

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

**Information filled by the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICSF)
Voluntary report on implementation of the Programme of Work on Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity**

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
1.1 To apply appropriate policy instruments and strategies, including building of capacity, for the effective implementation of IMCAM	SOUTH AFRICA: BENEFIT is a New Partnership for Africa's Development. (NEPAD) partnership programme Involving South Africa, Namibia and Angola, and funded by Norwegian and Canadian governments,	SOUTH AFRICA: South Africa has implemented the following legislative and institutional strategies: Marine Living Resources Act (18 of 1998) which includes provision for declaration of Marine Protected Areas, the Protected Areas Act (57 of 2003), the Biodiversity Act (10 of 2004), the the National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998). A forthcoming Act, the Integrated Coastal Management Act will increase co-ordination on this issue at provincial level. Provinces have also developed policies around integrated coastal management and are currently developing their own legislation in accordance with national acts. A Directorate: Integrated Coastal Management and	SOUTH AFRICA: Although legislation is in place, SA does not yet have a coherent, overall policy for implementation of IMCAM or strategy for co-ordinating work on this; Legislation does not explicitly protect the rights of small-scale fishers or protect their rights to preferential access to resources upon which they depend for their livelihoods; Small-scale fisheries is a neglected area within this directorate Policy on the implications of IMCAM for small-scale fishing communities is not a priority	SOUTH AFRICA: Training for representatives from fishworker organisations in legislative and policy frameworks Training for staff on the implications of the policy for small-scale fisheries is required Training for staff in applying a human rights based approach to IMCAM is required

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
		<p>Development is in place at the national level. Each of the coastal provinces has a coastal management unit.</p> <p>SA has adopted the Benguela Fisheries Interaction Training (BENEFIT) Programme and the Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem (BCLME) Programme. BENEFIT aims to train staff and conduct fisheries and other marine scientific investigations.</p>		
1.2: To undertake direct action to protect the marine environment from negative impacts	SOUTH AFRICA: Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities	SOUTH AFRICA: Legislative framework has been developed	SOUTH AFRICA: Lack of co-ordination between different tiers of government	SOUTH AFRICA: Capacity building for national, provincial and local government officials
1.3 To develop guidelines for ecosystem evaluation and assessment, paying attention to the need to identify and select indicators, including social and abiotic indicators that distinguish between natural and human-induced effects	SOUTH AFRICA: Partnership with WWF has been established, funding from FAO has been provided	SOUTH AFRICA: In its infancy – WWF have developed guidelines for ecosystems approach	SOUTH AFRICA: New area and still a lack of understanding. Narrow natural fisheries science perspective dominates	SOUTH AFRICA: Senior management do not have capacity in this area

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
2.1: to promote ecosystem approaches to the conservation and sustainable use of resources, including the identification of key variables or interactions, for the purpose of assessing and monitoring, first, components of biological diversity; second, the sustainable use of such components; and third, ecosystem effects	SOUTH AFRICA: Partnership with WWF and funding from FAO for EAF risk assessments	SOUTH AFRICA: Work has begun on this. EAF Risk Assessments have been conducted on 4 of SA's commercial fisheries and this process will be extended MEXICO: In Mexico no studies exist to understand this approach making it difficult to understand and apply the ecosystem approach	SOUTH AFRICA: Quite good data available on ecological components but not social or human dimensions MEXICO: Conventional orientation in science	SOUTH AFRICA: Capacity building on social indicators urgently required MEXICO: Promote capacity-building programmes in all universities and for stakeholders
2.2: To make available to the Parties information on marine genetic resources in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction and, as appropriate, on coastal and marine genetic resources under national jurisdiction from publicly available information sources.		MEXICO: Since 2001 there is a National Information System through the North American Environmental Council	MEXICO: High costs and low capacity in putting together information on marine genetic resources (there are more in terrestrial genetic resources)	
2.3: To gather and assimilate information on, build capacity to mitigate the effects of, and to promote policy development, implementation strategies and actions to address: 1) the biological and socio-economic consequences of physical degradation and		SOUTH AFRICA: In 2005 the Department completed the Development of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. This Strategy and Action Plan was based on an assessment of South Africa's biodiversity context which included a national scale spatial assessment	SOUTH AFRICA: Do not have rapid response capacity or early warning systems in place yet This assessment did not include an assessment of sustainable use	SOUTH AFRICA: Training and capacity building to assess socio-economic effects – and extent of, and impacts on sustainable use by indigenous and local communities

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
destruction of key marine and coastal habitats including mangrove ecosystems, tropical and cold-water coral-reef ecosystems, seamount ecosystems, and seagrass ecosystems including identification and promotion of management practices, methodologies and policies to reduce and mitigate impacts upon marine and coastal biological diversity and to restore mangrove forests and rehabilitate coral reef and in particular,ii) the impacts of mangrove forests destruction, coral bleaching, and related mortality on coral-reef ecosystems and the human communities which depend upon coral reef services, including through financial and technical assistance		(National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment – NSBA) with a marine component. This was also the first time that an ecosystems approach was used to assess the status of biodiversity. This spatial biodiversity assessment of the marine environment indicated that 65% of South Africa’s 34 marine biozones are threatened, with 12 % assessed as critically endangered, 15% endangered, 38% vulnerable and 35 % least threatened.		
		MEXICO: To a very small extent in the Mesoamerican Coral Reef	MEXICO: Focus is on developing a biological understanding of coral reef ecosystems	MEXICO: Workshops on interdisciplinary methodologies
2.4: To enhance the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity of marine living resources in	SOUTH AFRICA: FAO, SADC, NEPAD	SOUTH AFRICA: BCLME project with Namibia and Angola Promotes co-ordination in		

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction		areas beyond EEZ Joint training of compliance and enforcement staff within SADC region has been undertaken		
3.1: To establish and strengthen national and regional systems of marine and coastal protected areas integrated into a global network and as a contribution to globally agreed goals	INDIA: Government of India	INDIA: A) There is no single legislation or policy that specifically addresses the issue of marine protected areas in India. Protected areas, including marine protected areas, are covered under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972. Reports of the Government of India mention the need to increase the area under MPAs, but they do not form part of any specific plan or policy initiative. Existing MPAs are also not part of any specific network. While the National Board of Wildlife has a subcommittee on Marine issues, to look at existing and future MPAs MPAs. MPAs are also not explicitly part of fisheries management plans. Though the Wildlife	INDIA: Community participation in MPA planning and implementation remains minimal despite some provisions for the same in the Wildlife (Protection) Act. The process for settling rights of communities have not been completed, and few measures to protect the occupational and livelihood interests of fishing communities have been taken. Community-led initiatives for conservation are not recognized or supported. Lack of community participation remains a barrier to strengthening the system of MPAs.	INDIA: Need to train fisheries and forest department officials to be sensitive to social issues of community participation and to take into consideration existing legal provisions that provide spaces for participation, while designating new MPAs and in existing MPAs.

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
		(Protection) Act makes provision for conservation and community reserves, where communities can participate right from the point of designation of the reserve, there is no initiative taken to re-designate existing areas or make similar provisions in other categories of PAs, so that the conflict between local fishing communities and authorities is minimized. A community reserve is being proposed in Lakshadweep islands, and this could be a pilot.		
	SOUTH AFRICA: FAO, SWIOFC, SADC, NEPAD as well as NGOs such as WWF	SOUTH AFRICA: South Africa has met inshore targets to date and a full network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) has been compiled, which informs future proclamation of MPAs, with specific emphasis on offshore MPAs.	SOUTH AFRICA: Policy is not developed with public participation Specific implications for small-scale fishing communities not assessed	SOUTH AFRICA: National policy needs to be developed through a participatory process
		MEXICO: High level of implementation since 2004		MEXICO: Workshops with fishing sector including industrial and private sector
3.2: To enhance the		No information available		

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in marine areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction				
3.3: To achieve effective management of existing marine and coastal protected areas	INDIA: Government, Research institutes (Wildlife Institute of India), and NGOs	<p>INDIA: In the Indian context, the recent amendments to the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972, provide an inclusive approach to protected area management, calling for advisory committees to be set up for sanctuaries, and inclusion of communities in management of protected area categories.</p> <p>The Wildlife Action Plan of India lays out the various principles that are required for management, and calls for effective management of PAs, ensuring people's participation, and setting up participatory management committees for each PAs, with guidelines for local community involvement in the different management zones of PAs and adjacent areas.</p>	<p>INDIA: Most MPAs do not have management plans developed for the last few years, and recent efforts to develop such plans have highlighted that the process has not been consultative, as fishing communities living near these areas were not involved.</p> <p>Lack of co-ordination between the various institutional structures involved in implementing the provisions of PAs.</p> <p>There is no information on the number of people who are affected by conservation measures, especially gender-segregated statistical information.</p>	<p>INDIA: Officials need to be trained in preparing participatory management plans.</p> <p>Need to train communities to understand the importance of marine and coastal biodiversity and the potential role of protected area in protecting biodiversity. This would enhance their level of participation in monitoring and enforcement of protected area.</p>
	SOUTH AFRICA: WWF	SOUTH AFRICA: Training Course for managers has been	SOUTH AFRICA: No training for civil society and	SOUTH AFRICA: Training on policy implemented for

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
		developed and implemented	fishing organizations available Training biased towards ecological aspects, neglects social impacts and processes	both civil society stakeholders and all tiers of government
		MEXICO: Management effectiveness in general remains low to medium.	MEXICO: Economic interest and cultural barriers	MEXICO: Need to implement business orientation in productive sector
3.4: To provide support for and facilitate monitoring of national and regional systems of marine and coastal protected areas	INDIA: WII, Government of India	INDIA: No single system to support and monitor all the existing MCPAs in India, especially as there is no clear definition of an MPA	INDIA: There is no clear provision for monitoring of MPAs. The focus is primarily on undertaking technical studies to gauge the impact of setting up MCPAs. Time series data on the biological and social impact of conservation measures are not available.	Training is required for government officials to undertake regular social and economic monitoring of fishing communities in MPA areas
3.5: To facilitate research and monitoring activities that reflect identified global knowledge gaps and priority information needs of management of marine and coastal protected areas	INDIA: WII and Government of India	INDIA: The National Wildlife Action Plan (2006-2016) calls for better research and monitoring facilities of all PAs, integrated multi-disciplinary research encompassing scientific and socio-economic aspects.	INDIA: There are no comprehensive long term studies to understand the social consequences of MPA implementation for fishing communities in India.	INDIA: Research institutes specializing in socio-economic issues need to work with Government officials, NGOs and local fishing communities to undertake studies and for monitoring purposes.
		SOUTH AFRICA: Research has been initiated	SOUTH AFRICA: Fishing communities not included in research systematically	SOUTH AFRICA: Training in socio-economic indicators for research is required

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
			Bias towards biological/ecological aspects and neglect of socio-economic issues	
			MEXICO: Research has been undertaken by only one or two institutions strongly related with government	
4.1: To promote use of techniques, which minimize adverse impacts of mariculture on marine and coastal biological diversity	SOUTH AFRICA: FAO, NEPAD	SOUTH AFRICA: Regional NEPAD policy has been developed and conferences hosted to promote work on these issues Policies on mariculture/ aquaculture and ranching have been developed and address these concerns	SOUTH AFRICA: This is a new area with limited expertise and experience in SA	SOUTH AFRICA: Further research capacity required, particularly for historically disadvantaged coastal communities
		MEXICO: Start has been made in north pacific states	MEXICO: High cost of techniques but some start has been made by the private sector	MEXICO: Capacity building of private and industrial sector needed
5.1: To achieve better understanding of the pathways and the causes of the introduction of alien species and the impacts of such introductions on	SOUTH AFRICA: IMO/UNEP/UNDP			

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
biological diversity				
5.2: To put in place mechanisms to control all pathways, including shipping, trade, and mariculture, for potential invasive alien species in the marine and coastal environment				
5.3: To maintain an incident list on introductions of alien species				
6.1: To assemble a database of initiatives on programme elements through a cooperative approach, with relevant organizations and bodies, with special emphasis on integrated marine and coastal areas management	SOUTH AFRICA: SADC and NEPAD regional approach	SOUTH AFRICA: No, very adhoc approach although increasing efforts in this regard in the past 18 months		
	MEXICO: National Institute of Ecology in Mexico, National Commission of the Use of Biodiversity	MEXICO: A database was initiated in 2001, but the effort is limited to academic sector (governmental institutions)	MEXICO: The highly centralized information does not permit the dissemination to/ participation of other stakeholders	
6.2: To undertake effective collaboration, cooperation and harmonization of initiatives with relevant conventions, organizations and agencies while recognizing their independent mandates	SOUTH AFRICA: FAO, SADC	SOUTH AFRICA: Some co-operation happens within and through SADC, SWIOFC, NEPAD and BCLME initiatives. Co-ordination is still lacking on issues related to the social and economic impact on small-scale	SOUTH AFRICA: Lack of recognition of small-scale fishers rights in SA impedes effective collaboration and co-ordination	SOUTH AFRICA: Training on aspects of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries that pertain to small-scale fisheries is required for government officials

INTERNATIONAL COLLECTIVE IN SUPPORT OF FISHWORKERS
PROGRAMME OF WORK ON MARINE AND COASTAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Operational objectives of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII/5)	Partners identified in the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity (annex I of decision VII.5)	Progress made in implementation	Barriers to implementation	Priorities for capacity building to address the barriers
		communities.		

Note: This information has been compiled by ICSF based on studies and information compiled in South Africa by Masifundise Development Trust, Mexico by Julia Fraga and in India by ICSF case studies undertaken in five MPAs (Gulf of Mannar National Park, Gahirmatha (marine) wildlife sanctuary, Sundarbans tiger reserve, Malvan (marine) wildlife sanctuary and Jamnagar Marine National Park and Wildlife Sanctuary).

Fraga, Julia and Ana Jesus. 2008. Coastal and Marine Protected Areas in Mexico. Chennai, International Collective in Support of Fishworkers. 79p.

Sunde , Jackie and Moenieba Isaacs . 2008. Marine Conservation and Coastal Communities: Who Carries the Costs?: A Study of Marine Protected Areas and Their Impact on Traditional Small-scale Fishing Communities in South Africa. Chennai, International Collective in Support of Fishworkers. 49p.

Rajagopalan, Ramya. 2008. Marine Protected Areas in India. Chennai, International Collective in Support of Fishworkers. 69p.