Fisheries-Based Livelihoods in the post-tsunami context

PEOPLE’S REPORT
India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka & Thailand
All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)
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chapter one: introduction

The Indian Ocean tsunami of 26 December 2004 was a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. Across the 12 affected countries in Asia and Africa, more than 230,000 people were reported dead or missing, over 2.1 million were displaced and left homeless, and millions of dollars of infrastructure was destroyed. The disaster had a particularly severe impact upon the lives and livelihoods of the coastal fishing communities. Massive efforts were made to restore fisheries-based livelihoods in the months following the tsunami, enabling many to restart their activities. This was a significant achievement. However, the restoration of livelihoods in the sector was not uniform or equitable.

Numerous studies looking at the tsunami and other disasters have found that there is a differential impact of any disaster on the affected population, so too a differential timeframe in their recovery. The impact is greatest on poor people and excluded communities, and their struggle to recover is more prolonged than for those with access to and control over resources. Well before the tsunami, the livelihoods of many people in the fisheries sector were under stress. This was particularly evident in the increasing marginalisation of several poor and vulnerable categories of people, especially the assetless fishers (labourers) and the women and men involved in fish processing and local trade.

The deterioration of their livelihoods has, and is, resulting in increased poverty – and so vulnerability. This is due to various factors, including the over-exploitation of coastal resources primarily due to trade liberalisation, over-capitalisation of the fishing effort and changing access to markets. The States’ fisheries policies have tended to focus on increasing productivity through increasing mechanisation, commercialisation and investment. For example, infrastructure development has focused on commercial fishing and neglected what is needed to improve conditions for small-scale fisher folk. The ‘customary rights’ of small-scale fishers – who are the majority in the sector and whose practices are sustainable – have generally been peripheral to the policy-making processes and the policies. They have consequently had to unfairly compete for a dwindling resource. In Sri Lanka the effect of the war on fishers in the north and east of the country is debilitating. It is clear that any solution to the crisis in the sector will necessarily involve major policy reforms and a thorough reorientation of the policy-making institutions and their practices.
Following the tsunami, government departments and thousands of aid agencies were confronted by a complex situation of overwhelming dimensions and a lack of coordination – and policies – to guide the response. By the end of the first year after the tsunami, inadequacies in the effectiveness and coverage of the rehabilitation programmes were becoming apparent. A widespread and essential concern in tsunami-affected communities is the struggle to earn sufficient money to have a decent and dignified life. The experience of many small-scale fisher folk – and particularly women, excluded and minority ethnic groups, such as Dalits in India, Moken in Thailand, and Tamils and Muslims in Sri Lanka – reveal that the interventions and their implementation failed to understand or address the complex and multiple issues that challenge their lives and livelihoods. Members of these groups reported that they were largely ignored and not consulted in the relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction processes.

There was an unsustainable increase in overall boat numbers – with some people obtaining more than one boat for the one they lost and non-fishers getting boats in some areas. Rather than addressing the long-standing problems in the sector, some of the response activities, including those of civil society organisations, actively aggravated the conditions. In India, Sri Lanka and Thailand the devastation of coastal fishing communities was regarded by some in the government and business sectors as providing an opportunity for pursuit of ‘development’ policies favouring, for example, tourism development and other commercial investments on the coast.

This ‘People’s Report’ is not a report of an individual person or agency but is based on the work of alliances of 78 organisations and their discussions with 11,806 tsunami-affected people in fishing communities in India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The focus is the lives and livelihoods of small-scale or artisanal fisher folk which is taken here to include: fish producers using non-mechanised boats; post-harvest workers in the local fresh fish trade and in traditionally processed fish production and trade; and ancillary workers. This report adopts a definition of small-scale/artisanal fisheries which excludes commercial fisheries.

The report’s purpose is to understand and present the experiences and views of women and men in the fishing communities in relation to the tsunami response and the state of their livelihoods; their perceptions of the changes and how they respond to them. Discussions were not intended to extract information but to collectivise knowledge, analysis, bargaining power and voice concurrent to fisher folk claiming their rights. This documentation of the people’s perspectives is both to influence the policymakers in the post-tsunami context as well as to draw lessons on crucial issues and so inform the appropriate policies and guidelines for livelihood interventions in future disaster responses.

Based on the principle that governments have the responsibility to protect and provide what is necessary for each and every citizen to enjoy their rights, a critical analysis of the laws and policies relevant to the rights of fisher folk was undertaken in each of the participating countries. This also included the tsunami livelihood guidelines and policies adopted by States. Discussions with fisher folk indicate that the laws and policies which exist and which should uphold and protect their livelihoods are not being translated into practice.

This introductory chapter is followed by a brief introduction to small-scale fisheries and the people involved in it in the South and Southeast Asian context to contextualise the post-tsunami livelihood interventions. Chapter 3 provides a brief review of the policies, laws and institutions relevant to the small-scale fisheries sector. The approach and methodology is described in Chapter 4. The experience and perspectives of women and men in fishing communities regarding post-tsunami fisheries livelihood programmes and the different issues relevant to their livelihoods is documented in Chapter 5. This is followed by the conclusion in Chapter 6.
Given the radical changes in every aspect of fisheries over the last fifty years, it is impossible to define ‘small-scale’ fisheries – or the commonly used interchangeable terms of ‘traditional’ or ‘artisanal’ fisheries.

The FAO glossary defines artisanal fisheries as:

- Traditional fisheries involving fishing households (as opposed to commercial companies), using relatively small amounts of capital and energy, relatively small fishing vessels (if any), making short fishing trips, close to shore, mainly for local consumption.

However, it goes on to clarify that:

- In practice, definition varies between countries, e.g. from gleaning or a one-man canoe in poor developing countries, to more than 20 metre trawlers, seiners or long-liners in developed ones. Artisanal fisheries can be subsistence or commercial fisheries, providing for local consumption or export. They are sometimes referred to as small-scale fisheries.

In other words, ‘small-scale fisheries’ is open to interpretation.

The key stakeholders in the fisheries sector can be broadly classified into three categories.

**Producers**

Those who go fishing:

- The vast majority are men.
- Boats can be mechanised, motorised or non-motorised (traditional). Simplistically, any boat using mechanical means of hauling the nets is classified as ‘mechanised’ whereas manual hauling of nets is the ‘motorised’ boat.
- Motorised and non-motorised boats constitute the category of small-scale.
- One major difference between the small-scale and large-scale involves the sharing patterns. Typically on small-scale boats the crew generally receive a share of the catch while in the mechanised sector the crew generally receive a wage. In the ‘small-scale’ sector owners often double as crewmembers and earn an extra share. The existence of sharing is one reason why the fishing communities remained largely homogeneous in class terms until the advent of modernisation of the sector from the 1950s.
Post-harvest workers

Those who are processors and traders:
- A large proportion are women.
- The stakeholders can be identified by their supply chains:
  - (i) **Local fresh fish trade**: Largely the domain of women who sell fish in the neighbouring markets and towns. Their main competitors are the bicycle fish vendors. Increasingly, women have access to public or private transport systems so they can reach more distant markets and carry bigger loads than before. The bicycle fish vendors are shifting to motorbikes. The impacts of growing distant urban trade and export trade for different species are greatest on this group.
  - (ii) **Traditionally processed fish production and trade**: is also largely the domain of women, either as the producers or as wage labourers in traditional processing activities. The market in dried and salted fish is declining as a result of access to cheaper/fresh fish in the markets.
  - (iii) **Export trade**: A male-dominated activity (women are mainly present as workers in the shrimp processing factories). The big investments and big returns have pushed the sector to over-capitalise. Unlike the other activities in the sector, the export trade has developed along strictly commercial lines.
  - (iv) **Distant urban trade**: A major competitor for the local fresh fish trade and traditionally processed fish trade, urban trade developed based on the infrastructure developed for the export trade. The main source of supplies into the supply chain is small-scale fisheries. This sector has grown over the last two decades which has impacted negatively on some of the poorer stakeholders – especially the women traders and processors, and coastal fish consumers (Salagrama 2004).
  - (v) **Fishmeal**: Fish not used for human consumption is used for fishmeal, although fishing specifically for fishmeal production is not unknown.
- While the people in the export trade are generally the most affluent, those in the local fresh fish trade, migrant fishers working on mechanised boats and migrant women working in shrimp export processing plants are the poorest.

Ancillary workers

- Includes both men and women depending on the nature of the work.
- They undertake a range of support services such as: working at the fish landing centres; sorting, cleaning and transporting fish and shrimp; selling baskets and ice; repairing boats; preparing and selling food to fishers.
- Includes those working as labourers on multi-day boats.
- They are largely invisible and remain unrecognised as ‘fish workers’.

‘Middlemen’

Another group of stakeholders in the sector are the ‘middlemen’ who primarily supply finance (and other services like transport and ice) for fishing and post-harvest operations. One category of the middlemen is the moneylenders who mainly cater to the local fresh fish and traditionally processed fish trade. Their loans have a high interest rate and servicing these can account for up to 50 percent of a woman’s earnings. The second are ‘trader-financiers’ who provide ‘advances’ to the fisher folk in return for assured supplies of fish either at ‘fixed prices’ or, more widely, at a price less than the open market price. The trader-financiers are generally more active in the export and distant urban supply chains where both the margins and the competition are higher.

The modernisation of the fisheries sector in the aftermath of the Second World War resulted in the shift from subsistence-oriented, inward-looking fishing economies to a sector dominated by the drive to increase production and foreign exchange revenues. Government incentives were directed at entrepreneurs and investors. The overall impact of the structural changes that modernisation brought about in the way fish were targeted, handled, processed and traded have marginalised the traditional fisheries-based livelihoods of poorer people. The advent of new and more efficient technologies operating from the same beaches or landing centres, in the same waters and catching the same varieties of fish as traditional boats, gave rise to competition where the traditional technologies were the losers. (See appendix 1 for more details of the historical developments in the fisheries sector.)

The modernisation of fisheries also meant the ‘masculinisation’ of fisheries (Salagrama 2002) as the new supply chains and their attendant developments contributed to reducing the role of women in the sector. Their role in the ‘modern’ supply chains (the dominant export and distant urban trade) is confined to being ancillary workers. However, women play a critical – although frequently unrecognised – part in the domestic economy of small-scale fishers during the lean season when they are frequently the main family income earner; either through selling dried fish stored from a good fishing season or, more generally, by working in other sectors for wages.

Older people and single women are vulnerable groups in fishing communities. With growing modernisation and pressure on incomes, nuclearisation of families is the norm in coastal fishing communities in countries like India (Tietze 1985; Salagrama 2006d) and the lack of social security leaves the older people without a dependable income. Single women constitute a sizeable proportion of households (Bavinck 2001) whose poverty results from limited access to different livelihood-related assets. Children in fishing communities have an incentive to drop out of school as they can earn as much as an adult working for a day on the beach.
chapter three: a review of laws, policies & institutions relevant to small-scale fisheries

Key international instruments provide the right to livelihood and development and are binding on India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka and Thailand who have ratified them. These are the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the 1996 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and the 1996 International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). These provide the legal and political framework for the protection of human rights – for both women and men – and the assurance of dignity and well being.

The UDHR guarantees the right to life and livelihoods of all people and recognises the right to work and to non-discrimination in matters of employment. From the perspective of disasters, the UDHR enshrines the right of every person to social security and realisation of economic, social and cultural rights (Article 22). Likewise, Article 9 of the ICESCR recognises the rights of individuals to social security and social insurance. The ICESCR enshrines the right to be free from hunger and to an adequate standard of living for the individual and their families (Article 11).

While the following UN Declarations and Plans of Action (POA) are not binding upon States, they enunciate important principles for States and are moral obligations. The World Summit for Social Development (1995) and the concomitant Declaration stressed the centrality of people in sustainable development. The Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development (POA) lists principles for sustainable development within the fisheries sector and impresses upon countries the importance of:

(i) recognising the traditional rights of fishery workers in the national context;
(ii) enhancing income generation opportunities and diversification of activities to increase productivity in low-income and poor communities, including fisher folk;
(iii) promoting patterns of economic growth amongst different occupational groups, including fisheries, that maximise employment creation (paragraph 31(g), 32(d) and 50(f)).

The POA emphasises the importance of strengthening organisations, especially those run by women, to improve market access and increase productivity, to provide inputs and technical advice and to strengthen participation in planning and implementation of development plans and initiatives.
The Kyoto Conference or International Conference on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security (1995) explicitly recognised the significant role the fisheries sector plays in ensuring food security in the world, and the important economic and social role played by subsistence, artisanal and commercial fishers. The UN Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries 1995, contains provisions to protect and safeguard the rights and entitlements of sustenance for artisanal fisher people. Article 6.18 explicitly refers to the need to secure access rights for small-scale fisheries and advocates that States:

*should appropriately protect the rights of fishers and fish workers, particularly those engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, to a secure and just livelihood, as well as to preferential access, where appropriate, to traditional fishing grounds and resources in the waters under their national jurisdiction.*

Further to this, the Code declares:

*States and agencies, multilateral development banks and other relevant international organisations should ensure that their policies and practices related to the promotion of international fish trade and export promotion do not result in environmental degradation or adversely impact the nutritional rights and needs of people for whom fish is critical to their health and well being and for whom other comparable sources of food are not readily available or affordable (Article 11.2.15 of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries).*

The World Food Summit in Rome (1996) reaffirmed the right of everyone to development and to be free from hunger. The concomitant plan of action detailed the creation of an Institutional Framework for Sustainable Fisheries Development to enable States to achieve their commitments. Other conventions and laws impact on fisheries, such as the UN Convention on the Laws of the Seas (1982) which provides a framework for better management of fishery resources, through, for example, the sovereign rights of countries over their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs).

### 3.1 Institutional context

The Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Marine Resources (MFAMR) in the Maldives and the Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (MFAR) in Sri Lanka are the main fisheries policy-making bodies with the responsibility for promotion, development and management of fisheries and control over the different executive bodies set up for enforcement and implementation of laws, regulations and projects. In Sri Lanka, the other ministry that also influences the sector and its people is the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (ME & NR), which, *inter alia*, is responsible for the prevention of marine pollution.

At least 10 different ministries in India have influence on the fisheries sector (Mathew 2003). A further complication is that in the Indian Constitution, fisheries is a subject for the State List. This means that all policies, laws and regulations related to fishing in the coastal waters (i.e. up to 12 nautical miles) are framed and implemented by different states.

The Government of India's role is confined to monitoring fish production from the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) beyond 12 nautical miles, survey and assessment of fisheries resources, and research and training. Some other areas, for example, protection of biodiversity and coastal habitats, and prevention of pollution are in the Concurrent List, making them the responsibility of both levels of government.

State-run agencies like the Ceylon Fisheries Corporation, Maldives Industrial Fisheries Company Ltd. (MIFCO) and the Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA) in India have an explicit mandate to increase seafood exports from their respective countries. Few such initiatives are in place for developing domestic trade to cater to the needs of the small-scale fish processors and traders.

There are numerous examples of new institutions being added to the existing structures when a new challenge emerges in the sector (e.g. coastal and biodiversity conservation, global trade concerns) or when policies focus on new priorities, as the existing structures are deemed unable to cope. This results in a medley of institutions dealing with the sector in a piecemeal fashion and in relatively watertight compartments, due to the lack of institutionalised coordination mechanisms to facilitate more integrated approaches.

In countries like India and Sri Lanka this leads to: duplication in some areas while leaving gaps in others; conflicts within policy objectives as well as in implementing strategies; and overall negative impacts upon the livelihoods of the poor people. Ultimately, the profusion of agencies, and their frequently overlapping roles and responsibilities – as well as competition among them – becomes more a part of the problem than a solution.

This condition was exacerbated in the post-tsunami context where several State and non-State organisations took responsibility for reconstruction. Lack of adequate coordinating mechanisms resulted in delays, gaps and duplication. For example, in Thailand, nine ministries took responsibility for rehabilitation efforts in their respective areas which overlapped and conflicted with one another when it came to implementation at the community level.
3.2 Main thrust of fisheries policies/development plans

Fisheries-related policies/development plans across the four countries show some remarkable similarities in their focus as well as in the strategies adopted. There are four broad objectives around which the policies and plans are developed:

(i) economic growth: generally defined as contribution to national GDPs, and often linked to export performance;
(ii) food security: providing a cheap source of protein to the local populations;
(iii) livelihood support: for production and post-harvest activities; also focusing on social and economic development of the people depending upon the fisheries sector;
(iv) environmental/natural resource management: aimed at improved resource management.

However, a series of problems afflict the implementation of the policies as follows:

3.2.1. Tensions within fisheries policies and strategies

While almost all plans, strategies, projects and laws are aimed at achieving one or more of the key objectives, the inherent tension between the different objectives is not given due consideration or resolved with the result that different initiatives frequently work at cross-purposes. For example, encouraging increased production can contribute to economic growth or improved socio-economic conditions but this could be at the expense of long-term resource health; or increasing foreign exchange earnings through exports can have an impact on domestic food security or locally-based livelihoods etc. In countries like India, the policy emphasis on food security has largely shifted to export earnings over the years (Anjani Kumar et al 2003). This means that some of the objectives receive higher priority than others and where these are in conflict with the other policy objectives, the strategies promoted would be contrived to help the primary objective while appearing to do justice to the others.

The tensions on the horizontal plane (i.e. reconciling the differences within objectives) are compounded by gaps in implementation on the vertical plane. In policy documents, there is often no correlation between the expected outcomes of the plans and the proposed strategies to achieve them. This means the inclusion of standard phrases as policy objectives does not result in concrete, coherent strategies with attendant budgetary provision to achieve them. A further complication is that to achieve an intended objective it would be necessary to address a range of cross-cutting issues such as marketing, infrastructure, investment support, social organisation, policy reform and – in the context of tsunami – disaster mitigation. At the same time, it is necessary to address these at different levels (individual/community level, meso-/regional level, macro/national or international level). However the strategies adopted rarely transcend some fixed (and frequently technologically-oriented) solutions, implemented randomly at different levels.

Historically, policy making in fisheries has strongly focused on increasing production – through increasing fishing efficiency and introducing new technologies – coupled with an export orientation. However, although the various documents talk of a wide range of policy objectives, such as food security and livelihood support, their implementation boils down to reverting to increased production.

Apart from the implications of the production-oriented approaches for the health of the fisheries’ resources, a major problem pertains to their assumption that increased production automatically means benefits trickling down to everyone in the sector, which does not take into account the prevailing disparities in access (to the fish resources, to the technologies, to the investments, to the markets and so on) that are crucial for the poor to take advantage of the benefits. This also misses out the crucial link between production and markets and a whole range of supply chain relationships that influence the way in which fish production translates into wealth generation both at the macro level and at the individual level.

There appears to be only limited awareness about the impacts of a single-minded emphasis on increasing production on the sustainability of the sector or its implications on equity. This therefore allows the failure of policies to be blamed upon the shortcomings in implementation rather than as signifying a much deeper problem arising out of the fundamental basis upon which the policy framework rests. Similarly, while the lack of coordination between research and policy, between policy and implementation, and between implementation and impact assessment, could be the apparent reasons for recurrent policy failures, a more critical factor is the political dimension that underpins the policy process and resists (or encourages) change along particular paths, due either to vested interests or to ideological reasons.

As noted by several authors in recent times (for example, see Kurien 2005), for the small-scale fishers and the

---

1 For example, in India the influential 2001 Report of the Working Group on Fisheries for the Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007) recognises the problems of over-fishing in Indian waters in the territorial sea and emphasises the need to introduce “principles of scientific fisheries management”. It attributes “depletion, economic waste and conflicts among user groups” in coastal waters to the open access nature of Indian fisheries and over-capacity and advocates an immediate adoption of community-based and participatory approaches to complement scientific fisheries management. However no financial provision for fisheries management is made under the Tenth Plan.
poorer stakeholders in the sector, the continuing policy focus upon production, technological efficiency and foreign earnings has been the most critical impediment to achieving sustainable livelihoods.

3.2.2. Tensions in harmonisation with other policies

The problems of harmonisation can arise in instances where different ministries or departments have a direct or indirect role on the life and livelihoods of the fishers. In all countries, it is clear that the policies affecting fisher folk do not all arise from within the sector. For example, the changing global trade context or policies relating to rapid tourism and industrial development, as well as the implementation of environmental protection/conservation measures in the coastal areas in India, Sri Lanka and Thailand, takes place largely and actively ignoring the interests of the fishers, and the fishers’ bodies have very limited say in the matter.

Being an open access (or common property) resource, fisher folks' rights of access to the sea or to the coastal areas are frequently challenged by, for example, businesses’ interests. The lack of harmonisation between policies arising from different sources can – and do – mean that protection of the fishers’ access to them is inadequate. In countries like India, while the rights of the small-scale fisheries to inshore waters have been recognised in principle with the marine fishing regulation acts (although their implementation is very weak), there is no such recognition of ownership rights on land. One case of policy complexity relates to competing claims being made for access to the same resources on which the fishers depend. Government plans to develop the coastal areas for tourism purposes in Thailand, India and Sri Lanka contradicts their fisheries policy objective of protecting the livelihoods of the small-scale fishers.

Lack of harmonisation became even more complex in the post-tsunami context. Without coherent coordination mechanisms, the policies of different line ministries or departments can, and often do, come into conflict with one another. The restrictions by one Ministry on access to some traditional fishing grounds, or to housing in the coastal areas for conservation purposes, often fly in the face of proposals to provide more fishing boats or to construct houses for the fishers by another, as happened in many parts of Sri Lanka and India in the post-tsunami period. The National Disaster Management Policy of the Government of India, for instance, does not address important issues such as sustainable development, human-centred strategies, and the linkage between poverty and vulnerability to disasters from a livelihoods perspective.

3.3 Focus on small-scale fisheries in existing policies

One broad conclusion that can be drawn from a review of existing fisheries policies is that small-scale fisheries are not considered as the main motors for fisheries growth. In fact, in all countries, the analysis of fisheries policies and existing laws (and especially their performance) reveals a bias towards encouraging investments from the private sector and against the livelihoods of the small-scale fishing communities.

Policies have essentially focused on improvements in infrastructure, preservation and transport systems in Thailand, Sri Lanka and India to meet the export demand, while the small-scale sector receives much less attention, although it accounts for a major proportion of the people involved in the fisheries sector, caters mainly to domestic/local demand and provides livelihoods to a large number of poor people. This means that there exist huge gaps in fish landing and trading facilities in the small-scale sector, which increase risks (both physical and economic) and reduce fishers’ incomes.

Currently, in all four countries, the important contribution of small-scale fisheries to the livelihoods of fishers is widely accepted and enshrined in the policies. The People’s Constitution of Thailand (1997) guarantees the rights of traditional communities to conserve their ways of life and to participate in the management, maintenance, preservation and exploitation of natural resources and the environment.

However, while customary governance systems and laws prevailed in most marine fisheries around the region dating back to the pre-modernisation period, these are rarely legitimised or incorporated into the formal laws. The recognition of the seas as an open access resource, which was necessitated by the modernisation model, worked against recognising traditional rights of the fishers. Similarly, their land ownership claims survived only so long as there were no competing claims – for tourism, industrial and port development, oil exploration, environmental conservation/management. In India, in almost every case where such new claims have been made on the coastal lands, it is the fishing communities which have been ‘resettled’.

In other words, the issue of customary rights is a grey area whose continued relevance owes more to default than to official sanction, a fact that was illustrated by a case against traditional governance systems in post-tsunami India, where the law took the position that they

---

2 For instance, in Sri Lanka, two policies of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources – the National Environmental Policy and the National Wetlands Policy – can certainly have an impact upon achievement of the objectives of the National Fisheries Policy 2006. Similarly, there is potential for conflict between the activities of the Coastal Conservation Department (CCD) and the Department of Fisheries.
have no relevance and directed the government to actively root them out. Even in Thailand, the scope of the customary rights of the fishers remains fuzzy, as the post-tsunami experience involving the Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) project has clearly shown (see section 5.1).

Fisheries research is largely orientated towards fish, fishing technologies and export, but little attention has been paid to the people in small-scale fisheries – especially the poorer and excluded categories – their socio-economic systems, the impact of different changes upon their life and livelihoods and their needs and aspirations. Only the people directly dependent upon fishing and (to a lesser extent) upon fish processing or trade make it into the statistics, while a number of ancillary workers and secondary stakeholders (especially further along the supply chains) remain ‘invisible’ from a policy perspective. Added to that, the research that is carried out is often not made accessible.

By making equity secondary to growth, fisheries policies failed to contribute meaningfully to the livelihoods of the poor. Access to new technology was dictated by the entrepreneurship of the potential users, and it was issues such as political and bureaucratic patronage, ability to invest sizeable sums and social standing in the community that determined who benefited and who did not. This resulted in formation of hierarchies in the villages, with a small percentage of powerful people garnering most benefits, while the real poor benefited only from the trickle-down effects – or not at all. In Sri Lanka, the encouragement provided by the government to shift people into deep-sea fishing seems to have largely benefited people with political and financial clout with the result that the only way a traditional fisher could go deep-sea fishing is by working as a labourer on one of the new boats.

Women’s contribution to the economy has either been invisible or considered too ‘small-scale’ to deserve much attention from policy-makers. As a result they are largely bypassed and there are few policies or programmes specifically targeting their needs. Even now policy remains confined to some standard recipes (such as giving them training in fish quality control or in new skills like pickle making; setting up self-help groups), which amount not only to ignoring a complex reality, but are also ineffective even with what they attempt to do.

In summary, the existing policy-institutional context in fisheries has a limited focus on the small-scale fisheries. The emphasis on industrial fisheries and exports has adverse implications for the small-scale sector in terms of reducing the viability of their operations and marginalising them from their livelihood activities, besides affecting the long-term viability of the sector itself. The lack of representation for the small-scale fishers in the decision-making processes not only reduces the effectiveness of the policies to address their needs meaningfully, but also makes them counter-productive.
4.1 Principles

The approach and methodology used in bringing out this people’s report was based on the following principles:

- that the analysis is primarily informed and led by the experience of tsunami-affected women and men whose lives and livelihoods depend on fisheries;
- that human rights are core and that it is the responsibility of the State to protect and ensure that affected fisher folk enjoy their rights;
- that the right to information is fundamental if people are to know and claim their rights and actively participate in decision-making;
- that alliances of the affected fishing communities with their institutions and allies be strengthened and/or formed in each country at community, district and national levels to collectively engage with the policy making institution/implementing institutions in pursuit of their rights;
- that discussions with tsunami-affected men and women in fishing communities would collectivise knowledge, analysis, bargaining power and voice as a prelude to fisher folk claiming their rights.

4.2 Focus and methods

While the four countries all focused on small-scale fisher folks’ concerns, their specific interests varied. In India and Sri Lanka the discussions sought to explore the following key areas: (i) people’s experience of livelihood rehabilitation interventions in the small-scale fisheries sector post-tsunami; (ii) the issues currently facing fisher folk which are threatening their livelihoods as fishers, in fish processing or as ancillary workers; (iii) whether people are aware of their rights to a decent life and livelihood, and the barriers they encounter(ed) to obtaining their rights; (iv) their knowledge of fisheries laws, policies and institutions and the impact of these upon their lives and livelihoods. In the Maldives the consultations were broader and aimed to obtain a general understanding of the fisheries sector. In Thailand the discussions and analysis concentrated on two specific policies: Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) and Sea Food Banks.
The information generated through the community consultative process was collated and analysed to produce country level ‘people’s reports’. The term ‘people’s report’ is used to capture the idea that it is not a report of an individual person or agency, but the culmination of a process which has engaged members of the alliance and community representatives in its production.

4.3 Coverage and sampling

Across the four countries, 11,806 tsunami-affected men and women engaged in small-scale fishing and fish processing were consulted through discussions and individual interviews conducted by 78 organisations in 127 villages, islands and settlements. The sampling criteria and approach are described in appendix 2, and the names of the organisations in appendix 3.

Table 1. Sample for community-level discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Maldives</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coverage</td>
<td>4 atolls</td>
<td>8 districts</td>
<td>3 states 1 Union Territory 12 villages</td>
<td>10 districts 7 provinces</td>
<td>127 village level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 islands</td>
<td>71 villages</td>
<td>18 districts 30 villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>6,901</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>11,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations in the alliance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Process

The following activities were conducted, using an iterative process:

i. assessment of the policy environment and actors involved;

ii. alliance-building with organisations, movements and activists working on or interested in the lives and livelihoods of small-scale fishing folk;

iii. development of communication strategies and appropriate materials to inform the community of their rights;

iv. community awareness-raising on rights to livelihoods and to compensation in the post-tsunami context;

v. community analysis and organising to combat threats to fisheries-based livelihoods of poor people;

vi. generating information for policy intervention through the formulation of the people’s report and national alliance consensus leading to advocacy work;

4.5 Constraints

There were a number of constraints which influenced the way in which the process was carried out. These included: the limited time frame; the challenges involved in putting the principles into practice and grappling with different approaches and methodologies; the goal of the report being a by-product of the overall process rather than the end product; and the generation of organic links between the micro and macro levels.
Fisheries-Based Livelihoods in the post-tsunami context
During the community consultations with fishers\textsuperscript{1} it became obvious that:

(i) the livelihoods of the poorer groups were already negatively impacted by liberalised economic policies;
(ii) the disaster was not an isolated event but further exacerbated their poverty and difficulties;
(iii) the response overlooked the pre-existing stresses and concerns in the livelihoods of small-scale fisher folk;
(iv) the response was effective when the complexities of the situation and people’s aspirations were understood and acted on.

Fishers did not dissociate the tsunami disaster from the other (pre-tsunami) factors having a disastrous impact on their livelihoods. This section attempts to reflect the situation as articulated by the people. The key issues regarding post-tsunami livelihood interventions and the situation in the fisheries sector are presented as follows:

5.1 Customary rights
5.2 Groups overlooked in the tsunami response
5.3 Inputs
5.4 Markets
5.5 Infrastructure
5.6 Tourism and industrial developments
5.7 Diversification of livelihoods
5.8 Fisheries management and governance
5.9 Working conditions of fish labourers
5.10 Social protection
5.11 Disaster risk reduction, war and security
5.12 Summary

\textsuperscript{1} Throughout this section ‘fishers’ collectively refers to small-scale/artisanal fisher folk who participated in the community consultations, specifically: fish producers using non-mechanised boats; post-harvest workers in the local fresh fish trade and in traditionally processed fish production and trade; and ancillary workers.
5.1 Customary rights

Throughout the community consultations, fishers repeatedly reported that their right to the sea and the coastal land on which they live is being challenged and undermined. Either the content and/or enforcement – on the basis of pre-existing laws and policies or on new policies and guidelines drafted for coastal zone management – does not recognise or respect their customary rights.

5.1.1 Land ownership issues

I was sad. I asked them how they could do this [demolish her house]. They said my house was in the National Park area. I retorted it was not possible because it was the heritage from my grandparents. [Her grandmother is 101 years old.] How could that be invasion? They said they would report me to the police.

Woman from Chang Islands, Thailand

Across all four countries, the fishing people consulted expressed grave concerns regarding control over their land and access to the sea. Coastal land is essential to their lives and livelihoods, for example, landing and storing boats and equipment, operating beach seines, fish trade and processing, boat building and being able to monitor and assess the fishing conditions. In the post-tsunami context fishers reported that land tenure and their right to the coast became more contentious.

Even in Thailand where the 1997 Constitution recognises fisher folks’ customary rights, people reported numerous cases of coastal land conflicts post-tsunami. For example, private investors asserted (dubiously acquired) legal title to some coastal areas where fishing communities had lived for generations, threatening fishers with eviction and the deprivation of their livelihood.

An overwhelming majority of people consulted in the Thai fishing communities (97%) stated they were unaware of the Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) plans for their area. A common complaint was the lack of information and transparency in the way DASTA operates. The DASTA programme which is aimed at fast-track development of the coastal areas for tourism purposes, works directly with relevant government officials and departments to facilitate investors gaining access to the designated area – often exploiting the ambiguities in the status of customary land rights. Some fishers reported giving their approval without being aware that they were alienating their land rights for tourism purposes. Although the evident purpose of DASTA programme was to help people take advantage of tourism as a new livelihood activity, the fishers’ experience so far indicates that the real beneficiaries would be outside investors, with fishing communities fearing that the new developments will have a devastating impact on them.

Back then there were threatening letters coming in all the time. It is hard to believe that an official letter with the official Garuda emblem on it could contain statements like: “Taking legal action against the state will not bring a good consequence to your daily lives.” Many villagers and I still kept the letter. Many senior people could not eat and sleep. Some were even so stressed out and died due to having strokes. One man even ordered his relatives before his death that if this land issue had not come to an end, they were not to inter his body. Now, his body is still kept in the temple.

Woman from Samet Island, Thailand

- In Tamil Nadu, India, fishing communities regard the Coastal Regulation Zone Act as providing recognition of fishing settlements and permitting certain rights and protections. Fisher folk complained about the actions of the government which were displacing fisher folk from the coast to inland areas, with the loss of their traditional land lives and livelihoods.
- The fishing people consulted in Tamil Nadu and Kerala unanimously reject the proposed Coastal Zone Management legislation which they believe will seriously weaken the position of fishing communities.
- In Sri Lanka, fishers stated that the coastal buffer zone regulations applied soon after the tsunami were strictly enforced in the case of fishing communities building within the buffer zone but these were either lifted or ignored in case of tourism-related developments.
- The Sri Lankan Tourism Master Plan aim to establish 15 tourism zones along the coastal belt indicates the thrust of the government’s strategic direction.
- In the Maldives, access to land for fish processing is a major problem. The ban on drying fish on the roadsides and other public areas requires the processors to rent land for the purpose. Land in the Maldives belongs to the government and is not privately owned. Scarcity of land in some smaller islands makes leasing of land an expensive proposition. Land on several islands is controlled by politicians or taken on lease by wealthy businessmen, often for construction of fibre-reinforced plastic (FRP) boats, reducing availability of land for fish processing and traditional boat construction. Thus, even though there is a steady demand for traditional boats like the dhoni1, they cannot be constructed due to lack of land.

1 A multi-purpose sail boat with a motor or lateen sails that is used in the Maldives.
Coastal People’s Movement: Protesting against the government’s implementation of regulations

In adherence to the Environmental Protection Act (EP Act) of 1986, the Government of India established the Coastal Regulation Zones Act (CRZ) in 1991 which regulates development within sensitive coastal zones along the entire Indian coast. The CRZ Notification has protected the livelihoods and activities of fisher and other coastal communities.

“Most of the fishermen associations are satisfied with the present CRZ regime as it safeguards the coastal and marine ecosystems with the areas protected and no large developmental activities being permitted in the CRZ area. The No Development Zone of 200 metres in the rural areas, i.e. in the CRZ III areas, have helped the fishermen to berth their boats, drying fish, mend nets, etc., thereby protecting their fishing rights” (Swaminathan Committee Report).

The issue of the CRZ became controversial within a few weeks after the tsunami in Tamil Nadu when the District Administration insisted on fishers leaving their dwellings on the seashore and accepting houses up to one kilometre inland. In many districts, government officials obtained signatures from fishing community households for an alternative allotment of land and housing, conditional on relinquishing their rights over their traditional homestead land where they had been living for generations. The Government of Tamil Nadu subsequently passed Government Order No. 172 which stated since the Coastal Zone Regulation permitted only repairs of constructions that existed prior to 1991 in CRZ II, all families whose houses were destroyed partially or otherwise were given the choice of going beyond 200 metres and obtaining a constructed house worth 1.5 lakhs rupees free of cost. Those who did not choose to do so were free to repair their existing houses but would be ineligible for financial assistance.

At the same time the government has proposed that the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Notification replace the CRZ Notification based on the recommendations of the Swaminathan Committee’s Report. However, the CZM Notification does not provide for the rights and access of coastal communities. For example, livelihood activities such as fishing in CZM I waters and shores have not been mentioned, thus compromising the livelihood security of traditional fish workers. By not prioritising these activities in CZM I areas, the Notification has equated all activities without recognising the differential impacts caused by various activities.

In view of the above, a fishers’ movement has built up across the east coast in Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, as well as Orissa and West Bengal. This collectivisation and mass mobilisation of the fishing community aims to restore the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification, which is seen to be fundamental for protection of coastal communities and the environment. The formation of the national campaign against CZM was launched across 64 locations on 9 August 2007 to mark the Quit India day. The fishers demanded the government restore CRZ Notification and consider the negative impacts of CZM Notification. The movement has led to the Government of India making a statement in Parliament. In Kerala, the Kerala Independent Fishworker’s Federation is mobilising the coastal fishing communities to advocate the rights of fish workers and protest against the issues of sand-mining, exploitation of traditional fishing zones by trawlers, and the negative impact of tourism on the coast.
5.1.2 Lack of assured access rights to sea

Rights of access to fishing grounds are a fundamental need of small-scale fishers in all countries but fishers reported it is a problem, especially as competition mounts in the nearshore waters from the likes of large trawlers and purse-seiners. Recognition of the seas as an open-access resource works against recognising traditional rights of the fishers. Where policies and legislation exist to provide rights to the fishers, for example in India, people reported that their implementation is poor.

In some other countries, like Sri Lanka, there is no provision to ensure access to fisheries resources. (The 2004 draft Sri Lankan Fisheries Policy had provision for creating an ‘artisanal fisheries zone’ but the policy was never approved.) In the Maldives, commercial fishers must register, pay a licensing fee and follow a number of legal provisions enabling a significant degree of control by the Government. Maldivian small-scale fishers are exempted – thus providing both protection and incentive for the local fishers.

While measures exist in the Maldives, Sri Lanka and India to restrict and control access of foreign fishing vessels to the coastal waters, the deep-sea resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone are generally viewed by governments as a way to attract investments from foreign and local business communities. This has serious implications for the small-scale fishers. The fishers in India and Sri Lanka view the deep-sea fishing policies of their countries, which provide licences for joint ventures in deep sea fishing, with suspicion. Both for their assumption that the local fishing fleets do not have the capacity or potential to fish in the offshore/deep-sea waters, and that the new fleets will not have a negative impact on the livelihoods of the local fishers by competing with them over fishing grounds, and encroaching upon the inshore waters, as well as local markets. Women fishers in southern Sri Lanka reported that these foreign vessels release higher yields of fish to the market as compared to a very small catch by the local fisher families. This causes a sharp reduction in fish prices and lower income for the local fishers from an already reduced small catch.

Fisher folk across the south and east of Sri Lanka echoed the following comment:

Fisher, Gaafu Alifu Atoll, Maldives

Building dhoni is a good business but the government does not support or provide the chance to locals like us. The possibility is only for the rich – those who have uninhabited islands registered under their names. People like us can’t do it because we can’t lease a land area good enough for this work. The demand for dhonis is very high and it is up to the person who has got the possibility to get richer.

Wellabada, Balapitiya, Sri Lanka

People expressed their concern that these fishing vessels use superior technological devices for finding and catching fish. Local fishers are not able to compete with their available fishing technology. They explained how these foreign fishing vessels damage local fishing vessels by pushing them and destroying their fishing gear and nets. They also complained about the over-exploitation of local fish resources.

As foreign vessels operate in our waters, local fishers’ lives and livelihoods become vulnerable. Why doesn’t the government take any action against this?

Fisher, Hambantota, Sri Lanka

In Thailand, local organisations and fishers expressed their opposition to the proposed Sea Food Bank (SFB) which aimed to privatise the nearshore waters for cage-culture purposes. The waters are to be divided into a number of plots and allocated to prospective users who, as owners of the plot, have the same rights as they would if they owned a piece of land. Ostensibly aimed at providing sustainable livelihoods to the fishers, the SFB remains a controversial proposal for fishers because it attempts to privatise the sea which the people believe ‘belongs to everyone’. More seriously for the people was the fact that the allocation of plots by SFB was not confined to local fishers of the area. Anyone from anywhere can apply for an allocation, which has the potential danger of making the coastal waters the private property of a few large-scale investors. Even within villages, the allocation of plots was not uniform, and a number of people who could not obtain plots stood to lose their livelihood altogether.

5.1.3 Housing issues

We had been living here in peace for years until the tsunami came. Then they did not allow us to rebuild but expect us to move uphill. They said it is best for us. I say they know nothing about how we live. How do they expect us to take care of our boats if we live uphill? And what if they build a marina on the beach? How can we live there?

An Urak Lawoi from Lanta Islands, Thailand

In each of the four countries a huge housing programme was taken up all along the affected coastal areas, and...
access – or lack of it – to permanent houses has had a tremendous impact upon the livelihoods of fishing people in all four countries. On the positive side, fishers with permanent housing stated it has enhanced their access to the much needed ‘collateral’ for bank credit and improved their quality of life. It has also enhanced equity at the community level where the poorest people received houses of the same quality as those of the richer people, and at the household level as it provided opportunities for the houses to be jointly owned by the wife and husband.

On the negative side, people who were relocated to the interior reported that this has drastically reduced their ability to go fishing and their access to the beaches. In India and Sri Lanka, while some fishers reported being able to get their houses built in situ, many were forced to relocate up to 3-4 kilometres from the coast to be eligible for housing support. Those with sea-based livelihoods who wanted to stay in their original beach location – within the buffer or coastal regulation zones – were then ineligible for government housing support. In Thailand too, in some places new houses were built about 10 kilometres away from their original locations, and then people were asked to live in the new relocated sites. Fishers said that for ‘safety’ reasons, new houses were built on hills but this effectively reduces their access to the beaches. This relocation also led to disruption of their social networks.

5.2 Groups overlooked in the tsunami response

As the worst-affected livelihood sector, fisheries received the most coverage in the rehabilitation efforts both from the government and civil society organisations. It was widely reported in the community consultations that the post-tsunami livelihood-related rehabilitation focused on the provision of boats and nets, which catered to the male-dominated aspects of fisheries, whereas assistance to the post-harvest and ancillary activities was sporadic and, in terms of actual investments, insignificant. This was largely attributed to the agencies’ overwhelming interest in providing boats.

Huge amounts of funding were available for rehabilitation. Apart from the boats, such as fibre-reinforced plastic (FRP) boats, there were few major items able to absorb large outlays, especially in the post-harvest sector, while other needs – such as investment or market support – were not ‘photogenic’ as one reviewer called them.

The affected groups that reported being largely overlooked or ignored include: women involved in post-harvest activities; ancillary workers; socially excluded groups; those involved in fisheries-based livelihoods that were not recognised as such; migrant fishers and vulnerable groups such as older people and single women.

Women and men involved in post-harvest activities reported receiving little assistance from governments or other sources to rebuild basic assets destroyed by the tsunami.

In Sri Lanka the fisher folk consulted stated that women contributed up to 40 percent of the family income through post-harvest production. The loss of their livelihood has had a serious impact on the family economy as a whole – and more particularly for women-headed households. Groups of women in the east, south and west of Sri Lanka said that their post-harvest activities in dry and salt fish production were destroyed by the tsunami. Some said that they were moving out of these activities as they are no longer sustainable and cannot contribute to the family economy, while others are continuing their production but with much difficulty as they face marketing problems due to the high cost for inputs.

The major constraints fisherwomen said they faced in rebuilding their livelihood are: lack of initial capital;...
Infrastructure; vocational training (e.g. to improve the quality and the preservation technology); and the increased price of inputs. People also said that the open-market policy allowing the import of other post-harvest fish products, such as dry fish and Maldives fish, and their availability at lower prices is resulting in the marginalisation of local products and discouraging small, local, female producers.

Affected women stated that the compensation they received from the government or the subsidies or grants from I/NGOs was limited/inadequate. The type of support that had been provided tended to focus on the formation (or strengthening) of self-help groups, with some assistance for post-harvest initiatives such as the provision of ice boxes, solar fish dryers¹ or alternative income-generating enterprises. One positive example of support is briefly described below.

Social Need Education and Human Awareness (SNEHA) in India was already operating in the tsunami-affected area before the tsunami. It has formed more women's groups in villages since the disaster. In some villages the women were provided with vending vessels, and, within groups, individuals were provided seed capital to start vending. There is internal lending in a group with an interest rate of two percent per month as opposed to 10 percent with informal lenders. In one bigger village a fish-drying yard was constructed at an investment of 0.4 million rupees. The fish yard has resulted in a 20-30 percent increase in price realisation as the fish dries fast and there is an improvement in quality as it is no longer dried in mud/sand. A village was also provided with an auto-rickshaw to ferry the fish for vending. The bigger village has additionally got tent house equipment. SNEHA plans to promote a producers company in 2007, with the members of the federation which will be an enterprise of women involved in fish processing.

The strength of the intervention is that it builds on the current competence and activities of the members by trying to address certain aspects of the value chain which are local – drying and/or transport. Perhaps because SNEHA was present before the tsunami, the groups display high social cohesion and were able to expand and include more (affected) women post-disaster. There is proof of evolved systems and transparency within the groups. Most women know what is happening – including inflow and outflow of money. The groups also show a vision for the future.

Similarly, women selling fish face increased competition for fish at the landing centres with more powerful players, along with increased costs of investments. Nine out of every ten people consulted in Sri Lanka said that the open-market economic policies of the government have had a detrimental impact and displaced fisherwomen from small-scale fish vending and the post-harvest production process.

For 30 years I have been doing Maldives fish business and have received a good income too. If the government gives priority to our production and stops importing from Maldives, we, as women, definitely could contribute to overcome hardships in the family.

Welegoda, Devinuwara, Sri Lanka

If we get a reasonable price for our dry fish and Maldives fish it would be good for our survival. Although we produce them with difficulty, we do not receive a good price for them.

Hambantota, Sri Lanka

Fishing labourers also reported being excluded or ignored as the following case study illustrates (see opposite page).

¹ In India, assistance provided to small-scale fish processors included setting up expensive fish dryers using solar panels as the source of energy, ostensibly to help the women make better quality dried fish. The viability of the solar fish dryers is very doubtful (sun drying is readily available and doesn’t cost anything for maintenance and repairs) and the solar dryers are rarely used by the women (except to demonstrate their ‘benefits’ to visiting dignitaries).
Mrs Visalatchi who is 32 years old lives in Nagapattinam District, Tamil Nadu, India. Her husband is a labourer. They have a six-year-old daughter. They do not have a boat so her husband worked as a labourer in another’s boat and used to get 2,000 rupees per month. Their life depended on the boat owner. During the tsunami the boat on which her husband worked as a labourer was damaged. After the tsunami the boat owner received 80,000 rupees as compensation but he did not share even a single paisa with his labourers. If he used that compensation for another purpose instead of purchasing a boat, what will be the position of the labourers? As Mrs Visalatchi’s story indicates, the government should also consider the fisher labourers while making the policy and also give compensation to those who also depend on the sea but do not have any assets. The life of the labourers has been ignored by the government.

Socially-excluded groups such as Dalits in India and Moken in Thailand who are fishers, reported being left out or receiving inadequate attention. The former being considered by Indian authorities and others as people of a non-fishing background by virtue of their caste.

People living in ‘shadow zones,’ that is, in areas adjacent to those directly hit by the tsunami such as lagoons or backwaters, stated that their fisheries-based livelihoods were badly affected but this was generally not recognised. Similarly, in several parts of India, bicycle fish vendors, because of their supposed non-fisheries background (in terms of caste or geographical origin), were not acknowledged as ‘fish workers’ despite the fish trade having been their main occupation for generations.

In Devanampattinam, India, the farmers are a minority not only in number but also socially, as they belong to a Scheduled Caste community. They are dominated by, and subservient to, the fishing community. Though the fishing community was severely affected by the tsunami and experienced more loss of life and livelihood, members of the farmers’ community were also affected. They lost an important livelihood option as their lands turned saline due to the tsunami and hence their yield has decreased. This was not noticed by the government and other organisations who were engaged in the relief and rehabilitation work – only a few NGOs have taken an interest in the agricultural sector.

The fishing community claims that it lost its life and boats so only it should get the compensation. They say there were no deaths in the farming community – nor did they lose their land – so all the benefits should only be given to the fishing community. If any vehicle came with relief packages it was taken by the fishing community and they did not allow the vehicles to enter into area inhabited by farmers. The farmers didn’t receive any benefit from the government (GO.30, 124 and 203) apart from the compensation of 10 rupees for every cent (435.6 square feet; 100 cents = 1 acre) of their seawater-inundated land. The rights of the farmers have been denied by the government as well as by the majority of the village community.

Migrant fishers who had the misfortune of being at a location away from their native place meant that they could not obtain support in either place. It was reported that support to vulnerable groups such as older people, single women and people living with disabilities was also uneven and largely inadequate.

The impact of such changes is particularly severe for single women, who are forced to seek alternative livelihoods in tourism and other new activities coming up in the coastal areas. In India, women are seen to be moving into wage labour-oriented activities in agriculture, domestic service, urban trade, port and industrial work, and social forestry (Salagrama 2006d).
Fisheries-Based Livelihoods in the post-tsunami context
5.3 Inputs

The fishers experienced varying degrees of obstacles in procuring the inputs, particularly in the post-tsunami context. They reported that the price of inputs like fuel, engines, boats, nets and spare parts have gone up much faster than the market value of their produce, and that reasonable credit was difficult to obtain. While there has been a large increase in the production cost of fish and fish-products, it is however, the ‘middlesmen’ who decide the fish market price. People commented on the need for the State to intervene to regulate the market price for their catch, the price of fuel and gear, and to provide subsidies.

Fishers everywhere stated that a crucial concern is the rising cost of fuel to run motorised boats. In Sri Lanka, there has been an increase of 350 percent in the cost of fuel since 2000 (4.6 times), while in India it rose by 300 percent since 1998. The rising cost of fuel used in fishing operations was also reported to be a concern in the Maldives. Although the boats here use collector vessels to save steaming distance and time, the fishers said the cost of fuel is still forbidding as they also incur expenses to travel to the markets in Male. The lack of an inter-atoll public transport system adds to the costs.

By July, 2007, fuel prices have increased twice [this year]. In early June, it was 52 rupees and today it was raised to 68 rupees. We don’t know how many more times it will increase within this year. Not only farmers, but also fishers, will commit suicide if the fuel prices continue to increase this way.

Devinuwara, Sri Lanka

Some fishermen committed suicide due to fuel price hike and indebtedness. We don’t know how many will follow the same way in the future.

Devinuwara, Sri Lanka

In India, a subsidy (in the form of exemption of a sales tax) is available to the fishers to meet their fuel costs, but the fishers complain that the price of fuel has gone up to such an extent that the subsidy is almost meaningless. Sri Lankan fishers also noted that most fishing gear is imported and that there are no incentives or subsidies to encourage local production.

The maintenance cost of a motorised boat was reported to be quite prohibitive, and as fishers frequently operate from surf-beaten beaches, the boats suffer a lot of wear and tear. The cost of nets – which must be replaced frequently – keeps increasing, while the need to keep in stock a range of different nets is an absolute necessity to cope with the uncertainties in fishing.

The increase in costs leads fishers to frequently abandon fishing operations for long stretches of time. When the post-tsunami boats arrived in several villages in southern India, they remained on the beaches for months at a time because the fishers lacked the minimum investment required to take them to the sea. In other parts of India, the fishers have abandoned engines altogether and reverted to oars and sails, while a number of FRP boats – which cannot be operated without engines – are left to their fate on the beaches.

In the Maldives, some fishers reported a gradual shift from large dhonis to medium-sized dhonis, in order to economise by reducing consumption of fuel.

The questions repeatedly raised by Sri Lankan fishers during the consultations were: How can the fisher people survive the price increases in fishing gear? Who will help us survive? Which economic policy will help us attain a decent living? Is there any solution to the ongoing price hikes in fishing gear within the open market and liberalised economic policies?

While the international dimension behind the frequent increase in fuel costs is widely recognised, the fishers in all countries said that their government could be more pro-active in providing subsidies. Exploring new options like alternative power sources (solar or wind power); improving the efficiency of the existing engines and boat designs, enhancing access to ready repair and maintenance facilities; developing more robust boat landing centres (to reduce wear and tear), and marketing fishing inputs through cooperative outlets (to reduce intermediaries’ profit margins) was also suggested by the fishers in the community consultations. Fishers also commented on the lack of fish-finding equipment and technology.

Fishers in India and Sri Lanka commented on the large increase in the number of boats, compared to pre-tsunami numbers, which had largely resulted in increased fishing in the inshore waters. Fishers also reported other concerns regarding the new boats:

- Their quality of construction: many boats developed problems ranging from simple to quite serious after only a few months of use. This raised questions about the resilience of the boats to withstand the tough sea conditions, and highlighted a major gap in tsunami
response programmes with regard to the quality of their inputs and their coverage of sea safety.

• The new boat technologies: for example, fibreglass boats and engines are very new to the local communities and the capacity of the fishers to undertake maintenance and repairs is very low.

• The cost of fishing operations went up as a result of motorisation and increased engine horsepower, which coincided with huge increases in fuel costs. With capital investment being confined to one-off support (and most funding agencies having already gone), and the credit from the private sector being a major drain on the incomes, many fishers faced problems in finding finance for fishing.

• Another important implication of the new FRP boats reported by fisher folk is the marginalisation of traditional fishing technologies, like the raft catamarans of India and the plank-built dhonis of the Maldives, and the decreasing numbers of the former.

• Fishers’ experience in India is that many catamaran owners did not use their compensation to replace their lost catamaran, and many were provided a shared ownership of a fibre boat. A serious consequence of the artisanal fishers leaving catamaran-based shallow water fishing to take up deep-sea fishing is that they are becoming labourers. They have gradually written off their shared ownership over the fibre boats—which were vested in five persons per boat—by either selling it to a resourceful person among the five, thereby rendering it to a single owner, or to an outsider. This is how the transition from catamaran owner to a fisher labourer has happened.

Even in cases where the market values of fish catches have gone up, fishers stated that the increased dependence on credit from traders for meeting recurring costs has reduced their share in the returns.

The inability of small-scale fishers to receive a reasonable price for their catch is due to their indebtedness.

Heard in the south and east of Sri Lanka

We take loans with high interest rates and buy boats, engines and nets. The fuel price is also very high and we cannot get a reasonable price for the fish we catch today. This income is not adequate even for the fuel price – so how can we pay back the loans?

Ninthavur, Sri Lanka

Fishers reported that because they cannot earn enough compared to their expenses, they become indebted in the end. Due to these circumstances, fishers said they have started selling or leasing out their fishing gear to an investor and have become a fish worker under the same person (investor). Fishers are giving up the industry and parents are not willing to employ their children in fishing.

In the Maldives, some of the people consulted stated that younger people are either working on larger fishing vessels or shifting to other livelihoods.

I’m now 67, so now I only do the reef fishing. I can’t leave fishing as I’m so fond of this job. But it is very sad as there are not many young people willing to be engaged in this type of work.

Fisherman, B. Eydhafushi, Maldives

Notwithstanding the policy measures to bring formal banking closer to the poor people, access to institutional finance remains very weak for people in small-scale fisheries. With the need for investments to buy engines and nets and to finance fishing (and trade) only partially met from the rehabilitation programmes, a majority of people turned to informal money-lenders, which meant paying a large proportion of their earnings to service the debt. Access to informal credit itself became more difficult in the post-tsunami period as many money-lenders (and trader-financiers) lost their investments and became more particular about their lending operations. This meant that, for the fishers, the access to informal credit decreased while its cost—already too high—rose to new heights.

According to a recent FAO study in the tsunami-affected parts of India (MCG 2007), over 60 percent of the credit needs of the fishers (both men and women) are still met by the informal sector (with an effective interest rate of 190 percent per annum), while the formal banking institutions (with 12-14 percent EIR) hardly account for 6.6 percent, or a tenth of that coming from the informal sources. In other words, the largely exploitative private money-lenders still remain the main source of credit to the fishers while the supposedly ‘development’ oriented formal banking systems steer clear of them.
5.4 Markets

The fishing people consulted in Sri Lanka and India declared that governments should take a more active role in the markets. The problem was attributed to the disproportionate attention given to commercial fishing – large trawlers and export markets – to the neglect and detriment of local markets, small-scale fisheries and fish workers, even though larger numbers of people – and poorer people – are engaged in the latter. The extent of support provided for local marketing – investment, preservation and transport, and infrastructure – is regarded as inadequate.

A number of market-related issues raised by small fishers across Sri Lanka resonated with issues raised elsewhere:

- Lack of effective government involvement to regulate the market and ensure just prices for both fishers and consumers. As the State Ceylon Fisheries Corporation purchases only three percent of fish produce in the country – at the same purchase amount offered by the middlemen in the market – it has no significant influence on the market prices of fish.
- Lack of an effective plan to purchase, store and release excess fish to the market in an appropriate time, during low-yield seasons.
- Reduction in the quality of fish due to lack of proper transportation, cold storage facilities and ice factories in the coastal areas.
- Lack of facilities for the post-harvest fish processing work and little attention to improvement of post-harvest technologies.

In addition, fishers in Sri Lanka’s east reported the difficulties they face in bringing their catch to the market in a timely manner due to war-related restrictions. They also have to use fish to pay bribes, due to various threats by military groups.

In Sri Lanka, in all districts, eight out of ten people consulted highlighted the importance of state intervention in the market and requested assistance to overcome the issue of the middlemen – or the private sector/businessmen – who they regard as controlling the market prices, transportation, distribution and sales, and breaking down the relationship between consumers and producers. For example, in Matara District people said that one kilogram of Alagodu fish costs the consumer approximately 250-270 rupees. The producer receives only 150-180 rupees from the transaction, while, with minimum labour, the middlemen receive a profit of around 100 rupees per kilogram.

As already mentioned, fishers reported that allowing the entry of foreign fleets into Sri Lankan national waters for fishing also enables them to land their catches in the local markets, leading to the marginalisation of the small-scale producers and traders in the markets.

In the Maldives, people said that the monopsonistic practices of a few traders in Male are keeping the prices low for the dried or salted fish. They thought that if more buyers could be encouraged to take part in the business, this would increase competitiveness and increase the price of dried fish.

Efforts to protect the stake of the poorer people in the face of competition from more powerful new entrants are nonexistent. Thus, in Sri Lanka, women said that the import of high-quality dried fish products, which are sold at a cheaper rate than that produced locally, depresses the demand for the local produce as the women processors cannot compete with the imported products in terms of quality and at the price that they are sold.

In Sri Lanka, India and Thailand, open market policies are adversely affecting the livelihoods of the small-scale fishers. The increase in costs of fuel, engines, boats, nets and spare parts, is just one part of the change. Others include alienation of customary rights to the sea (with programmes like the Sea Food Bank in Thailand, and licenses to foreign and domestic ventures in India and Sri Lanka) and to coastal land (with promotion of tourism in Sri Lanka and Thailand, with Special Economic Zones in India). The changes to the subsidy regime also includes withdrawal of tax exemptions (on income, sales, exports) granted in the past and charging user fees for public infrastructure, healthcare and other utilities. The implementation of these policies has been devastating for different categories of the stakeholders, especially the poor and vulnerable groups.
5.5 Infrastructure

The tsunami caused substantial destruction of infrastructure in all four countries. Fishers protested against the rehabilitation focus on expensive export-oriented infrastructure rather than the provision of the low cost infrastructure critical for ensuring the livelihoods of the large number of people involved in the local fish trade and processed fish trade. Everywhere fishers spoke about the need for good landing sites and facilities, anchorage points, or fishery harbours to launch their boats and canoes to the sea and park/anchor them safely after the fishing trip. While the restoration of infrastructure in the coastal areas has been projected as a priority in the tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction process, in some areas the basic infrastructure facilities improved, but in many other places there are still poor or no facilities.

In Sri Lanka, for instance, as against its own estimate of 17,888 million rupees required for reconstruction purposes, the government allocated a meagre 418 million rupees for livelihood development of coastal communities for the five-year period (Ministry of Finance, Tsunami Reconstruction and Development Strategy, Sri Lanka).

In the absence of proper landing centres, fishers in many parts of Sri Lanka and India described operating their boats through narrow and often hazardous channels to reach the shore. Even where some landing facilities (anchorage points, jetties) exist, they are hopelessly insufficient to berth all the boats, especially in the post-tsunami period where their numbers have increased. A majority of small-scale fishers continue to land their catches on open beaches without any post-harvest infrastructure to expedite the movement of fish to markets in good condition, which is a cause of losses arising from spoilage, poor quality and contamination.

People reported that the lack of access to basic infrastructure affects the quality of fish processed by traditional methods (drying, salting), often contributing to sizeable losses and loss of value. An increasing problem mentioned by the people involved in fish processing is the issue of land ownership, which is becoming contentious in all countries and affects the processors’ capacity to invest in even basic infrastructure necessary for processing.

We do not have a fishery harbour in the Balapitiya area. We have to go to Galle or Beruwala to sell our fish-catch. By that time, our fish have already become rotten or spoiled.

Balapitiya, Sri Lanka

In several locations in Sri Lanka, Thailand and India, fisher folk expressed their concerns about the construction of harbours without assessment of the potential impact on the environment and fishing livelihoods. For example, the construction of harbours led to erosion-related problems, or the harbours themselves remained useless due to siltation or wave action. Sri Lankan fishers in Puranawella-Devinuwara, Beruwala and Kudawella reported that the incorrect design of the harbour, which did not take into account the basic minimum requirement of breakwaters, and wind and wave directions, resulted in the increased danger of accidents for small fishers and fish workers. Similarly, in Thailand, villagers reported how, without consulting them, the government authorities constructed a seawall in front of luxurious hotels to prevent coastal erosion. As a result, the change in the tidal direction is causing serious beach erosion to their nearby village.

The construction of modern commercial harbours has also displaced or threatens small-scale fishing communities. This has also affected their livelihoods adversely through, for example, the loss of landing sites and harbour facilities.

The Oluwil harbour construction is very difficult for our fishermen. The government removed beach seine fishers from the area, promising compensation. Fisher people who were displaced by the tsunami will be further displaced.

Oluwil, Sri Lanka
5.6 Tourism and industrial developments

_When they chase us away from the coast and build hotels – will we go to sea by flying?_
_Dodanduwa, Sri Lanka_

_The government gives more emphasis to tourism than fishers. In the very near future we will lose our landing sites too._
_Kochchikade, Sri Lanka_

During the consultations, fishers in Sri Lanka, Thailand and India felt that their government’s plans are displacing coastal fishers and small-scale fishing industries and that the construction of large-scale tourist hotels and tourism zones has become a major development strategy in the post-tsunami development process. Numerous examples were given of fishers being evicted from their land to make way for tourism or other developments, ignoring their customary rights to fishing grounds and to the land on which they reside. Tourism is a major foreign currency earner in all four countries. The situation in the Maldives is somewhat different to the other countries in that only uninhabited islands are slated for tourism development.

In the Maldives small fishers also felt that they were neglected by the government.

_The government needs to do something to promote fishing in the same way as tourism. Why is the Government only thinking about tourism? For them is this dirty work or what?_
_Fisherman, Raa Atoll, Maldives_

As already mentioned, affected fishers consulted in Thailand declared that the Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) programme in Thailand is threatening fishers’ rights to their land while at the same time providing opportunities for large-scale private investment on the coast. In five out of seven tsunami-affected locations where community consultations were held, the government has projected mega development projects and exclusive tourism developments under the post-tsunami recovery programme.

For example, at Phi Phi Island foreign investors in high-class hotels and resorts are welcomed with special tax-exemption deals. At Koh Korkhao an international airport will be constructed in response to increasing numbers of foreign tourists, while the nearby village of Namkem is slated to be a historical village, demonstrating typical fishers’ livelihoods which will entail the displacement of many. People confirmed that the process is top-down with no accountability to the local community. Mangrove forests and beach lands have been encroached by the hoteliers and land investors with the facilitation of local government officials. Around 150 communities in six provinces are involved in land conflicts with private investors and government agencies.

In India, the proposal to set up Special Economic Zones (SEZ) in coastal areas is seen as a major threat to the livelihoods of the fishers. Apart from their displacement from the coast, the fishing community are also concerned that the industrial activities planned under these SEZs will cause marine pollution, moreso because of the ineffective enforcement of environmental laws.

One example of people’s customary rights being ignored is in Negombo, Sri Lanka, where more than 150 dry fish producers said that they are facing the threat of displacement from their lands, as, under the Ramya Nagara (city beautification) development program, the Negombo Municipal Council wants people to relocate.

During the consultations in Ampara district, Sri Lanka, people expressed their dissatisfaction with the tsunami rehabilitation programme and the fact that although thousands of people are still waiting to receive houses there are reports that the government plans to invest in the construction a 1.06 billion rupees bridge in Arugam Bay, Pothuwil. They declared that it is due to the fact that Arugam Bay has the potential to be an attractive tourist city in the east coast that it is being given more attention.

In India, the proposal to set up Special Economic Zones (SEZ) in coastal areas is seen as a major threat to the livelihoods of the fishers. Apart from their displacement from the coast, the fishing community are also concerned that the industrial activities planned under these SEZs will cause marine pollution, moreso because of the ineffective enforcement of environmental laws.
5.7 **Diversification of livelihoods**

*Our income is not adequate at all. No fish when fish prices are high, but low prices when we have a higher catch. Also, we do not have work throughout the year.*

Unakuruwa, Sri Lanka

In India it was reported that women fish vendors who had been provided with training in jute bag making, candle making and lampshade making for sale to tourists had stopped their former occupation. However, if labour costs are considered in these time-consuming activities they are hardly viable.

With several categories of fish workers being squeezed out of the sector, diversification of incomes has become an important issue, and the evidence from Sri Lanka and India shows that the alternatives were not any more sustainable than their old activities and in many cases actually paid less. A review of the performance of post-tsunami alternative livelihood programmes in India indicates that there have been very few success stories and a majority failed to achieve their objectives (Salagrama 2007), which frequently has to do with a simplistic understanding of people’s needs and choices.

**Diversification of livelihood: An experience from Community Development Organisation Trust (CDOT), Chennai, India**

CDOT provides vocational training in Cell Phone Repairing, Desktop Publishing, Hardware Networking and Web Designing. The target group is the daughters and sons (18-24 years of age) of affected fisher folk and labourers’ families. Except for the first, which is focussed on women, the other trainings have people from both genders. The training consists of a technical module of 2-4 months’ duration and a life skills module of one month. The interventions are primarily aimed at diversifying income sources and thereby reduction in vulnerability. The skills developed are in some of the highest areas of growth in the country and so ensure potential for fixed wages or wages and commissions. In addition to the technical skills, life skills are also imparted, which is crucial. Most interventions target the younger generation not interested in fishing and related jobs. The intervention has collaboration with many institutions to get technical know-how or resource persons and then to find employment for the trainees. For example, for cell phone repair training, CDOT collaborates with a private institution and the first batch of trainees has been absorbed by telecom service providers like Nokia, Reliance and LG etc.

**Small-scale group enterprises**

CDOT has initiated a few small-scale group enterprises by training women and then investing in common infrastructure like machinery, facility on rent and running of the business. The unit for processing fish into pickles was started when a group of women went on an exposure trip to Tutikodi Fisheries College and became interested in this activity. In early 2007, 35 women were involved in processing and the remaining 70 were responsible for marketing. All were receiving a wage of 50 rupees per day with the later getting additional commission if the product is sold above a certain pre-decided rate. At that time two employees of CDOT were engaged in the enterprise, one for managing and the other for quality assurance. The investment in the unit is two million rupees in addition to expenditure on training. The investment in the collective infrastructure or enterprise for raw material processing is significant, ensuring that the collective gets the benefit of value addition.
5.8 Fisheries management and governance

The affected fisher folk consulted in all countries – both men and women – expressed the need for better management of the resources, and their concern is that any management measures should take into account the possible costs for different categories of people and comprise strategies to reduce their hardship. In Sri Lanka, 3,000 people out of the 4,155 consulted felt a need for effective management solutions to address the resource declines in coastal waters which they primarily attributed to over-fishing, industrial pollution, and destructive/illegal fishing methods. Although a number of fisheries management measures do exist in all countries for conserving and managing the resources¹, the fishers contend that the scope as well as the formulation and implementation of the management measures is far from satisfactory.

For example, in Sri Lanka fishers reported that while the use of certain nets is banned, their sale is not, so the nets continue to be sold. Most of the fishers consulted in Sri Lanka believed that the country’s legal framework was sufficient and that if the necessary political will is present then the issues can be solved.

There is no systematic approach to monitor illegal fishing operators and to take legal action against them for complete prevention of the harmful fishing.

Trincomalee, Sri Lanka

Although there are education programmes on illegal fishing and the impact on the environment, there are rules and regulations which are not effectively enforced and have no real impact on the lives of the fishers.

Negombo, Sri Lanka

Although policies do make an explicit mention of community participation, this is not the case. In India, Sri Lanka and Thailand fisher folk articulated numerous examples of where they have been ignored by the governments, effectively alienating the fishers from decision-making roles. Fishers expressed the need for them to have a more pro-active role in the decision-making processes governing their lives and livelihoods, especially in the context of reduced availability of, and weakening access to and control over, resources.

Management measures often have costs which are reflected in changes to the terms of access to different resources on which fishers depend. Small-scale fishers complain that it is they who pay the bigger costs. The restrictions on fishing in the inshore waters, near river mouths or in mangrove areas, which provide livelihoods to sizeable numbers of people, require total or partial stoppage of activities by the artisanal fishing boats (which cannot go out) while the mechanised fleets manage to seek alternative fishing grounds and survive.

Similarly, the enforcement of management-related regulations in countries like India is regarded as being more stringent where small-scale fishers are involved, while the mechanised trawlers often go without penalty. The interactions in the four countries clearly show that people’s awareness of, and understanding about, the various institutions, their roles and responsibilities, the different policies (both fisheries and non-fisheries) and their implications for their livelihoods, remain extremely weak. This impacts their capacity to deal with the institutions confidently.

A fundamental problem is also that policies – and policy-makers – exist on a different plane from that on which the fishers live; and there is a huge gulf dividing the two. In many cases, not only the policy process but even the language in which it is drafted (generally English), is difficult for people to relate to. Together with lack of space for community consultation (let alone participation) in policy making, this means that most fisheries’ plans are presented as fait accompli, so the fishers have to learn to live with them as best they can.

¹ These include seasonal fishing bans; mesh size regulations; bans on destructive fishing gear; closure of access to sensitive/fragile habitats; putting a cap on the size of the fishing fleets; restricting harvesting capacities (in terms of engine horsepower or nets carried onboard); undertaking stock replenishment efforts (e.g. by setting up fish aggregating devices, artificial reefs and by sea ranching) and encouraging fishing fleets to diversify operations to the offshore/oceanic/under-exploited waters.
It is important that the affected fishing communities in whose name rehabilitation plans are being formulated be made a part of the entire planning process, right from the beginning and not made to choose from some options presented by the Government and other multilateral agencies. We should not allow the fishing community, which has been completely devastated by the tsunami, to be enslaved by unviable and unsustainable options made in their names by others.

Kattumaram-Makkal Medai, Citizens’ Platform for Tsunami Affected Fishers, Tamil Nadu, India

In India, the government mediated its efforts through the traditional Panchayats. However the role of these Panchayats was mixed as they favoured equal rather than equitable distribution of all the resources that came into their village as relief or rehabilitation measure. Fisher folk reported that while in some cases distribution to male members may have been satisfactory, widows and Dalits were typically excluded. Likewise, fishing labourers missed out on compensation or support from these Panychayats as they also are not recognised as fishers and hence excluded from registering in the Fishermen’s Cooperative Societies. In the past, fishers did not see any significant benefit in registering themselves with the Fishermen Cooperatives, apart from the 1,200 rupees given to them during the lean fishing season every year. As a result many of them were reluctant to register themselves. However, since the tsunami the number of people showing interest in registering with these cooperatives has increased after they saw that the government compensation was given only to those who were registered with the cooperatives.

The entire village of Akkaraipettai in India is under the control of the traditional Panchayat which consists of the President, Secretary, Treasurer and 12 members of the committee. All the problems are dealt with by the traditional Panchayat only. The traditional Panchayat has played a vital role in deciding and allocating tsunami assistance to the people. The formal Panchayat is working with the traditional Panchayat.

The Fishermen Co-operative Society of Akkaraipettai was registered in the 1980s under the Tamil Nadu Act 206. The criteria for membership are that he/she should belong to the fishing community and should not be below 18 years of age and not above 60 years of age. The society consists of 2,890 male and 1,880 female members. There is a separate society for both men and women, but there is no regular meeting for women, they join with the men’s society for meetings even though they have a separate president. The Society collects 75 rupees for saving. Up until 2003 women used to get only 600 rupees and men 1,200 rupees as compensation for during Deepavali time. However, now both receive 1,200 rupees as compensation for the rough season. If a member of the society dies under the age of 60, the family get an insurance payout of 51,000 rupees. However, if the person is over 60 they do not get anything.
5.9 Working conditions of fish labourers

The community consultations highlighted the labour and safety issues of fish workers on multi-day fishing vessels. To cope with the declining fish catches and the growing cost of operations, the fishing boats go farther out to sea and stay longer periods at a stretch, which breeds concern about the living and working conditions of the crew members. People reported an increased incidence of injuries and risks faced by the fishers who are forced to adopt unsafe fishing techniques such as long-lining in an environment of high competition due to commercial fishing.

The World Forum of Fisher People (WFFP) has been struggling to win the rights of fish workers for years. As a result of their campaign, and many others, the ILO adopted a new fisheries convention on fish workers’ labour standards in June 2007 (Work in Fishing Convention, ILO, 2007). Fishers need to campaign for their governments to ratify the convention to ensure that the rules and regulations are implemented according to the convention.

The difficulties fishers said they face related to safety and security are as follows:

- Sea safety issues especially, as even the first aid facilities onboard are often quite rudimentary if not non-existent. There is also a lack of knowledge of treatments in the case of emergencies.
- Few boats are stocked with life-jackets and other life-saving devices. Periodical monitoring by the port officials is practically non-existent.
- Irregularities and other forms exploitation occur when shares are distributed to workers in multi-day boats.
- There is no job security due to a lack of social security measures.
- The risk of exposure to natural disasters at sea is very high and the lack of advanced warning systems onboard puts the lives of the fishers at grave risk.
- In both Sri Lanka and the southern zones of India, the use of communication systems onboard is banned because of the prevailing war conditions.
- Labour laws are notoriously absent onboard. The working conditions on the boats can be tough, involving long working hours, hard work and braving harsh conditions at sea.
- Women working in shrimp processing factories, for example in Kerala, India, have to contend with living and working conditions which often constitute abuse of human rights.

5.10 Social protection

Some of the men and women in the artisanal fisheries sector expressed concern about the lack of access to and coverage by social support programmes which would enable them to cope with deprivation and vulnerability in a more sustainable manner. The ILO fisheries convention on fish workers’ labour standards (June 2007) proposes some social security measures, such as legal protection for job security, safety in the sea, leave, leisure and pension schemes to ensure a safe life during old age. In Sri Lanka very few fishers consulted knew about the convention and benefits that they could achieve if the Sri Lankan government were to adopt it.

In the wake of the tsunami, fishers and their families faced difficulties such as:

- the compensation for disappeared fishers cannot be claimed as the family do not have the death certificate;
- widows were unable to claim for lost livelihood – they were not eligible to claim for lost assets which were regarded as belonging to their deceased husband.

While, for example, India has a social welfare component in their fisheries plans and this is reflected in the form of housing, lean-season assistance (savings-cum-relief) and insurance, the scope and coverage of these programmes is regarded as inadequate. For instance, it is only very recently that women became eligible to receive insurance, which was made possible by years of agitation by fishers’ organisations.

A major gap in the coverage of the welfare programmes is the provision for older people who lead an extremely precarious existence, many of them literally scavenging for their survival, yet totally ignored in policy context.
the society takes care of all fishing-related needs. The selling or auction of the catch is done collectively by the society, thus obtaining a much better price for the fishermen. The converse is that a member cannot sell his catch otherwise or alone.

Since the fishermen have a relatively high annual financial requirement for investment in their activity. Also, to take care of the lean period, the society provides finance at 12 percent per annum to meet this demand. This is deducted on a daily basis from the earnings realised from the catch. The society also provides a savings service – compulsory as well as voluntary.

In addition, all the members are insured. SIFFS has been able to influence insurers to develop a product for fishermen. The member’s life is insured for 100 rupees annual premium. Post-disaster, SIFFS has been able to come out with a product where a fishing unit (all five members including the crew) is insured against accidental death at sea, at a 165 rupees annual premium. The uniqueness of the scheme is that it is impersonal, and is irrespective of which crew goes in which boat and if the crew change their team. All this has been possible because of collectivisation.

Since the institution provides all kinds of services for fishing, the members get a nominal discount and preference for availing of the services.

The village societies are federated into district federations which are primarily responsible for conflict resolution and advocacy. The executive committee is elected from among the members and has the authority to prepare strategy and make decisions which the operating structure executes.

Until the disaster the societies took only boat owners as members and by virtue of the same, had only male members. Now crew are taken as associate members on the recommendation of the boat owners. The associate members are not allowed to participate in the general body to elect the executive committee and their loan eligibility is linked to the savings. As a reflection of the value of its services, membership in this village had grown to 209 in early 2007 (up from 86 in December 2004) and all fishing unit owners except for one had taken membership. The society now has 400 associate members who are crew.

SIFFS has also started forming groups with women who are engaged in fish vending. There is a plan to buy an icebox and vehicle to facilitate the storage and transport of fish.

SIFFS has been able to work towards risk reduction in the fishermen’s traditional occupation by coming out with unique insurance schemes due to its ability to influence insurers based on the scale of its memberships.
5.11 Disaster risk reduction, war and security issues

In the ordinary course of events fishers face a range of hazards in their work quite apart from the coastal areas being frequently prone to natural calamities such as cyclones, floods, erosion and, less commonly, tsunami. In both situations, the fisher folks’ experience is that preparedness and the reduction of underlying causes of risk are inadequate. They reported lack of the following:

- advanced warning systems on board to alert crews to natural disasters;
- proper communication systems – such as using lights or other methods – to prevent getting entangled with the big cargo ships in the sea and the subsequent destruction of their nets;
- light-buoyant or other devices to recognise submerged rocks or any other dangerous objects underwater near the coast;
- access to instruments such as Global Positioning Systems (GPS), which can be used when losing track during rough weather to arrive safely at their destinations;
- knowledge regarding changes in the weather patterns in different seasons.

*Our boats get damaged when they go on the rocks as we do not have lights at the harbour.*

Kimbulagalahena, Sri Lanka

In Sri Lanka, fisher folk consulted in the north and east stated that the war is seriously impacting their livelihoods due to:

- their reduced access to raw materials, technology, transportation, markets and investments;
- reduction of the fishers’ access to fishing grounds;
- limiting the fishing times and duration;
- a number of other restrictions, for example in the use of outboard motors, that make fishing a very poor and hazardous occupation.

The fishers in these areas stated that their current levels of income were less than a tenth of the pre-war period. The fall in income is compounded by the increase in prices of basic necessities such as food, leading to malnutrition and starvation. As a result, people migrate to other areas for permanent settlement, which exacerbates the prevailing conditions in the areas they migrate to and leads to tensions with the local communities.

Fisher people expressed their concern regarding the lack of policy and State interventions to release fishermen when they are arrested in neighbouring countries. This is quite a regular occurrence in most countries in the region due to the long distances travelled to catch fish whereby boats can enter into another country’s waters. This can lead to their arrest and imprisonment for fishing there illegally.

As authorities of neighbouring and other countries arrest Sri Lanka fishermen and keep them for long periods of time, why don’t the Sri Lankan government and authorities take any effective action to release them?

Negombo, Sri Lanka

5.12 Summary

Some of the policy and institutional gaps emerging out of the community consultations with affected fisher folk can be summarised as follows:

- The major problems faced by the small-scale fishers in the pre-tsunami period (declining fish catches, weakening access rights to the sea and land, changing trade context, marginalisation of women and the poor, over-capitalisation and increased cost of operations) were not addressed in post-tsunami livelihood support programmes and some of the issues may even have been exacerbated by these programmes.
- Small-scale fisheries and fish workers receive less attention from policy-makers who are more focused on privatisation and increasing investments for faster economic growth.
- Macro-economic policy changes have negative implications for the local small-scale fishers.
- The policy processes – whether in the livelihood context under normal circumstances, or in the disaster management context – are top-down and effectively treat fishers as passive recipients rather than as active participants exercising their rights.
- There is a lack of attention given to poor fishing people and their needs, particularly women.
- Strategies tend to be piecemeal and focused on specific components rather than on the whole picture. People and livelihoods receive less attention than fish and technologies.
- Policies continue to ignore the existence of fisher folks' customary rights in the coastal areas.
- The existing fisheries’ management policies – if properly implemented – have the potential to address many of the issues faced by the sector today.
- Post-tsunami, alienation of fishers from their habitats and fishing grounds increased, sometimes ostensibly for their own safety or livelihood support, but at times to make way for private investment in, for example, tourism.
- No comprehensive research or planning was attempted to:
  (i) understand the fishers’ livelihood needs from capture to sale so that integrated interventions could be made at different points in the supply chains to enhance the viability of their operations;
  (ii) to develop appropriate technology particularly in the post-harvest processing.
- Fishers’ capacity to cope with future disasters remains as poor as it had been in the previous instance.
chapter six: conclusion

6.1 People

The purpose of this report is to understand and present the lives and livelihoods of small-scale fisher folk in the post-tsunami/post-disaster context. The conclusion will focus specifically on disaster management concerns. The previous sections highlight the greater vulnerability to disasters of fisher folk, who are poor. As indicated, there is a need to go beyond simplistic generalisations like ‘fishing communities’ to unpack and identify the very poor and excluded, such as single women, assetless labourers, minority groups and aged people with no means of support. The first step towards addressing their needs would involve developing a comprehensive understanding of the people in different supply chains and their respective roles and responsibilities. This also needs to focus more broadly from ‘fisheries’ livelihoods’ to ‘fisheries-based livelihoods’ to include those such as ice sellers, fish vendors and so on whose livelihoods invariably remain invisible from a policy perspective.

As evidence from any disaster situation shows, the marginalisation of people who are poor prevents them from accessing support and assistance, and at the same time makes them peripheral to those providing it. Together with disaster management agencies and small-scale fisher folk themselves, concerted efforts are required to ensure that they and their institutions are better prepared to deal with the disasters that they will inevitably confront as an integral part of their lives.

The role that women have traditionally played in the sector demands that they be included in the policy processes. There is a need to focus on the specific activities that the women have been involved in – local fresh fish trade, fish processing and trade, shrimp peeling – and ensure that they are protected from the negative impacts of the changes that are occurring in the sector and beyond. This would need to be achieved not so much through special legislations or through measures such as providing ice boxes, but by enabling them to have a bigger – and more sustainable – role in the supply chains. This means providing them with access to and control over the resources, technologies, infrastructure, affordable credit, markets, social support and decision-making in the political processes. The intention here is that the women involved in the sector become active economic agents, not the recipients of patronising support.
6.2 Policies

It is also of fundamental importance that the various governments and their ministries responsible for fisheries enact laws and policies whose implementation will reduce the poverty of small-scale fisher folk, and thus decrease their vulnerability to disasters. These must include:

- A more explicit pro-small-scale fishers and pro-poor orientation in policies and practices.
- A focus on people and livelihoods and less focus on production and technologies; a shift away from increasing production to maximising returns – from quantity to quality and from volume to value.
- More attention paid to the domestic markets, traditional supply chains and the associated infrastructure required by small-scale fisheries) rather than to commercial and export-oriented ventures.
- Recognition of customary rights to the coast, habitation and livelihood.
- Recognition of women’s livelihoods in small-scale fishing as stated above.
- Provisioning of appropriate subsidies for fishing inputs such as fuel and fishing gear, etc.
- Development of comprehensive social protection policies, schemes and practices.

6.3 Practice

For the above to be effective and sustainable the following are indispensable:

- Harmonisation between:
  (i) different policy objectives;
  (ii) policies of different ministries/departments;
  (iii) policies at the international, national and local levels;
  (iv) policy rhetoric and practice on the ground.
- A people-centred research and knowledge-building process which would dynamically link the local to the national and international levels, and simultaneously inform the policies and practices.
- Small-scale fisher folk and their institutions – particularly those of women – are central to the decision-making and accountability processes.
appendix 1 Contextualising fisheries-based livelihoods: an historical overview of the development of the fisheries sector in the Asia region

i. Traditional fishing economies

Prior to the Second World War, the fishing economies in the South and Southeast Asian regions were characterised by typical pre-industrial modes of production. Fishing was subsistence-oriented, involved simple and local technologies, and based on local demand. Restricted by the simple fishing gear and vessels, and with abundant coastal fish resources, most fishing was confined to nearshore waters.

In an open access-based activity like fishing, social cohesion and parity were necessary to maintain the communities' collective claim upon the resource, as well as to meet the requirements of the fishing activity itself. The customary governance systems evolved keeping this sensitive (even fragile) balance in view, with a strong emphasis on safeguarding the existing pattern of things and ensuring equitable access to the resources and the sustainability of operations. There was little consideration of seeking options for enhancement and maximisation of production. The countries of the area were not yet urbanised to any great extent and therefore fishing (both marine and inland) was directed mainly at the need to supply food for these village communities which were often not fully monetised or formalised. The supply of fresh, preserved or processed fish for large centralised markets, either domestic or international, was largely unknown.

Women played a crucial role in the distribution of fish, carrying them to the neighbouring villages and markets; undertaking simple preservation and processing methods such as salting, drying and manufacturing fish sauce. In countries like India and Sri Lanka, this would give rise to a clear gender-based division of labour in the traditional fishing economies and an important role to the women in the economic system. Although women had a well-defined role in the production systems, the extent of their representation in the political and administrative systems was limited, especially in case of widows and single women.

Several studies from the pre-1950s indicate that the fishing economy in the pre-modernisation period was characterised by poor incomes, poor integration with the larger society, seasonal (and long-term) deprivation, and widespread poverty.

ii. Modern fishing economies

Modernisation of marine fisheries in the Asia region began in the aftermath of the Second World War. For example, in the newly independent Sri Lanka and India, the drive to attain national self-sufficiency in food production, to earn foreign exchange to overcome huge gaps in the balance of payments, and to provide new employment opportunities, led to a programme of modernisation. This focused on the introduction of new boats and mechanisation of fishing fleets in order to expand their operations to new fishing grounds and to target new species. In Sri Lanka, fish production was twelve times its 1950 level as a result of the mechanisation and modernisation programmes implemented by the State.

The new technologies required new skills and often very large investments that the cash-starved fishing communities could not make. Governments facilitated the uptake of these technologies by providing incentives to prospective entrepreneurs in the form of generous subsidies and loans as well as training for skill enhancement in the newly-created fisheries training institutes. This led to the formation of a distinct craft-owning class which was not involved in actual fishing itself. Many of those with traditional fisheries-based livelihoods were left out of the modernisation process.

Village-level cooperatives brought into existence for channelling support to the enterprising fishers have had serious consequences for the viability of cooperative institutions as independent entities in countries like India and Sri Lanka. In order to increase private sector participation in fishing, the governments promoted the sea (and other coastal/estuarine waters) as an 'open access' resource. Customary arrangements for controlling entry and user rights for different groups of fishers were totally ignored. This exploitation of open access and class formation within communities actively worked against the ability of customary governance systems to assert their equity-maintaining function which weakened their overarching role in the communities.

On the shore, the operations of the new boats were facilitated by upgrading the post-harvest infrastructure – fishing harbours and anchorages, chilling and processing plants, transport facilities – and by extending support to the exporters in dealing with international markets. New institutions were brought into existence to help in the process, for example, Ceylon Fisheries Corporation (CFC) and Ceylon Fishery Harbours Corporation in Sri Lanka, Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA) in India, and Maldives Industrial Fisheries Company Ltd. (MIFCO) in the Maldives.

Rapid growth in the global demand for seafood contributed to changing the subsistence-oriented, inward-looking marine-fishing economy in Asian countries into a capitalistic system with an overt commercial orientation dominated by the twin themes of...
growth in production and increase in foreign exchange revenues from the sector.

While the benefits of such a shift – especially in the short-term – were quite significant in economic terms, this was not uniform across the fishing communities. The overall impacts of the structural changes that modernisation brought about in the way fish were targeted, handled, processed and traded have been negative and marginalising for many poorer people engaged in traditional fisheries-based livelihoods. The advent of new and more efficient technologies (which operated from the same beaches or landing centres in the same waters and caught the same varieties of fish as the traditional boats) gave rise to competition where the traditional technologies were the losers. The higher economic returns, which attached new social status to the modern technologies, drew new distinctions amongst the fishing communities and reduced the effectiveness of social controls that had existed previously. The new systems resulted in some poor fishers becoming labourers (working for shares onboard and/or wages onshore) with hardly any scope for upward economic mobility.

In many ways, the modernisation of fisheries also meant the ‘masculinisation’ of fisheries (Salagrama 2002) as the new supply chains and their attendant developments contributed to reducing the role of women in the sector. With export markets and distant urban markets dominating the supply chains, the women’s access to fish dwindled and they found themselves having to compete with more powerful traders who could even influence the direction of fishing effort in any given area by focusing fishing effort upon certain high-value species. The advent of export chains gave rise to a credit-market nexus between the fishers and the traders, and led to fish catches being directly supplied to the external traders without being auctioned at all. The traders’ access to ice and rapid transport systems encouraged this process.

While the economic benefits of some of these changes at the community level are big, the social costs for some are more significant and damaging. The conditions of single women (who constitute a sizeable proportion of the households in a community) became more precarious, as their options were very limited. The one new activity that women could take advantage of from the modernisation process involved shrimp peeling, a tedious job that replaced independent businesses with wage labour, and frequently giving rise to serious human rights-related problems for women.

iii. Conditions prevailing in the fisheries sector at the time of the 2004 tsunami

Modernisation led to a rapid increase in marine-fish production in all the countries around the Bay of Bengal region. As long as production grew along with additions to harvesting capacity, surpluses were reinvested in increasing fishing capacity or efficiency. By the 1990s overall production started flagging. Some of the common manifestations of the decline included: decreased catch per boat; increased landing of juveniles; uncharacteristic fluctuations in seasonal availability of fish; changes in species’ composition in an area; and disappearance or decline of certain commonly-harvested species. This resource depletion is primarily attributed to competition, destructive fishing and over-fishing. Different fishing systems scrambling for control over a limited resource have resulted in increased conflicts with fishermen resorting to harmful practices such as fishing in sensitive areas, using smaller-meshed nets and blocking migratory paths. Small-scale fishers are particularly hard hit by the policies which pushed for unsustainable expansion.

One FAO report stated:

Exploitation was done in an often uncontrolled, unregulated manner. When stocks were depleted by [...] new fishing methods, fleets moved on to the next area or stock. This sequential plunder also occurred across fisheries as the declining economic performance of one fishery spurred the transfer of vessels and fishers to a new, developing fishery (very often with government assistance) which in its turn also declined (FAO, 2006: vii).

According to FAO, over 77 percent of all fisheries’ resources are fully or over-exploited and only three percent are categorised as under-exploited.

Coupled with the decline in fish catches is the more important issue of over-capitalisation of effort, which is manifested in the high levels of investments made in capital assets and the mounting operational costs to keep the fleets gainfully employed. So long as the returns were commensurate with the effort, the investment needs were not a major issue for the fishers (especially as there was a constant flow of investment from the government as well as the private sector), but once the fish catches started declining and the private sector investors became more careful with their investments, this started to become an important concern. In livelihood terms, the cost of operations became the most important deciding factor of viability of operations and affected virtually every aspect of production, processing and trade. While over-capitalisation primarily is concerned with large-scale investments, the impact these have impacted negatively on the livelihoods of small-scale fishers.

The economic-liberalisation policies and structural-adjustment programmes that most governments in the region have implemented since the late 1980s have reduced the direct support flowing into the sector. More importantly it led to the withdrawal of existing subsidies (e.g. for fuel), which meant a major setback to the modernisation technologies whose economic viability
increasingly depended upon the continued existence of subsidies. The need for high investments thus meant that ownership of production tools (boats, nets) became confined to fewer people, with the trader-intermediaries often becoming the *de facto* owners. In many ways, there were few winners in the modernisation process; even its evident beneficiaries (like owners of mechanised boats, aquaculture farms and export processing units) found themselves riding a tiger they could not get off any more.

In Sri Lanka, economic-liberalisation policies meant that imported, high-quality dried fish and other fish products entered local markets at a cheaper price, which affected the businesses of local fisherwomen involved in the fish trade. Environmental concerns – for example, to protect turtles – led to denial of access to coastal fishing communities to their traditional fishing grounds, giving rise to immense hardship to some of the poorest people in the sector.

The international seafood trade, especially for shrimp, has started showing signs of fluctuation since the mid-1990s. This is attributed partly to the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the new global trade arrangements it has been striving to bring into existence, and partly to the concerns of the importing countries relating to food safety, environmental impacts of fishing or plain protectionism.

The impacts have been severe for the fisheries’ economies of the Asian countries, which have become largely export-driven. The shrimp-orientation of some of the activities – like mechanised fishing, brackishwater aquaculture, processing and export, ancillary services related to shrimp production and trade (shrimp hatcheries, feed mills, packaging material, refrigeration services) – and their economies of scale do not permit diversifying into other species easily, which meant that they bore the full brunt of the shrimp-related trade measures and even had to invest sizeable sums to keep pace with the fast-changing global trade context. Thus, in India, the emphasis on Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) and other quality standards meant that the export processing industry needed major investments in processing units, which literally bankrupted a number of businesses, and left thousands of people – predominantly women – unemployed. The collective impact of such changes can be summarised as diminishing access for different stakeholders in fisheries to resources, technology, investments, and markets, which is further aggravated by weak social support systems, changing macro-economic policies and lack of capacity to diversify. Geographical migration by the men – largely to work in fisheries-related activities – and occupational migration by women is a growing trend, but it is clear that there are limited alternative livelihood options for both men and women.

The use of the phrase ‘diminishing access’ – rather than ‘diminishing availability’ – raises the critical issue of equity, which could well be a more important manifestation of the crisis than the *physical* non-availability of fish or fishing tools (Salagrama 2007). The scramble for survival at the household level meant that there was limited scope for meaningful collective responses to emerge. Most fish worker organisations evolved as issue-based entities, focused on meeting the immediate needs of the people. This makes it difficult for a community-led holistic alternative development model to develop.

While the condition of the fisheries sector was recognised at the time of the tsunami, there is little evidence of this being translated into pro-active policies to address the key issues. Partly, this was due to the fact that there were no easy answers to problems facing the sector and partly the unwillingness to undertake radical policy reforms which threaten the foundations upon which fisheries development has been based. Associated with this is the fear of significant costs, in economic, social and political terms.
appendix 2 Sampling criteria and approach

This People’s Report is the result of a process focused on participatory consultations that took place with the tsunami-affected coastal fishing communities in India, Sri Lanka, the Maldives and Thailand during the first half of 2007.

In each country, before community consultations the process started with a workshop with all the facilitating organisations to develop a common understanding regarding the various principles and assumptions behind the People’s Report, and on the methods and processes to be adopted during the consultations. In some countries preparation of awareness-raising materials for the community consultations – including leaflets, banners and posters – was conducted at the same workshop.

In some countries a meeting of wider civil society groups was also convened to inform them about the People’s Report preparation process to build consensus and seek greater solidarity and support. In Sri Lanka for example, this group included trade unions, community-based organisations (CBOs), NGOs, cooperatives, women’s organisations and other civil society organisations. The participating organisations agreed to be involved in the formulation of the People’s Report at the field (community) level as well as the national level.

The main strategy of the People’s Report preparation was to raise people’s awareness about the existing policies and regulations and to facilitate discussions. The discussions were expected to allow people to analyse the implications of those policies on their lives and livelihoods; express their views on the issues, concerns, and possible solutions and policy alternatives; and stimulate community mobilisation on the issues.

People analysed their situation and the impact of various policies and institutions on their livelihood using various participatory techniques including the seasonal calendar and income and expenditure analysis. Apart from this, country-specific issues such as the impact of war in Sri Lanka, the impact of tourism policy in Thailand and Coastal Zone Management related policies in India were also analysed by the fishers.

The sampling process for the selection of villages was purposive random sampling to cover the tsunami-affected geographical locations in each of the four countries. The villages selected were those where one of the members of the facilitating organisations was working with those communities. Apart from that, villages were selected from the provinces where the government had plans to implement some specific policies, such as the Sea Food Bank and Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) in Thailand.

In India the consultations were conducted by a network of 31 organisations in 18 districts from three states (Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala) and one Union Territory (Andaman and Nicobar Islands). This was done through 47 focus group discussions, seven discussions with community collectives and four consultations with CBOs/NGOs. A total of 6,901 women and men fishers participated in this consultation process including the Panchayat leaders and members of the fishermen’s cooperatives.

At the village level, twenty household interviews were also conducted from each village, again using purposive random sampling procedures. Samples were interviewed on a rolling basis with:

- any five families that had lost a member of their family in the tsunami;
- any five families that had lost livelihood but not lives;
- any five women-headed families that had not already been selected in the above categories;
- any five families from excluded groups, e.g. Dalits, agricultural labourers, salt workers and persons with disability.

Focus-group discussions were conducted separately with women and men in each village.

In Sri Lanka, a total of 4,155 women and men fishers participated in the consultation process from 71 villages in eight out of the ten tsunami-affected coastal districts of the eastern, southern and western coast. A group of 30 organisations joined in this consultation process.

In Thailand more than 700 tsunami-affected people affected by DASTA and SFB participated in consultations from 12 locations in 10 districts from seven provinces. Most participated in seminars or focus-group discussions. Among them, 101 were key community members whose main role was liaison, providing information from the government officials to other community members and vice versa.

In the Maldives, the community consultations were held with 50 men and women comprised of local fishers, fish processors, farmers, people involved in businesses related to tourism, and people employed in tourist resorts on 14 islands from four atolls.
appendix 3 *Names of the organisations involved in the process of the people’s reports in India, the Maldives, Sri Lanka and Thailand*

### India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>All India Forum for Traditional Fisher-folk People’s Rights</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dalit Land Rights Federation</td>
<td>Villupuram, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Meetchi</td>
<td>Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Coastal Community Protection Movement</td>
<td>Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu Pondicherry Fisher People’s Forum</td>
<td>Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>TRISEA Fisherfolk Federation</td>
<td>Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Thirunelveli Fisherfolk Federation</td>
<td>Thirunelveli, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>District Fishermen’s Youth Welfare Association</td>
<td>Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SRUJANA</td>
<td>Kakinda, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Society for Integrated Rural Development</td>
<td>Guntur, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Grama Swarajaya - Rural</td>
<td>Payakaraopet, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>NISARAGA</td>
<td>Nellore, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Pradesh Sampradaya Matsya Karula Samakhya (APSMS)</td>
<td>Vishakapatnam, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Samudra Theerapu Matsya Karula Trade Union (SMTV)</td>
<td>Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Karunaiyaya - Social Service Society</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>National Alliance of Women (NAWO)</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Siga Community Service Guild</td>
<td>Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Pazaverkadu Action Network</td>
<td>Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Cheshire Homes International</td>
<td>Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Gandhian Unit for Integrated Development (GUIDE)</td>
<td>Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Education Exnora</td>
<td>Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Irula Tribal Women’s Welfare Society (ITWWS)</td>
<td>Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Dalit Mannuraimai Kootamaippu</td>
<td>Puducherry, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Indo - Global Social Service</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Gandhi Rural Education and Research</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Integrated Women Development Institute</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Mother Nala Thondu Niruvanam</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Gram Vidiyala Trust</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Bharathi Trust</td>
<td>Tiruvallur, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Social Need Education And Human Awareness</td>
<td>Puducherry, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Village Educational Service Association</td>
<td>Vedaranyam, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Thirumalai Trust</td>
<td>Nagapattinam, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Churches Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA)</td>
<td>Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Discipleship Centre</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Vannuksil</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tirunelveli Multipurpose Social Service</td>
<td>Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Trust for Rural Uplift and Education</td>
<td>Sathankulam, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Annai Theresa Welfare Trust</td>
<td>Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Society for Education and Development</td>
<td>Nagercolli, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Kerala Swatanthara Matsya Tozhilali Federation</td>
<td>Trivendrum, Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>ActionAid International</td>
<td>Port Blair (Andaman &amp; Nicobar Islands) Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Sri Lanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sumedhagama Fisheries Corporation</td>
<td>Trincomalee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pumphuhar Fisheries Corporation</td>
<td>Trincomalee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Puttlam District Fisheries Solidarity</td>
<td>Mundel, Puttlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Youth Leaders</td>
<td>Puttlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Sebastian Fisheries Coop. Society, Barudalpola</td>
<td>Barudalpola, Puttlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Southern Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Matara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Southern Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Devinuwara, Matara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southern Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Rathgama, Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Southern Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Dodanduwa, Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Polonnaruwa District Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Kalahagala, Polonnaruwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Polonnaruwa District Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Deke Ela, Polonnaruwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Walawe Kantha Maha Sangamaya</td>
<td>Ambalanatha, Hambantota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Polonnaruwa District Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Kalahagala, Polonnaruwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Polonnaruwa District Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Deke Ela, Polonnaruwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Walawe Women’s Federation</td>
<td>Ambalanatha, Hambantota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Savistri</td>
<td>Dodanduwa, Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Savistri</td>
<td>Thelwatta, Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rekawa Development Foundation</td>
<td>Netolipitiya, Hambantota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kalutara District Fisheries Solidarity</td>
<td>Beruwala, Kaluthara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Small Fisheries Society, Kalutara North</td>
<td>Kalutara North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Small Fisheries Society, Wadduwa</td>
<td>Wadduwa, Kaluthara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Small Fisheries Society, Beruwala</td>
<td>Beruwala, Kaluthara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rural Women’s Front</td>
<td>Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vehi Lihini Institute</td>
<td>Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rural Women’s Front</td>
<td>Nuwara Eliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Youth Movement</td>
<td>Manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>DIFSO</td>
<td>Pothuwil, Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>DIFSO - Kalmunai</td>
<td>Kalmunai, Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>DIFSO - Panama</td>
<td>Panama, Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>DIFSO - Ninhavur</td>
<td>Ninhavur, Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>DIFSO</td>
<td>Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Valachchena Deep Sea Fisheries Organization</td>
<td>Batticaloa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>People’s Planning Commission</td>
<td>Rajagiriya, Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Savistri</td>
<td>Pitakotte, Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pulse Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kokilai Fisheries Cooperative Society, Kokilai</td>
<td>Kokilai, Trincomalle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ruhunu Diriya Dheewara Foundation</td>
<td>Tangalle, Hambantota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>United Fishers &amp; Fish Workers Congress</td>
<td>Ratmalana, Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>United Federation of Labour</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>PIADS Forum</td>
<td>Karuwalagawewa, Puttalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sri Vimukthi Fisher Women Organisation</td>
<td>Negombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fish Workers Union, Barudalpola</td>
<td>Kudamaduwella, Puttlam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Negombo Lagoon Fisheries Organisation</td>
<td>Negombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Disappeared Fishermen’s Parents &amp; Wives Association</td>
<td>Devinuwara, Matara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>National Fisher People’s Union</td>
<td>Negombo, Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Diriya Kantha Union</td>
<td>Trincomalee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Action Aid International - Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Colombo 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Praja Abilasha Network</td>
<td>Negombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Youth Society</td>
<td>Maruthamunai 02, Ampara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sinhagama Society, Beruwala</td>
<td>Beruwala, Kalutara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>People’s to People Dialogue on Peace &amp; Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Negombo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>NAFSO Secretariat</td>
<td>Negombo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Maldives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>National Women’s Development Society</td>
<td>Villingilli, Gaafu Alifu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Maamendhoo Island Development and Youth Awareness Association</td>
<td>Maamendhoo, Gaafu Alifu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nilandhoo Island Development Society</td>
<td>Nilandhoo, Gaafu Alifu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Organisation for Development, Edutainment and Sports</td>
<td>Dhaandhoo, Gaafu Alifu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Association for Fonadhoo Youth Awareness</td>
<td>Fonadhoo, Laamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mathimarahdoo Zuvaanunge Jamuiyya</td>
<td>Gan, Laamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maabaidhoo Isdharivarunge Gulhun</td>
<td>Maabaidhoo, Laamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dhanbidhoo Women’s Development Committee</td>
<td>Dhanbidhoo, Laamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Foundation for Eydhafushi Youth Linkage</td>
<td>Eydhafushi, Baa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Dharavandhoo Islanders Society</td>
<td>Dharavandhoo, Baa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kendhoo Zuvaanunge Gulhun</td>
<td>Kendhoo, Baa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Goidhoo Zuvaanunge Jamuiyya</td>
<td>Goidhoo, Baa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Club Youth Star</td>
<td>Ungooafaru, Raa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Care Society</td>
<td>Male’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pakee Khon Huk</td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rak Samet Group</td>
<td>Samet Islands, Rayong Province</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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India
GUIDE
Pazaveli, Vembakkam Post, Chengalput Taluk
Kancheepuram District 603 111
Tamil Nadu
Tel: +91(0) 44 2742 9429
Email: guide@vsnl.net

The Maldives
Care Society
Fiyaathoshimagu
Male’
Tel: +96 (0) 33 25547
Email: info@caresociety.org.mv

Thailand
Kor Por Sor Mor
(Network of Community Organisations for Social and Political Reform)
2044/18 Petchburi Road
Huaykwang
Bangkok 10320
Tel: +66 (0) 2 716 5610/ 716 5611
Email: contact@chumchonthai.or.th

Sri Lanka
National Fisheries Solidarity (NAFSO)
10, Malwatta Road
Negombo
Tel: +94 (0) 31 223-9750/ 487-2692
Email: fishmove@slt.lk and wfp.gs@gmail.com