



EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY
LAKE VICTORIA FISHERIES ORGANIZATION
SECRETARIAT



REPORT

Entebbe 2016: Advancing a global work programme for rights-based approaches for fisheries

Entebbe, Uganda, 1 – 4 March 2016



Preparation of this document

This document is the report of the Global Stakeholders' workshop *Entebbe 2016: Advancing a Global Work Programme for FAO on Tenure and Rights-Based Approaches for Fisheries* and was produced with the technical and financial support of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The Global Stakeholders' Workshop was hosted and organized by the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), which is an institution of the East African Community. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations provided technical and financial support to Entebbe 2016. The meeting was held at the *Imperial Botanical Beach Hotel and Convention Center* between the 1st and 4th March 2016 in Entebbe, Uganda. The global workshop followed-up on other events on rights-based approaches for fisheries such as the global forum *UserRights 2015* (Siem Reap, Cambodia, March 2015) and the informal think tank *Friends of UserRights 2015* (Fiumicino, Italy, October 2015).

Next to *UserRights 2015* and *Friends of UserRights 2015*, *Entebbe 2016* took into account the results and information generated by recent consultations supporting the development of the Small-scale Fisheries Guidelines (SSF Guidelines). It specifically addressed issues related to concepts and terminology in fisheries tenure and provided improvements on information and knowledge for improving the global knowledge base on how to improve fisheries tenure on a practical level.

The purpose of Entebbe 2016 was to:

- a) foster a mutual understanding of the challenges faced by different groups in fisheries communities with regard to rights-based approaches for inland and marine fisheries;
- b) advance the skeleton global work programme on rights-based approaches in marine and inland fisheries¹; and
- c) review the first part of the document *A technical guide to support the implementation of the voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security*.

The knowledge gained at *Entebbe 2016* was used to summarize the report.

¹ The skeleton work programme is based on six thematic areas of work identified by *UserRights 2015* participants. These thematic areas of work were developed into a draft skeleton work programme at *Friends of UserRights 2015*. Entebbe 2016 participants reviewed and refined the draft skeleton work programme.

Contents

Preparation of this document.....	ii
List of Acronyms	v
Executive Summary.....	1
<i>Purpose of the event</i>	1
<i>Highlights</i>	1
<i>Toolboxes for communities</i>	3
<i>Next steps</i>	3
1. Tuesday, 1 March 2016.....	4
1.1. <i>Workshop Opening</i>	4
1.2. <i>Speakers</i>	4
1.3. <i>Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session</i>	5
1.4. <i>Parallel working Groups on Part 1. Characteristics of tenure in fisheries</i>	5
1.5. <i>Presentation on Lake Victoria as a pilot project using the VGGT and SSF guidelines-where we are, what is missing and where we want to go</i>	5
1.6. <i>Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session</i>	6
2. Wednesday, 2 March 2016	6
2.1. <i>Plenary Session on terminology session</i>	6
2.2. <i>Plenary Discussion on Session on terminology session</i>	8
2.3. <i>Speakers</i>	9
2.4. <i>Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session</i>	9
2.5. <i>Presentation on Political Economy</i>	9
2.6. <i>Plenary Session on Political Economy and governance</i>	10
2.7. <i>Speaker on rights and fisheries</i>	12
3. Thursday, 3 March 2016	13
3.1 <i>Plenary Session on delineation of rights and processes for doing so</i>	13
3.2 <i>Plenary discussion on delineation of rights and processes for doing so</i>	15
3.3 <i>Plenary Session on International user Rights</i>	16
4. Friday, 4 March 2016	17
4.1 <i>Plenary Session on Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods</i>	17
4.2 <i>Plenary Session on Capacity Development</i>	21

4.3	<i>Summary of key points discussed</i>	23
4.4	<i>Next steps</i>	25
4.5	<i>Connecting to the global: regional perspectives on the work programme</i>	25
4.6	<i>Plenary Session on connecting to the global: regional perspectives on the work programme</i> ..	26
4.7	<i>Presentation on IFAD Projects</i>	26
4.8	<i>Stepping forward: Tactics for getting this programme of work through COFI and off the ground.</i>	26
4.9	<i>Expectations</i>	27
4.10	<i>Closing remarks</i>	27
	Appendix I: List of Participants.....	28
	Appendix II: Agenda and Programme	32
	Appendix III: Working Group Members Entebbe 2016.....	36

List of Acronyms

AU-IBAR	African Union - Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources
COFI	Committee on Fisheries
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EAC	East African Community
EAFM	Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
EU	European Union IFAD International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labor Organization
ITQ	Individual Transferable Quota
LVFO	Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization
LTA	Lake Tanganyika Authority
LVEMP II	Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project Phase II Marine Protected Area
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
RFB	Regional Fisheries Body
RFO	Regional Fisheries Organization
RFMOS	Regional Fisheries Management Organizations
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SSF	Small-scale Fisheries
SSG Guidelines	Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small Scale Fisheries in the context of food security and poverty eradication
TURFs	Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries
USD	US Dollar
VDS	Vessel Day Scheme
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and the Context of National Food Security

Executive Summary

Purpose of the event

The Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO), a technical institution of the East African Community on Fisheries and Aquaculture, organized the Global Workshop *Entebbe 2016: advancing a global work programme for rights-based approaches in fisheries*. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) provided financial and technical support to *Entebbe 2016*. The Global Workshop was held in Entebbe, Uganda from 1st to 4th March 2016. The key purpose of the workshop was to gather stakeholders' views on how to advance a global work programme for FAO on Tenure and Rights-based Approaches for Capture Fisheries and to find common ground and options for empowering the future for fishers and fisheries.

The workshop was attended by 36 participants from 21 countries. They discussed what could be included in the global work programme in reference to the six key thematic areas that included political economy and governance, delineation of rights and processes for doing so, capacity development, financing, enhancement/diversification of livelihoods and International user rights and tenure. *Entebbe 2016* participants went through each thematic area and made recommendations on how these could be improved. Best practices and lessons learnt were identified by participants based on their own experiences in a wide range of fisheries.

It was underscored that the knowledge gained from the workshop will be used to advance the global work programme on Tenure and Rights-Based Approaches for Fisheries. An important tool for supporting the implementation of the global work programme is the document *Responsible Governance of tenure in fisheries: A technical guide to support the implementation of the voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security*.

The workshop was designed as an interactive event. The programme consisted of scene-setting presentations that focused areas of interest and related to practices of tenure and rights in fisheries; discussion panels that provided a diverse range of perspectives from various stakeholders, including governments, subject matter specialists, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs); and, working groups that reported back during plenary sessions on their results of their deliberations.

Highlights

Presentations given at the workshop featured issues on Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries, Sustainable and Equitable Fisheries Management Contributing to Food Security and Nutrition of Fishers, key enabling conditions for successful co-management and inadequate information, data and knowledge on existent biomass, socio-economic key issues and sustainable development potential of those directly and indirectly dependent on the resources undermines taking reasonable and sustainable governance and management

decision. Participants from developing and developed countries provided a wide range of suggestions as to how the global work programme could be revised and made available for use by stakeholders. The workshop participants represented a wide range of perspectives from fishers to academics, NGOs, governments and international organizations.

During the workshop, several participants raised questions regarding the areas covered by capacity development. There was also concern that rights-based approaches implementation processes might face many challenges if conducted without considering the importance of co-management and the ecosystem approach. Group discussions during the breakout sessions highlighted the role of agriculture as an alternative or complementary source of income, educating children to help them prepare for work outside the fishery, consideration of livelihoods enhancement/diversification in context of socio-economic and cultural factors, usage of money collected by the State from fishers to support local fisheries management, gender equity considerations especially by not overburdening women with extra duties and the promotion of long term strategies for technical support .

Entebbe 2016 participants noted that weak governance of fisheries resources was common around the world resulting in a range of biological, economic and social problems, including depletion of fish stocks, habitat degradation, loss of wealth, and poverty in fishery-dependent communities. It was agreed that improving tenure systems for fisheries requires an improved governance structures (that specifies rights to the fisheries: who can fish, for how long, and under what conditions whether the access is for individuals or fishing communities). Case studies presented at *Entebbe 2016* included examples of tenure systems that have made positive environmental, economic and social contributions.

Some of the main lessons learnt from the workshop were how the programme could benefit from partners like IFAD, that training methodology targeting the young generation must be well thought out to enable meaningful results, that one has to be careful with alternatives opportunities as those must be sustainable (e.g. fisher-folk moving into other sectors can increase competition for non-fisheries resources which might lead to conflict).

During the plenary discussions, concerns were raised about the potential negative consequences of restricting access to fisheries through the introduction of systems such as limited entry licensing or individual transferable quotas (ITQs). In particular, some participants feared the privatization of common pool resources for the benefit of wealthy fisheries stakeholders and the exclusion of young people aspiring to enter the fishery. Several participants noted that no fisheries management system is perfect and careful consideration should be given to identifying rights-based approaches that best meet all stakeholders' objectives.

Other issues raised included (i.) States should support investment opportunities that are favorable for the local context and of beneficial nature for SSF; (ii.) reconsideration and fair compensation of under-valued labor (shadow work) by women and promotion for women's involvement in fisheries value-chain and post-harvest activities to promote gender equality; (iii.) exploration of ecosystem services as potential emerging area for income generating activities for fishing communities (e.g. tourism, re-recreational activities); (iv.) provision of

proper and timely information on the status and opportunity of other livelihood options; and (v.) facilitation of connection with other partners with expertise in (alternative) employment issues.

Toolboxes for communities

Focus needs to be placed upon individual rights, community rights, and their priorities with regard to economics, social, and environmental objectives one wants to achieve through rights-based approaches). States should support/ facilitate access to micro credits schemes and grants.

Next steps

FAO needs to lead global activities by initiation of inventory of case studies on rights-based approaches in fisheries (global focus), dialoguing and facilitation of cross-sectorial policy coherence and between different scales, developing tools for documenting tenure allocation processes.

Local and national activities to be led by governments, capacity development to be done at both local and regional level. FAO to assist countries to assess and take into account impact of fishing agreements on small-scale fishers. FAO to prepare training programmes.

Entebbe 2016 participants agreed that all stakeholders need to be involved in the process of establishing pilot projects on the ground. Furthermore, the impact of education, health and social services on ability to secure alternative livelihoods needs to be assessed.

1. Tuesday, 1 March 2016

1.1. Workshop Opening

Welcoming remarks were given by the following individuals:

- Mrs. Joyce Ikwaput Nyeko, Representative of the Director Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Uganda.
- Mr. Godfrey V. Monor, Executive Secretary, Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization.
- Ms. Rebecca Metzner, Chief, Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch, FAO, Rome.

The workshop was attended by 36 participants from 21 Countries. The list of participants is presented in **Appendix I** and the programme of the workshop is reproduced in **Appendix II**.

The purpose of the workshop was presented by Dr. Rebecca Metzner. She highlighted the main processes conducted since the 1980s that have resulted in the endorsement of (i.) the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) in 2012 and (ii.) the Small-sale Fisheries Voluntary Guidelines (SSF Guidelines) in 2014. The *Entebbe workshop* was a follow up on the global forum Tenure and Fishing Rights (UserRights 2015) held in 2015 and attended by 140 participants from 38 countries. The *Entebbe 2016* workshop was organized to advance the global work programme and to improve knowledge sharing on Rights-Based Approaches for Fisheries. She stressed the need to discuss definitions and terminology used to develop a common understanding.

1.2. Speakers

Dr. Wordsworth Odame Larbi, Land Tenure Officer, FAO, SFE, Addis Ababa

Dr. Wordsworth Larbi, presented terminology as used in the VGGT. The VGGT has been adopted by the world community to guide on the principles and practices for the improvement of governance of tenure of natural resources in 2012. Dr. Larbi provided clarification on the following terminology: tenure, legitimate tenure rights, customary tenure systems, governance of tenure, responsible governance, principles of the VGGT and ten principles of implementation.

Dr. Paul Macgillivray, Independent Fisheries Consultant, Nova Scotia, Canada

Dr. Paul Macgillivray presented a spectrum of tools that can be used to clarify suitable rights-based approaches for a fishery. He presented terms used in fisheries tenure systems (common property, access rights, fishing rights, property rights, individual transferable quotas, territorial use rights, etc.), characteristics of tenure (transferability, durability, exclusivity and security), highlighted four key concerns requiring clarification in fisheries tenure, the tenure and user rights, property rights, challenges in communicating approaches to managing fisheries, linkage between human rights and rights based approach, the next

steps required for better communication and questions which require further consideration regarding fisheries tenure.

Dr. Dubravka Bojic, FAO.

Dr. Dubravka Bojic presented governance of tenure in the context of fisheries tenure. She highlighted processes required, important steps during decision-making processes, coordination of possible divergent objectives, mechanism for conflict resolution, principles relevant for responsible governance, political economy of development approaches, what influences design and allocation, governance assessment to understand the current situation and political economy analysis to understand governance arrangements and priorities.

1.3. Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session

More clarification was sought on the difference between tenure and rights: It was explained that tenure provides the relationship for using the resource while rights addresses what is supposed to be done and what is not supposed to be done. It was clarified that FAO wanted ideas from the participants to contribute to the skeleton of the global work programme on rights-based approaches for fisheries. Need to define responsible governance to ensure that fisheries resources are used sustainability and benefit the people who depend on them. The VGGT and the SSF Guidelines are directed at States. However, they serve as important guidance tool for civil society and private sector. More emphasis was to be put on economy but sociology including quality of participation need to be added. Clarification between customary and communal was requested.

Definitions in the guidelines: Need to be clear on the definitions being used to be able to communicate properly to governments and small scale fishers. Need for participation of different stakeholders to negotiate on the various options and agree. Need to concentrate on addressing the problems rather than terminologies. Questions were asked on the sort of development capacities required for small scale fisheries to participate and benefit from the guidelines? What are the processes required and how do they link to the guidelines. How will the guidelines be transmitted to small scale fishers?

1.4. Parallel working Groups on Part 1. Characteristics of tenure in fisheries

The plenary was divided into 4 parallel working groups to consider Part 1: characteristics of tenure in fisheries. The groups were organized to reflect gender, regional representation and expertise as per list of participants. Details of the participants are given in Appendix III.

1.5. Presentation on Lake Victoria as a pilot project using the VGGT and SSF guidelines- where we are, what is missing and where we want to go

Mr. Godfrey V. Monor, Executive Secretary, Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization

Mr. Monor presented "Lake Victoria as a pilot project using the VGGT and SSF guidelines- where we are, what is missing and where we want to go". He highlighted general information on the lake, fisheries in the lake with annual production worth USD 840 million, fishing effort with 1,530 landing sites, 206,425 fishers, 982,400 gillnets, 69,912 fishing crafts and

14,240,718 longline hooks. Fisheries largely open access with weak restrictions and enforcement systems. Key challenges include the following: tenure system not well defined especially in the water, limited alternative incomes and limited value addition, limited capacity building, mindset of fishers towards change and champions to advocate the voluntary guidelines. What is required included: governance and tenure system need to be well outlined and understood, secure tenure rights to fisheries resources, control of overfishing, fishing areas and areas to fish. Need to introduce modified user rights in Lake Victoria.

1.6. Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session

Governments sharing Lake Victoria should show commitment and include fisheries in national policy documents. However, it was found out that there are challenges of limited funding for implementation of fisheries interventions and there are limited alternative livelihoods to fishing. Lake Victoria has harmonized management measures but there are still challenges of management of transboundary resources and need assistance in controlling access. User rights need to be tried on Lake Victoria and on specific species to improve the situation. Fishers need to be supported to add value to increase their income and to become more effective in management.

It was noted that although Lake Victoria has got challenges but there are also great opportunities to build on like, the co-management, Beach management Units, resource monitoring, coordination and collaboration among riparian governments.

2. Wednesday, 2 March 2016

2.1. Plenary Session on terminology session

The four groups presented outcomes of the discussions.

Group A: Session on terminology session

General comment: Guidelines should present clear and concise definitions of the key terms/concepts.

Tenure and rights: Tenure is more applicable to land than marine resources (fish stocks) as one can't own fish stocks so tenure systems should be used instead.

Governance: team suggested replacement of good governance with responsible governance more easily measured and enforced. Consultations to have full consensus of everybody takes a lot of time and resources and the group suggested putting emphasis on participation.

Human rights and fisheries tenure systems: Suggestion was to at least tone down emphasis on human rights in the context of fisheries management. Perhaps human rights in the context of fisheries should be included under good governance in this document

Group B: Session on terminology session

General discussion

Tenure

- a) Tenure rights should not just focus on small scale but also big large scale fisheries
- b) The scope of the guidelines is restricted to FAO and there is need to expand
- c) What was the problem that led to the developments of guidelines on tenure system
- d) The development of the guidelines should consider tenure and rights in the management of the fishery along the value chain of the fishery.
- e) Guidelines needs to capture rights and responsibilities of the fishers
- f) Guidelines should also consider tenure rights of new comers since most young people are joining the fishing industry due to increase in global population
- g) Guidelines should take care of tenure rights to land adjacent to fishing areas
- h) Need for explanation on how tenure right is secured and retained
- i) Help governments deal with the challenge of tenure rights and subsistence fishing.
- j) Clearly state the vision for tenure and fisheries, articulate the objectives of the guidelines and provide a roadmap of how to use them.
- k) Use a glossary that concisely defines key terms and explain key concepts
- l) Focus on practical 'how to' advice, complete with examples of what to do (and to avoid). Clear guidance required on allocation of rights, how to tackle illegal fishing, defining roles and responsibilities and essential fishery management tools that go along with tenure rights.
- m) It is essential to consider tenure rights in the context of the practical; realities of fishing sustainability: part of FAO's role should be to include clear guidance on assessing fisheries and determining how to set goals for fishery sustainability and set and enforce fishing/harvest limits so that fishing can continue.

Group C: Session on terminology session

- a) Fisheries being a public resource owned by everyone, the issue of ownership in tenure should be explained.
- b) There should be a paragraph to give the reader the impression or angles about definitions so that it is not open to interpretation.
- c) The participation of fisher folk in decision-making is important; they are not always included in this process, especially small-scale fisher folk.
- d) The guide feels very broad and complex; the audience should be better defined. Suggested that the audience should be fisheries officers, government officials and they would trickle down the information.
- e) FAO should provide tools to the officials, so that they understand how to carry out the capacity building and take it to the fisher folk in their language.

- f) The guide should provide the scope and define the responsibilities of all the parties involved.
- g) The guide should not go all the way to consumption of fishery products, limit itself to access, use, harvest and commercialization.
- h) Fisheries are a contested resource, therefore the delineation and legitimization of the access is important.
- i) There is no reflection of how local leadership can influence fisher folk and access to fisheries, this should be considered.
- j) When implementing the guidelines it should be looked at holistically and not in a local or national or regional way.
- k) Development of simpler user guides for fisher folk is important.
- l) The implementers need guidance that show the different tenure approaches, do's and don'ts, successful examples.
- m) It should include aspects as identifying windows of opportunity to influence decisions.
- n) Small-scale fisher folk should be allowed an equal opportunity at the decision table, like industrial fishers. This is important to include in the guide.
- o) Coordination of actions at local, national, regional levels required

Group D: Session on terminology session

- a) Provide a clear definition of tenure as it is easier to understand with regard to land and not in fisheries. Indicate how tenure relate to open access regimes.
- b) Clearly articulate the objectives of the document.
- c) Provide a glossary and examples to simply the use of the document .
- d) Tenure in fisheries – Should include management and conservation for sustainable fisheries resources utilization.
- e) Key issues for consideration: People want to understand how rights can be located, tenure rights in fisheries, practical tools to make tenure rights works, how tenure rights can help with IUU fishing, how tenure rights relate to roles and obligations for sustainable fisheries.

2.2. Plenary Discussion on Session on terminology session

- a) Human rights are a new dimension in the guidelines and needs to be defined. Need to recast the section on human rights to indicate that with the reverse the human rights are also affected.
- b) Rights: comes with roles and responsibilities.
- c) The document should include environmental governance.
- d) Overall objective which is food security need to be very clear in the document.
- e) The guidelines provide guidance on designing and assigning rights. There is need to balance interests but may not be possible to have consensus of everybody.

2.3. Speakers

Rebecca Metzner, Chief - Policy, Economics and Institutions, FAO, Rome

Rebecca Metzner presented the skeleton draft work programme on tenure and Rights-Based Approaches for fisheries, including how it was developed and why. Members of the think tank also highlighted aspects of the document. The presentation provided information why and how the guidelines were developed including the thematic areas in the guidelines. Thematic areas included political economy and governance, delineation of rights and processes, capacity development, enhancement/diversification of livelihoods, international user rights and tenure and financing.

2.4. Plenary Discussion: Question and Answer Session

There was need for a work programme with priorities and known scope given limited resources. The workshop was requested to come up with priorities for each thematic area and practical interventions.

The need for capacity development for all stakeholders, clear and harmonious processes was stressed. Participants suggested pilot elements in the guidelines to see what is working and what is not. Like aspects of marine protected areas, tenure systems, user Rights, good governance. Workshop proposed to annex pilots with a high chance of success to the guidelines for consideration when presenting to COFI. Exchange visits were also suggested to share information, experience and lesson learning.

2.5. Presentation on Political Economy

Dubravka Bojic, FAO

Dubravka Bojic presented on Political Economy and governance in the context of the work programme. She highlighted four areas for consideration: Delineating rights, capacity development, international user rights and tenure and enhancing livelihoods. Information was given on multiplicity of frameworks and tools for analysis to generate strategies for action, identify local actors and champions that can harness change. It was noted that problems in fisheries are socio problems. Political economy tries to identify underlining factors that affect expected successes. The process should be done with the participation of relevant stakeholders to look at policies, legal framework, ideas and perspectives, levels of collaboration, main stakeholders, major interest groups, history, level of organization, mechanisms for dialogue, capacity to participate and any relevant information available and accessible.

Ms. Jessica Landman, Senior Director, Environmental Defence Fund (EDF) Oceans

Jessica Landman gave a presentation on SEA SALT analysis. The presentation highlighted the following:

- a) Secure: Tenure length to be sufficiently long for participants to realize future benefits of sustainable management.

- b) Exclusive: Secure privileges are assigned to an entity (individual, cooperative, community) and should be recognized and defensible by law.
- c) All Sources: Tenure rights include/cover all sources of fishing mortality (landed fish, discarded fish) – and total mortality does not exceed the catch limits.
- d) Scaled: Management units are set at the appropriate biological level – one that considers biology and political systems.
- e) Accountable: Participants in the tenure system are required to stay within their allocated share of the resource (number of fish, amount of gear, area of TURF) and/or comply with other controls, and are held accountable if they fail.
- f) Tenure rights: should include all fishing mortality landed fish and discarded fish.
- g) Scaled: rights should be set at appropriate biological level considering both biology and political systems.
- h) Accountable. Participants in the tenure system are required to stay within their allocated share of the resource (number of fish, amount of gear, area of TURF) and/or comply with other controls, and are held accountable if they fail.
- i) Limited: controls should be set at scientifically appropriate levels even when based on limited data.
- j) Transferable: it is risky but makes it easier for fishers. Holders of tenure rights can lease, sell or bequeath their tenure rights.
- k) Three Cs: New research shows that community co-decision/co-management plus effective champions greatly increase chances for success.

2.6. Plenary Session on Political Economy and governance

Group A: Political Economy and governance

Tentative activities: Global level

FAO should:

- a) Prepare an inventory of the existing tenure systems and Rights-Based approaches associated with these tenure systems. Recognize and build on already existing inventories; also should prepare an inventory on existing methodologies, tools and indicators for political economy and governance – not only limited to fisheries.
- b) Coordinates the development of methodologies , tools and indicators for assessing factors of success and failures, based on existing human rights standards with a particular focus on the SSF VG and VGGT Tenure.
- c) Coordinates the development of methodologies and tools for integrating the social component of sustainable development into existing approaches to user rights such as ITQs, catch shares, TURFS and other community based systems, and open access systems which to date have focused more on the ecological and economic components.
- d) Coordinates dialogue between all stakeholders (not only SSF).

Regional component

- Regional level should be added (e.g. Lake Victoria and South China Sea). This could be cross-linked with the key area of work on international user rights.

National and local level

- a) States should be taking the lead (together with other actors who can also initiate the process).
- b) FAO should:
 - support legislative and institutional reforms.
 - Provide capacity development (including fisher folk leaders and members) to address identified issues; CD in this context to organisation, skills and knowledge, (tools to access internet for research and finally to enable fishers to participate in negotiations that address political economy issues) = enabling environment.
 - Partner with local stakeholders to collect baseline information for understanding the fishery and tenure system.
 - Facilitate dialogue, deliberative governance and the co-production of new knowledge and information amongst all stakeholders that integrates local ecological knowledge and fishing communities with other form of knowledge.

Group B: Political Economy and governance

Global level

Develop a legal analysis framework that can compare jurisdictions in light of the VGGT guidelines. Prepare or update inventories, eliminate bullet 2 – unsure how this will help and delete last global bullet.

Local level activities

- a) FAO to present a list of types of activities it anticipates to be carried out
- b) Capacity development should be moved to capacity development section.
- c) When developing a fisheries law the planning should start at a local level – model legislation
- d) Facilitate achieving cross sectoral (between land and sea) policy coherence and between local, national and regional levels and between scale of fisheries (large/industrial and small scale).

Overarching considerations:

- a) Develop a framework for tenure rights legislation that can be utilized by the constituent countries. legislation should be based on the realities of that country.
- b) Guidelines – all of them- specifically refer to HR declarations – so do we really need a separate tool to assess this?
- c) Clarify the level of the bullets – we interpret this to be level of support.
- d) Many of the activities need to be described differently.

- e) FAO to prioritize governments and communities who want to make a transformation, not only government, and not only CSOs and NGOs.

Group C: Political Economy and governance

- a) Definition of political economy.
- b) Governance system: need for tools for rapid assessment of political governance.
- c) Transboundary issues: need for nested analysis to identify the gaps at different levels.
- d) Need tools for organizations and governments.
- e) Need to support the people first and fish to be secondary.
- f) Need to develop capacities for socio-economic and governance in fisheries resource management.
- g) Need to address food security and livelihood as we address political economy.
- h) Have pilot projects in different fisheries.

Group D: Political Economy and governance

Global level

- a) Need to prioritize activities by countries or regions or by ecosystem units.
- b) Organize by type of tenures\criteria for case studies.
- c) In each pilot case provide indicator success, provide diagnostic tools for social dimension and indicate outside factors that affect the fisheries.
- d) Add reference point for indicators.
- e) In activity 4 include outside sectors.
- f) Add global forum for dissemination and sharing by research institutes, CSO, NGO, and coordinated by FAO.

Local level

- a) Disseminate guidelines and awareness about political economy and governance.
- b) Identify capacity development gaps and main issues related to governance of tenure.
- c) Process to allow fishers to understand and participate.
- d) Provide good and bad examples.
- e) Exchange visits.
- f) Building capacity for local government not only for the fishery sector.

2.7. Speaker on rights and fisheries

Mr. Adam Soliman, Director, The Fisheries Law Centre, Canada

Adam Soliman presented on rights and fisheries. He explained constitutional and Human Rights, Property (and contractual) Rights (Common or Private) and types of Property Rights (state property or public property, common property or collective property, private property and open-access). Property is a bundle of rights, and individual rights within this bundle can be separated, transferred, removed or added. Several rights of property can be attached to a single good. "Ownership" was explained to be composed of the following rights:

possession, management and control, income and capital and transfer. Rights and Ownership comes with duties as well and this needs to be understood. Regarding a license, it is a bundle of rights. Government issues a license/permit to a fisherman (public law). Community can lobby and gets rights (public law). Community can distribute the rights to fishers (private law). A fisher can also give rights to another fisher (private law).

3. Thursday, 3 March 2016

3.1 Plenary Session on delineation of rights and processes for doing so

Group A: Delineation of rights and processes for doing so

General considerations

- a) Clarify what is included in bioecological and socioeconomic sets of data (make sure data including historic catch data is included in one or the other).
- b) Under ii, define objectives, safeguards may be may be imposed to achieve (community) objectives.
- c) Use disadvantaged, vulnerable and/ or groups and/ or individuals discriminated against (with an interest in the resource) instead of Women, non-fishers, children.

Activities Global level: FAO to develop a database on 1-3

Activities at national/local level

- a) Clarify and give examples on types of rights and quality of rights.
- b) Support impact evaluation.
- c) Analyze trade-offs.
- d) List, describe and apply existing tools for data collection.

Group B: Delineation of rights and processes for doing so

General considerations

- a) Structure sections similarly. Include introduction.
- b) Additional introduction points could include the following:
 - i. Provide communities with the tools and information they need to put in place allocation mechanisms that meet community priorities.
 - ii. Need to define clear objectives (environmental, economic and social) for allocation processes to meet community goals. The objectives need to be defined with associated guiding indicators based on the human rights standards reflected in the principles of the VGGT and SSF VG SSF. It has to be noted that objectives are likely to differ between locations and that there is no 'one-size-fits all' set of objectives.

- iii. The quality of rights is inter alia determined by the rights being clear and recognized and whether a science and conservation-based fishery management and governance scheme is in place to ensure that there remain fish to be caught.
- c) Allocation process: rights need to be designed (as well as defined and assigned) .
- d) Use of must and shall. Shall is legally binding.
- e) Capacity building should be shifted to the capacity building section.
- f) Dispute resolution mechanisms should be developed and made accessible to all stakeholders.
- g) Allocation of rights: Compensation should include alternative livelihood.
- h) Why the split between global and local? The language is all generic.

Global level activities: modified text in italics

- a) Modified: Documentation of existing diverse legal and policy approaches to *designing and assigning rights in diverse geographic and political circumstances.*
- b) Documentation and analysis of different tenure systems and their implications for the full and effective participation of women and other *disadvantaged* in fisheries.
- c) Dispute resolution mechanisms should be developed and made accessible to all stakeholders.

Local level activities

- a) *Tools for mapping tenure systems in specific sites to collect information on the existing attributes of the systems.*
- b) *Support the impact evaluation of other sectors/ activities on tenure and fishing rights and compensation schemes and vice versa, such as shipping routes, hydroelectric dams, wind farms, aquaculture zones, mining, tourism.*
- c) *Conduct research on how cultural and religious issues associated with tenure have been taken into account in design of tenure systems.*

Group C: Delineation of rights and processes for doing so

General considerations

- a) Identification of all the stakeholders that will participate in the process.
- b) The participation mechanisms must be defined to insure appropriate representation of the stakeholders within the process.
- c) The rules must be clear from the beginning, how the participation process will develop.
- d) The way in which the final decision is going to be made must also be transparent.
- e) Participants must understand the meaning of the rights concept and the type of rights that are being discussed.
- f) When talking about groups to be considered in the allocation of rights, youth should substitute children. Also fisher folk organizations should be included.
- g) The responsibilities of those that will be allocated rights must be clear to the participants from all sectors, especially when selling the opportunity or idea.
- h) Food security and poverty alleviation should be factors in defining the rights.
- i) There should be tools for the documentation of the process, telling the story.
- j) Documenting of customary rights.

k) Property rights: resources should be sustainable.

Group D: Delineation of rights and processes for doing so

General considerations

- a) Participation and transparency: Political processes need to be recognized and understood to inform processes to develop tenure systems.
- b) Bioecological and socioeconomic data: add environmental and institutional data to this section.
- c) Processes, tools and community goals: community leadership is essential and should be developed/assigned.
- d) Allocation of rights processes: Minorities need to be considered, Not sure non-fisheries should be considered (e.g., truck drivers, boat builders, gear suppliers, etc.).
- e) It is important to understand existing power relationships – fishers, fish buyers, fish transporters, fish processors, fish exporters, etc.
- f) Having a catch history based on illegal fishing should not be recognized as establishing pre-existing rights. In some instances, defining illegal fishing may be difficult.
- g) Specific measures to eliminate all forms of discrimination must be adopted. Not all stakeholders should have equal priority in allocation processes (e.g., fishers who use destructive fishing gear). Equity is important in allocation processes.

Global Level activities

- a) There is overlap between activities identified in this section and in the Political Economy and Governance section. (e.g., inventory of tenure systems).
- b) In addition to documentation of existing legal and political approaches, include information sharing.
- c) FAO identified as the lead on the global level activities with potential to partner with NGOs.

Local Level activities

- a) Local refers to national and regional within a country.
- b) Government ownership is important but governments do not necessarily have to initiate the process (e.g., NGOs).
- c) Governments may not know the issues or have the capacity to deal with them.

3.2 Plenary discussion on delineation of rights and processes for doing so

- a) MPAs should be given special consideration under delineation of rights. Activities to include inventories, what stocks exist, socio-economic, benefits, participation in the processes.
- b) Learn from customary practices in land.
- c) Expand and make terms more understandable at local level.

3.3 Plenary Session on International user Rights

Group A: International user Rights

General considerations:

Clarify what you mean by migrant issues (p. 10, para 1).

Tentative activities (global and regional)

- a) Add: coastal states should have equitable allocation independent form whether they are exercising their rights.
- b) On a global level: FAO can connect RFMOs and RFBs.
- c) On a regional level: RFMOs should review existing stocks and make sure that allocation processes reflect changes (e.g. overfishing and CC).
- d) Modify sentence: The project will to develop tools for assessing tradeoffs between fishing Agreements with fishing Fleets and SSF: issue of surplus/ access for foreign fleets versus keeping it for SSF.

Group B: International user Rights

General considerations

- a) Small scale fisheries who prefer a shared or transboundary should be allowed.
- b) Government to work with FAO to establish information on agreements.
- c) Include transforming RFOs to RFMOs.
- d) Large vessels entering exclusion zones: Need to help countries to ensure that when they enter into foreign fishing agreements that they take into consideration impacts on small scale fishers including accurately accounting for catch in calculating surplus”.

Group C: International User Rights

General considerations

- a) Need for assessment tools for impacts on the small scale fishers by foreign fishing agreements and migrant fishers.
- b) Regional arrangement should consider SSF.
- c) Regional arrangement: Need to achieve some level of harmonization, monitoring arrangements.
- d) Rights should go with responsibilities and these should be clear.
- e) Compliance and enforcement and need to generate revenue to finance the management arrangements put in place.
- f) Need to develop tools for rapid assessment of value of fisheries to help negotiations on access agreements.

Group D: International User Rights

General consideration: Add impact of oil exploration, hydro-power and conflict resolution at national level

Tentative activities

- a) Proposed activities already being implemented instead look for partnership opportunities.
- b) Need to formalize the rights of migrant fishers and fish workers.
- c) Understand the impact of foreign fleets on SSF.
- d) Consider market certificates as part of tenure rights.

4. Friday, 4 March 2016

4.1 Plenary Session on Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods

Group A: Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods

General considerations

- a) Need to consider the whole supply/value chain.
- b) Link scientists with fishing communities and vice versa.
- c) Demographic changes need to be considered.
- d) Take decent labor conditions into account (forced child labor, slavery).
- e) Examine notion “fishery as the last resort”.
- f) Add value without undermining local food security.
- g) Be careful with alternative opportunities. Must be sustainable, fisher folk moving into other sectors can increase competition and thus conflict. Consider what people do best and assist them to improve.
- h) Things to note: fewer fishers can lead to improved resources and higher employment good fisheries management is key for identifying opportunities for livelihood diversification.

Tentative activities

- a) States should support economic investments beneficial for local context and beneficial to SSF.
- b) Need to promote investments in value addition. promotion for women’s involvement in fisheries value-chain and post-harvest activities to promote gender equality.
- c) Exploration of ecosystem services as potential emerging area for income generating activities for fishing communities (e.g. tourism, re-creational activities).
- d) States should facilitate access to micro finance.
- e) Toolboxes to the community need to be explained.

- f) Focus needs to be placed upon individual persons (individual rights), their institutional aspects, community rights, and their priorities (out of economics, social, and environment).
- g) States should support/ facilitate access to micro credits schemes and grants.

Group B: Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods

General considerations

- a) The section need an introduction.
- b) Move first bulletin to the activities.
- c) First bulletin in activities to be included in general consideration.
- d) Fishing communities faced with declining fish stocks, and communities creating tenure systems that have the potential to reduce the number of fishers will need assistance in making the transition to sustainable and livelihoods.
- e) Creating additional opportunities for livelihood enhancement especially for women and youth.
- f) This can be complementary to fishing and need not wait for a crisis to be initiated.
- g) Considering FAO's comparative advantage and expertise, activities should focus on poverty alleviation through such measures as supporting job diversification, adding value to existing landings and improving access to financial services – however, adding value must not exclude the poorest from accessing fish products locally and or regionally; (this was moved up to General considerations).
- h) Deleted Linking scientists with fishing communities.
- i) Process is crucial: need to directly involve the affected communities from the beginning in identifying issues and solutions and draw from traditional knowledge of fishers and scientific research.
- j) The issue is an inter-disciplinary area between fisheries and other sectors/policy domains.
- k) Demographic changes need to be considered.
- l) Take decent labor considerations into account (e.g., child labor, slavery).
- m) Improve use of existing landings (e.g. post-harvest processing) without undermining local/ regional food and nutrition security.
- n) The notion "fishery as the last resort" needs to be reexamined.

Tentative activities

- a) FAO look to other institution for areas outside fisheries.
- b) FAO to collect and rapidly disseminate example cases of successful and unsuccessful enhancement/diversification of livelihoods to inform future efforts. Promote appropriate livelihood enhancement activities.
- c) Assess and make recommendations for development of under-valued resources where opportunities exist.
- d) Facilitating connecting communities with available technical resources to improve the processing of products and the identification of under-valued resources.

- e) Exploration of ecosystem services as potential emerging area, and develop pilot projects for income generating activities for fishing communities.
- f) Explore compensation schemes of fishers for assuming management responsibilities such as enforcement and data collection as an alternative to fishing.
- g) FAO should explore opportunities with fishing villages for ecotourism, community based tourism, volunteer-tourism and other communities to promote ecologically friendly and sustainable tourism.

Group C: Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods

General considerations

- a) Terminology – need consistence with use of terms ‘fisher-folk’, poverty reduction.
- b) Difficulty of fishers to move from fisheries business. Explore what other viable alternatives may be there to motivate fishers to change.
- c) Alternative livelihood must not necessarily be a separate activity. What about developing value added within the value chain? E.g. IFAD experience in Indonesia on fish-based products prepared by communities, Links to markets.
- d) Need to consider the economy of the country, opportunities, available, support systems to be put in place for movement to other activities (facilitated access to credit, to land, incentives, etc.) – through participatory engagement with fishers directly.
- e) Define target – SSF (issue: what about those working at boats owned by others)
- f) Special programmes and training in different fields (e.g. aquaculture), especially for youth. Are there any such programmes for fishers? Be more innovative in training programmes (beyond making baskets or goat rearing for fishers’ wives), business education, etc.
- g) Support development of fishers’ organizations to invest in transport on sea.
- h) Lesson learning from other poverty reduction and local development plans.
- i) Tap into fishers’ ideas and desires for new activities.
- j) Mode of payment – most often at daily basis – difficult to save.

Tentative activities

- a) Collection of experiences and supporting exchange visits (rewarding best performers)
- b) Evaluation of the situation with all actors concerned– Example of a tool - tri-dimensional participatory mapping and scenarios of gains and losses, and plus action plan for starting with all stakeholders in the community. PTDM – participatory tri-dimensional model.
- c) Explore livestock and horticulture as alternative area (what it means in terms of needs – access to land, inputs, credit etc.).
- d) Consider social protection issues for fisheries – insurance, pension schemes.
- e) Mapping the territory where fishers fish within the area – base for the TURFs, which can change along the seasons. If it moves to the neighboring TURF, will indicate where there are overlaps.
- f) Develop certification schemes for adding value (e.g. Senegal, locally-led scheme).

- g) Support fishers to be organized in a cooperative that can take care of payments in line with catches (example from Kenya).
- h) Identify tools for assessment of employment conditions (decent work) – ILO. How to deal with under-valued labour? Useful info for states' social protection schemes.

Group D: Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods

General considerations

- a) Enhancement within the fishing sector (enhance fish stocks; protect the ecosystem, value added processing (improve quality/reduce waste, market access is an important issue (price paid to fishers is low compared to retail or export value).
- b) Recognize the role of agriculture as an alternative or complementary source of income.
- c) Can learn from ideas/examples from Lake Victoria involving women (Fishers raising ducks, goats, horticultural activities, barter trade, micro-banking/revolving fund initiatives, small space activities.
- d) The case of working with children: need education to help them prepare for work outside the fishery, role for NGOs (e.g., World Vision, Save the Children, address child labor.
- e) Consider livelihoods enhancement/diversification in context of socio-economic and cultural factors.
- f) Gender equity considerations. Be careful not to overburden women with extra duties.

Tentative activities

- a) Identify activities that fishers are interested in. Involve them in brainstorming.
- b) Role of fisher and fish worker community organizations (e.g., cooperatives).
- c) Role of the State/Government: Set standards, develop strategies to generate revenue to support alternative livelihoods e.g. Alternative Livelihood Fund.
- d) Use money collected by the State from fishers to support local fisheries management.
- e) Promote long term strategies for technical support - capacity building.
- f) Learn from the experience of others. Monitor results.
- g) Explore the impact of education, health, social services, etc. on ability to secure alternative livelihoods.
- h) Establish pilot projects. Monitor and share results.
- i) Explore/map potential alternative livelihood activities.
- j) Understand the importance of ecosystem services Ref: Principles of relevance to an ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF).

4.2 Plenary Session on Capacity Development

Group A: Capacity Development

General considerations

- a) We have to clarify what capacity we are talking about!
 - i. Clarify Objective of the capacity.
 - ii. Capacity building should focus on human development (administrative /governance not to forget negotiation skills of fisherfolk).
 - iii. Providing infrastructure and making equipment accessible (cold chain and physical infrastructure e.g. landing sides).
 - iv. Don't forget the capacity of other stakeholders to understand the fishery and the importance of the resource.
- b) Amend the following sentences: (last sentence para 1): "include building the resilience and adaptive capacity of SSF communities to among other things disaster risk management...", (para2, 3rd line): Be more specific with what you mean by power relations?, (local level line 3): Drop "based on human rights approach".

Global level activities

Develop a generic capacity need assessment tool kit and specify who should conduct states and other actors.

Local level activities:

Develop capacity to use tools and amend Local Level Bullet one: delete based on human rights-based approaches.

Group B: Capacity Development

General considerations

- a) Where possible, capacity development and training material should be based on good practices
- b) Avoid duplication of effort

Tentative activities-Global level

- a) Identify broad categories of stakeholders
- b) Facilitate establishment of FAO World Fisheries University
- c) FAO to explore development of extension services model for capacity development
- d) FAO to develop (or identify existing) models for attitude and behavior change suitable for creating support for tenure systems

Group C: Capacity Development

General considerations

- a) Need to be clear on capacity development. Capacity development needs to be a programme to deliver what has been planned and not only training.
- b) Include building the capacity of the state apart from fishing communities.
- c) Identify champions from national to local to support the programme.

Tentative Activities: Global level

- a) Overall assessment of the programme to identify the capacity needs and identifying the most cost effective tools required for capacity development.
- b) Support Professional training: Training of trainers and support rolling out to share knowledge. Include follow-up mechanism of those trained.
- c) Develop programme and mechanism for capacity development.
- d) Awareness and knowledge to national, local and community on the programme.
- e) Identify champions at national and local level when creating awareness.
- f) Draw lessons from successful experiences.

Tentative activities: Local level

- a) Support development of capacities of local communities/organizations to prepare projects/plans to source for funding.
- b) Identify community facilitators.
- c) Support exchange visits for lesson learning.
- d) Connect with the relevant institution at country level on the existing capacity Development programmes.

Group D: Capacity Development

General considerations

- a) Capacity Development include: Human resource development and Institutional capacity.
- b) Infrastructure is related to capacity development and fundamental to support many activities.
- c) Knowledge and capacity should be developed on topics not identified in the draft work programme.

Tentative activities: Global

- a) Continue current FAO activities related to VGGT.
- b) Recognize and understand how to use new approaches to capacity development.
 - Use “modern” tools taking into consideration generational shift in how to learn (e.g., e-learning based on internet technology/ICT for Fish).
- c) Ensure that training materials are adapted to those being trained.

- d) Trainers should be familiar with and accepted by the local community.
- e) Networks of trainers.
- f) Training at the global and local level should be harmonized to incorporate a variety of topics that are often presented as discrete topics (co-management, Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, etc.).

Tentative activities: Local Level

- a) Training approach should include on-the-job practical training.
- b) Accreditation – FAO should harmonize approaches based on existing systems.
- c) Capacity development on fisheries issues can begin in schools.
- d) Drop reference to training on biomass data but include statistical data collection.

4.3 Summary of key points discussed

The summary of key points discussed was given by Lena Westlund. She highlighted areas in the work programme, what was presented and discussed. The different areas of the work programme were: political economy and governance, delineation of rights and processes, international user rights and tenure, enhancement/diversification of livelihoods and capacity Development. A summary was given on what was discussed in each area is given below:

- a) Political economy and governance: presentation and working groups
 - i. FAO to lead global activities
 - ii. Inventory and selection of case studies according to criteria
 - iii. Need for dialogue, and sharing of experiences and results
 - iv. Facilitate cross-sectoral policy coherence and between different scales
 - v. Local (and national) activities to be led by governments
 - vi. FAO to support legislative and institutional reform: model legislation needed
 - vii. Capacity building/tools for fisherfolk to participate (enabling environment)
 - viii. Need also for regional level
 - ix. Make activities clearer and more detailed

- b) Delineation of rights and processes: presentations and working groups

General:

Some overlaps with component on *Political economy and governance*

- i. Participation of fisherfolk from very beginning of process, attention to gender
- ii. Clarify data needs: socioeconomic, bioecological, environmental and institutional
- iii. Define objectives as start of process
- iv. Discrimination can be positive; strive for equity.
- v. Focus on youth (instead of children)
- vi. Leadership is essential

- vii. Capacity building needed for more than conflicts
- viii. MPAs required

Global level activities:

FAO to develop database, coordinate dialogue between stakeholders and develop tools for documenting tenure allocation processes

Local level activities:

- Need for stakeholder analysis and understanding of power relations (fishers, boat owners, buyers, etc.)
- Research on culture/religion in relation to tenure systems
- Government ownership is important but governments do not necessarily have the knowledge and capacity – support needed to initiate the process (e.g., NGOs).

c) International user rights: working groups

General: Migrant fishers: Agreements between countries to avoid arrests, understand migration and formalize migrants' rights. Conflicts at the national level become more complicated in transboundary areas, e.g. conflicts between sectors, between SSF and LSF, etc.

Activities: FAO to work with RFBs/RFMOs, assist countries to assess and take into account impact of fishing agreements on small-scale fishers (partnership – EU – Transparency initiative).

d) Enhancement/diversification of livelihoods: working groups

General:

- i. Alternative livelihood could be complementary, within fishery value chain
- ii. Consider local food security
- iii. Lack of land can restrict opportunities
- iv. Innovative training programmes and long-term support required
- v. Focus on children, the next generation through education, addressing child labour (partnerships outside fisheries, e.g., NGOs)
- vi. Consider livelihood options in context of socio-economic and cultural factors
- vii. Gender equity considerations, e.g., careful not to overburden women with extra duties but be realistic
- viii. Role of fisher and fish worker community organizations (e.g., cooperatives)

Activities:

- Document programmes and their successes and failures, learn from the experiences of others and exchange visits
- Establish pilot projects and monitor results

- Explore the impact of education, health, social services, etc. on ability to secure alternative livelihoods
- Consider Ecosystem services based activities
- Assess and address social protection issues for fisheries – insurance, pension schemes
- Identify tools for assessment of employment conditions (decent work) – ILO
- Make tools available for community level assessments (self-assessment tool, tri-dimensional participatory mapping)

e) Capacity building: Working groups

- i. FAO lead/coordinate at global level with partners as appropriate
- ii. Mechanism for sharing results and dialogue
- iii. Governments to led at local / national level
- iv. Need for regional level activities
- v. Fisherfolk participation
- vi. Gender equity, involve youth and consider children
- vii. Learn from existing experiences, make available or develop tools, and pilots
- viii. Long-term processes required
- ix. Need for cross-sectoral collaboration and attention to what happens outside fisheries and at different scales
- x. Power relations along the value chain
- xi. Capacity development to communities and governments, all levels to adapt tools and processes
- xii. Legal and institutional frameworks assessment
- xiii. Migrants need to be catered for
- xiv. Capacity required in implementation of MPAs
- xv. Harmonization of introductions
- xvi. Avoid jargon
- xvii. Clear definitions required

4.4 Next steps

FAO will circulate the revised VGGT Technical Guide document to participants for comments and the comments are expected in track changes. FAO will finalize the proposed work programme and also prepare information paper to accompany the proposed work programme before presenting it to COFI. The programme will first be approved by COFI in July 2017 before it is rolled out. The workshop suggested that the programme should include a monitoring and evaluation part and also possible partnerships to advance the programme.

4.5 Connecting to the global: regional perspectives on the work programme

The plenary divided into three working groups of (Asia, Southern America and the Caribbean and Africa) to consider practical realities of example cases which the participants believed could held empower them and their fisheries.

4.6 Plenary Session on connecting to the global: regional perspectives on the work programme

The groups presented as follows:

Cambodia is implementing user rights and co-management and has a lot to offer to others. The work programme is expected to contribute to capacity development to strengthen local co-management, financial management, support to enforcement of local tenure rights and income diversification

Republic of Korea: FAO has a training program for fishermen but does not include tenure systems and this is required.

Philippines: MPAs were established but they are not successful because of lack of rights. They could benefit from capacity building work programme.

The regional examples given were of Mekong River Commission, Coral Triangle Initiative (have training programmes but no tenure system and rights based management).

Caribbean and African: Africa fisheries were reported to have similar problems and no specific good example to learn from on user rights. Major problem include open access, political patronage, mind set to change, increased fishing effort and illegal fishing. What is needed is political will, technical, financial assistance, capacity building and support in implementation of tenure systems and user rights.

4.7 Presentation on IFAD Projects

Dr. Richard O. Abila, Senior Technical Specialist, Fisheries and Aquaculture, IFAD

Dr. Abila presented on IFAD funding. He provided information on the financial products offered by IFAD (loans, grants) and non-financial ones like knowledge products, policy dialogue, technical expertise and partnership. Since the 1990s, IFAD has funded 68 loans and 12 grants and currently they have 22 loans and 9 grants running. The common project themes include: resources management systems, fish value chains infrastructure and services, aquaculture and mariculture systems, Fisheries Institutions and Organizations development, financial access, rural/coastal infrastructure and emergency/ disaster response.

For the FAO initiative, IFAD works with governments and Countries would have to prioritize fisheries activities and request for support from IFAD in addition to meeting their requirements.

4.8 Stepping forward: Tactics for getting this programme of work through COFI and off the ground.

Mr. Johan H. Williams, Specialist Director, Norwegian Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries, Norway

Mr. Johan introduced processes required towards approval from COFI. He highlighted the need for lobbying to get support as the participants who have discussed the work

programme may not be members of the delegations attending COFI and many Members States are not operating small scale fisheries. The terminologies used may not be clear to all like use of governance instead of management.

It was noted that Donors have changed the environment of financing from a basket to specific areas. Provision of specific project proposal may aid/influence approval and funding.

4.9 Expectations

The participants were requested to state their expectations from the workshop. An analysis of what was given is highlighted below:

- a) Clear understanding of small scale fisheries
- b) Better understanding of tenure and Rights-Based approaches for fisheries
- c) Better understanding of the VGGT
- d) Global vision to benefit small-scale fisheries
- e) Improve the technical guide
- f) FAO work programme
- g) Pilot projects identified
- h) Specific topics: fisheries assessments, management options, conflict resolution, impacts/interactions
- i) Networking

4.10 Closing remarks

Dr. Rebecca Metzner thanked the hotel for the services offered, participants for the work done and FAO and LVFO for the organization.

Mr. Lay Mitchell Addison gave a vote of thanks. He thanked LVFO and FAO for the arrangements made, accommodation and documentation. He also thanked participants for their involvement and exchange of knowledge.

Mr. Monor thanked everybody for getting the courage to come to Uganda to attend the workshop especially after the elections. He informed participants that LVFO would like to embrace tenure and user Rights-Based approaches on Lake Victoria but needs support. He thanked Dr. Rebecca Metzner and her team for the organization, support and facilitation. He wished everybody safe journey back home.

Appendix I: List of Participants

<p>Mr. Mitchell Addison Lay Coordinator Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organisations New Winthropes, St. Georges Antigua and Barbuda C: +268 784 4690 E: mitchlay@yahoo.co.uk</p>	<p>Mr. Adam Soliman, MSc., JD, LL.M Director The Fisheries Law Centre 7340 Westminster HWY, Suite 210 Richmond, BC V6X 1A1, Canada P: +604 288 7992 F: +604 343 3690 C: +778 838 5505 E: adam@fishlaw.org W: www.fishlaw.org</p>
<p>Dr. Robert Arthur MRAG C/o 18 Queen Street, London W1J 5PN, United Kingdom C: +44 7720 888164 E: r.arthur@mrage.co.uk</p>	<p>Mr. Yassine Skandrani President Tunisia Small-scale Fisheries Association BP 15 Emimel Nenzel Jemil 7080 Bizerte Tunisia T: +216 22 057479 C: +216 75 490391 E: skandraniyassine@yahoo.fr</p>
<p>Ms. Kaing Khim Deputy Director General (DDG) Fisheries Administration (FiA) # 186, Norodom Blvd, P.O. Box 582, Phnom Penh, Cambodia T: +855 23 213 026 C: +855 17 988911 / 888 988 911 E: kaingkhim@online.com.kh</p>	<p>Mrs. Nancy Gitonga Fish Africa P.O. Box 64358 – 00620 Nairobi, Kenya T: +254 722 967739 F: +254 20 2734095 C: +254 722 967739 E: nanisgitonga@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Mr. Erick Alexander Ross Salazar Science Manager MarViva Foundation P.O. Box 020 - 6151 Santa Ana, San José, Costa Rica T: +506 2290 3647, Ext. 7028 F: +506 2231 4429 C: +506 8833 7294 E: ross.salazar@gmail.com / erick.ross@marviva.net</p>	<p>Mr. Samuel Kenyanya Senior Assistant Director Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries State Department of Fisheries P.O. Box 58187, Nairobi, Kenya C: +254 725 205821 E: samuelkenyanya@gmail.com</p>
<p>Mr. René Shärer, ICSF Brazil Caixa Postal 51 Prainha 00 Canto Verde 62840 970 Beberibe, CE 62840 – 970 Brazil T: +55 85 9 9921 0285 C: +55 85 9 9921 0285 E: fishnet@uol.com.br</p>	<p>Mrs. Joyce Ikwaput Nyeko Acting Commissioner Directorate of Fisheries Resources Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries P.O. Box 4, Entebbe, Uganda C: +256 772 482599 / 703 945772 E: joyikwaput@hotmail.com; aanyuj12@gmail.com</p>
<p>Mr. Paul Macgillivray Fisheries Consultant 2706 Highway 337, Antigonish, Nova Scotia Canada B2G 2L2 C: +604 307 4950 E: paul.macgillivray@icloud.com</p>	<p>Dr. Nelly Isyagi, Project Officer, AU-IBAR P.O. Box 30786 00100, Nairobi, Kenya T: +254 203 674000 F: +254 203 674341 C: +254 704 864088 E: nelly.isyagi@au-ibar.org</p>

<p>Dr. Andrew Baio Fisheries Economist / Consultant University of Sierra Leone Fourah Bay College, USL Mount Aureol, Freetown, Sierra Leone T: +232 7882 5548 C: +232 8842 5151 E: acimbaio@gmail.com</p>	<p>Mr. Johan H. Williams Specialist Director Norwegian Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries Kongens St 8 – 0030 Oslo, Norway T: +47 9002 4446 C: +47 9002 4446 E: jhw@nfd.dep.no</p>
<p>Prof. Ragnar Arnason, University of Iceland Department of Economics, University of Iceland Saemundargata 2, Reykjavik 101, Iceland P: +354 525 4539 E: ragnara@hi.is</p>	<p>Dr. Richard O. Abila Senior Technical Specialist – Fisheries and Aquaculture IFAD Via Paolo di Dono 44 00142 Rome, Italy T: +39 06 54592865 F: +39 06 54593865 C: +39 335 798 5253 E: r.abila@ifad.org</p>
<p>Ms. Jessica Landman Senior Director, Oceans 1875, Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 600 Washington D.C. 20009, U.S.A T: +1 301 312 4193 C: +1 301 312 4193 E: jlandman@edf.org</p>	<p>Mr. Blessing Mapfumo Fisheries and Aquaculture Advisor C/o FAO South Africa UN House, Pretoria P.O. Box 13782, the Tramshed, Pretoria T: +27 12 354 8540 F: +27 12 354 8531 C: +27 766 318729 E: blessing@hempelco.com</p>
<p>Mr. Kaitira Ibrahim Katonda Director of Fisheries Lake Tanganyika Authority (LTA) Kigobe Nord, 84 US Avenue P.O. Box 4910 – Ngagara, Bujumbura, Burundi T: +257 79 138000 / 22 273585 F: +257 22 275663 C: +257 79 138000 E: kaitira.katonda1@gmail.com</p>	<p>Mr. Papa Gora Ndiaye Executive Director, REPAO Sicap Liberte 4 No. 5000 B. P. 47076 Dakar, Senegal T: +221 338 252787 F: +221 33 825 2799 C: +221 77 644 3473 E: gndiaye@gmail.com</p>
<p>Mr. Terrence Compton Phillips Senior Technical Officer Caribbean Natural Resources Institute Building 7, Unit 8, Fernandes Industrial Centre Eastern Main Road, Laventille Trinidad and Tobago. P: +868 626 6062 F: +868 626 1788 C: +868 397 5897 E: terrence@canari.org</p>	<p>Dr. Wordsworth Odame Larbi Land Tenure Officer FAO Sub Regional Office for Eastern Africa CMC Road P. O. Box 5536, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia T: +251 94 219 6515 E: Wordsworth.Larbi@fao.org</p>
<p>Dr. Claudio Baigun Wetlands International 254 Mayo, 758 Buenos Aires Argentina T: +54 11 4791 5769 E: cbaigun@gmail.com</p>	

<p>Dr. Rebecca Metzner Chief - Policy, Economics and Institutions Branch (FIAP), F406 Fisheries and Aquaculture Department Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy T: +39 06 5705 6718 F: +39 06 5705 0062 C: +39 347 9211 269 E: Rebecca.Metzner@fao.org</p>	<p>Ms. Dubravka Bojic Programme Officer – Governance and Policy Support Unit Economic & Social Development Department (ESD), C399 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy P: +39 06 5705 2021 E: dubravka.bojic@fao.org</p>
<p>Mr. Chiguk Ahn Fishery Officer - FIAP, F415 Fishery and Aquaculture Policy and Economics Division Fishery and Aquaculture Department Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations P: +39 06 57053156 F: +39 06 57050062 C: +39 392 1082032 E: Chiguk.Ahn@fao.org</p>	<p>Ms. Lena Westlund Fisheries Consultant - FIAP Fishery and Aquaculture Department Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy E: lena.westlund@fao.org</p>
<p>Ms. Anika Seggel, Consultant – FIAP, F407 Fishery and Aquaculture Department Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy P: +39 06570 56505 E: anika.seggel@fao.org</p>	<p>Ms. Mairi Miller (Mary Elizabeth) Consultant – FIAP, F 420 Fishery and Aquaculture Department Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy T: +39 389 920 1108 C: +39 389 920 4108 E: maryelizabeth.miller@fao.org</p>
<p>Mrs. Radhmina Ramadhan Mbilinyi Fisheries Specialist Lake Victoria Environment Management Project II P.O. Box 211, Mwanza, Tanzania T: +255 28 250 2684 F: +255 28 250 2523 C: +255 754 433096 E: rad1213@yahoo.co.uk</p>	<p>Mr. Rodrick Kundu Fisheries Specialist Lake Victoria Environment Management Project II P.O. Box 9220 - 40100, Kisumu, Kenya T: +254 20 20563 F: +254 20 20284 C: +254 712 978816 E: rodkundu@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Mr. Solomon Kihui Environment Specialist Lake Victoria Environment Management Project II P.O. Box 9220 - 40100, Kisumu, Kenya T: +254 57 2020563 F: +254 57 2020560 C: +256 720 341574 E: skihui2014@gmail.com</p>	<p>Mr. Aventino Bakunda Principal Fisheries Officer Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries Department of Fisheries Resource Management and Development C: +256 772 592547 E: aventino_b@yahoo.com</p>

<p>Mr. Godfrey V. Monor, HSC Executive Secretary Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 776 705634 / +256 752 705634 E: monorgv@lvfo.org</p>	<p>Mr. Samson B. Abura Director, Information, Communications and Technology Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 776 859297 E: sbabura@lvfo.org</p>
<p>Dr. Rhoda Tumwebaze Director, Fisheries Management and Development Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 772 927889 E: rtumwebaze@lvfo.org</p>	<p>Ms. Claire Mukobi Personal Secretary to the ES Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 752 497763 E: ctumukobi@lvfo.org</p>
<p>Mr. Justine Inyalio Accounts Assistant Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 774 116665 E: justine@lvfo.org</p>	<p>Mr. Chris Kintu Lubowa Protocol Officer Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization T: +256 434 125000; Ext. 5022 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 772 626541 E: kintuchris2005@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Mr. Fred Wabwire Driver to the Executive Secretary Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 782 154449</p>	<p>Mr. Francis Ochola Driver, Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization P.O. Box 1625, Jinja, Uganda T: +256 434 125000 F: +256 434 123123 C: +256 782 669604</p>
<p>Mr. Edwine Ojambo Driver, LVEMP II P.O. Box 9220, Kisumu, Kenya C: +254 723 213649 E: otamboojambo@yahoo.com</p>	<p>Mr. Paul Obwalatum Driver, DFR Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries P.O. Box 102, Entebbe, Uganda C: +256 772 976544</p>

Appendix II: Agenda and Programme

Entebbe 2016: Advancing a global work programme on rights-based approaches for fisheries

Agenda and Programme

Day 1: Tuesday, 1 March 2016 – Identifying common ground

Time	Agenda	Moderator/ Speaker	Remarks
8:00 – 9:00	Registration		
9:00 – 9:30	Opening and welcome remarks	LVFO FAO	
9:30-9:45	Purpose of meeting	Rebecca Metzner	
9:45 – 10:30	Coffee Break and photo session		
10:30 – 12:30	<p>Terminology – towards common understanding of concepts and terminology used in tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries.</p> <p>Presentation on terminology as used in the VGGT (20’) Presentation on terminology as used in 2015 version of Technical Guide on the VGGT (20’) Plenary-panel discussion</p>	Wordsworth Larbi Paul Macgillivray and Dubravka Bojic Paul Macgillivray et al. / <i>Chair and moderator: Godfrey Monor.</i>	
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 – 15:30	<p>Continuation of the terminology session: breakout groups discuss and review terminology and concepts used in tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries.</p>		Groups organize according to lists distributed by LVFO. The groups select one facilitator and one note-taker. FAO will take back-up notes. The facilitator chosen by the group will present back to plenary. The groups will review and discuss Part 1 of the 2016 Tech. Guide. The note-taker will use a PC to write-down proposed changes directly in the document.
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee		
16:00 – 17:00	<p>Session on Lake Victoria, tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries. Presentation: “Lake Victoria as a pilot project using the VGGT and SSF Guidelines – where we are, what is missing, and where we want to go”. Panel: Q & A on fisheries tenure at Lake Victoria</p>	Godfrey Monor LVFO/ <i>Chair and moderator: Rebecca Metzner</i>	
17:00	Close of day		

Day 2: Wednesday, 2 March 2016 – Revising a draft work programme on tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries (I)

Time	Agenda	Moderator/ Speaker	Remarks
8:30 – 10:00	Reporting back -Terminology Session Day I		15' for groups to report back and 15' for Q&A with group representatives.
10:00 – 10:30	Coffee Break		
10:30 – 11:30	Skeleton draft work programme Presentation of skeleton draft work programme on tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries, including how it was developed and why. Plenary Q&A to the FoUR panel	Rebecca Metzner (FAO) Friends of UserRights 2015members/ <i>Chair and moderator: Rhoda Tumwebaze</i>	Clarify purpose of this session and following session on areas of work with regard to the work program.
11:30 – 12:00	Presentation on Political Economy and Governance in the Context of the Work Programme Presentation SEA SALT	Dubravka Bojic Jessica Landman	
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch		
13:00 – 14:50	Going into key areas: work session 1: Political Economy and Governance		Facilitated breakout groups. Review, identify potential gaps and revise this module of the work programme. Prioritize activities within key area of work for (1) FAO and (2) other institutions/ organizations.
14:50 – 15:00	Synthesize and finalize to prepare to report back on work session 1.		
15:00 – 15:20	Coffee Break		
15:20 – 16:00	Report back from work session 1	<i>Chair and moderator: Lena Westlund</i>	10' report back/ group incl. Q&A
16:00 – 17:00	Legal frameworks of different Rights including Q & A	Adam Soliman	
17:30	Close of Day		

Day 3: Thursday, 3 March 2016 – *Revising a draft work programme on tenure and rights-based approaches for fisheries (II)*

Time	Agenda	Moderator/ Speaker	Remarks
8:30 – 9:45	<p>Going into key areas of work session 2:</p> <p>The Delineation of Rights and Processes for doing so</p> <p>+ Synthesize and finalize to prepare for reporting back</p>		<p>Facilitated breakout groups.</p> <p>Review, identify potential gaps and revise these modules of the work programme.</p> <p>Prioritize activities within key areas of work for (1) FAO and (2) other institutions/ organizations.</p>
10:00 – 12:30	Field Trip Local Landing Side		Meeting in Lobby 10:00 sharp
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch		
13:30 – 14:45	<p>Going into key areas of work session 3:</p> <p>International User Rights and Tenure</p> <p>+ Synthesize and finalize to prepare for reporting back</p>		<p>Facilitated breakout groups.</p> <p>Review, identify potential gaps and revise these modules of the work programme.</p> <p>Prioritize activities within key areas of work for (1) FAO and (2) other institutions/ organizations.</p>
14:45 – 15:00	Coffee break		
15:00 – 16:00	Report back from working session 2 &3	<i>Chair and moderator: Lena Westlund</i>	10' report back/ group incl. Q&A
16:00 – 17:30	<p>Going into key areas of work session 4:</p> <p>Enhancement and diversification of Livelihoods</p> <p>+ Synthesize and finalize to prepare for reporting back</p>		<p>Facilitated breakout groups.</p> <p>Review, identify potential gaps and revise these modules of the work programme.</p> <p>Prioritize activities within key areas of work for (1) FAO and (2) other institutions/ organizations.</p>
17:00	Close of day		

Day 4: Friday, 4 March 2016 – *Identifying synergies for financing regional dimension of a skeleton draft work programme*

Time	Agenda	Moderator/ Speaker	Remarks
08:30 – 09:00	Reporting Back Session 4	Anika Seggel	
09:00 – 10:00	Working Session 5: Capacity Development		
10:00 – 10:30	Coffee		
10:30 – 11:15	Reporting Back Session 5 on Capacity Development	Anika Seggel	
11:15 – 12:00	FAO Presentation and plenary discussion on final work programme	Lena Westlund	
12:00 – 13:00	Connecting to the global: regional perspectives on the work programme.		<p>Facilitated breakout groups.</p> <p>Examples from all regions where participants believe the contents of one (or more) of the 5 modules could help/ empower them and their fisheries.</p> <p>Participants are requested to consider practical realities of example cases (e.g. already existent initiatives, finances, legal, political factors).</p> <p>Please assign yourself to one of the three working groups (1. Asia, 2. Southern America and the Caribbean and 3. Africa)</p>
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 – 15:00	Reporting back on regional perspectives	Regional group reporters on panel	15' per group (incl. Q & A)
15:00 – 15:30	Presentation IFAD Projects including Q & A	Richard Abila	
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee		
16:00 – 17:00	Stepping forward: Tactics for getting this programme of work through COFI and off the ground	Johan Williams	
17:00 – 17:30	Closing remarks	Rebecca Metzner Johan Williams	
17:30	Close of workshop	LVFO/FAO	

Appendix III: Working Group Members Entebbe 2016

Working Groups *Entebbe 2016*

Group A

1. Mitchell Lay
2. Ragnar Arnason
3. Nancy Gitonga
4. Wordsworth Larbi
5. Godfrey Monor
6. Joyce Nyeko
7. Kihui Solomon
8. Anika Seggel

Group B

1. René Schärer
2. Adam Soliman
3. Jessica Landman
4. Kaitira Katonda
5. Rodrick Kundu
6. Nelly Isyagi
7. Johan Williams
8. MaryElisabeth Miller
9. Chiguk Ahn

Group C

1. Terrence Phillips
2. Robert Arthur
3. Mapfumo Blessing
4. Richard Abila
5. Dubravka Bojic
6. Rhoda Tumwebaze
7. Erick Salazar
8. Rebecca Metzner
9. Andrew Baio

Group D

1. Claudio Baigun
2. Paul Macgillivray
3. Khim Kaing
4. Birane Sambe
5. Papa Gora Ndiaye
6. Yassine Skandrani
7. Samson Abura
8. Lena Westlund