

Changing global seafood trade standards harm poor fishers

RIU

Validated RNRRS Output.

New research is warning policy makers that globalisation is harming poor fishing communities. These communities already have a smaller share of the market because of new regulations. More controls in the pipeline mean further downsizing. Poor fishers have no way of coping with these changes and must either be helped to find other ways of making a living or helped to adjust to the new standards. Involving communities in managing fisheries and in drawing up quality control processes is a start to helping them adapt. Governments, and development agencies and NGOs such as FAO, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, CARE and Oxfam, are already taking these new findings into account to plan fisheries developments that will help poor fishers cope with globalisation.

Project Ref: **PHF14:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **Natural Resources Institute (NRI), UK**

Source: **Post Harvest Fisheries Programme**

Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Environmental Impact](#),

Description

PHF14

Research into Use

NR International
Park House
Bradbourne Lane
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 6SN
UK

Geographical regions included:

[India](#),

Target Audiences for this content:

[Fishers](#), [Processors](#),
[Traders](#),

A. Description of the research output(s)

1. Working title of output or cluster of outputs.

In addition, you are free to suggest a shorter more imaginative working title/acronym of 20 words or less.

Globalisation and Seafood Trade Legislation: the Effect on Poverty in India

2. Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable.

PHFRP - Post Harvest Fisheries Research Programme

3. Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate)) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities.

R 7970 Globalisation and International Seafood Legislation: the Effect on Poverty in India

Lead Institution: Natural Resources Institute (NRI)
University of Greenwich, Medway Campus,
Chatham Maritime, Chatham, Kent ME4 4Tb

Project Leader: Dr Peter Greenhalgh
P.Greenhalgh@gre.ac.uk
Tel: 01634 883596

Other NRI staff: Mr Ivor Clucas
Ms Nicolienne Oudwater

Project Partners

Integrated Coastal Management (ICM)
64-16-3A Pratap Nagar, Kakinada
533 004 Andhra Pradesh, India
Contact: Mr Venkatesh Salagrama, Managing Director
Tel: +91 (0) 884 2364851
Email: vsalagrama@gmail.com

Other ICM staff: G. Durga Prasad

South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies (SIFFS)
Karamana, Trivandrum 695 002, India
Contact: V.Vivekanandan, Chief Executive
Ph: +91-471-2343711, 2343178

Res: +91-471-2501018
Mobile: +91-9847084840
E-mail: vivek@siffs.org

Other SIFFS staff: G. Simon

Cirrus Management Services (P) Ltd.
53A, 1st Main, NGEF Layout, Sanjaynagar
Bangalore 560 094 India
Contact: M.S.Ashok
Email ashok@cirrusworld.org
Ph +91 (0) 80 23419733, 23519007

Other Cirrus staff: R.Supkar

4. Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced? (max. 400 words). This requires a clear and concise description of the output(s) and the problem the output(s) aimed to address. Please incorporate and highlight (in bold) key words that would/could be used to select your output when held in a database.

Using a multi-disciplinary approach the research from 2001-03 aimed to:

- improve the information base on the link between **globalisation, post-harvest fisheries, and livelihoods of poor communities in India;**
- produce a methodology to assess impact of **legislation** on the poor in the post-harvest fishery sector; and,
- develop policy recommendations related to poor people's livelihoods, poverty eradication and access to **global seafood markets.**

Some of the key findings included:

- Legislation enforced by importing countries and Indian authorities has lead to industry downsizing and increased **stakeholder vulnerability.**
- Major changes in the control systems and infrastructure will be required throughout the supply chain entailing implementation of control measures at all stages of the production chain rather than only at the "processing" stage" as at present. Further impacts are likely when the anticipated changes and strengthening of legislation occurs.
- The need to enhance the ability of the poor to upgrade their systems and provide incentives for this process.
- Poor **information flows** and lack of information are hampering the development and involvement of the poor in the industry.
- The need to provide infrastructure and communication systems to allow the poor to adjust to more stringent export regulations.
- The need to develop alternative livelihood options for those marginalised by the changed legislation.
- Policies and their implementation need to be more context-specific.

- To minimise industry losses and enhance poor people's access to global seafood markets, there must be community participation both in resource management and in quality assurance systems.

The research results and policy recommendations were made available in hard copy and CD-Rom: NRI Globalisation and **International Seafood Legislation**: the Effect on Poverty in India CD-Rom 2003 ISBN 0 85954 553 9.

Presentations were made to relevant stakeholders through a final workshop held in January 2003 and to senior staff in several Indian research organisations and government departments.

Inputs were made into several projects:

- FAO/DFID/GTZ project on, 'The Implications of **Liberalisation of the Fish Trade** for Developing Countries',
- EU project on the impact of the **WTO Doha Round** on the fisheries sector
- The publication of 'A Guide to the **Analysis of Fish Marketing Systems** Using a Combination of Sub-Sector Analysis and Sustainable Livelihoods Approach'
- Oxfam study on **market supply chains** in Orissa fisheries sector and improving stake of primary producer communities
- FAO **Post-tsunami fisheries livelihoods support programme**

5. What is the type of output(s) being described here?

Please tick one or more of the following options.

Product	Technology	Service	Process or Methodology	Policy	Other Please specify
X			X	X	

6. What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other commodities, if so, please comment

The main commodity focus is fish. However, some outputs relating to the organisation of the supply chain and the export trade as well as the analysis of food safety legislation, particularly SPS (Sanitary and Phytosanitary) measures, would be relevant to the development of trade in other commodities, particularly crops.

7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options. Leave blank if not applicable

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillsides	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting
					X		

8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing
	X					X

9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (**max. 300 words**).

Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

The output can be clustered with the following outputs / projects:

R7969 (Fish Distribution from Coastal Communities in Bangladesh – Market and Credit Access Issues)

R 7799 Changing Fish Utilisation and Its Impact on the Poor in India

R8111 Poverty and Post Harvest Fisheries in Ghana

R8112 Globalisation in Uganda

ZD 0083 – Cambodia Post-harvest Fisheries Livelihoods Project

R 7008 - Fish Loss Assessment and Reduction – field based methods

R8286 – Developing market information systems within the aquatic foods supply chain; University of Sterling.

Also, the previously mentioned “Guide to the Analysis of Fish Marketing Systems Using a Combination of Sub-sector Analysis and the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach”, could benefit from a conceptual update, including the inclusion of case studies from other countries

A range of research activities relating to the impact of globalisation and legislation on food exports from developing countries are being undertaken by various donor organisations including DFID, FAO, the World Bank, Asia Development Bank and USAID as well as various research organisations. In India, CIFT, MPEDA, and several universities are beginning to focus upon impact of globalisation and legislation on food exports. The Delhi-based Research and Information System for the Non-Aligned and Other Developing Countries (RIS) has done considerable work on these issues.

Validation

B. Validation of the research output(s)**10. How were the output(s) validated and who validated them?**

Please provide brief description of method(s) used and consider application, replication, adaptation and/or adoption in the context of any partner organisation and user groups involved. In addressing the “who” component detail which group(s) did the validation e.g. end users, intermediary organisation, government department, aid organisation, private company etc... This section should also be used to detail, if applicable, to which social group, gender, income category the validation was applied and any increases in productivity observed during validation (**max. 500 words**).

**Project Activities, Methods, Responsibilities, Validations and Time Frame
2001 - 2004**

Activities	Project partners responsible	Validation group
Start-of-project workshop in Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh (AP), India in order to jointly prioritise research agenda, identify tools and techniques to meet objectives.	NRI, ICM, CMS, SIFFS	27 fisheries sector stakeholders: producer organisations, NGOs, research and academic organisations, government and private sector
Desk research on international seafood legislation, globalisation and sustainable livelihood approaches with particular reference to the fisheries sector.	NRI	Representatives from the industry and community e.g. fishermen, boat owners, traders, etc.
Data analysis and assessment of the main export markets for Indian seafood products, particularly the EU, Japan and USA	NRI	As above
Data collection and analysis of the seafood export sectors in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Orissa. The export supply chain was mapped in each state; the poor were identified within the chain along with the impact that international legislation had on them. A combined livelihoods approach and sub-sector analysis was used in the analysis.	ICM, CMS, SIFFS, NRI	As above
Analyse the changes in the livelihoods of poor participants in the export supply chain.	ICM, CMS, SIFFS, NRI	As above
End-of-project workshop to present research findings, validate methodology and develop policy recommendations.	NRI, ICM, CMS, SIFFS	36 participants representing a range of fisheries sector stakeholders (e.g. government, NGOs, private sector, research and academic institutions).
Dissemination activities – papers, reports, web articles (Final Technical Report)	NRI	Feb 2003 to June 2003

Further dissemination activities including: CD-Rom of all project papers; preparation of 'A Guide to the Analysis of Fish Marketing Systems Using a Combination of Sub-Sector Analysis and Sustainable Livelihoods Approach'; presentations of findings to senior staff in New Delhi of Department of Fisheries, Indian Council of Agricultural Research and MPEDA.	NRI, PHFRP	2003-04
Impact Review of 'PHFRP R7799 and R7970	Stirrat and Clucas	February 2005
Post project activities included inputs to other major fish sector studies using some of the project outputs, including study on FAO/DFID/GTZ study on "Policy Research: Implications of Liberalisation of Fish Trade for Developing countries: EU study on Sustainable Impact Assessment (SIA) of the Doha Trade Round on the Fisheries Sector; Oxfam study on market supply chains in fisheries sector in Orissa and strategies for improving stake of primary producer communities; FAO Post-Tsunami support programme 'Fisheries Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make?'	NRI, ICM	2004-06

11. Where and when have the output(s) been validated?

Please indicate the places(s) and country(ies), any particular social group targeted and also indicate in which production system and farming system, using the options provided in questions 7 and 8 respectively, above (max 300 words).

Two Workshops were held in India, each lasting two days; namely an Inception Workshop in June 2001 and a Final End of Project Workshop in February 2003. At the Workshops there were 27 and 36 participants respectively, representing a cross section of fisheries industry stakeholders ranging from producer organisations, NGOs, government organisations and private companies involved in the fish export industry of India. At the Inception Workshop various presentations were made, key issues identified and researchable issues and methodologies were discussed. Scoping studies were then conducted in the selected states of Andhra Pradesh (AP), Kerala and Orissa, and the key findings and recommendations from these studies, as well as the findings from the desk research (on international seafood legislation, globalisation and sustainable livelihood approaches with particular reference to the fisheries sector) were then fed into the final formulation of research issues and sites, to ensure integration and linkages. Those targeted in the research were the poor and vulnerable in the fish processing and distribution chains – including coastal and aquaculture fishing communities (e.g. artisanal fishermen, boat and net owners, small scale processors, service providers, traders and distributors). During the research activities regular discussions were held with the various research teams, particularly those undertaking the state analysis to validate the methodology and the findings to date. In addition, key informants who knew the sector well were consulted regularly. There was an inbuilt mechanism for validating the study results at the industry/community level. The tiered approach used for data collection (from state/district level to communities to groups to specific households) also worked in the reverse while validating the results.

At the Final Workshop the methodology and research findings were discussed and validated. Later brief presentations of findings were also made to senior staff in New Delhi of the Department of Fisheries, Indian Council of Agricultural Research and MPEDA. Finally some research aspects were validated in related studies cited in the Table.

Current Situation

C. Current situation

12. **How and by whom** are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (**max. 250 words**).

Project outputs have been used in several major fishery sector studies and resultant policy discussions:

- Kleih, Greenhalgh, Marter and Peacock (2006). Sustainability Impact Assessment of the Proposed WTO Negotiations: Fisheries Sector Study; NRI Final Reports including Indian (by ICM) and other case studies available at <http://www.sia-trade.org>. Funded by the EC the findings were presented at several Workshops attended by members of various EC Directorates and a large number of civil society organisations.
- Bostock, Greenhalgh, and Kleih, (2004). Policy Research: Implications of Liberalization of Fish Trade for Developing Countries NRI ISBN 0 85954 560-1. Funded by DFID/ FAO/GTZ and includes India case study by ICM. Project documents including details of the two workshops held at the FAO are available on www.nri.org and www.onefish.org/id/225570 websites.

Two ICM studies namely

- Study on Market supply chains in fisheries sector in Orissa and strategies for improving the stake of primary producer communities; (2004) funded by Oxfam- GB India.
- 'Fisheries Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make?' (2006) FAO Post-Tsunami Livelihood Support Programme

As one Project partner stated "The research outputs have led to a changed perception of 'reality' in the sector and that, it can be argued, is the most desired outcome of *any* research."

13. **Where** are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (**max. 250 words**).

The global nature of the issues addressed and the global nature of fisheries (e.g. employs 38 million in production and \$63 billion exports) make it difficult to assess where outputs are being used. Within India, the lack of coordination or interactions between many fisheries agencies makes it very difficult to say how outputs are being utilised and promoted.

Nevertheless, research results have been distributed widely in hard and electronic copies, through NRI, PHFRP and FAO websites and 500 CDs containing all Project outputs. Project document requests have been received from various countries (including Bangladesh, Ghana, Nigeria, Peru and Thailand). Also important contributions

have been made to major projects and publications (#12).

ICM is active in using, publicising and disseminating Project outputs e.g. in FAO's post-tsunami fisheries livelihood support programme explicit recommendations highlighted the importance of changing global seafood trade requirements while designing and setting up new infrastructure in Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry. Programme funding and implementing agencies (i.e. World Bank, ADB and Department of Fisheries) are in the process of accommodating these emerging global trends while planning new fisheries-related infrastructure in these states. Thus, Project outputs are percolating into the policy realm. Similarly, based upon ICM's recommendations, organisations such as CARE are planning studies to assess Tamil Nadu's fishing communities' infrastructure needs bearing in mind emergent trade issues. ICM and SIFFS have undertaken awareness raising programmes for fishworkers in AP and Orissa. However, apart from ICM/SIFFS and possibly CMFRI, it has not been possible to identify Indian people/organisations directly using Project outputs.

14. What is the scale of current use? Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading (max 250 words).

Since outputs are abstract recommendations, rather than specific tools or some 'physical asset', it is difficult to monitor the scale of current use. People/institutions receiving the outputs could have made use of them but no mechanisms exist to measure this. No database has been kept of people contacting NRI, ICM, Cirrus or SIFFS or website hits measured. Certainly NRI obtains requests, while ICM "keeps receiving visitors (academic researchers, NGOs, development consultants. interested in exploring the international trade vis-à-vis traditional livelihoods in Indian fisheries) as well as requests (through email, post and telephone) which indicates the international seafood trade is becoming more important from a research as well as a development perspective in India and that the outputs of research must be contributing to all such work."

Regarding "how quickly use was established", fishery trade matters have become increasingly important both globally and nationally. For fishers exposed to trade awareness programmes, it takes longer to make the connection with the larger processes, but it is too early to suggest how awareness will translate into concrete long-term benefits for them.

Regarding the spread of 'usage', many people are now more aware of the trade and seafood legislation issues than previously, due to the Project and its two offshoots, but the spread remains piecemeal and does not add up to a coherent whole as yet. All in all the 'uptake' of outputs has been rather sluggish which is surprising especially in the context of a rapidly and radically changing global seafood context.

15. In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key facts of success? (max 350 words).

As yet, other than the direct research partners, it is difficult to identify in India any programmes, policy or institutional structures that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the outputs. As indicated under #12 and #13, some efforts were made to promote Project outputs through programmes such as the FAO's fisheries livelihood support programme in the post-tsunami period and some amount of success achieved in raising awareness amongst people and agencies, but it is doubtful if this has become sustainably institutionalised.

The interest shown by the Directors of Fisheries and other key institutional players in the various states too remains to be translated into action. Similarly, while organisations like Oxfam and CARE have been quite interested in taking up some of the recommendations to implement some projects, these remain largely individual rather than institutionally driven. As yet, there has been no evidence of launching a new project which – at least partly – drew from the Project outputs.

However it is important to recognise that major donor and government organisations are increasingly recognising that the fishery trade and the globalisation and legislative issues analysed in the Project can have a major impact on the incomes and livelihoods of the poor. As such, they are undertaking both further analyses of these issues as well as discussing various policy options to mitigate negative impacts arising from the legislation.

Environmental Impact

H. Environmental impact

24. What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)

This could include direct benefits from the application of the technology or policy action with local governments or multinational agencies to create environmentally sound policies or programmes. Any supporting and appropriate evidence can be provided in the form of an annex.

There could well be some environmental benefits, if the project recommendations – for instance, for cleaner fish landing and processing activities; for safe disposal of wastes etc. – are taken onboard and implemented by the national level agencies, but since this has yet to take place, they remain in the realm of hypothesis at the moment.

25. Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words)

None have been identified to date

26. Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of natural disasters and increase their resilience? (max 200 words)

Vulnerability to natural disasters is directly related to the sustainability of livelihoods and access to good quality of life. Cyclones in the Indian coastal states can be a disaster for tens of thousands since it can destroy their work and quality of life. To the extent that Project outputs lead to increased livelihood sustainability for the poor, their capacity to cope with disasters will increase correspondingly.

More directly, Project findings propose improvements in the coastal infrastructure (harbours, processing and transport systems) which could potentially lead to improved protection and enhanced capacity to escape away from the shore. This was the case with many tsunami-affected communities in Tamil Nadu; where good infrastructure and roads enabled people could to respond faster and escape.

Climate change affects the productivity and species make-up of fisheries. Proposed outputs will help poor sector stakeholders better understand the nature of change and how to identify both negative and positive impacts of global changes and take actions to mitigate negative changes and accentuate positive impacts.

Many sector stakeholders (e.g. aquaculture) are also engaged in agriculture and if the efficiency and profitability of fisheries can be improved it could compensate for any reduced yields or natural disasters affecting agriculture.

