

THE NORWEGIAN FISHERY FORUM 2010.
7th APRIL 2010

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

By Permanent Secretary Jørn Krog:

The Royal Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs

Outline

- Division of responsibility between the MFA and the MFCA
- Background scenario: significance of the fisheries sector and current management challenges
- The new sectoral agenda: from find and catch to ecosystem management
- The new intersectoral agenda: Holistic and integrated approaches –marine spatial planning – The international framework of FAO, UNEP, IMO and others
- Conclusion: Norwegian core competence and contributions in sustainable fisheries management and ocean governance

Introduction

My intervention will firstly focus on the importance of fisheries in global food supply. Secondly I will pin point some trends which are, from my Ministry's point of view, likely to get a more prominent ranking on the development policy agenda. I will particularly give attention to some new normative trends which will affect the conducting of fisheries activities globally. Let me however firstly set out with a few opening remarks as to my Ministry's role within this area.

Division of responsibility between Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs.(MFCA)

Assistance to the development of fisheries in developing countries supplied by Norway goes, as we know, back to the 1950ies. Fisheries were indeed the initial domain for government supported development.

Development aid has been an important foreign policy area and the responsibility is consequently trusted *the Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. The policy formulation, implementation and operations of bilateral development assistance within the fisheries and aquaculture sectors are today separated from the portfolio of the *Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs*.

However, as far as international fisheries and aquaculture policy issues are concerned, the *Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs* is practically in the driver's seat. FAO, in particular *Committee of Fisheries* and the *Sub- Committee on Aquaculture* and the *Sub- Committee Trade*, and the *Codex Alimentarius* are the major arenas where policy formulation and standards for implementation are set – and consequently affect, to varying degrees, the situation in developing countries.

Most policy areas in Norway are, as in all other countries, designed to serve national interests and objectives. This connection is not true as far as Norwegian bilateral (land- to land)) assistance concerns. The overall development policy objective is directed at the advancement of economic growth and poverty reduction in developing countries. Consequently Norway's development assistance is not conditioned by any reciprocity clauses backing Norwegians investments in the recipient country's fishing industry.

It is an interesting question to what degree there is a conflict between these two sets of objectives, whether they can be reconciled, and what are the tradeoffs in such an attempt of reconciliation. In this context it is also interesting to discuss developments in the roles and relationship between the two ministries and the interface between fisheries policy and fisheries development assistance.

The *Report No. 13 (2008-2009) to the Storting (Parliament) Climate, Conflict and Capital* says that "...Norway shall make contributions to better coordination and effectiveness in relevant international institutional settings for better governance of ocean and marine resources..." This position is also underscored in the *Report No 15 (2008-2009) on Main Directions on Foreign Policy (Interests, responsibility and possibilities)*. One major goal is to strengthen a holistic and coherent approach in the authorities' handling of foreign policy issues.

This new approach is in fact driven by the shift in development assistance from supporting micro-level projects to more program based and macro level directed assistance. At the same time the pressure and demand on fisheries and aquaculture are very challenging as to adjust to high global standards and regimes for sustainable fisheries. What we now witness are an ever closer integration between the fisheries policy agenda and the policy development agenda.

This trend compels both the industry and managers to apply an ever more long term and global outlook on their business conduct. The problem is, however, whereas the fishing industry in the developed world relatively easy can adapt to the requirements of the new global standards, this situation is not or only modestly reflected in the developing world. However, if this may seem to represent a competitive advantage for producers in the developed countries, this is not necessarily so: non-compliance and irresponsible fisheries tarnish the image of the entire global business, and hence is a problem for all.

The background scenario

Concern about the contributions of fish to global food security and the role of trade in achieving this area is of surprisingly recent origin on the global scale. In 2004 the report *Responsible fish trade and food security (FAO Technical paper 456)*, sponsored by the Norwegian the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and FAO was published.

The report examined international trade in fishery products and the impact on food security in two ways: (a) indirectly, as a source of livelihood through employment and revenue generated by the fisheries sector; and (b) directly, in the form of fish as food. Allow me to present a few highlights from the report:

On the significance of fish as food:

- Fish products are among the most widely traded foods, with more than 37% by volume of world production trades internationally
- Fish (including shellfish) provides essential nutrition for 3 billion people.
- Provide at least 50% of animal protein and minerals to 400 million people in the poorest countries.

I would also like to add reference to the many reports on the many positive health effects on fish in the diet in both developed and developing countries

On the significance of fisheries as source of livelihood:

- Over 500 million people in developing countries depend, directly or indirectly, from fisheries and aquaculture for their livelihoods (FAO).

With regard to this point I think it is very important to make a distinction between the *low tech, small scale, and subsistence fisheries sector*, and *the high tech, commercial and more industrial fisheries*. While the small scale sector often serve as a form of cheap social security net, the commercial sector has the potential to contribute positively to the national economy. And let me remind you that aquaculture worldwide is growing at a pace of 7% annually.

Needless to say, however, we all know the profitability and contribution from fisheries to the national economy in any fishing nation depends on sound resource management and an economic framework conducive to business development. Unfortunately we witness that many fish stocks are, particularly in the southern hemisphere, in poor condition and in no way near the MSY harvesting potential – reflecting the standard agreed in the Johannesburg Millennium goals.

The blame for this problematic situation is simply mismanagement in various forms such as policy failures, over-fishing, unsustainable fishing methods, poor legal instruments, lack of enforcement, external exploitation, pollution, IUU fisheries etc. Food quality standards are also in many countries below acceptable levels, and aquaculture production practices are not always sustainable (e. g. scampi in South-East Asia-Salmon in Chile)

The new sectoral agenda

The red line through the history of modern fisheries management has been to capitalize value adding to the resource in order to increase the economic benefit. For a long time the main task was to identify and catch as much fish as possible. As a consequence many developing as well as developed countries are experiencing depletion of the fish stocks harvesting potential.

Fishery resource depletion and aquatic ecosystem degradation in many developing countries are, according to FAO, closely associated with species that have become highly traded in the international market. We find, as you know, a multi-faceted interplay of causes which can be offered to explain this situation. I leave the issue here.

We have however come to realize that fisheries management issues are to be taken well beyond the framework of being an *internal* fishing industry business affair. *Ecosystem based fisheries management* is now seen as a key to ensure sustainable fisheries worldwide, but is sizable more costly and demanding to implement compared to the “simple find and catch”-approach which was the point of departure for modern fisheries management. It is increasingly also becoming a standard demand for the public, consumers, and international NGO's

Coupled with the demand for sophisticated management of fisheries and aquaculture regimes there is also a growing demand for *ecolabeling and traceability of seafood products*. The consumers want to know when and where the fish was caught, and whether it was caught legally or not. Importers request attestation validating the seafood as safe and originates from sustainable fisheries.

While this development may have contributed to plugging the loopholes for unsustainable fisheries and the menace of IUU worldwide, it may also serve as a de facto technical barrier to trade

It is apparent that the developed fishing nations are much better equipped in terms of scientific knowledge and financial resources to implement this approach to their fisheries industry.

For many developing countries the challenge of implementing such an approach may seem insurmountable, and they are about to be left behind in the evolution of fisheries management models. A recent study has shown that only a few countries worldwide have adapted and implemented to the new managements standard at a reasonable scale.

The new intersectoral agenda

Fishing and maritime transport industries have traditionally been the primary and privileged user of oceans. This situation has changed radically. The growing activity in new and profitable fields such as oil and gas extraction, ocean windmills, transport of oil etc. must be regulated and coordinated with more traditional activities.

We observe conflicts are surfacing and create problems for politicians, managers, scientists, stakeholders and opinion makers. Different industrial activities in, on, at, under and by the oceans and the seas make demand on aerial space. A balance must be struck between the various interests involved.

New actors and new perceptions of challenges facing mankind globally have increasingly, as we now can observe, forced and generated imperatives to move the fisheries management and ocean governance in new directions. The claiming of more holistic and integrated and intersectoral approaches and institutional arrangements follows as a consequence.

On the national level this development is characterized by increasingly complex, yet also ever more formalized structures for co-management of the oceans by the various line ministries. A case in point is the Norwegian Barents Sea Management Plan, The Norwegian Sea Management Plan, and the North Sea Management Plan which is under preparation.

There is in Norway and other Nordic countries a vibrant debate on whether such plans could form the blueprint for future ocean management structures, or whether an overarching authority for ocean management would be a better alternative.

UN-agencies cooperation

On the international level *a new architecture* affecting international ocean governance is emerging. Today ocean governance is by and large built on three **UN** institutional pillars: *FAO*, *UNEP* (United Nations Environmental Programme) and *IMO* (International Maritime Organization). Their interdependence is growing. The need for holistic and integrated management in many areas transform the relationship between these key institutions at international and regional levels.

This will not necessarily turn out to be a seamless adaptation. We find examples where regional bodies see their mandate in new perspectives. One actual emerging issue is *OSPAR* (a regional branch of UNEP) apparent interest to trespass the *NEAFC* (North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission – a FAO Regional Management Organization) mandate to give advice on fisheries management.

This development may be seen as an inconvenient intrusion in the well established fisheries management machinery. However we also have to realize that conflicts of interest between users have to be solved or harmonized by opening new avenues for cooperation. The issue of establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPA) and IUU fishing can illuminate what I have in mind.

Marine Protected Areas (MPA)

One of the real bones of contention between the fisheries and environmental sectors is the striking of the line between - on the one hand to see the ocean and sea as a source of food security and livelihood and - on the other hand appraise the value of marine biodiversity. UNEP (well supported by NGOs) has strongly advocated establishment of *marine protected areas* (MPAs) in the worlds oceans and seas in support of this position Fisheries biologists and oceanographers have disagreed on the scale, location and value of MPAs.

One recent and interesting example of cross institutional cooperation between *FAO* and *UNEP*, is the ongoing process between these institutions aiming at developing joint guidelines for establishment of MPAs. The *FAO* and *UNEP* joint effort will hopefully be conducive to better and less contested decision-making as better and consensual criteria of selection of MPAs can enable the striking of a better sustainable distribution of wealth economic.

Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) Fisheries - Compliance and enforcement.

The curbing IUU fisheries is of decisive value to developing countries as IUU activities pose a severe threat to the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development. Markets, small and large, are severely impacted as a consequence of this kind of criminal activity.

The gravity of what we are talking about was eminently illuminated by Dr. A. Iyambo, Minister of Fisheries and Marine Resources in Namibia, in a speech he delivered in 2008. According to Dr. Iyambo an estimate indicate that IUU fishing was costing sub-Sahara over US\$ 1 billion per year. By putting figures on the issue, we can have some idea of (quote Iyambo) *"...the enormity of the problem...Illegal fishing distorts fisheries statistics and trade thus sabotaging management decisions...This destructive activity also undermines fish conservation efforts and sustainability of regimes..."*

As you may know, Norway has tried to encourage this work, which we see as a natural extension of the work done in NEAFC during recent years. IUU fishing in this area is by no means the only or the most serious in the world. The emerging trends in the North Atlantic can demonstrate the increasing importance of the global instrument.

Reliance on the implementation of flag State duties to prevent IUU fishing has proved to be insufficient, and enhanced port State control is thus crucial in combating IUU fishing. Cooperation between *FAO* and *IMO* is mandatory in this regard.

In recent years the importance of coordinated port State measures has been recognized by regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) and through the adoption of a globally binding agreement on Port State Measures in *FAO*. Such a cost-efficient approach to control and enforcement is particularly useful for developing countries firstly because all harvested fish must be landed at some point and secondly that the use of such measures do not entail substantial resources compared to for instance inspections at sea.

FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) has adopted voluntary instrument (the *FAO Model Scheme*) describing basic and minimum port State measures for subsequent regional implementation.

The *South East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (SEAFO)* and the *General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)* already have adopted schemes heavily influenced by the *FAO*

Model Scheme, while work is going on or under consideration in tuna organizations such as the *International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas* (ICCAT) and the *Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission* (WCPFC). The *Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living resources* (CCAMLR) has adopted a range of port State measures to track landings and the flow of trade of Patagonian toothfish.

Conclusion – how can Norway contribute?

Unfortunately fisheries and aquaculture development assistance have for various reasons not been high neither on the international nor the national agenda. This image must be changed. So - what are our interests, key experiences and areas of expertise?

Norway has and can offer (with the limits of demand and personnel capacity) relevant and valuable expertise within areas like:

- Research and education
- Regional cooperation on fisheries and ocean management
- Aquaculture policy and regulations
- Safety at sea for small vessel
- Seafood safety, ecolabeling and tracking
- Overcapacity and fishing fleet regulations
- Co-management and participation by the fishing industry
- Coastal Zone Management and emergency preparedness
- Fisheries and aquaculture technology

Norway enjoys trust and confidence internationally. Our technologically advanced fisheries and aquaculture sector and sophisticated scientific and legal framework supporting this sector are a benchmark for many developing countries. My Ministry has been contacted during the past 10 years by roughly 20-25 countries seeking for cooperation to establish new platforms and/or expansion of the technology oriented branch of their fisheries and aquaculture sectors. Here we undoubtedly find an underutilized potential which should be open international markets for our supporting national industries.

Norway's extensive experience and knowledge on how to operate with and influence the international agenda on fisheries issues can be expanded. Norway's timely support in 2005 of the *World Bank Profish initiative* addressed the crucial issue of how the developing nations should identify and tackle the most critical issues to lift the sectors. So far as I am informed, however few – if any- outcomes or impacts have materialized from the Bank. The *World Bank* has neglected policy initiatives and investments in the marine and aquatic fishery sectors for years. Now however the WB apparently is giving internal institutional strength to serve the sectors by employing fisheries experts. A redressing is apparently underway.

Norway should, in my mind, continue to strengthen *FAO* and *the World Bank* by providing general support to their fisheries related works. We should also encourage cooperation and strengthening partnerships between Norwegian institutions and these two organizations. I also believe that our experience with *ocean governance* as manifested in the recently developed management plans for our seas could be relevant for many fisheries nations. Our national experience aimed at combating IUU fishing could probably also be relevant for others. As you may know legal and policy formulation experts from the Ministry or its subordinate bodies has been seconded or granted leave of absence in order to assist with legal framework and policy development in several countries. This practice could and should be further explored and developed.

Thank you so much for your listening. I hope my intervention will provide some input for your deliberations today and tomorrow.