

Annex 6

Report of the Field Trial on Participatory Action Plan Development (PAPD)

Report of the Field Trial on Participatory Action Plan Development (PAPD) held at Sakthikulangara, Kerala, India, 25-29 April 2005

The Participatory Action Plan Development (PAPD) for Consensus Building developed by the Centre for Natural Resource Studies (CNRS), Bangladesh, was field tested at Sakthikulangara, Kerala, India, from April 25-29, 2005. The field trial was attended by officers and select staff from partner countries of the Project Enabling Better Management of Fisheries Conflicts coordinated by the WorldFish Centre, Malaysia.

Before the conduct of the field trial, a pre-PAPD mock training was conducted at Mitraniketan, Kerala, to brief those involved in the field trial, particularly the co-facilitators and field trial staff, on the need to conduct the trial effectively and efficiently. Facilitators were invited from non-government organizations (NGOs) as well as government organizations. The Project Team from Mitraniketan, who had earlier attended the Bangladesh training, conducted the meeting. A copy of the meeting's agenda and the programme is given as Appendix 1 to this report.

The field trial was conducted in local Malayalam dialect and script in a fishing village at Sakthikulangara of the Kollam District of Kerala. The other non-Indian participants were guided by local team members with English translations of the happenings in the field trial. The Team adapted the CNRS PAPD facilitators' guide and followed closely the methodology, which they trained for during the PAPD Training-Workshop in Bangladesh from 20-24 March 2005. Guided by the CNRS Manual, the fisheries conflicts in Sakthikulangara were identified during the pre-PAPD surveys, literature review, and other relevant information. Sakthikulangara's fisheries conflicts involved three groups of fishermen engaged in crafts and gears in fishing. They were categorized as traditional, motorized and mechanized fishers.

The field test focused, however, on two groups: traditional and mechanized groups of fishers. The principal facilitators were assisted by a team of co-facilitators and assistants. An international group of observers from WorldFish and CNRS was divided to attend between the mechanized and traditional groups.

This report covers the day-to-day programme of activities of the four-day field trial.

Day 1—Opening Ceremony, Problem Prioritization, Analysis and Stakeholder Analysis

Opening Ceremony

The field trial was officiated with a briefing-orientation made by the organizers to inform the participants and observers on the objectives of the field trial and the importance of conducting PAPD in consensus building.

The four-day activity was held in its entirety at the St. Anne Convent School. The principal facilitators, Dr. Reghu Ram Das, Dr. Ananth and Dr. Rajan, each welcomed the participants and expressed appreciation for their willingness to actively participate in the four-day field trial. The participants were requested to introduce themselves, after which they were divided into two groups, the traditional fishers comprising Group I and the mechanized into Group II. The field trial was conducted simultaneously in two separate rooms. The respective groups were each assigned a classroom where the field trial was formally conducted.

A method to further familiarize the participants, facilitators, field trial staff and observers with each other in each big group was made through a group dynamics exercise. This involved using a ball of yarn that helped operationalize the purpose of the field trial, the importance of teamwork, and

how they would relate the lessons learned from the exercise. This was followed by briefing the participants on the project activities as well as the process they would undergo and complete in Day I of the trial.



Problem identification

After the briefing, the fishers in each group were broken into the small groups, this time to identify the problems they encountered in the fisheries sector. Each small group was given cards to write down the problems they were able to identify. They were each given 15 minutes to complete the exercise.

Each of the two big groups was asked to present their problems and was requested to sort out the common ones. The problems identified by both traditional and mechanized groups are reflected in the matrix below:

Table 1. Problems of Traditional Fishers

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collision between traditional and mechanized boats causing damage to boats 2. Damage to nets by mechanized boats 3. Inclusion of ring seines in traditional fishing sector 4. Collision between traditional and mechanized boats causing death to humans 5. Resource depletion 6. Night fishing 7. Fishing juvenile fishes 8. Light fishing 9. Conflicts between the traditional fishers and boat owners 10. Pair trawling from August to September 11. Unemployment due to trawl ban 12. Exploitation by middle men 13. Lack of quality drinking water 14. Exploitation by money lenders 15. Low income of traditional fishers 16. Exploitation by company owners 17. Unhygienic situations in coastal villages 18. Lack of sea wall 19. Lack of transport facilities 20. Common ice plant facilities 21. Ignorance of government of fishing labor issues in the processing fields 22. Lack of housing facilities 23. Lack of marketing facilities 24. Political interventions 25. Lack of proper cold storage facilities 26. Lack of health care facilities 27. Dumping of wastes in the sea |
|---|

Table 2. Problems of Mechanized Fishers

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Trawl ban during monsoon2. Night fishing3. Intrusion of foreign trawlers4. Use of ring seines5. Use of high power engines6. Increase in fuel cost7. Stay fishing8. Increase in cost of spare parts9. Increase in cost of nets10. Age-related problems of fishers11. Economic loss due to small catch12. Migration of fishers to other areas13. Exploitation of middlemen

Based on the identified problems, each group was instructed to sort them out into project-related and non-project-related problems.

Through a consensus, each group listed down the project-related problems (based on the fisheries conflicts) presented below:

Table 3. Project-related Problems of Traditional Fishers

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Collision between traditional and mechanized boats causing damage to boats2. Damage to nets by mechanized boats3. Inclusion of ring seines in traditional fishing sector4. Collision between traditional and mechanized boats causing death to humans5. Resource depletion6. Night fishing7. Fishing during the juvenile stage of the fish8. Light fishing9. Conflicts between traditional fishers and boat owners10. Pair trawling from August to September11. Unemployment due to trawl ban12. Use of inboard engines13. Intrusion of foreign trawlers14. Fishers from other areas
--

Table.4. Project-related Problems of Mechanized Fishers

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Trawl ban during monsoon2. Night fishing3. Intrusion of foreign trawlers4. Use of ring seines5. Use of high power engines
--

Problem Prioritization

The project-related problems were then analysed and prioritized through a ranking method. The participants were each given five sticks on tags. Each participant was requested to cast his/her vote for each of the problems. They were even allowed to stick all the five tags in any one of the problems. The prioritized problems are reflected below:

Table 5. Prioritized Problems of Traditional Fishers

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Collision between mechanized and traditional boats resulting in losses of crafts and gears -I2. Night trawling-I3. Collision between mechanized and traditional boats resulting in loss of lives-II4. Unemployment due to trawl ban5. Pair trawling from August to September

Table 6. Prioritized Problems of Mechanized Fishers

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ring seine fishing 2. Fishing by high powered traditional boats during trawl ban-II 3. Night fishing 4. Intrusion of foreign trawlers-III 5. Timings of the trawl ban-I 6. Intrusion of trawlers from other states
--

Problem Analysis and Solution

After the problem identification and prioritization, the traditional and mechanized groups were asked to analyse each problem vis-à-vis dimensions of cause, impact, affected groups and solutions, as reflected in the Table below:

Table 7. Problem-Cause-Impact-Affected Group-Solution of Traditional Fishers

Problem	Cause	Impact	Affected Group	Solution
Collision between traditional and mechanized boats resulting in losses of boats and gears	Carelessness of boat drivers Inadequate facilities in the boats	No proper income due to the accidents Fall in debt trap Loss of employment Socioeconomic losses suffered by the families Fear to practice fishing after the accidents	Traditional fishermen and their families Boat owners	Properly enforce the MFRA within the area of operation Strengthen the patrolling boats Make registration of boats compulsory
Night trawling	Catching prawns and mollusks Increase of fish catch during the night	Destruction of gill nets Reduced catch during daytime for day fishers Destruction of fishing equipment among traditional fishers Increase in conflicts	Traditional fishers Gill netters Insurance companies Fishers' families	Make night patrolling compulsory Strict enforce action against night fishers Avoid political interventions
Collision of between traditional and mechanized boats resulting in loss of life	Inexperienced boat drivers Inadequate identification of traditional boats during the night	Loss of livelihood of the deceased family Increase in conflicts in the community	Family of the deceased	Ban night trawling Fix fishing time by boats owners Ban pair trawling Make licensing of boat drivers compulsory Fix reflectors in traditional boats
Unemployment due to trawl ban	Reduced catch Loss of fish to processing in the industry Fishing by foreign trawlers	Reduced quality of life Increase in debts	Boat owners, laborers and related groups	Supply free ration to affected groups Increase compensation package Ban foreign trawlers
Pair trawling from August to September	Turbidity formation attracts fish to the shore	Reduced catch by traditional fishers Conflicts between traditional and mechanized	Traditional fishers	Strengthen patrolling

Table 8. Problem-Cause-Impact-Affected Group-Solution of Mechanized Fishers

Problem	Cause	Impact	Affected Group	Solution
Use of ring seines	Resources are not shared Price decline Resource depletion	Reduced catch Sustainable resources affected Food security affected Reproduction of the fish affected Lack of resources	Fishermen Future generations General public Government	Regulate through acts Use active gears Provide fish storage facilities
Traditional boats fitted with high capacity engines	Losses in catch Losses in prawn varieties Catching of juvenile fish Indiscriminate categorization of crafts and gears	Loss of resources Loss of capital Resource depletion and debt trap	Boat owners Fishing laborers Associated fishing labor activity Government and the public	Complete ban or remove the ban Allow only traditional fishers Avoid use of ring seines Allow boats to fish with gill nets
Night trawling	Disturbances caused in the sea bed make the fish shoals to migrate from the region Night trawling for mollusks and prawns	Boats are burned Reduction in the availability of certain species of prawn and commercially important fishes Causes fish migration from the region Reduction in catches Increased conflicts among boat owners Conflict with traditional fishers Reproduction of fishes are curtailed Problems in the environment	Boat owners Laborers Traditional fishers Future generation Public	Complete ban of night trawling Strict enforcement of government rules Collective action of boat owners Self-regulation Collective action by the associations Strengthened patrolling Initiating action by the association Collective action by laborers Laws on marketing and fishing sales
Intrusion of foreign trawlers	Lobby of the north political system	Reduction in the size of catches Losses incurred by the export market Destruction of coral reefs Loss to the Indian economy Government compensation to fishers due to loss of resources	Boat owners Government	Enforce acts against intrusion of foreign trawlers Don't give permanent licenses

Problem	Cause	Impact	Affected Group	Solution
Unemployment due to trawl ban	Fish lays eggs during this period Demand by traditional fishers Prawns are caught more during the period Trawl ban is not scientific Satisfying the minorities Political influence	Reduced income Reduced number of fishing days Migration of laborers to other fields	Boat owners Laborers in the processing sector	Remove trawl ban Change the trawl ban period

After analysing each of the problems and their impacts, both groups were requested to prioritize their perceived solutions to the problems. The groups' common agreement or consensus was considered as final prioritization of the solutions.

Stakeholder Analysis

The stakeholder analysis helped in identifying who could be contacted first when conflicts arose. Based on the questions, the participants from both groups informed the stakeholders that they contacted them immediately with regard to the mitigating conflicts in their area. The stakeholder analysis was conducted through a technique that involved distributing of cards to small groups within the two big groups. The facilitators guided the participants in making a list of the stakeholders, sorting out the commons ones. The participants were then requested to place the cards based on their perceived positive and negative relationships with the stakeholders.

The cards were positioned as positive, negative and neutral sides. The results of the stakeholder analysis are as follows:

Table 9. Stakeholder Analysis by Traditional Fishers

<u>Positive Side</u>	<u>Neutral Side</u>	<u>Negative Side</u>
Hospital MATSYAFED Port Office Fisheries Minister NGOs Fisheries Department MPEDA Schools Cooperatives Religious Institutions Fishermen's Unions Boat Owners Marine Enforcement Police Fish Agents/Merchants Politicians	Middlemen	Corporations

Table 10. Stakeholder Analysis by the Mechanized Fishers

<u>Positive Side</u>
Boat Owners
Members of the Legislative Assembly
Marine Enforcement
Local Priest
Labor Unions
Fisheries Department
Police
Fishermen from other Areas
Union of Traditional Fishermen
Politicians
Wholesale boat owners

Resource Mapping and Seasonal calendar

The resource maps and seasonal calendar were made by each group with the participation of the stakeholders.



Day 2

Problem Cluster and Prioritization

Both groups' analysed problems on the first day were clustered, deleting the common ones. All the clustered problems were listed and presented to the participants on the second day. The second day of the PAPD involved both the primary stakeholders and secondary stakeholders. The secondary stakeholders were previously informed about the process and were asked to comment on the problems that the primary stakeholders were likely to prioritize. The facilitators explained all the problems that were clustered before the group. The seven clustered problems were explained, informing the participants that care was taken by the facilitators' team in clustering to guide them reach a consensus.

The problems that were clustered were mutually accepted by both groups. Both the groups gathered in plenary for the problem cluster and prioritization activity. Three groups were then formed from among the total number of participants. Each of the three groups was provided with the problem cluster for prioritization and was provided with color tags for voting using 1-7 scale. Three problem clusters came out of this activity, as follows:

Table 13. Prioritized Problem Clusters

- | |
|--|
| 1. Collision of boats and losses to crafts and gears |
| 2. Resource depletion |
| 3. Night trawling - I |
| 4. Unemployment due to trawl ban- II |
| 5. Pair trawling |
| 6. Intrusion of foreign trawlers -III |

The problem-solution matrix for the three prioritized problem clusters were depicted for the participants for better understanding of the solutions to the problems identified by them. The three problems were once more explained to them, using the problem-solution matrix. The facilitator then informed the groups to identify five important possible solutions for further analysis. The facilitator informed the groups that they need to select the most important and workable two solutions for the first problem, two for the second, and one for the third problem in order for them to select the five most important solutions for effective analysis. The selection of the five solutions was based on the agreement among the groups. There were arguments and disagreements between the groups in selecting the most important five solutions.

The group at last came to a consensus with five possible and workable solutions. The secondary stakeholders were invited to comment on the problems and the solutions that were selected by the participants.

Day 3 Impact Analysis on the Solutions

The impact analysis on solutions was made on the third day. The social/political, technical/economic, environmental and sustainability indicators were identified for the impact analysis of solutions agreed upon by the participants. The charts were displayed before the group and the questions were posed to give response on the impact of each solution.

The following Table details the impact analysis of solutions by both traditional and mechanized groups.



Table 15. Impact Analysis of Solutions by the Traditional Fishers

Problem	Solution	Objective	Alternative	Social/Political	Technical/Economic	Environmental	Sustainability
Night fishing	Ban night trawling and impose stiffer actions against violators	Protect fisheries resources Restore peace in the society Avoid conflict in the fisheries sector Ensure job security for the gill netters		Help increase living standard of fishermen Ensure and restore peace in the community Help reduce exploitation by middlemen Require cooperation among government, NGOs and other agencies With government permission, respective agencies should enforce rules and regulations	Implementation of solutions doesn't require additional financial requirement and incur any loss to any group Government has to provide technical support to patrolling Include persons with technical knowledge and ensure action for 24 hrs Include working groups from the community to ensure enforcement of the rules	Resource enhancement	Government should take steps to enforce rules and avoid political interference People's action groups should be created for monitoring purposes
Night fishing	Collective action to restrain from night fishing	Ensure sustainability of fisheries resources Ensure peace and solidarity in the society		Require cooperation from various organizations—government, NGOs, trade unions, political Opposition from night trawlers	Require financial commitment		People's action groups should continuously monitor the activities
Unemployment due to trawl ban	Change the trawl ban period	Ensure employment opportunities		Increased conflict Interventions from political parties	Destruction of resources	Destruction of resources	Ensure collective action of all types of fish workers
Unemployment due to trawl ban	Increase compensation during trawl ban period	Reduce employment pressure and starvation during the ban		Ensure employment opportunities with the help of NGOs, cooperatives and SHGs during the trawl ban	Help reduce poverty and starvation during the trawl ban	Government should earmark more funds for the fisheries sector	Changing governments should ensure the packages

Problem	Solution	Objective	Alternative	Social/Political	Technical/Economic	Environmental	Sustainability
Intrusion of foreign vessels	Strict enforcement against foreign trawlers that cross borders	Prevent exploitation of Indian resources by the foreign vessels	Collective protest by local fishermen License should not be given to trawlers	Resource enhancement Intervention by the political machinery	Reduced financial liability	Increased conservation of the ecosystem results in increase of fish population	Changing governments should not change policies
Night fishing	Enforce rules against night trawling and punish violators	Ensure that all fishers catch fish Prevent accidents (traditional) Stop boat fishing during nights Get more catch for day fishers	Conduct awareness campaigns for fishers Allow night fishing in October after 9pm-5am for catching tiger prawns		Government intervention Deep sea patrolling will not happen Government is not utilizing the resources properly Formation of united groups	People who entirely depend on night trawling Loss of profit due to scarcity of tiger prawns Enhancement of fisheries resources Availability of tiger prawn reduced by 80%	Bring a common understanding
Night fishing		To avoid night fishing completely To avoid conflicts among fish workers	Enforcement of laws (government intervention)	Great agitation from different groups of fishermen	Losses for the owners Formation of association of small scale owners Formation of association for boat workers Formation of association for support workers	More available fisheries resources	Unity of small-scale boat owners Regular discussions and awareness campaigns
Unemployment	Change the trawl ban period to November-December	Harvest more Boats workers not to lose work	Remove the ban Complete ban Allow gill netters and small-scale fishers to fish Ban night fishing only	Beneficial to the entire community Price of fish from traditional fishers is reduced Government decision	Increased in income Gill netters get more fish Reduced debt of boat workers Night fishing could be avoided	More available prawns and fish will increase	Decision of the government
Unemployment	Increase compensation during trawl	Prevent famine Take up	Allow working of gill netters	Ensure allowances for boat workers and associated workers	Welfare board should start small-scale savings programme		While no provisions yet for alternative employment for

Problem	Solution	Objective	Alternative	Social/Political	Technical/Economic	Environmental	Sustainability
	ban	educational expenses of children Compensate household expenses	Use other fishing techniques There should be long-term alternatives for livelihood	Politicians intervene in the payment of allowances	Central government should allot more funds		fishers, government should make arrangements for protecting them
Intrusion of foreign trawlers	Prevent trawlers that cross Indian borders strictly thru law enforcement	More available fish Get more value for fish in the export market Improve economic status	Exporters should maintain quality of exported fish Workers/ boat owners should be able to market their fish directly Big boats should be used for fishing Cold storage facilities should be provided	Northern lobby	North Indian lobby losses commission Indian navy Coast guard Availability for foreign revenues Benefits for the government Local consumers	Increased fish resources Avoid endangering the following fish species: lobsters, red ring, reef, cod Avoid over exploitation	Law enforcement Decision of the central government Fish workers

Social Impact analysis

The social impact analysis was made to identify the positive and negative impacts on the fisheries conflicts against each stakeholder that the participants identified during the stakeholder analysis.

The social impact analysis for both the groups are presented below

Table.17 Social Impact Analysis by Mechanized Fishers

Problems	Night fishing		Unemployment		Intrusion by foreign vessels
Solutions	Ban night trawling and impose stiffer actions against violators	Collective action to restrain night fishing	Change the trawl ban period	Increase compensation during trawl ban period	Strict enforcement against foreign trawlers that cross borders
Stakeholder					
Boat owners	+	+	+	=	+
Fisheries Dept	+	+	+	-	+
Religious org	+	+	+	=	+
Marine Enforcement	=	+	+	=	+
Police	=	+	=	=	=
Politicians	=	+	=	=	=
MATSYAFED	=	=	=	=	=
Post Office	=	=	=	=	=
Fisheries Minister	+	+	-	+	+
NGOs	=	+	+	=	=
MPEDA	=	=	=	=	=
Cooperatives	=	- (+)	=	=	=
Fisheries Trade unions	+	- (+)	- +	=	+
Bank	=	=	+	=	+
Fish agents	=	=	+	=	+
Money lenders	=	=	+	=	+
Legal metrology Dept	=	=	=	=	=
Corporation	=	=	=	=	=
School	+	+	+	+	+

Table 18. Social Impact Analysis by Mechanized Fishers

Problems	Night fishing		Unemployment		Intrusion by foreign vessels
Solutions	Ban night trawling and impose stiffer actions against violators	Collective action to restrain night fishing	Change the trawl ban period	Increase the compensation during the trawl ban period	Strict enforcement against foreign trawlers that cross borders
Stakeholder					
Boat owners	+	+	+	=	+
Fisheries Dept	=	(+)	=	-	+
Religious organizations	+	+	+		=
Marine Enforcement	=	=	=	=	(+)
Police	(+)	(+)	(+)	=	(+)
Politicians	-			=	(+)
Trawlers from other areas	-	-	+	=	+
Boat owners of the night fishing	-	-	+	=	+
Local MLA	+	+	=	=	=

Problems	Night fishing		Unemployment		Intrusion by foreign vessels
Solutions	Ban night trawling and impose stiffer actions against violators	Collective action to restrain night fishing	Change the trawl ban period	Increase the compensation during the trawl ban period	Strict enforcement against foreign trawlers that cross borders
Stakeholder					
Fish merchants	-	-	+	=	+
Trade unions	(+)	+	+	+	+
Union of traditional fishermen	+	+	+	=	+

Analysis of the Indicators for Consensus Building

The analysis of indicators for consensus building was displayed before the groups who were requested to rank the items.

The facilitators explained the indicators for better understanding. Ranking, based on the agreement among the groups, was based on these: 1-Very Important, 2-Important, 3-Fairly Important, 4-Not Important.

The results on the consensus-building indicators are presented below.

Table 19. Analysis of CB among Traditional and Mechanized Fishers

Consensus Building Indicators	Ranking Traditional	Ranking Mechanized
Mutual trust/belief	3	1
Social cohesion	3	1
Advocacy/lobbying to overcome resistance	1	4
Mutual cooperation	2	2
Care for community interest not only self interest	2	2
Social unity	2	2
Compromising attitude	3	2
Work for the community wellbeing	2	1

Day 4—Consolidation Work by the Project Team

Day 5—Consensus Building on Proposed Activities

The final day was attended by all the primary and secondary stakeholders, namely: K. Sanjeev Ghosh, Director, Department of Fisheries; K. Viswanathan, Director, Mitraniketan; K. Sudha, Assistant Director of Fisheries, Sakthikulangara; Charley, President, Boat Owners Association; Lalithamma, Sub-Inspector, Fisheries Department; Ramachandran Nair, Kerala Institute for Environmental Studies; Ambros and Andrews, Kerala Swathanthra Matsya Thozhilaly Union leaders; and Rev. Fr. Romance, Director, Quilon Social Service Society, Sakthikulangara.

The meeting started with a prayer followed by a welcome speech by Dr. Ananth P.Natarajan.

Dr. Reghu Ram Das emphasized the importance of PAPD and its role in consensus building, particularly in helping the facilitators to conduct the field trial. He further stressed that through the field trial, 42 problems confronting the traditional and mechanized groups of fishers were identified until they were narrowed down to their selected three problems and five solutions. The feasibility (doable or not) of five solutions were discussed in detail with each of the two groups presenting their respective views.

Mr. Kunjan Morris, who represented the traditional group, spoke about the usefulness of the discussions and the exercises, which he also found very successful. He reiterated the need to reduce the use of large mesh-size gears. He expressed optimism about the potential use of PAPD in addressing conflict situations prevailing in the fisheries sector.

Mr. Antony Joseph, who represented the mechanized group, said that during the introduction of boats as part of the Indo-Norwegian Project, there was no delineation between mechanized and traditional groups. The boats were supplied to fishing laborers belonging to the traditional sector. After that, monopolists (capitalist group) got into the picture, consequently changing the whole scenario. The current number of boats belonging to actual fishing laborers was only 27 and the remaining boats were those of the monopolists. He was of the opinion that there should be a ban on night trawling. Pair trawling should also be controlled. The government should allow them to use gillnet during the ban. Some arrangements should be made for the government to procure the fish products. The PAPD process enabled them to learn so much about new development-oriented matters. To them, mutual understanding, togetherness and cooperation are very much needed in reducing conflicts prevailing in the region. It is, then, essential for government and NGOs to help in the awareness campaigns.

Mrs. Sabeena Cleetus was all praise of the PAPD process and also of the opinion that trawl ban should be abolished. Cooperation amongst the fishers is a must for achieving a better quality of life.

Secondary stakeholders were invited for the discussion.

Director K. Viswanathan of Mitraniketan commented that, so far, the discussions proved very fruitful. Based on the discussion, an amicable settlement could be formulated to address the problems prevalent in the coastal community. Unhealthy competition should be fully avoided. Autocratic attitude of some sectors in the community in the coastal region should be avoided. In this regard, cooperation is essential and relevant organizations should take the necessary initiative. Mitraniketan could do a lot and thus offered all the help it could give in consensus building and in sustaining all efforts along this line.

Mr. Charley Joseph, President of the Boat Owners Association, also suggested that night trawling should be totally avoided. Trawling at night catches some such species as *sankhu* (gastropods) and tiger prawns, which are highly valuable. Some actions by the marine enforcement as well as the police adversely created lot of problems among mechanized fishers. Sometimes, boats seized from the boat-jetty were falsely documented as seized from the sea and charged with unauthorized fishing in the sea. State and central governments should intervene properly in effecting the trawl ban after making necessary studies vis-à-vis the need for and the timing of such a ban. The costs of boats depreciate much, since they are kept idle during the ban. Outboard engine boats pollute the sea and cause damage to the fish resources as one-third of the fuel leaks out to the sea. If we change the period of the ban to some other time, night trawling could be effectively checked and situations handled properly. Talks at the government level are very much necessary to save the sector. The organization that took the initiative in conducting consensus-building programme should take further initiatives to incorporate other sectors of the community to make the consensus appropriate and relevant to the community's needs.

Mr. Ambros, President of the Swathanthra Matsya Thozhilali Union, commended the participants for identifying the three problems during the four-day trial that were meant to help save the marine fishing sector. However, a lot of changes could be likewise observed in the fishing practices of the traditional sector. Gears used by traditional fishers are also of the destructive type; for example, the present ring seines used by them are 300m, a gradual replacement of the older gear 30m long. There were instances when traditional and mechanized fishers jointly fought for the benefit of the coastal community, especially against foreign trawling operations. Similar enthusiasm among both the segments would create wonders as far as the development of the sector is concerned. Use of in-board engines with ring-seine in the traditional sector should be examined properly as this is destructive. Earlier the traditional or mechanized sector could plead for their respective rights and problems, but the field trial had been instrumental in bringing them

together and succeeded in its attempt at incorporating the views, problems and rights of both sectors. He expressed optimism in sustaining the cooperation and unity of both the conflicting sectors, thus paving the way for long-lasting solutions to fisheries conflicts and problems that confront them.

In her closing remarks, Dr. Nerissa D. Salayo, Project Leader, Enabling Better Management of Fisheries Conflicts, The WorldFish Center, reminded the participants and guests that, since development is a long process, it is of primordial importance that key players of development take their part in the process. Corollary to this is the importance of the field trial and its use of the PAPD process as a first significant step that could lead to improving the lives of fishers and the community they live in. The field trial brought to light the role of the community—particularly of fishers and their families, and those with a stake in the fishery resources—in consensus building towards enhancing conflict management in fisheries. She likewise reminded everyone that while it is necessary for them to allow rooms for understanding each other, there remains the fact that no particular person or group of people in a community holds the key to finding or unlocking the absolute solution to a particular problem. Dr. Salayo thanked the participants and stakeholders for coming to the field trial and for giving their share that contributed largely to the accomplishment of the four-day activity. She lauded the organizers, particularly the NGO-partner, Mitraniketan, for the successful handling of the PAPD field trial. She likewise commended the facilitators and staff for the efficient management of the field trial, and for ensuring the active participation of everyone. She also expressed appreciation to the guests and observers for their contribution to the field trial.

In concluding the four-day activity, Dr. Reghu expressed gratitude, on behalf of the organizers, co-facilitators and project staff, to all the 25 primary stakeholders for their valuable inputs through all the sessions as well as the secondary stakeholders who shared equally valuable suggestions towards reaching doable solutions. He informed everyone that that the proceedings of the field trial would be sent to all concerned, specifically relevant institutions and organizations for policy-level discussions geared towards a comprehensive development of the marine fisheries sector.



**Mitraniketan,
Vellanad, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala**

**Pre-Planning Meeting on the PAPD Trial
Sakthikulangara, Kerala, India
Project Better Management of Fisheries Conflicts
15-16 April 2005**

Programme

Day I

- 14.00 Address by Shri K.Viswanathan, Director, Mitraniketan
14.30 A short note on the Project
14.45 Discussion on the PAPD field trial to be implemented at Sakthikulangara
15.30 Tea break
15.45 Discussion cont.....

Day II

- 9.00 Discussion cont....
11.15 Tea break
11.30 Discussion cont....
13.00 Lunch
14.00 Discussion cont.....
15.30 Tea break
15.45 Session closing

Field Trial Team at Sakthikulangara

Group 1

Traditional

- Facilitator: Dr. Reghu Ram Das
Co-Facilitators Mr. Jayan
Miss Sibi
- Assistants Mr. Antony Joseph
Mr. John Jo Varghese
- Observers Dr. Nerissa D. Salayo
Mr. Arif Hossain
Mr. Te Sokkhoeun

Group 2

Mechanized

- Facilitator Dr. J.B.Rajan
Co-Facilitators Mr. Puskarani
- Assistants Dr. P.N. Ananth
Dr. P.T. Suraj
- Observers Mr. Paul L. Manalo
Ms. Usha Kanagaratnam
- Technical guidance Mr. Anisul Islam

List of Field Trial Participants

Dr. Reghu Ram Das
Project Coordinator
Mitraniketan
Vellanad, Trivandrum, Kerala

Mr. Jayan
Senior Research Fellow,
Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute
Cochin, Kerala

Miss Sibi
Project Coordinator
Quilon Social Service Society
Kollam, Kerala

Mr. Antony Joseph
Research Associate
Mitraniketan, Kerala

Mr. John Jo Varghese
Training Associate
Mitraniketan KVK
Vellanad, Trivandrum, Kerala

Dr. Nerissa D. Salayo
Project Leader
The WorldFish Centre
Penang, Malaysia

Mr. Md. Arif Hossain
The WorldFish Centre
Bangladesh

Mr. Te Sokkhoeun
Fisheries Action Coalition Team
Cambodia

Dr. J.B.Rajan
Member Secretary
Kerala Institute for Environment and
Development
Trivandrum, Kerala

Mr. Puskarana
Technical Assistant
Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute
Cochin, Kerala

Dr. P.N. Ananth
Training Organizer
Mitraniketan KVK, Vellanad, Trivandrum

Dr. P.T. Suraj,
Training Associate
Mitraniketan KVK,
Vellanad, Trivandrum, Kerala

Mr. Paul L. Manalo
Consultant
The WorldFish Center

Ms. Usha Kanagaratnam
Research Assistant
The WorldFish Centre
Penang, Malaysia

Mr. Anisul Islam
Director
Centre for Natural Resource Studies
Bangladesh

Mr. Selvakumar
Ex- trainee
Mitraniketan KVK
Vellanad, Thiruvananthapuram
Kerala

Institutions Involved in the Field Trial

The WorldFish Centre, Malaysia

Mitraniketan, India

Fisheries Action Coalition Team, Cambodia

Kerala Institute for Environment and
Development, India

The WorldFish Centre, Bangladesh

Quilon Social Service Society, India

Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute,
Cochin, India