



# Fisheries development issues and their impacts on the livelihoods of fishing communities in West-Africa: An overview

Christophe Béné<sup>1</sup> and Arthur E. Neiland<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for the Economics and Management of Aquatic Resources (CEMARE), Depart. of Economics, University of Portsmouth, Locksway Road Southsea PO4 8JF, U.K.. <sup>2</sup>Institute for the Sustainable Development of Aquatic Resources (IDDRA), Portsmouth Technopole, Kingston Crescent Portsmouth PO2 8FA, U.K.  
email:christophe.bene@port.ac.uk or neiland@iddra.org

Received 18 November 2002, accepted 10 January 2003.

## Abstract

Fisheries (in particular small-scale fisheries) provide a vital source of food, employment, and economic well-being for rural people throughout the world. In West Africa several million households along the coast and also inland are critically dependent on fishing for their livelihoods. However, fishing communities are often characterised as being amongst “the poorest of the poor”. The main objective of this paper is to review the major issues relating to the development and management of small-scale fisheries in West Africa and to examine their impacts on the livelihoods of the fisheries-dependent communities of the region. Several major issues are identified, discussed and briefly illustrated using numerical examples or extracts of official documents. Globally, it appears that the fisheries sector, despite its potential role as a powerful lever for poverty reduction, is often neglected by national or supra-national decision-makers. Since 1999, however, a number of international initiatives (sponsored by Donor Agencies) have attempted to overturn this negative perception.

**Key words:** Small-scale fisheries, west Africa, development policies, livelihoods, poverty.

## Introduction

The fact that fisheries provide a vital source of food, employment, trade and economic well-being for people throughout the world is widely recognised. In West Africa, several million households along the coast and also inland are critically dependent on fishing for their livelihoods. However, fishing communities have often been characterised as being amongst “the poorest of the poor”. Poverty in fishing communities is indeed a major and on-going issue which has been a focus for International Development Organisations over the last 50 years. The main objective of this paper is to review the major issues relating to the development and management of small-scale fisheries in West Africa and to examine their impacts on the livelihoods of the fisheries-dependent communities (FDCs)<sup>†</sup> of the region<sup>‡</sup> (<sup>†</sup> In this review, the term “fisheries-dependent communities” (FDCs) is used in a broad sense and includes any group (family, village, community, etc.) whose livelihoods is partially or totally dependent on fisheries-related activities (fishing, processing, trading, packing, boat or gear retailing or repairing, etc.). This therefore includes individuals involved in full-time professional fishing activities, full-time or part-time crew members, but also (women) processors or traders, retailers, seasonal –or even opportunistic–river or floodplain agro-fisher communities, fish transporters, etc.);(<sup>‡</sup> In this review no distinction is made between coastal and inland (continental) fisheries, for the origin and causes of the problems affecting FDCs in West-Africa are sufficiently similar between the two types of fisheries).

The paper is structured as follows: The main information which underpins the review has been collated and summarised in one table (Table 1), the content of which is then explained more in depth in the rest of the paper. In order to keep the

whole review concise and focussed, the information has been synthesised very thoroughly. A series of boxes are placed throughout the text to illustrate its content using numerical examples or extracts of official documents.

## The Issues and Their Impacts on FDC Livelihoods

The issues relating to the development and management of small-scale fisheries in West-Africa are varied, complex and for the most, interdependent. Table 1 below attempts to summarise these issues. Column II characterises the nature of the issues and associated constraints (grouped into 8 ‘generic’ points initially listed in column I) and Column III highlights their specific implications in terms of FDC livelihoods and vulnerability to poverty. The rest of the paper presents in more detail the different points enumerated in Table 1. For clarity, the headings used for the following 8 sections correspond to the ‘generic’ points listed in column I of the table.

## Fisheries: an economic sector integrated into a wider system:

Although a significant proportion of the households who depend on fisheries in West Africa are still relying to some degree on a subsistence-based system, West African fisheries and their communities have not evolved in isolation. Today, the fishery, as an economic activity but also as a ‘social matrix’, is totally and irreversibly integrated into a wider system through local, regional and international socio-economic and commercial links<sup>1</sup>. Too often in the past, however, fisheries have been considered from a narrow sectoral perspective, where both the analysis of the issues and the policies proposed to address these issues were identified and conceived using a mono-sectoral approach<sup>2</sup>. Today both academics and –unfortunately still to a lesser extent– decision-makers have started to realise that the fishery sector can only

be considered as an integrated part of a more general socio-economic system.

This necessity to widen the analysis and the way policies are conceived, is also applicable to the problem of the reduction of poverty in FDCs. Until very recently, the general perception about the cause(s) and nature of poverty in FDCs has been (over)simplistic and essentially based on a Malthusian model. Poverty in FDCs was usually related to the open-access nature of the fisheries and assumed to derive from the following sequence of events: open access  $\rightarrow$  over-exploitation  $\rightarrow$  reduced catch  $\rightarrow$  low income = poverty<sup>3</sup>. Following recent progress made by the international community (donors, academics, practitioners) in analysing poverty, the perception of poverty in fisheries has dramatically evolved. It is now understood that the causes of poverty in FDCs have complex origins, are multi-dimensional, and are very often related to constraints which are not specific to the fisheries sector (Box 1).

**Box 1.** Poverty in FDCs: a multi-dimensional issue  
Recent field-based participatory assessments<sup>5-7</sup> conducted in Ivory Coast, Guinea and Senegal have shown that the main development constraints faced by FDCs are not related to the level of abundance of the resource but to the following factors:

- \* Shortage of infrastructure, in particular lack of roads
- \* Limited access to drinking water, sanitation and electricity
- \* Lack of schools, health infrastructure, and other social services
- \* Inadequacy of storage and cold-storage infrastructure for fisheries products
- \* Lack of communications equipment (e.g. phones lines)
- \* Lack of credit facilities

Poverty of FDCs cannot, therefore, be addressed exclusively through intra-sectoral approaches<sup>4</sup>. Poverty assessments, but also the actions aiming at poverty reduction in fisheries sector, must in contrast be designed and implemented through a multi (or trans)-sectoral approach.

**Different functions and contributions at different levels of the economy:** In West Africa, the fishery sector offers different contributions and plays different roles in local and national economies. Its role is crucial for many rural populations (often relatively isolated geographically) for which this activity represents the basis of their economic well-being, in terms of employment, incomes, and food security (Box 2)

**Box 2.** Fishery and food-security  
It is estimated that 19% of the protein intake of the developing countries in the World is provided by fish. This share can exceed 25% in the poorest countries, and up to 100% in isolated parts of coastal or inland areas (where river, floodplain or lake related fishing activities take place). For instance in West Africa, the proportion of animal protein consumed derived from marine products is 47% in Senegal, 62%, in Gambia and 63% in Sierra Leone and Ghana<sup>8,9</sup>.

But fisheries can also represent the central activity –or even the “activity of last resort” –for a large segment of urban households for which alternative activities may be rare or even lacking. Globally it is estimated that in West Africa more than 15 million people depend on this activity to ensure part, or the totality, of their daily income.

At the national level, the fishery sector also makes an important contribution to the economic development of West African countries. In some, the fisheries sector ranks first amongst the primary sector activities (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, etc.) in terms of GDP and is the premier export sector, ensuring a large part of government revenues (Box 3).

**Box 3.** Contribution of fisheries to the national West African economies.  
The contribution of the fisheries sector in Cape Verde stands at over 40% of export earnings and 5% of GDP. The decline of the mining industry and the lack of diversification of the Mauritanian economy created a situation where the fisheries sector alone accounts for approximately 25% of the State revenues and over 50% of export earnings. Senegal has revealed the extent to which fisheries are important to national development: some 600 000 people earn incomes and make their livelihoods from the fisheries sector, which has now become the premier export sector (almost 30% of total earnings)<sup>6,9</sup>.

For those countries highly dependent on fisheries, the development and viability of this sector has become a national priority, both economically and socially.

#### **Different Views and Perceptions, and Divergent Objectives**

The socio-economic importance of fisheries is acknowledged (to a certain extent) in numerous official documents and declarations made by West-African countries or regional institutions (Box 4).

**Box 4.** The recognition of the importance of fisheries for the livelihoods of people  
In its 2002-2010 Strategic Action Plan<sup>10</sup>, the Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission (SRFC) [composed of Cape Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, and Senegal] acknowledges: "The development of the fishery sector has been extremely important for the sub-region since the 70s. Nowadays, the sector strongly contributes to the economic and social development of the countries of the sub-region. It plays a crucial role in central domains such as food-security, employment and wealth, as well as the balance of payment of these countries" (p.4-5)

However, in reality, the fishery sector is often neglected by government decision-makers. Usually relegated in the national budget behind other economic sectors, fisheries –and in particular small-scale fisheries- do not often receive a high national priority. Limited or no budget at all, restricted or inadequate human resources, the discrepancy is large between the effective contributions of this sector to the local and national economies, on one hand, and the resources or budgets allocated by governments on the other. For illustration, in 1999, the annual budget (not including staff salaries) of the Chadian Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture (DPA) was 5 million CFA ( $\gg$  US\$ 7000) to ensure the functional and operational activities (monitoring, implementing, reinforcement) for the entire country<sup>11</sup>. One of the reasons for this neglect is that the contribution in terms of livelihoods and national well-being of fisheries is usually poorly understood at all levels (micro to macro). In fact, fisheries are often considered by national decision-makers purely and solely as an income-generating sector. This is particularly the

case for those countries which enter into Fisheries Agreements with other countries (Fisheries Agreements are commercial arrangements between Developing Countries and other countries, e.g. European countries, People's Republic of China, Korean, Japan) which allow the latter to exploit the coastal resources of the formers in return for financial compensation).

For illustration, in the 2000 version of their Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) <sup>12</sup>, the authorities of Mauritania (a country with significant fisheries agreements) explicitly recognised "As far as fisheries is concerned, the strategy of the government is to optimise the economic rent generated by this sector" (p. 21). At the same time, however, (and like the majority of the other West African coastal nations) Mauritania is calling for urgent actions to protect its national aquatic resources which appear to be declining rapidly, threatened by over-exploitation. Ironically, it is now recognised that this overexploitation is mainly due to the highly-subsidised foreign (Italian, Spanish, French) fleet which exploits the Mauritanian Exclusive Economic Zone under the Fisheries Agreements <sup>13</sup>. This example is, unfortunately, just one of the many contradictions which characterise the situation of West African fisheries. It illustrates, in particular, the increasing number of constraints and underlying issues of policy coherency that face governments (at the national level) and International Institutions (at the regional or international levels) <sup>14</sup>.

#### Weak and Ill-Adapted Institutions

In terms of management, the fisheries sector in West Africa is under the responsibility of a range of institutions, acting from the local to the national (or even supra-national) levels. The structures, roles, and objectives of these institutions appear, at best, redundant and overlapping, and at worse, contradictory and conflicting. These multiple layers of institutions and organisations make the overall functioning of the system particularly opaque (according to the actors themselves), inoperable and rigid, and not prepared for the constant adaptations imposed by the rapid ecological, economic and/or social changes affecting the sector.

The consequences of this incapacity to manage the whole system are serious, and particularly for those natural resources which appear to be increasingly over-exploited (Box 5). But the repercussions of these institutional malfunctions are also severe for the fishing communities. Despite various decentralisation and co-management programmes launched

#### Box 5. The over-exploitation of aquatic resources in West Africa.

In its 2000 State of World fisheries and Aquaculture <sup>14</sup>, the Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that the situation in the Tropical Atlantic Zone is "serious".

Likewise the SRFC <sup>15</sup>, based on various recent stock assessments concludes to:

*"- the overexploitation of the fishery resources with high commercial values (coastal demersal and deep species), inducing a level-off of the total capture volumes; a clear decline in the capture volumes of certain species; and a reduction in the size of the fish landed."*

*"- a level of exploitation close to the maximum level for the coastal pelagic resources, with a level of exploitation variable depending on the areas and species". (p.5)*

over the last decade in West Africa (e.g. Mali, Ivory Coast, Senegal) in order to improve the managerial situation, these institutional reforms do not seem to have led to a better governance in the fishery sector of these countries. In particular they failed to improve the representation of the FDCs within the planning and decision-making processes. A large number of fishers (individuals or even whole communities) are still totally excluded from these decision-making processes. Furthermore –as also observed in other circumstances- this inequality usually benefits the strong and powerful groups or communities to the detriment of the poorest and most vulnerable (generally those who are already marginalized) (Box 6).

#### Box 6. Lack of representation and transparency in fisheries management.

Kassibo, in his analysis of the Malian fishery in the High Diaka region, reports <sup>16</sup>:

*"... the non-resident fishers have been excluded totally from the fisheries committees by the local fishers influenced by the traditional leaders. These traditional leaders (...) used the legitimate authority delegated [by the central government] through the decentralisation process to appropriate all the top-positions in these committees. (...) They then used this [newly devolved power] to privilege the interests of their lineages to the detriment of the principle of equity. The non-resident fishermen were left out from the new decisional bodies by some fraudulent manipulations." (p.86 and 91)*

#### Fisheries and Poverty: A Strong Correlation

Since the early 1960s, a large number of International Development Programmes have been launched to address the issue of poverty and underdevelopment in fisheries. Up to the mid-80s, this underdevelopment (generally understood as low productivity) was attributed to the limited production capacities of the fisheries, i.e. the lack of effective means of production (e.g. inefficient fishing gears, poor port and landing infrastructures, inadequacy or lack of processing technologies, etc.). For more than three decades, the International and Bi-lateral development agencies have therefore promoted fishery development through productivity-oriented programmes based on the introduction of new, 'modern' (and capital-intensive) boats, fishing gears and equipment <sup>2</sup>.

Has the economic or social situation of the fishermen and their family been positively affected by these productivity-oriented programmes? Has the livelihood of the FDCs been improved by the introduction of these new fishing gears? It seems that even if some positive results can be observed in the short run, globally in the longer term, the answer is: No. In fact, beyond the apparent correlation between poverty and fisheries, a series of questions -which have so far been only addressed partially or even ignored- need to be answered: what sort of poverty are we talking about here? What are the real causes, what is the real nature, of this poverty? Does poverty affect all fishermen 'equally' or does it affect only a part of the community? Is poverty intrinsically related to the fishing activity, or is it the result of external mechanisms or circumstances reinforced by sector-specific constraints? Those are some of the key questions that need to be addressed urgently if there is to be an improvement in the livelihoods of African FDCs in the future.

### **The Impacts of External Factors and Extra-Sectoral Policies**

As emphasised earlier, fishing is not an economic activity isolated from the rest of the national or trans-national economic systems. In fact, fisheries are part of a more global organization which is, itself, complex and characterised by different (economic, social, political) dynamics functioning at different scales (local, meso, national, international). Unfortunately, in addition to the weaknesses of the local institutions which often make the most marginalized individuals or groups 'voiceless' at the local level, the decisions relating to macro-economic policies at the national or international levels are usually taken without inviting fishery stakeholders (in particular those of small-scale fisheries) around the discussion table. For illustration, the fishery sector is totally absent from the current version of most PRSP prepared by national African experts/economists (with the notable exception of Senegal) under the supervision of the World Bank, even if the fishing sector –due to the number of people concerned and the degree of deprivation faced by certain FDCs- should represent a major entry point for any programme on poverty reduction. This issue of poor representation unfortunately does not only concern the local or national levels. It is also noticeable at the (sub)-regional level, as illustrated by the total absence of reference to the small-scale fishery sector in official documents of economic organisations such as ECOWAS or UEMOA (Box 7).

#### **Box 7. Small-scale fisheries and Sub-regional Economics Institutions.**

Although separate entities, UEMOA (West African Economic and Monetary Union) and ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) are very similar in terms of their objectives, actions and policies<sup>17</sup>. Ultimately their goal is to encourage growth and development in West Africa through the promotion of co-operation and market integration and the creation of an economic and monetary union between their respective (and sometimes common) state members. As such, they do not develop specific policies addressing directly fisheries and FDCs issues. It is only through market integration, harmonisation of commercial and economic policies, and trade liberalisation schemes that those organizations may expect to have impacts on the livelihoods of FDCs. Unfortunately, these types of policies appear to be neutral-poor (i.e. non-redistributive) and it is now widely recognised that the factor which characterises specially the poor (as individuals or groups) is precisely their inability to benefit from neutral policies and programmes.

Inevitably, in these circumstances, the specific needs of FDCs are not taken into account. Fisheries are therefore affected by extra-sectoral factors and policies whose externalities (positive and/or negative) appear to have extremely important impacts on the livelihoods of the FDCs. This is palpable, in particular, through the impacts that the various structural adjustment programmes (SAP) –either those initially imposed by the World Bank or the latest schemes voluntarily adopted by national governments- have induced indirectly within the FDCs over the last two decades (Box 8).

**Box 8.** The indirect impacts of SAP on West African FDCs. What the exact economic role of SAPs has been on the national economies of West African countries is hard to tease out. What is clear, however, from an increasing number of reports and document (including documents from the Bretton Woods institutions) is the negative social and ecological impacts of these SAPs. Under budget restrictions imposed by these SAPs, central governments find it more and more difficult to allocate the (human and financial) resources necessary for the research, management planning, capacity building and implementation of tasks related to the sustainable use of natural resources. With respect to fisheries, SAPs may not have influenced directly the way fisheries have been managed over the last decade (decentralisation and co-management programmes were already being taking place in an attempt to address governance and management issues). However, it is indisputable that SAPs have had indirect negative impacts on livelihoods of rural communities and therefore on FDCs through the reductions in the other public sectors' expenditures. These include restricted access to health service and education, and limited expansion in infrastructure and communications. The last, of course, have major implications for distribution (notably between rural and urban populations). More directly, cuts in the public sector also limit the resource available for the development of social and human capital in fisheries (and other rural) communities, especially the more vulnerable and poorest of these communities<sup>7, 18</sup>

#### **Rapid and Destabilizing Changes**

Acknowledging the institutional weaknesses of the sector, or the impacts of external policies to 'explain' the critical status of both the aquatic resources and the communities which dependent upon these resources, should not mask another fundamental aspect of the problem: The speed and amplitude of the social, economic and political changes that have taken place in West-Africa over the last four decades (post-independence period). Commercialisation, increasing urbanisation, demographic growth, rapid technological changes, trade internationalisation, etc., all these factors have, to a great extent, also contributed to the weakening or destabilisation of local or national institutions, or even led to their complete disappearance in some parts of Africa<sup>19</sup>.

#### **Difficulties in Seizing and Analysing the Problem**

Finally, can one reasonably expect to achieve a correct understanding and representation of the problem of fisheries development at all? And, more pragmatically, can one expect to be able to integrate and address all the different aspects of this problem into a coherent policy aimed at improving the livelihoods of the thousands of people depending on fishery activity in West-Africa? These are the two underlying and fundamental questions that ultimately needed to be answered, acknowledging humbly that the responses, so far, have been piece-meal, sectoral, and based on mono-disciplinary approaches. It is on the basis of these lessons that various International Development Organisations have recently launched a series of new initiatives. In 1999, the UK Department for International Development (DFID), in collaboration with the United Nation Food and Agricultural

Organization (FAO) initiated the US\$ 34 million “Fisheries Sustainable Livelihoods Programme” (SFLP). This programme includes 25 countries in West Africa and specifically aims at addressing the issue of poverty in West Africa FDCs<sup>20</sup>. In November 2001, an international Workshop on “Small-Scale Fisheries, Poverty and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries” was also organised in Cotonou (Benin) by the SFLP and FAO<sup>21</sup>. More recently the FAO Advisory Committee on Fisheries Research organized a “Joint Working Party on Poverty in Small-Scale Fisheries” in Rome (April 2002), and the European Commission (DG-DEV) initiated the EC “Working Group on Fisheries Development Issues”.

Is the future of fisheries-dependent communities in West Africa necessarily brighter thanks to this new, ‘revitalised’ focus by the International Donors community? This is certainly what we would like to observe, but the complexity and scale of the issues and the lessons from the past should keep us away from contented, too large optimism. A long, laborious way is still ahead.

### References

- <sup>1</sup> Chauveau J.-P., Jul-Larsen E., and Chaboud C. (eds.) 2000. *Les pêches piroguières en Afrique de l’Ouest; pouvoirs, mobilités, marchés*. Paris: Editions Karthala, IRD, CMI, 385 p.
- <sup>2</sup> Neiland A. 2001. Fisheries development, poverty alleviation and small-scale fisheries: a review of policy and performance in developing countries since 1950. In: Neiland, A. and Béné C. (eds.). *Proceedings of the Workshop Small-Scale Fisheries, Poverty and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*. Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (SFLP), DFID-FAO-SFLP, Cotonou, Benin, 12-22 November 2001.
- <sup>3</sup> Béné C. 2003. When fishery rhymes with poverty, a first step beyond the old paradigm on poverty in small-scale fisheries. *World Development*, **31**(6) in press.
- <sup>4</sup> Willmann R. 2001. Poverty in coastal fishing communities. In: Neiland, A. and Béné C. (eds.). *Proceedings of the Workshop Small-Scale Fisheries, Poverty and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*. Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (SFLP), DFID-FAO-SFLP, Cotonou, Benin, 12-22 November 2001.
- <sup>5</sup> Corcoran E., 2001. Poverty profile of marine artisanal fisheries communities, Republic of Guinea. Cotonou: Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme, mimeo, 26 p.
- <sup>6</sup> Failler P. and Kane A. (eds.), 2000. *The impact of policies, institutions and processes on the livelihoods of fisheries communities in Sénégal*. NCU Sénégal, SFLP Field Report No.10 Cotonou: Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme.
- <sup>7</sup> Lenselink N. and Cacaud P., 2001. *Artisanal fisheries management; fishers’ role and impact on their livelihoods – a synthesis of case from Mauritania, Sénégal, Guinea and Ghana*. Cotonou: Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme, mimeo, 47 p.
- <sup>8</sup> Anon. 2000. Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. Fisheries and Poverty Reduction. COM(2000)724 final version. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, 20 p.
- <sup>9</sup> Anon. 2001. *Sub-Regional Workshops on the impact of Policies, Institutions and Processes (PIPs) on the Livelihoods of fisheries Communities in West Africa*. Cotonou: Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme, mimeo, 15 p.
- <sup>10</sup> SRFC 2001. *Strategic Action Plan (2002-2010)*. Sub-Regional Fisheries Commission –Executive Secretary Office, 15 p.
- <sup>11</sup> Oualbadet M. and N’Gaba Tchéré D., 1999. *Country review: Chad. A first Phase report of the project Sustainable development of continental African fisheries, a regional study of policy options and policy formation mechanisms for the Lake Chad Basin*. N’djamena: Lake Chad Basin Commission, (documents in French). 44 p.
- <sup>12</sup> Anon. 2000. Islamic Republic of Mauritania, *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, December 2000, 44 p. + Appendixes.
- <sup>13</sup> Kaczynski V. and Fluharty D., 2002. European policies in West Africa: who benefits from fisheries agreements? *Marine Policy* **26**: 75-93.
- <sup>14</sup> FAO, 2000. *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome: available at [http://www.fao.org/sof/sofia/index\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/sof/sofia/index_en.htm)
- <sup>15</sup> SRFC, 2001. *Elaboration of a sub-regional access regime for foreign fleet in West Africa*. Sub Regional Fisheries Commission Technical Report No.3. FAO and Grand Duché de Luxembourg. *Projet “Suivi, control et surveillance de pêche industrielle dans les pays membres de la CSRP” – AFR/013/LUX*, 39 p.
- <sup>16</sup> Kassibo B., 2000. *Les systèmes traditionnels d’aménagement des pêches et leur impact dans le cadre de la lutte contre la pauvreté au Mali (pêcheries fluviales dans le Delta Central du Niger)*. Paper presented at the Seminar on the Livelihoods and Fisheries Management in the Sahelian Region. Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme. Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 3-5 July 2000: CIFA/PD/FAO, 78-92.
- <sup>17</sup> Anon. 2001. *Achievement and Prospects Report*. ECOWAS, available at <http://www.ecowas.int/>
- <sup>18</sup> Blacke B., 2000. Structural adjustment policies and sustainable livelihoods in West African inland fisheries. SFLP Field Report No.7, Cotonou: Sustainable Fisheries Livelihood Programme, 31 p.
- <sup>19</sup> Moorehead R. 1989. Changes taking place in common-property resource management in the inland Niger Delta of Mali. In Berkes F. (ed.) *Common property resources. Ecology and community-based sustainable development*. London: Belhaven Press, 256-272.
- <sup>20</sup> FAO 2000. *Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme*, Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization. Available at <http://www.fao.org/fi/projects/sflp/index.html>.
- <sup>21</sup> Neiland A. and Béné C. (eds.) 2001. *Proceedings of the Workshop Small-Scale Fisheries, Poverty and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*. Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (SFLP), DFID-FAO-SFLP, Cotonou, Benin, 12-22 November 2001.

**Table 1.** The main issues of fisheries development and management and their impacts on the livelihoods of fisheries-dependent communities (FDCs)

<b>I</b> Generic Issues / characteristics	<b>II</b> Nature of the issue - General implications	<b>III</b> Implications for FDCs
Fisheries : an economic sector integrated in a wider system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Development and management policies generally sectoral</li> <li>* Lack of integrated / multi-sectoral approach both at the analysis (diagnostic) and intervention (policy) levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Incorrect diagnostics of the opportunities and constraints faced by FDCs.</li> <li>* Incorrect and oversimplistic perception of the nature and causes of poverty in FDCs.</li> <li>* Inappropriate and poorly adapted fishery development policies.</li> </ul>
Different functions and contributions of the fishery sector at various levels of the economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Fisheries represent a central element of livelihoods (income, food security, employment) especially for the poorest individuals / groups (safety-net, "activity of last resort").</li> <li>* Important contribution to the national economy (export revenues, fisheries agreement revenues, hard currency, etc.) in particular for the poorest countries (e.g. The Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Mis- or under-evaluation of the contribution of fisheries to the livelihoods of FDCs.</li> <li>* Role of fisheries generally evaluated in terms of production capacities (captures volumes and commercial values).</li> </ul>
Stakeholders and intra / extra-sectoral institutions have different views and objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Different perceptions of the stakeholders about the nature of the issues and the potential role of fisheries.</li> <li>* Different and often divergent perceptions by institutions and other outside-sector actors (frequently in contradiction with the views of the stakeholders within the fishing sector).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Interests of FDCs generally under-represented or even deliberately ignored by policy-makers.</li> <li>* Impacts generally negative on FDC livelihoods.</li> </ul>
Lack of widespread and appropriate institutions for fisheries management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Lack of credit and human resources.</li> <li>* Mis-management / over-exploitation of the aquatic resources.</li> <li>* Lack of representation / participation of the local stakeholders.</li> <li>* Institutions unable to adapt to changing factors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Decline of the FDC sustainable livelihoods.</li> <li>* Exclusion and marginalisation of the poorest.</li> <li>* Degradation of the living conditions of the more vulnerable individuals / groups</li> </ul>

**Table 1** (continued).

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b> Generic Issues / characteristics</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>II</b> Nature of the issue - General implications</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>III</b> Implications for FDCs</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Fisheries and poverty are strongly correlated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Situation of extreme poverty / vulnerability of certain communities.</li> <li>* Difficulty to properly diagnose nature and causes of poverty</li> <li>* .Incorrect fishery development policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Unawareness of the real causes of FDC poverty.</li> <li>* Absence of pro-poor and poverty reduction policies.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">Strong impact of extra-sectoral factors and policies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Fishery stakeholders seriously affected by extra-sectoral policies that they cannot control/influence (e.g. structural adjustment reforms).</li> <li>* Lack of representation of the different actors (local, national) in the national or supra-national decision-making processes.</li> <li>* Fisheries absent from PRSP</li> <li>* Issue of policy coherence (both at the national and international levels.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Impacts globally negative on the most vulnerable FDCs (generally those weakly or not integrated into the market dynamics).</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">Fisheries have to face rapid and dramatic changes (internal, external)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* 'Global' scale of changing factors (international)</li> <li>* Fishers and FDCs unable to cope.</li> <li>* Fisheries institutions (local, national) unable to cope</li> <li>* Negative impact overall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Marginalisation of the (economically and politically) weakest within the FDCs.</li> <li>* Marginalisation of the less-active / more isolated FDCs (also generally the more disadvantaged in terms of social capital).</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;">Difficulty in analysis and integrating the problem.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Multi-dimensionality, transectoral, and complex nature of the problem.</li> <li>* Strong influence of mono-disciplinary paradigm/approach.</li> <li>* Analytical framework and policies usually mono-sectoral.</li> <li>* Difficulty to adopt and implement multi-disciplinary approaches.</li> <li>* Piece-meal solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Problem of identification of pertinent poverty reduction policies</li> <li>* .Un-coherency of fishery development policies.</li> </ul>