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FOREWORD

The Sustainable Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (SFLP) is a regional poverty alleviation programme for small-scale fisheries in West Africa. The programme is based on the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF). It focuses particularly on strengthening the human and social capital of fisheries stakeholders, promoting sustainable fisheries resource management, and developing an institutional and political environment which takes into account the needs and aspirations of the fisheries communities.

The experience that the SFLP has accumulated since it was set up in 1999 that small-scale fisheries are, on the whole, rarely taken into account in public economic and social development policy. Fisheries policies are typically guided by sectoral approaches, where the human factor is often of negligible importance in decision-making. In some cases, the effect of this is to increase the vulnerability of small-scale fisheries communities. Moreover, fisheries stakeholders find it difficult to broaden their outlook from the immediate issues related to poverty, to consider alternative, or complementary, solutions, beyond the sectoral boundaries. These various elements are all entry points for the SFLP in promoting the development of sustainable and adapted poverty alleviation strategies in the small-scale fisheries communities of West Africa.

With these aims in mind, the SFLP has set particular importance on strategic partnerships with other donors and NGOs. In this context, the SFLP has found that there has been a convergence in the concepts and approach of different donors when dealing with poverty alleviation in West Africa. The underlying principles of these initiatives are close to those of the SLA, particularly the need to promote holistic, participatory and dynamic modes of planning, and to encourage the emergence of synergies between the different development partners. In this context, the PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper) process, initially encouraged by the Bretton Woods institutions, takes on particular importance in the various countries.

Since the PRSP process is likely to have an increasing influence on the policies and institutions, which affect poverty alleviation, the SLFP decided to include an activity on that specific issue in its 2002 work plan. Requests and questionnaires were sent to the SFLP National Coordination Units (NCUs), and, on the basis of the results, the SFLP Regional Support Unit (RSU) was able to compile some national poverty alleviation documents and carried out a preliminary analysis of the relationship between the PRSP process and small-scale fisheries. The main outcome of this clearly showed that small-scale fisheries are rarely taken into account in PRSPs formulation, and that the NCUs have little knowledge of the approach and issues related to PRSPs.

This omission led to consultative talks with the SFLP participating countries in order to understand why small-scale fisheries had not yet been included in the PRSP processes, to assess the advantages of their inclusion with reference to the SLA and the CCRF and, where necessary, to identify potential areas where the SFLP could provide support to the various countries in this process of integration. This dialogue led the RSU to organize a Consultation,
in Cotonou from 12 to 14 November 2002, on integrating small-scale fisheries in poverty reduction planning in West Africa.

A total of eleven countries were asked to send representatives to the meeting. The choice of countries was based on an analysis of the questionnaires sent back by the NCUs, and the representation of French-, English- and Portuguese-speaking countries. The answers to the questionnaire provided a lot of useful information, including the relative importance given to fisheries in the national poverty reduction strategy and the way in which the fisheries administration has been involved in the PRSP process.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) are likely to have an increasing influence on the overall policy and planning frameworks for poverty alleviation. Meanwhile, small-scale fisheries are rarely or poorly taken into account in the current stages of the PRSPs processes in most of West African countries. In order to examine how the SFLP could eventually assist in promoting the better integration of fisheries into PRSPs, the Regional Support Unit (RSU) of the Programme organized a Consultation in collaboration with some technical services of FAO Headquarters (AGAL, FIPP, TCAS). Eleven countries from the region participated in the Consultation whose expected outcomes were to:

1. Analyze the issues related to the PRSP and poverty alleviation in fisheries;
2. Assess and comment the current degree of integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSPs;
3. Identify possible actions aimed at promoting the better integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSPs with reference to the guiding principles of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA);
4. Gather information to serve the preparation of an informative Circular to the NCUs (National Coordination Units) on the PRSP process.

This report contains a summary of the presentations and the findings of the plenary sessions and the working groups. An annex presents in a synthetic way the role of small-scale fisheries in current strategies for poverty reduction in the countries who participated in the Consultation.

The salient findings of the Consultation include the following:

- There is more knowledge about poverty in general terms than about poverty in small-scale fisheries, as a result in particular of the lack of poverty assessment and analysis of fisheries communities;
- The current and potential contribution of small-scale fisheries to economic growth, poverty reduction and food security is generally not well appreciated;
- As a consequence of the above, and also due to institutional constraints at local and national levels, the small-scale fisheries sub-sector has rarely been fully included in the PRSP process;
- The potential advantages derived from the better integration of small-scale fisheries into PRSP are several and there are some opportunities towards the better involvement of fisheries stakeholders in the national process for PRSP formulation and implementation;
- Some actions to strengthen the capacities of the fisheries stakeholders in promoting the better integration of small-scale fisheries into PRSP were identified, with emphasis on the development of the following: fisheries poverty analysis and planning units, information tools on the role of the fisheries sector in poverty alleviation, communication strategies and fisheries stakeholders’ lobbying capacities, and organization and empowerment of fisheries communities;
- The SFLP was invited to consider the following possible actions: organization of a training programme on methods of poverty assessment and analysis in fisheries, development of methodologies for the analysis of the current and potential role of fisheries in the framework of poverty reduction and food security policies, awareness-raising and communication with reference to the role and issues of small-scale fisheries towards poverty reduction objective, capacity building of the fisheries administration with priority on fisheries planning and participatory programming in poverty alleviation, and support for sub-regional cooperation.
- The Consultation can be seen as an important step towards the better integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSP processes, a process in which the SFLP has an important role to play, including through promoting the development of strategic partnerships with other donors.
REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION

Introduction and Organisation

1. The following countries were represented at the meeting: Benin, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, and Sierra Leone. Each national delegation was composed of two top civil servants, one representing the fisheries administration responsible for planning, and one representing the structure responsible for drafting the PRSP. Three FAO experts, and the members of the RSU, also took part in the meeting. The list of participants is given in Annex 1.

2. The RSU team leader, B. Horemans, welcomed the participants. He emphasized the importance of the Consultation to the SFLP at this point, as it places particular emphasis on initiatives to encourage a process of change in policies and institutions for sustainable livelihoods in fisheries.

3. C. Breuil of the RSU explained the SFLP’s expectations from the meeting, which were the following: a mutual understanding within each delegation of the issues related to the PRSP and poverty alleviation in fisheries; agreement on a series of topics for discussion (potential entry points for the countries and the SFLP) to promote, where appropriate, better integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSP; and information to serve the preparation of an informative circular to the NCUs on the PRSP process.

4. Details were then given of the provisional agenda and the way the meeting was to be organized. The final agenda (see Annex 2) included plenary sessions, for which simultaneous interpretation was provided, and the language-based working group sessions.

5. The meeting was chaired by, in order: L. Harding (Ghana), M. Kourouma (Guinea), A. Touray (The Gambia) and E. Meleg (Côte d’Ivoire). The RSU members (C. Breuil, M. Kébé, F. Turay) and the FAO experts (L. Bockel, J. Dijkman, R. Willmann) also helped facilitate the work of the meeting.

6. During the plenary sessions, papers of general interest were presented, together with the main conclusions of the country reports, which each delegation had been asked to prepare for the meeting. Each presentation was followed by discussions, and acted as an introduction to the working group sessions.

7. The topics of the general presentations were: an overview of poverty in small-scale fisheries (R. Willman, FAO); an overview of PRSP processes (L. Bockel, FAO); the level of integration of fisheries into regional PRSP processes (F. Turay, RSU); and opportunities for the better integration of fisheries into PRSPs in the context of improving small-scale fisheries livelihoods (C. Breuil, RSU).

8. The three working group sessions were organized in a logical sequence. The first session was aimed at appraising current knowledge of poverty in small-scale fisheries and assessing the institutional involvement of sector stakeholders in the PRSP processes. The second looked at the reasons why the fisheries sector had been so poorly taken into account in the PRSPs, assessed the advantages of its better integration, and identified actions, which could reverse
the trend. The aim of the third session was to develop proposals and recommendations towards the better integration of small-scale fisheries into national poverty alleviation policies, and the role of the RSU and the NCUs in this context. The results of each working group session were presented and discussed in the plenary session.

9. On the final day of the meeting, each delegation was asked to draw up an outline “national action plan” based on its answers to the following two questions: How can fisheries be better entrenched in the PRSP processes? And, in this context, what role could the NCUs play? Each delegation presented a summary of its outline in the plenary session.

10. At the final plenary session, the main conclusions and proposals for follow-up to the findings of the meeting were discussed as part of the SFLP’s future activities. B. Horemans officially closed the meeting.

RESULTS

Summary of the presentations of general interest

11. R. Willmann gave an overview of the current state of knowledge of poverty in small-scale fisheries. After noting the importance of global fisheries in terms of employment and food, he outlined the main features and causes of poverty in general, and in fisheries in particular. He took the results of the two sub-regional SFLP workshops on “small-scale fisheries, poverty and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries” (Cotonou, November 2001), and the meeting of the FAO working group on poverty in small-scale fisheries, which the SFLP attended (Rome, April 2002). He then went through a series of activities that could help to reduce poverty within fisheries communities, emphasizing the important (current and potential) contribution of fisheries to the objective of poverty alleviation in the countries of the sub-region. He concluded his presentation by inviting the participants to consider a series of issues related to the development of poverty alleviation policies for fisheries, and better targeted and adapted monitoring systems.

12. L. Bockel gave a general presentation on the PRSP process. He went through the background to the emergence of PRSPs, referring to structural adjustment policies in particular, and then went on to present the principles, approach and tools of the PRSP process. The links between the PRSP and public policy, including sector policy, and country-donor relations in the context of the PRSPs were also considered. Particular emphasis was put on the next stages of the PRSP process, with the preparation of sector programmes in the framework of the operationalization of the PRSPs. These sector programmes should be a crucial stage in the PRSP planning process. He concluded his presentation by pointing out how important it was to distinguish the PRSP document preparation phase, in which some sectors of the rural economy, such as fisheries, had perhaps not been adequately involved, from the implementation and monitoring of the PRSP. Given the dynamic nature of the PRSP process, there were opportunities to promote the better integration of small-scale fisheries into national poverty alleviation policies, and the countries of the sub-region should take these opportunities.

13. F. Turay looked at the current level of integration of fisheries into the PRSP processes in the 25 SFLP participating countries. The information was based on the analysis of the (final or interim) PRSPs and the questionnaires completed by the NCUs. He said that 17 countries
were currently drawing up interim PRSPs, but only 6 had reached the stage of the final PRSP (Burkina Faso, The Gambia, Guinea, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal). However, the fisheries sector was not very visible in any of the PRSPs, final or interim, with the exception of Guinea and The Gambia, where the situation was relatively satisfactory. This general statement was based on three main considerations: i) the place of fisheries in poverty at the national level, and its capacity to generate growth to help the poor; ii) the limited range and number of poverty appraisals due to the poor level of representation of fisheries communities in the poverty profile sampling and the lack of analyses of vulnerability to poverty; and iii) the low level of representation of the sector stakeholders (administration and communities) in PRSP formulation.

14. C. Breuil gave an analysis of the main trends in the development of sector policy since the end of the 1970s and their impact on the forms of exploitation and the living conditions of the communities. On this basis, he emphasized the need for improved fisheries planning in order to support sustainable resource management and to ensure the better appreciation of poverty alleviation issues in fisheries. The potential of the SLA and the CCRF were considered for the development of fisheries planning. The matter of the better integration of fisheries into PRSPs was also discussed, with reference to the SLA guiding principles. The PRSPs are an opportunity to include fisheries policies in a more holistic approach, and to reconcile sustainable resource management, poverty alleviation in fisheries communities, and the sector’s contribution to economic growth. This could be one of the main issues related to the integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSPs with reference to the SLA, including, better coherence between public policies with an impact on the sector, the mobilization of development partners to support the empowerment of the communities, and an incentive to improve and break down the barriers around fisheries planning.

Country reports

15. A summary of the country reports can be found in Annex 3. Each report includes an overview of the role of fisheries in the economy, some information from the appraisal of poverty in fisheries, and an analysis of the fisheries sector in the PRSP process, i.e. level of implementation of the PRSP, elements of the sector poverty alleviation strategy, the involvement of structures responsible for fisheries in formulating the PRSP, and the role given to fisheries under the PRSP.

16. A matrix highlighting the data of interest in analyzing the links between small-scale fisheries and the PRSP can be found in Annex 4. It was drawn up on the basis of the country reports and with the help of the participants.

Main points raised in the plenary discussion

17. The discussions following the general presentations and country reports mainly concerned two issues: the nature and causes of poverty in fisheries, and the factors related to the integration of fisheries into the PRSPs.

18. On the nature and causes of poverty, the participants highlighted the following points:

- One of the important causes of poverty in fisheries is the way in which communities manage their income, which is generally seasonal.
The pervasive insecurity of living conditions within fisheries communities, particularly within migrant communities.

The target groups in poverty alleviation in fisheries should be the poorest groups, but also the vulnerable groups, given the importance of the context of vulnerability in fisheries livelihoods.

Poverty alleviation in fisheries requires differentiated and adapted strategies, depending on the context: inland or maritime fisheries.

Poverty alleviation programmes in fisheries should also look at issues related to the sustainable management of fishery resources.

19. With respect to the integration of fisheries into PRSPs, the discussions focused on the following issues:

- The PRSPs should ultimately form an overall framework for public action towards poverty alleviation and the fisheries sector should not be left behind in the PRSP process. Fisheries administrations are called upon to be yet more vigilant and proactive in future stages of the PRSPs.
- The development of sector programmes will be a fundamental stage in the PRSP process. Particular effort should be put into the (better) integration of fisheries into PRSPs at this stage. This could include, amongst other things, supporting the fisheries administrations in participatory programming and budgeting of micro-projects.
- The participants expressed the wish to promote exchanges of experience between the countries concerning the best practices for PRSP processes and the process of ensuring the integration of fisheries into PRSPs.
- The participants did, however, point out that, while the PRSPs were intended to provide some answers to the problems of poverty alleviation, it would be a good idea to build up other specific activities alongside, which the PRSP, guided as it is by macro-economic concerns, may not take into consideration.

20. The participants also stressed the need to coordinate foreign aid providing support to the various countries in the formulation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of poverty alleviation programmes for fisheries. In this context, consultative mechanisms ensuring regular discussion between donors should be encouraged in each country.

**Working groups**

**Current knowledge of the nature, incidence and causes of poverty within fisheries communities**

21. Although the nature and incidence of poverty in rural area were relatively well understood in most countries, there is still very few data available on poverty in fisheries communities, and where it does exist it is often unreliable. There was unanimous agreement on the need to establish a reference framework on the nature and extent of poverty in small-scale fisheries. This should include countrywide poverty appraisals to complement the existing information.

22. The working groups found that the causes of poverty in West African fisheries communities included other factors that were more complex than the issues generally mentioned in the literature. They highlighted the following factors: the high level of exploitation, combined with poorly adapted forms of fisheries management, the communities’ poor income management capacity, the difficulty of retraining fisheries stakeholders,
problems with access to credit, conflicts and unfair competition with industrial fisheries, and the extent of post-harvest losses.

Current contribution of the fisheries sector to poverty reduction

23. Small-scale fisheries made a considerable contribution to food security in most of the countries concerned.

24. The contribution of small-scale fisheries to total GDP, however, was relatively low, at less than 5% in most of the countries. However, this estimate did not include the indirect multiplier effects of the fisheries sector; these were generally included in the national accounts under other headings, but are thought to be substantial.

25. In social terms, it was generally agreed that, taken as a whole – and particularly when processing and marketing were included – small-scale fisheries was a significant source of employment at national level. Small-scale fisheries could support nearly 10% of the working population in some countries. Moreover, there are increasing numbers of people who base their livelihoods on fisheries. Small-scale fisheries were still attractive, despite the high level of exploitation in most areas.

26. There was still some potential for the development of small-scale fisheries in certain areas of the coast. However, this could not be realized without better control of industrial fisheries, and the closer involvement of fisheries stakeholders in development initiatives.

27. Another contribution that fisheries made to poverty reduction was in generating foreign income and helping the balance of payments. This contribution to the macro-economic balance was more common with deep-sea fishing, but small-scale fisheries also made a substantial contribution through the continued development of export markets.

28. The working groups were unanimous in regretting the lack of data from which to assess the true contribution of small-scale fisheries to national economies and rural poverty alleviation. Hence the need for conducting analyses of artisanal fishery sub-chain was emphasized, in order to highlight the importance of the economic and social role of small-scale fisheries in most countries.

Level of institutional involvement of the fisheries administration in the PRSP processes

29. The level of involvement of the fisheries administration in formulating the PRSPs varied greatly according to country. In the Anglophone countries, it had been relatively low, except in one case. In the Francophone countries, the opposite was true. However, most delegations did recognize that, even when the fisheries administration had been involved in the various stages of the PRSP preparation, the final document still had little to say about the sector.

Fisheries communities’ participation in the local (decentralized) processes of PRSP preparation

30. Rural communities, in the broadest sense of the term (including fisheries communities), were involved in the various stages of the PRSP preparation. However, it was difficult to
assess the involvement of fisheries communities specifically, that seems to vary greatly between different countries, and different areas of the same country.

31. The working groups did, however, emphasize that, as progress was made with the implementation of the PRSP, particularly with the preparation of the sector programmes, the fisheries communities would unequivocally become more involved in the PRSP process.

Poverty reduction strategies in fisheries, links with the PRSP, and specific monitoring indicators for fisheries within PRSPs

32. Most countries had developed poverty reduction strategies for fisheries during the 1990s, as part of the fisheries planning, or natural resource planning, exercises. However, the quality and effectiveness of these strategies were difficult to assess without any grid to analyze poverty reduction policies in fisheries.

33. Moreover, any assessment of the degree of integration of these strategies in the PRSPs could only be subjective. It was, however, agreed that, in general, all the strategy proposals drawn up by the fisheries administrations were only very slightly taken into account in the PRSPs. The fisheries sector, in fact, most often found itself “submerged” within poverty reduction strategies for agriculture or natural resource sectors (forestry, wildlife, fisheries, etc.). Given this, some countries expressed their intention to draft sector strategies better adapted to the objectives and needs of the PRSPs, so as to promote the better integration of fisheries in the PRSP.

34. One of the consequences of this lack of taking into consideration of the sector strategies in the PRSPs was that, with a few exceptions, there were almost no specific fisheries activities included in the PRSPs. The corollary of this was that there were generally no specific indicators for fisheries in the PRSPs.

Factors which explain the low degree of integration of fisheries into most PRSPs

35. The factors that help to explain the low level of integration of fisheries into PRSPs were mainly institutional. However, national policy makers, some donors, and civil society in general could also be put down to an incorrect perception of fisheries contribution to the objective of poverty reduction.

36. In institutional terms, the most common problem was that the fisheries administration came under the ministry responsible for agriculture or rural development. Traditionally, the interests of the fisheries sector have not been well represented within these ministries. The result of this has been a dilution of the sector’s proposals and specificities as progress was made in the preparation of the PRSPs. This problem was compounded by the fact that the fisheries administration and actors were relatively weak in lobbying and defending the sector’s interests, because of a lack of organization. In addition to this, there was the lack of information available on the nature and incidence of poverty in fisheries, and the sector’s economic and social role.

37. With respect to the general perception of fisheries, there were still many prejudices which certainly contributed to the sector not being taken properly into account in the PRSPs. Fisheries were often seen as a sector with only limited perspectives in terms of economic
growth, given the limited resources and their high level of exploitation. However, there were possibilities for increasing added value in small-scale fisheries, particularly downstream, through effective development policies. Another idea commonly encountered was that the fisheries sector should not be included in PRSPs because it generated significant financial resources, through access rights and taxes, and so it should be self-financing. However, the fact of the matter was very different, as the sector had always been neglected in budgetary policy. Finally, the policy-makers and civil society in general tended to generalize the nature of the environmental and social problems caused by fisheries, whether industrial or small-scale, to the detriment of small-scale fisheries.

38. Finally, in most countries, donors seemed to be abandoning the fisheries sector. This was probably another factor, which could explain the fact that fisheries were hardly taken into account in PRSP formulation.

Expected benefits from PRSPs for fisheries communities

39. The PRSPs should provide guidance for any future public action on poverty alleviation. Small-scale fisheries ought therefore to ensure its integration into PRSP processes, and the drafting of sector programmes would seem a good opportunity to do this.

40. There were many different expected benefits from PRSPs for the fisheries communities, particularly the promotion of sustainable resource management and improved access to basic social services. The communities would also benefit from better access to communication infrastructure, which should open up new markets for them. The PRSP process would also give added impetus to fisheries communities’ participation in local planning in the context of decentralization.

41. It was shown that an overall increase in government budgets, through the PRSPs, should have positive effects on fisheries administration budgets, and hence on their capacity to provide more services to fisheries communities. Finally, it was noted that, in general, the approach encouraged by the PRSPs was very different from those of the former structural adjustment programmes, particularly with the involvement of the local population in their formulation, implementation and monitoring. This gave hope that the resulting programmes and projects would respond better to the communities’ needs and aspirations, and that there would be better coordination between the roles and responsibilities of the administration, the private sector, the communities and the NGOs in management and monitoring.

Types of support to be promoted within the central administration in order to better integrate fisheries into PRSPs

42. Four main areas of intervention were identified to help strengthen the capacities of the central administration in order to promote the better integration of fisheries in PRSPs:

- Encourage the creation and/or strengthening of fisheries poverty analysis and planning units, and build up their capacities in: poverty assessment and analysis, planning and programming, and monitoring and evaluation; these units should be placed under the ministry responsible for fisheries, whilst also ensuring links and synergy with structures within the Ministry responsible for planning;

- Develop information tools on the role of the fisheries sector in the economy and poverty alleviation (e.g., observatory on poverty in fisheries);
- Develop communication strategies and strengthen the fisheries administration’s lobbying capacities to the main policy makers and donors;
- Promote the creation of frameworks for consultation and the development of strategic partnerships involving the fisheries administration, other technical ministries, donors and civil society.

**Types of support to be promoted locally, including within communities, to facilitate better integration of fisheries into PRSPs**

43. Particular emphasis was put on the following types of support for the administration in the field including local authorities:
- Capacity building in poverty assessment and analysis, planning and programming, monitoring and evaluation, and extension;
- Communication activities to sensitize local authorities on the problems and opportunities of the fisheries sector with respect to the objective of poverty reduction;
- Support and advice to contribute to mainstreaming small-scale fisheries in local development planning associated with decentralization.

44. The following actions were underlined for fisheries communities:
- Improving the socio-professional organization and organizational structuring/development of fisheries communities;
- The organization of various types of training: income management, community project formulation, negotiating, infrastructure management, etc.;
- Support for diversification of sources of income;
- Awareness-raising on environmental issues.

**Priority action for the SFLP to encourage better integration of fisheries into PRSPs**

45. The priority actions for the SFLP, as identified by the working groups, can be divided into five categories:
- The organization of a training programme on methods of poverty assessment and analysis in fisheries based primarily on conducting case studies and organizing sub-regional workshops. This training should be aimed first and foremost at officials from the fisheries administration, but also at members of NGOs involved in programmes in support to fisheries sector.
- The development of methodologies for the analysis of the current and potential role of fisheries in the framework of poverty reduction and food security policies. This could be done through case studies, and lead to the development of information systems.
- Awareness-raising and communication concerning the role of and issues involved in small-scale fisheries towards poverty reduction objective. This should be aimed primarily at the structures responsible for macro-economic planning and the PRSP process. One possible action could be to promote the organization of seminars NATIONAL FORA between fisheries actors, the ministry of planning, the structures responsible for the PRSP, the main donors, and possibly members of parliament. Another could be to support the production of a letter of information to policy makers on the contribution of small-scale fisheries to poverty alleviation and on initiatives towards the integration of fisheries into PRSPs.
- Capacity building of the fisheries administration with priority for the central administration, on fisheries planning and participatory programming in poverty
alleviation, and, for the field administration, on the drafting and consolidation of local development plans in partnership with local and community institutions.

- **Support for sub-regional cooperation** with the aim of increasing the effectiveness of national poverty reduction policies in fisheries. Possible areas of cooperation include the following: the inclusion of fisheries sector programmes (under the PRSP) in joint programmes, the promotion of exchanges and transfers of experience and knowledge between countries, and conflict management (including drafting bilateral small-scale fisheries agreements).

### National action plans

46. During the last session, each delegation was asked to present the main points of their outline “national action plan”. An initial analysis of these outlines showed that, in considering how fisheries could be better entrenched in the PRSP process, the delegations highlighted the following:

- Improve knowledge of the nature, causes, and extent of poverty in fisheries;
- Assess the contribution of fisheries to the economy and its role in poverty alleviation and, on this basis, launch sensitization and communication campaigns;
- Strengthen fisheries communities’ capacities for empowerment and to defend their interests;
- Strengthen the capacities of the administration in fisheries planning and programming for poverty alleviation;
- Develop frameworks for consultation between the stakeholders of the fisheries sector, the structures responsible for the PRSPs, and the donors.

47. Each delegation was asked to discuss and develop the outline with their NCU, as well as to specify the possible role of the NCU in the further development of national action plans.

### CONCLUSION AND FOLLOW-UP

48. At the end of the meeting, the participants were asked to fill in a questionnaire to give an evaluation of the Consultation, both in terms of the work in the plenary sessions and the working groups, and as to how its objectives had been met. This showed that the meeting met its objectives satisfactorily.* The participants also said that the Consultation had raised hopes regarding the opportunities offered by the PRSPs for poverty alleviation in fisheries in West Africa, with reference to the SLA and the CCRF.

49. The meeting can also be seen as an important step towards the better integration of small-scale fisheries into the PRSP processes, a process in which the SFLP has an important role to

---

* 19 of a total of 22 participants completed the questionnaire; it used a scoring system from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 3 (excellent). For the plenary sessions and working groups, the participants gave an average of 2.5 and 2.7 respectively. More specifically, on whether the objectives of the meeting had been achieved, the participants gave the following scores: mutual understanding of the issues related to PRSP and the problems of poverty alleviation in fisheries – 2.7; areas for future discussion at national level towards the better integration of fisheries into the PRSP – 2.7; areas for possible support of the SFLP to encourage this integration process – 2.6; exchanges of experience and knowledge on the PRSPs and poverty alleviation in fisheries between the countries – 2.3; and information collected to prepare an informative circular on the PRSPs for the NCUs – 2.3.
play, not only in promoting certain activities within its domain, but also as a catalyst for developing strategic partnerships with other donors.

50. The various general documents and country reports presented at the meeting will be put on the SLFP website (http://www.sflp.org) at the beginning of 2003.

51. With respect to the follow-up of the findings of the meeting, the RSU will support the development of the outline national action plans, ensuring that the NCUs of the countries concerned play a key role.

52. The RSU also intends to prepare and disseminate an Informative Circular to NCUs on the PRSPs in the context of poverty alleviation in small-scale fisheries. The findings and the documents compiled during the meeting will be used for this. The circular should be available in the first half of 2003.

53. Finally, and with the aim of ensuring the inclusion of the different proposals made at the Consultation, the SFLP intends to contribute to the preparation of an outline support programme for improved integration of small-scale fisheries into PRSPs and, where necessary, to help seek funding. This programme could be primarily based on the following elements: capacity building of fisheries stakeholders; the development of tools for poverty assessment in fisheries; the development of tools to assess the role of fisheries in poverty alleviation and the organization of national fora/seminars.
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AGENDA
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- Brief presentation of the SFLP, objectives and methodology of the Consultation (B. Horemans et C. Breuil - RSU)
- General overview of poverty in small-scale fisheries (R. Willmann - FAO)
- PRSP processes: context, approach, tools and links with public policies (L. Bockel - FAO)
- Case studies by countries on the characteristics of poverty and on the status of PRSP process (The Gambia, Mauritania, Sierra Leone, Côte d’Ivoire, Congo)

(PM)
- Working Groups: Session 1

Day 2

(AM)
- Presentation of the results of the working groups for session 1 (M. Kébé et F. Turay - RSU)
- Case studies by countries on the characteristics of poverty and on the status of PRSP process (Liberia, Sao Tome et Principe, Ghana, Benin, Nigeria, Guinea)

(PM)
- Complementary information on the level of integration of fisheries in PRSP processes from the regional level (F. Turay – RSU)
- Towards a better integration of fisheries into PRSP: opportunities in the context of improved small-scale fisheries livelihoods (C. Breuil - RSU)
- Working Groups: Session 2

Day 3

(AM)
- Presentation of the results of the working groups for session 2 (M. Kébé et F. Turay - RSU)
- Introduction to Working Groups on possible actions to promote in the context of the SFLP (M. Kébé –RSU)
- Working Groups: session 3
- Working Groups by country (national action plans)

(PM)
- Presentation of the results of the working groups for session 3 (M. Kébé et F. Turay - RSU)
- Presentation of draft national action plans (all countries)
- Conclusions and follow-up (C. Breuil et B. Horemans – RSU)
Annex 3

COUNTRY SUMMARY ON FISHERIES IN POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGIES
(Source: country presentations at the Consultation)

1. Benin

   **Fisheries in National Economy**
   Domestic fish production in 2001 is estimated at 38,500 MT, more than 90% of it is attributable to the artisanal fisheries. About 800,000 people (about 15% of the active labour force), including 62,000 fishers and 40,000 fish processors and traders, depend on the fisheries sector, in particular the artisanal sub-sector, for their livelihood. While contributing marginally to the GDP, the sector is also a principal source of cheap animal protein (50% of the animal protein intake).

   **Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis**
   Benin has a population of about 6.4 million (2001), and 57% of it is rural based. The most recent poverty profile (2000) puts national and rural poverty (% of people living below the national poverty line) at 30% and 33% respectively. Although the share of fisheries in rural poverty is 12%, the number of poor people in fisheries dependent communities is considered high.

   **Fisheries in the PRSP Process**
   Benin completed her IPRSP\(^1\) in June 2000, and is presently finalizing the full PRSP (2003-2005). Fisheries is one of the Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, and its participation in the PRSP process is limited to some consultations. The fisheries sector development strategy was made available to the PRSP process. The fisheries-based actions in the draft PRSP mainly concern the promotion of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries.

   **Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction:**
   The fisheries sector, as part of Agriculture, is a priority sub-sector in the draft PRSP. As a key growth sub-sector, fisheries is expected to continue to provide employment, income and cheap animal proteins for the poor.

2. Côte d'Ivoire

   **Fisheries in National Economy**
   The fisheries sector in Côte d'Ivoire produce, on an annual basis, between 70,000 to 100,000MT of fishery products; 60% of this production is attributed to the artisanal fisheries. Although contributing less than 1% (0.8%) of the GDP, the fisheries sector provides livelihoods for more than 400,000 persons (about 75% of them dependent on the artisanal sub-sector), as well as, generating foreign exchange earnings. Fishery products are the most important source of animal products intake in Côte d'Ivoire; per caput fish consumption is estimated at 16.5 kg/year.

---

\(^1\) Interim Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper
Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
Côte d’Ivoire has a population of about 15 million (2000), and carried out a number of household income and expenditure surveys (1985, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2002). The most recent survey, the results of which are yet to be released, is the most comprehensive, including a participatory poverty assessment part and covering selected artisanal fishing communities in the sample. The 1998 poverty profile puts the proportion of the poor at about 34% and 42% of the national and rural populations respectively, thus indicating the relatively high prevalence of poverty in the rural areas. As many as 10% of the national poor are in fisheries, the incidence of poverty in fisheries, particularly in the artisanal sub-sector, is extremely high; exceeding 80%.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
The country completed its IPRSP in March 2002 and immediately commenced the preparation of its full PRSP. The creation of the Ministry of Animal Production and Aquatic Resources (Ministère de la Production Animale et des Ressources Halieutiques) improved the place of the fisheries sector in the PRSP process, especially in the thematic working and national dialogue groups. Fishing communities are also gradually being involved in poverty assessment, setting of priorities and in the poverty reduction monitoring system. The sector’s development strategy is an important reference in the PRSP process. Although the formulation of the PRSP is on going, it has identified some fisheries-based actions, which concern mainly the improvement in fish supply for national consumption and capacity of women and young people for better reward from fisheries activities.

Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction
The full PRSP is expected to have fisheries as a critical sector in reducing poverty in the country. In this regard, the fisheries sector is principally expected to contribute to food security by providing cheap food fish and sustainable livelihood strategies for the poor.

3. Republic of Congo

Fisheries in National Economy
The Republic of Congo produces annually about 30,000 MT of fishery products, and about half of them by the artisanal fisheries. With a per caput fish consumption of 20.7 kg/yr, the sector is important in contributing about 40% of the national animal proteins. The sector, especially the artisanal sub-sector, is an important source of employment.

Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
Congo has a population of about 3 million (2001), and more than 70% of which is urban. About 70% of the Congolese population live below the national income poverty line, and poverty is predominantly urban. Although some artisanal fishing communities were covered during the 1996 poverty profiling, estimates of poverty in fisheries are not available. Poverty in fisheries, in particular the artisanal sub-sector, is however considered to be high.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
The PRSP process, in the Congo, is still at the Interim PRSP stage. As one of the Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture, the fisheries administration has limited representation in the governance of the PRSP process. The sector has put in place a participatory mechanism for the formulation of its strategy, which will be informed by the almost completed study on PIP
(policy, institutions and processes), supported by the SFLP. This fisheries sector strategy will be provided to the PRSP process.

**Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction**

Fisheries is not a priority sector in the draft IPRSP, and as a result, no critical poverty reducing actions are assigned to it. Following thorough analysis of poverty in and growth potential of the sector, the place of the sector in the full PRSP is expected to improve.

4. The Gambia

**Fisheries in National Economy**

The fisheries sector is dominated by the artisanal sub-sector, which produced in 2001 about 30,000 MT. The sector contributes about 3% of the GDP and 3% of government revenue (1991). Recent estimates, however, put the sector’s contribution to the GDP at 8%. About 31500 people are employed in both the artisanal and industrial sub-sectors, with the artisanal sub-sector accounting for about 95% of the employment. The country is highly dependent on the fisheries sector as a vital source of cheap animal proteins for the poor, and the per caput fish consumption is estimated at 21.4 kg/year. The sector also generates foreign exchange, as it exports more fishery products in value terms than it imports; in 1998 the value of exports of fishery products was about 20 times that of imports.

**Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis**

The Gambia has a population of about 1.3 million (2001), of which 80% are rural. Since 1989 three household income and expenditure surveys have been undertaken (1989, 1992, 1998) to provide data for poverty analysis. To complement the 1998 survey, a qualitative poverty assessment was also carried out. About 51% of the population live below the national poverty line (1998) and most of them are in the rural areas. The available information suggest women to be poorer than men, and declining rural and urban poverty trends since 1989: From 1989 to 1998 the incidence of poverty fell from 64% to 48% and from 76% to 61% for the urban and rural sectors respectively. Fisheries sector’s share of the total number of poor people is very small (about 1.4%).

**Fisheries in the PRSP Process**

The fisheries sector is part of the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment and its representation in the governance structure during the formulation of the full PRSP-completed in July 2001- was in effect reasonable. The sector is represented at all administrative levels (e.g. task force, thematic working groups, dialogue groups) but the lowest ones (that is below the divisional levels). This representation is not institutionalized at the regional, divisional and municipality levels. Fishing communities participate, to certain extents, in poverty assessment, setting of priorities and in poverty reduction monitoring. Within the Ministry, the sector has a general fisheries development strategy (rather than a specific poverty reduction strategy), which was provided to the PRSP formulation process. The fisheries-based actions in the PRSP, though limited, are proposed within the context of diversification of livelihoods strategies.

**Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction**

In general, the PRSP is socially oriented to the extent of overshadowing the growth generating sectors. The fishery sector is not critical in reducing poverty, but it has a minor role in
generating alternative livelihoods activities and in continuing to provide cheap food fish. The sector is also expected to contribute to the PRSP budget.

5. Ghana

**Fisheries in National Economy**
Fish production in Ghana, during the period 1993-2000, ranged from 341,000 MT (1994) to 465,000 MT (2000); most of which is from the artisanal fisheries. The fisheries sector is an important contributor to national growth (4.5% of GDP in 2000), food fish (70% of the daily animal protein intake), employment and incomes (supports about 10% of the population) and foreign exchange (21% of total non-traditional export). The bulk of the fisheries employment, including 200,000 fishers, is generated by the artisanal sub-sector.

**Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis**
Ghana has a population of about 19 million (2001), which is still mostly rural (64%). During the 1990s, Ghana carried out two poverty surveys (1991/92, 1998/1999) that reveal poverty to be rural biased and declining. According to the 1999 poverty profile, 40% and 50% of national and rural populations live below the national income poverty levels respectively. The poverty surveys did capture a limited number of fishing communities, but fisheries activities fall within the category of ‘non-farm self-employment’. This category shows an incidence of poverty of 29% (1999), which is not only lower than the national average (40%), but also lower than for ‘food crop farming’ (59%) and ‘export farming’ (39%). thus the fisheries sector’s contribution to national poverty is relatively small, but it contains a high number of poor people.

**Fisheries in the PRSP Process**
Ghana is at the stage of finalizing the full PRSP, following the completion of the IPRSP in June 2000. Fisheries sector, being part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, has limited representation in the PRSP governance structure. The sector’s representation is more evident at the level of the thematic working group. Consultation of fishing communities is also evident in poverty assessment, setting of priorities and in tracking poverty reduction. The sector development strategy formed part of the contribution of the Ministry to the PRSP process. The draft PRSP has, however, no defined fisheries-based actions.

**Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction**
Although agriculture and agribusiness are critical poverty reduction sectors, the draft PRSP made no mention of the fisheries sector. However, given the importance of fisheries, mentioned above, the sector will mainly be implicated in contributing to the PRSP budget and food security.

6. Guinea

**Fisheries in National Economy**
The sector, especially the artisanal sub-sector, records an annual fishery production of about 90,000 MT (2000). The sector is considered relatively important in the Guinean economy; contributing to the generation of livelihoods (more than 15,000 direct employments, including 3,000 fishers), cheap animal proteins (per caput fish supply of 10.8 kg), economic growth, national revenue, and foreign earnings.
Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
The Guinean population is estimated at 7.4 million (2001). Although the urban population growth rate far exceeds that of the rural, the population in Guinea is still predominantly rural. Poverty in Guinea is multi-dimensional and varies with gender and region. It is higher in the rural areas where 52.5% of the population live below the national poverty line; only 25% of the urban population are below the national poverty line. Although some fishing communities were captured in the 1994/95 household income and expenditure survey, no analysis of poverty in the sector has been done. Poverty in fishing communities is, however, considered high.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
The fisheries sector in Guinea is administered by a separate Ministry. The sector fully participated in the preparation of the full PRSP, completed and approved by the key stakeholders in July 2002. The fishing communities not only have, to a certain degree, a voice in the poverty assessment and setting of priorities, but also in the poverty reduction monitoring system. Further, the fisheries sector’s development strategy, a vital input in the formulation of the PRSP, is also poverty oriented. Consequently, the PRSP includes fisheries-based actions and poverty monitoring indicators. The actions concern mainly the improvement of fisheries community village infrastructure, facilities and human capacity. The sector is also benefiting from the interim debt relief resources.

Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction
The PRSP aims at reducing national poverty from 40.3% to 30% by 2010. Towards reducing poverty (within and outside the sector), fisheries sector, as one of the critical poverty reduction sector is expected to improve its annual growth rate to about 10% to be able to generate adequate employment, incomes and cheap fish food for the poor. The sector will also participate in the financing of the critical poverty reduction activities. In terms of generating livelihoods, the artisanal fisheries is expected to make significant contribution.

7. Liberia

Fisheries in National Economy
Between 1996 and 1999, annual fish production ranged from about 5,000 to 11,000 MT. The Artisanal sub-sector accounts for about 60% of domestic fish production. The fisheries sector is vital in accounting for 65% of the animal protein intake of the Liberian people. The sector is also considered to be important in contributing to GDP (10%), livelihoods and government revenue. Direct employment in both primary and secondary sectors is estimated at 10,000; most generated in the artisanal fisheries.

Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
Liberia has an estimated population of 2.7 million (1999), and about 54% of it is rural. The 1999 poverty estimates put the proportion of the national population living below the national income poverty line at 75% and that for the rural at Poverty at 86%. Although no comprehensive assessment of poverty in fisheries has been done, the incidence of poverty in fisheries appears to be relatively low.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
Liberia is not presently participating in the World Bank-led PRSP process, as relations with the IMF and the World Bank are yet to be re-established. The country, with help of other
Donors, especially the UNDP, is implementing a number of poverty alleviation actions within the context of its Medium Term Plan for Reconstruction and Development (2001-2006). The Bureau of National Fisheries provided inputs, through the Ministry of Agriculture, during the formulation of the Plan.

**Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction**

The fisheries sector, particularly artisanal fisheries, within the Medium Term Plan, is called upon to contribute to national food security (by providing cheap food fish, employment and incomes for the poor) and to national budget for financing certain poverty reducing activities.

8. Mauritania

**Fisheries in National Economy**

The fisheries sector in Mauritania produced 640,146 MT of fishery products in 2001: 97% of which are accounted for by the industrial sub-sector alone. Fisheries is an important sector in the Mauritanian economy, especially in contributing to the GDP (10%), export earnings (50%), national budget (25%) and the generation of employment and personal incomes. The direct and indirect employment of the sector is estimated at 36000 persons, of which 32000 are provided by the artisanal fisheries sub-sector.

**Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis**

The country has a population of about 3 million (2000), and less than half (42%) of it is rural. Poverty in Mauritania is considered to be on the decline: the percentage of the poor (those living below the national poverty line) decreased from 56.6 in 1990 to 50.5 in 1996. Poverty is multi-dimensional and endemic in the rural areas, which account for 76.4% of the poor in 1996. Estimates of poverty in fisheries, the artisanal sub-sector in particular, are not provided in the most recent national poverty profile. Although artisanal fishing communities are predominantly found in the rural areas, they are considered to be relatively less poor compared to the rest of the rural communities.

**Fisheries in the PRSP Process**

Mauritania is presently implementing her full PRSP, completed and adopted in January 2001. Given its national importance, the fisheries sector is administered by a separate Ministry of its own and given its national importance; the sector is adequately represented in the processes of formulating and implementing the PRSP. The fishing communities are also implicated in the poverty assessment, setting of priorities and in the poverty reduction monitoring system. Further the sector has a fisheries development strategy, used as an input in the formulation of the PRSP. The PRSP includes fisheries-based actions and monitoring indicators. In the artisanal sub-sector, critical poverty reduction actions include strengthening of community human capacity and improvement of physical and natural capital assets.

**Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction**

Within the PRSP, fisheries is considered as a key growth generating sector with strong multiplier effects. The average annual growth rates of the industrial and artisanal fisheries sub-sectors are estimated at 1.7% and 10% respectively. The artisanal fisheries sub-sector, in particular, is providing employment and incomes especially for the unemployed youths and rural communities that have lost their vital sources of livelihoods because of unfavorable climatic changes. The sector is continuing to contribute to the national budget in order to finance critical poverty reducing activities within and outside the sector.
9. Nigeria

Fisheries in National Economy
Annual domestic fish supply in Nigeria stands at about 400,000 MT, 80% of which is from the artisanal fisheries sub-sector. The fisheries sector accounts for about 2% of the GDP, 40% of the animal protein intake and for substantial number of employment, especially in the rural areas. The sector, in particular artisanal fisheries, is a principal source of livelihood for over 3 million people, including an estimated 700,000 artisanal fishermen. The sector’s contribution, though minimal, is also evident on the export market.

Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
Nigeria has a population of about 126.9 million (2000), and more than half (55%) of it is rural. The poverty surveys, carried out in the 1980s and 1990s, show poverty to be relatively high in the rural areas, and increasing over time. About 72% of the rural population live below the national poverty line compared to 66% at the national level. The poverty surveys capture fishing communities, but fisheries employment is categorized under agriculture, which shows an incidence of poverty of 71% in 1999. Although the incidence of poverty in artisanal fishing communities is considered high, the contribution of the fisheries sector to national poverty is considered to be relatively low.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
Nigeria is presently completing her IPRSP. The Fisheries Department is part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. The participation of the fisheries sector in the ongoing IPRSP process is mostly limited to consultation. Selected fishing communities participate in poverty assessment, as well as in IPRSP validation workshops. The sector, presently reviewing its strategy, provided input into the IPRSP process.

Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction
Although the fisheries sector is not explicitly listed as a priority area in the draft IPRSP, there are number of on-going and planned programmes (partially supported by international development agencies) aiming at reducing poverty in fishing communities.

10. Sao Tome and Principe

Fisheries in National Economy
The fisheries sector in Sao Tome and Principe is predominantly artisanal. The artisanal sub-sector accounts for about 90% of the annual national fish production of about 3500 MT, 70% of the national animal proteins, as well as 6% of employment. The fisheries sector, in general, contributes about 6% of the GDP.

Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
The country’s population, most rural, is estimated at 0.15 million (2001), of which about 54% live below the national income poverty line. Most of the poor are rural, given the relatively high proportion of the poor (68%) in the rural population. A significant proportion of the poor depend on artisanal fisheries as a source of livelihoods.
Fisheries in the PRSP Process
The country is presently preparing its full PRSP following the completion and approval of the Interim PRSP in June 2000. The fisheries sector is one of the Departments of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, and the Ministry represents the sector at the highest levels of the PRSP institutional arrangement. The sector is part of the national dialogue and thematic working groups. The fishing communities also take part, though limited, especially in poverty assessment and setting of priorities. The available fisheries development strategy, provided to the on-going PRSP process, is being reviewed to take into account the emerging poverty issues in the sector.

Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction
The on-going PRSP process considers the fisheries sector important in terms of its contribution to the total number of poor people, and of its potential to provide cheap food fish and livelihoods for the poor. The sector is also expected to provide limited contribution to the national growth processes. As a critical poverty reduction sector, the full PRSP is expected to have fisheries specific activities.

11. Sierra Leone

Fisheries in National Economy
In Sierra Leone, the artisanal fisheries sub-sector produces about 87% of the estimated annual domestic fish production of 60,000 MT (2001). The sector accounts for about 3% of the GDP. It constitutes an important source of livelihood for coastal and inland fishing communities and of cheap animal protein (per caput supply of 12.3 kg/year). Prior to the civil war, the fisheries sector employed about 10% of the economically active population.

Fisheries in Poverty Diagnosis
The country’s population is estimated at 5 million (2001), about 63% of it is rural. The most recent poverty profile (1994) puts the proportion of people living below the national poverty line at about 82%, 57% of them are from the rural areas. Because of the ten-year civil war, the incidence of poverty is considered to have increased. Before the war, the fisheries dependent communities were considered to be better off than other rural communities. The current integrated household income and expenditure is expected to produce updated data for poverty analysis. Although fishing communities are represented in the survey sample, it is not evident that the sample fishing households will be sufficiently large to allow for a statistically significant assessment of poverty in fishing communities.

Fisheries in the PRSP Process
The Sierra Leone IPRSP was completed and approved in September 2001, and since then the country has been engaged in formulating the full PRSP. During the preparation of the IPRSP and until July 2002, the Fisheries sector was part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Marine Resources. As a result, direct representation of the sector was limited at the thematic working group level. With the creation of the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources in July 2002, the representation of the sector in the PRSP process is expected to improve. The sector’s strategy, under review, will be provided to the PRSP process.

Fisheries’ role in Poverty Reduction
Within the IPRSP, reference is only made to the fisheries sector in terms of its contribution to food security. In this regard, the sector is expected to provide employment, incomes and
cheap food fish for the poor, including returnees and internally displaced persons. As the understanding of poverty in fisheries and the participation of fisheries in the PRSP process will be enhanced, the place of the sector in the PRSP is expected to improve.
# COUNTRY INFORMATION ON SMALL-SCALE FISHERIES IN PRSP

(Source: Participants at the Panel Discussion, Cotonou 12-14 November 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (millions)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>126.9</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. National poverty profile

- **Year**
  - 2000
  - 1998
  - 1996
  - 1999
  - 1999/95
  - 1999
  - 2000
  - 1996
  - 2001
  - 1994

- **Fishing communities represented in sample?**
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - No
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes

- **National poor (% total pop.)**
  - 30
  - 33.6
  - 70
  - 40
  - 40.3
  - 76.2
  - 46.3
  - 65.7
  - 53.8
  - 81.6

- **Rural poor (% rural pop.)**
  - 33
  - 42
  - 61
  - 50
  - 52.5
  - 86
  - 61.2
  - 72
  - 68
  - 83.3

- **Share of fishing in national poverty**
  - 12%
  - 10%
  - High
  - Not high
  - Not high
  - Not high
  - High
  - Not high
  - Not high
  - High

- **Incidence of poverty in fishing**
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High
  - High

## 2. Importance of Fisheries

- **GDP total (%)**
  - -
  - 0.8
  - -
  - 2.8
  - 4.5
  - -
  - 10
  - 10
  - 2
  - 20
  - 3

- **Consumption per caput (kg/year)**
  - -
  - 16.5
  - 80
  - -
  - 21.4
  - -
  - 70
  - -
  - 10.8
  - -
  - 13.4
  - -
  - 65
  - 30
  - -
  - 23.6
  - -
  - 70
  - 67

- **Revenue (% budget)**
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -

- **Export value (US$ millions)**
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -
  - -

## 3. Fisheries Administration: separate Ministry?

- Yes
- No

## 4. Fisheries administration in PRSP institutional arrangement

- **Inter-Ministerial Committee**
  - Yes
  - No
  - No
  - -
  - No
  - Yes
  - -
  - -
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - No
  - -
  - No

- **Steering Committee**
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - -
  - -
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - No

- **Task Force**
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - -
  - -
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - No
  - -
  - Yes
  - No

- **Thematic working group**
  - No
  - Yes
  - No
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No

- **National dialogue group**
  - No
  - Yes
  - No
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - -
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - Yes
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No

- **Negotiating macroeconomic framework**
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - -
  - No
  - -
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No
  - No

Annex 4

DFID-FAO ~ SFLP/FR/15
5. Fisheries communities’ participation in (I)-PRSP formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Poverty assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Priority setting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National budgeting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Fisheries sector strategy in the context of (I)-PRSP formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Available &amp; separate</th>
<th>Part of other sectors</th>
<th>Provided to PRSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Fisheries in the (I)-PRSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One of the priority sectors?</th>
<th>Any actions for fisheries?</th>
<th>Any fisheries based indicators?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Possibility of estimating number of fishers from recent population census?</th>
<th>Zones where fishing is important (to be considered in sectoral analysis)</th>
<th>Any recent household income &amp; expenditure survey covering part of these zones?</th>
<th>No. of Municipalities where fishing is a dominant activity</th>
<th>Any national representative/ federation of fisherfolk?</th>
<th>Any participatory diagnosis at municipality level that could be used for constraints analysis?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- Zonal where fishing is important (to be considered in sectoral analysis)</th>
<th>- Any recent household income &amp; expenditure survey covering part of these zones?</th>
<th>- No. of Municipalities where fishing is a dominant activity</th>
<th>- Any national representative/ federation of fisherfolk?</th>
<th>- Any participatory diagnosis at municipality level that could be used for constraints analysis?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>