – is there no connection or has the link just not been apparent and possible to measure?
- Make increased use of tendering: Norwegian institutions & competence perhaps not as relevant for SSF and poverty reduction at the local level
- Use a more cross-sectoral approach – the underlying problem is often found in other sectors and so aid may need to reach to other areas in order to achieve results in fisheries

In the *discussion* that followed, the issue of fisheries' contribution to poverty alleviation was picked up on, and whether fisheries contribute to economic growth, and it is thereby that poverty is reduced. Poverty is a macroeconomic problem and the mix required between local-level poverty reduction and the sector's contribution to economic growth and overall poverty reduction is not clear.

This session was followed by two brief presentations on **Institutional reform** within FAO and CGIAR respectively.

*Mr. Staffan Larsson, the Swedish Board of Fisheries*, (ppp) presented the **FAO independent, external evaluation, its findings and the ongoing reform of the organisation**. The Immediate Plan of Action, adopted in the autumn of 2008, included the development of:

- A new Strategic Framework for the Medium-Term Plan 2010-13 and the Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11
- Introduction of a Results-Based Framework, and
- Organisational Results to integrate outcomes from the application of both assessed contributions (regular funding) and extra-budgetary resources

Reference was made to the WHO model which includes:

- Integration of extra-budgetary funding into programme budget
- transparent links to the Medium-Term Strategic Plan
- four or five outcome indicators for each strategic objective
- baseline data for each indicator
- quantified short- and medium-term targets and estimated resources required
- allocation by outcome, geographical region and office (HQ, region or country)

In early September 2009, FAO presented its new results-based framework including a Strategic Framework 2010-19 along with the Medium-Term Plan 2010-13 and Programme of Work and Budget 2010-11. For the first time, FAO presented a budget integrating regular programme and extra-budgetary funds. Six organisational results had been defined for fisheries for the period 2010-13.<sup>11</sup>

In this context, the planned Swedish support to an FAO programme for fisheries and aquaculture in Africa was mentioned; it is Sweden's wish that other donors' support will fit into these broad framework programmes.

In the ensuing *discussion*, reference was made to COFI and its budget discussions where members are still unable to make real recommendations to the Council and instead deliver a long shopping-list, which leaves the FAO Secretariat to decide anyway. It was emphasised, however, that this process is still in its early stages – the Immediate Plan of Action was adopted in November 2008 and the latest COFI session took place in early March 2009.

*Mr. Stephen Hall, WorldFish Center*, drew parallels to the FAO discussion in his presentation (ppp) on **Transforming International Agricultural Research**. Mr. Hall started by pointing to the rising number of hungry people in the developing world, that food riots is a phenomenon when prices spike, that the financial crisis and the recession complicate food security, and referred to the forecasted climate-change induced changes in global food production. Changing for greater impact includes transforming international research and a transformation of the CGIAR, focussing on the architecture of the system (the centres, funds and consortia) and the how we do business (culture, roles and mechanisms).

Strategic objectives are necessary in order to focus on the big challenges, along with programmatic funding to deliver impact at scale. There is a need to assess the wider development impact that the work is intended to catalyse, by focussing on the strategic objectives. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, this needs to be based on measurable targets for direct development impact from programmes (more directed targets needed) and also measurable targets for research and development outcomes. As for delivery, measurable output targets by programme is required for stewardship, proof of concept, learning and influence.

Mr. Hall concluded his talk by outlining the High-Level Sequencing of the Transition within CGIAR along with the High-Level Implementation Timeline and Milestones. It is expected that funders will be able to assess the final recommendations in March 2010.

---

<sup>11</sup> The documents were approved by the FAO Conference on 18-23 November 2009.

## **Other business**

The last presentation, delivered by *Mr. Joost van Lieshout, Wageningen International*, concerned **the Co-Fish website**: [www.cofish.org](http://www.cofish.org) The website was set up in view of last year's European Fisheries Development Advisors Network meeting, in Zaandam, the Netherlands. Its prime focus is Africa and its purpose to share information and facilitate conferences. Mr. Van Lieshout demonstrated how to search for information and there was a discussion on whether the network could identify the various resources from which information could be extracted. It was underlined that it would be a joint effort and not cost much to maintain the site. It would, for example, be an easy way to find out who does what.

Mr. Van Lieshout ***proposed that each participant finds five websites where information is sourced from so that these can be added to the site.*** There are some restrictions, however; Sida, for example, does not have an open database and so a search through Sida would not be possible.

Picking up on the proposal from DFID that this group come together ***to discuss the external aspects in the forthcoming CFP reform***, there was a discussion on the contents and practicalities of such a meeting/seminar, including who to invite and when a meeting could be convened. Suggestions and questions included:

- Should invitations be addressed to ministries in view of the Council debate?
- How to ensure broad Member-State participation and including the southern countries not currently actively involved in the Network?
- Might it be preferable to organise the meeting in Brussels in order to allow for broad COM participation, including both DG DEV and DG MARE?
- Would an invitation extended from the Commission allow for better representation from southern Member States, or an invitation from the Swedish Presidency endorsed by COM?
- Could the meeting initiate a process towards a more coherent MS voice on the potential role of development aid, RFMO reform, IUU-fishing etc.?
- Would it be useful to open the meeting to include NGOs and the industry?

DFID would be prepared to fund some policy research to serve as background and discussion input for the meeting, to initiate debate, and could share those ideas shortly.

***The Swedish Ministry for Agriculture would further explore the possibility of arranging a meeting. It was agreed that end-November would be an option for holding the meeting.***

## **Who does what & next steps - Tour de table and discussions**

*Kieran Kelleher, WorldBank*: Mr. Kelleher referred to the recent evaluation of PROFISH<sup>12</sup>, the increase in core staffing within PROFISH, and the establishment of the initiative ALLFISH<sup>13</sup> where ICFA<sup>14</sup> serves as the secretariat. Longer-term commitment (e.g. for three

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTARD/Resources/336681-1224775570533/PROFISHevaluation.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> Alliance for Responsible Fisheries – a global public-private alliance for sustainable fisheries

<sup>14</sup> International Coalition for Fisheries Associations

years) from donors would substantially facilitate PROFISH planning. Current activities include work on political economy of reform and Fish 2020 (2030)<sup>15</sup>. There is also a big project in West Africa in the pipeline, initially covering four countries; it is a high-risk project – initially about capacity building and illegal fishing activities, good governance, and about extracting benefits from the value-chain. The project, which is open to donors, has a financially complicated structure. A decision was expected in the next couple of weeks. As for Climate Change, PROFISH is focussing on areas combining synergies between mitigation and adaptation. There is still substantial funding available for projects within the Strategic Partnership Fund for Africa (only 20 of 60 million committed) for which there is considerable pooling possibilities (1:3 GEF funding); projects need to have a transboundary dimension. Mr. Kelleher also mentioned his forthcoming retirement and the process of looking for his replacement.

*Hannu Mölsä, Fish Innovation Centre, Finland:* Finland is currently increasing its contribution to fisheries, focussing on inland fisheries management and aquaculture. For inland fisheries in Africa, Finland has supported the establishment of the Lake Tanganyika<sup>16</sup> Fisheries Authority, mainly supported by the African Development Bank along with FAO and the IUCN. In terms of aquaculture, Finnish support is first and foremost about technology transfer. Projects are not aiming at the poorest but involve semi-commercial activities, and working with local institutions. Institutional collaboration is important, including private/public relations and the promotion of private industry engagement. The Fish Innovation Centre provides business services for entering into partnerships.

*Brit Fisknes, NORAD:* In Africa, bilateral support includes fisheries management and Monitoring, Control and Surveillance measures in Mozambique, and there will probably be a new phase of co-operation with Angola. As capture fisheries is under increasing pressure, there has been a number of requests from countries on marine large-scale aquaculture. Co-operation would imply supporting government institutions on methodology, the selection of species, hatcheries, feed etc. but the countries often want to try this out themselves. The private sector is reluctant to invest in techniques they are not familiar with. Co-operation with Thailand on aquaculture has worked well, but they have a longer history in aquaculture than sub-Saharan African countries. In addition, there is the Nansen Programme, focussing on west Africa. The Programme may enter into more MCS-related activities. NORAD would be interested in learning about what co-operation other countries have with west Africa as regards MCS.

*Ágústa Gísladóttir, Icelandic International Development Agency:* Funding for development co-operation is down by 30% for 2009 and another 20% in 2010. Iceland will focus on fewer countries as well as fewer sectors – fisheries is one of three priority sectors and accounts for over 25% of their budget. There is a joint funding arrangement with Norway for Mozambique involving a five-year programme. There is also co-operation with Uganda on strengthening capacity around lakes other than Lake Victoria, including community development and Beach Management Units. Iceland would like to join forces with other countries on this. Iceland has also been strong supporters of Profish from the outset. From the latest Profish Steering Committee meeting, it would appear that there is almost no dedicated funding from other donors and Ms. Gísladóttir encouraged other donors to look for funding for Profish, particularly as the Profish/FAO co-operation seems to work increasingly well.

---

<sup>15</sup> A study on global fish supply and demand

<sup>16</sup> Lake Tanganyika is shared by Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Tanzania and Zambia

*Bernd Wirtzfeld, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany:* Mr. Wirtzfeld explained that there is strong competition for development funding in Germany and that it is difficult to make the voice of fisheries heard. Some co-operation is still on-going around Lake Victoria and there is bilateral support with Senegal and Mauritania although there are currently no activities in Mauritania. Mr. Wirtzfeld highlighted three important issues for this group: a) the European Commission's Green Paper on CFP reform, which includes an important development process, b) the CAADP and how to strengthen fisheries in this process, and c) how to bring fisheries higher up on the international development agenda. As regards the latter, Mr. Wirtzfeld suggested that perhaps a workshop could be arranged tackling this issue.

*Marleen Monster, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands:* Ms. Monster emphasises three issues from a Policy Coherence for Development point of view: a) the EU IUU-regulation and the need to watch out for barriers to trade, b) the European Commission's Green Paper, and c) fisheries subsidies in the WTO negotiations. As for Dutch fisheries development co-operation issues, Ms. Monster handed over to

*Petra Spliethoff, Senior Advisor, Wageningen International:* Ms. Spliethoff explained that the Netherlands are involved in capacity building on IUU issues in Asia (Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia) and welcomed any suggestions on how to co-operate on this, for example with NORAD. In terms of Africa, there is co-operation with Senegal on policy change and capacity building on food safety regulation compliance, and a few projects in Eritrea and Sudan. Ms. Spliethoff underlines that these countries may need considerable support to tackle governance issues.

*Stephen Hall, WorldFish Center:* Mr. Hall explained that for WorldFish Center a key issue is how to improve fisheries management, particularly in terms of small-scale fisheries. Mr. Hall further expressed some concern over the fact that the only intellectual framework seems to be a wealth-based one and that while this is important there needs to be recognition that other paths are also needed; how to establish management that build resilience, for example, is important.

*Tim Bostock, DFID, UK:* Mr. Bostock echoed Iceland's words about Profish and underlined that the donor community need to increasingly forget about individual priorities; funds need to be pooled and the donor community function as a "steering committee". In this context, PROFISH offers an opportunity, as does the CGIAR for the research side of things. Fisheries development support need to show progress in order to attract funding. DFID is increasingly focussing on multilateral programmes, to avoid a vast number of parallel projects in individual countries. PAF, about which Mr. Bostock had previously talked, is one such example. There is a joint DEFRA<sup>17</sup>/DFID programme in order to foster better engagement by the UK on international policy; at the moment, focus is on the CFP reform and its external aspects. The UK is working both with Profish and NEPAD and with the CG centers through the agricultural research programme. As regards bilateral co-operation, there is a dialogue with China on sustainable development, including fisheries and covering e.g. management (rights-based), the IUU regulation, aquaculture systems and the implications for African aquaculture (together with WFC) and the Chinese long-distance fleets.

---

<sup>17</sup> UK Government Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

*Johan Sundberg, Sida, Sweden:* Mr. Sundberg explained that substantial cuts in the development co-operation budget had been advertised by the Swedish Government. On average, this implied a 15% cut, but as bilateral co-operation would not be touched, it would involve greater cuts for global and regional support. Sida had planned for programme-based global and regional (Africa) support to FAO, UNEP and IMO but the extent to which this could be implemented was uncertain. Sida is looking to develop a joint agriculture, fisheries and forestry programmatic partnership with FAO. There would be no further regional support to Latin America. As for South-East Asia, Sida would co-finance the Bay of Bengal LME (together with Norway) and there would be continued support to SEAFDEC on building resilience against natural disasters.

### ***The Chair's conclusions***

Mr. Sundberg concluded that a more programmatic approach will be crucial for development co-operation success and that the Network is an important forum for keeping in touch and looking for synergies. In this context, Mr. Sundberg underlined that the further involvement of southern European countries would be important and that it would be beneficial if the next European Fisheries Development Advisors Network meeting could be held under the incoming EU Presidency, Spain. Sweden would take it on to have a dialogue with Spain on this, together with the Commission. The review of the Common Fisheries Policy would be an extremely important process for 2010, particularly in terms of coherence. Another important issue would be how to create a dialogue with governments in developing countries on the importance of fisheries on the development agenda, and how to get fisheries into their national plans of action and their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers as well as how to promote integration between fisheries and agriculture and river-management, in particular in Africa.

Mr. Sundberg thanked all participants for constructive discussions and closed the meeting.

EUROPEAN FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT ADVISORS NETWORK MEETING  
- GÖTEBORG, 17-18 SEPTEMBER 2009 -

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Ágústa Gísladóttir, Director of Fisheries Desk, Icelandic International Development Agency  
Arthur Neiland, Co-Director, IDDRA, UK  
Barbara á Tjaldrarflótti, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Faroe Islands  
Barbara Focquet, DG Mare, The European Commission  
Bernd Wirtzfeld, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany  
Brit Fisknes, NORAD, Norway  
Gunilla Greig, Swedish Board of Fisheries  
Hannu Mölsä, Fish Innovation Centre, Finland  
Joacim Johannesson, Swedish Board of Fisheries  
Johan Sundberg, Sida, Sweden  
Joost van Lieshout, Wageningen International, The Netherlands  
Kasper Holgers, Swedish Board of Fisheries  
Kieran Kelleher, The World Bank  
Marleen Monster, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands  
Peter Jarchau, Project Manager, GTZ, Germany  
Petra Spliethoff, Senior Advisor, Wageningen International, The Netherlands  
Rune Castberg, NORAD, Norway  
Staffan Larsson, Swedish Board of Fisheries  
Stephen Hall, WorldFish Center  
Tim Bostock, DFID, UK  
Vincent Ringenber, DG Mare, The European Commission  
Ylva Engwall, Ministry of Agriculture

16 September 2009

European Fisheries Development Advisors  
meeting - Göteborg, 17-18 September 2009  
PROGRAMME

Thursday 17 September

09.00 – 09.30: **Welcoming address & introductions**

*Johan Sundberg, Sida*

09.30 – 10.30: **Coherence policy in practice**

*Vincent Ringenberg, European Commission  
Staffan Larsson, Swedish Board of Fisheries*

10.30 – 11.00: Tea & coffee

11.00 – 12.30: **Review of the Common Fisheries Policy –  
the external dimension**

*Barbara Focquet, European Commission*

**A programmatic approach to aid & donor harmonisation**

*Introduction Johan Sundberg, Sida & Staffan Larsson, Swedish Board of  
Fisheries*

12.30 – 13.30: Lunch

13.30 – 17.00: **Development approaches in Africa**

The session will be broken up by a 30-minute break for refreshments –  
timing to be determined as appropriate

*Partnership for African Fisheries - Tim Bostock, DFID*

*Fisheries and Aquaculture in Africa: investing for development impact –  
Stephen Hall, WorldFish Center*

*Wealth-based fisheries promoting best practice - Arthur Neiland, IDDRA*

18.00 Depart for theatre

18.30 Play: "Beyond the Sea"

20.00 Dinner at "Le Village Restaurant & Wine bar"

# Sida

Friday 18 September

09.00 – 10.00: **Evaluations of Development Co-operation**

*Aid effectiveness in Africa - Arthur Neiland, IDDRA*

*Evaluation of Norwegian Development Co-operation in the Fisheries Sector - Brit Fisknes/Rune Castberg, Norad*

10.00 – 13.00 **Who does what & next steps - Tour de table and discussions**

The session will be broken up by a 30-minute break for refreshments - timing to be determined as appropriate

13.00 Lunch

14.00 Closing of meeting