



CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE

ON CORAL REEFS, FISHERIES AND FOOD SECURITY



ECOSYSTEM APPROACH TO FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (EAFM)

A Solomon Islands Policy Review



May 2013

This publication was prepared for the Solomon Island's National Coordinating Committee with funding from the United States Agency for International Development's Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP).



Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM): A Solomon Islands Policy Review

AUTHOR:

Gillian Goby

EDITOR:

Anne-Maree Schwarz, WorldFish Center, Honiara, Solomon Islands

KEY CONTRIBUTORS:

Robert Pomeroy, University of Connecticut, Storrs, USA

Maurice Knight, Coral Triangle Support Partnership, Jakarta, Indonesia

USAID PROJECT NUMBER: GCP LWA Award # LAG-A-00-99-00048-00

CITATION: Goby G., Schwarz A.M., Pomeroy, R., Knight, M. (2012) Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM): A Solomon Islands Policy Review. Honolulu, Hawaii, The USAID Coral Triangle Support Partnership.

PRINTED IN: Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, May 2013

This is a publication of the Coral Triangle Initiative on Corals, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF). Funding for the preparation of this document was provided by the USAID-funded Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP). CTSP is a consortium led by the World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy and Conservation International with funding support from the United States Agency for International Development's Regional Asia Program.

For more information on the Coral Triangle Initiative, please contact:

Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security Interim-Regional Secretariat
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries of the Republic of Indonesia
Mina Bahari Building II, 17th Floor
Jalan Medan Merdeka Timur No. 16
Jakarta Pusat 10110, Indonesia
www.coraltriangleinitiative.org

CTI-CFF National Coordinating Committee
Ms. Agnetha Vave-Karamui, Chairperson
National Coordinating Committee Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster
Management & Meteorology
P. O. Box 21 Vavaya Ridge
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 23031 / +677 23032 ext. 206
Email: agnetha.vavekaramui@gmail.com
www.ctisolomons.net.sb/cti

© 2013 Coral Triangle Support Partnership. All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this report for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders.

Disclaimer: This document is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

COVER PHOTO: Man fishing. © 2013 Tory Read

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction. | 4 |
| 1.2 Methods and Report Structure | 4 |
| 2. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) | 5 |
| 3. International and Regional (EAFM) Context. | 7 |
| 3.1 Fisheries (EAFM) Conventions | 7 |
| 3.1 Regional EAFM Initiatives | 9 |
| 4. Analysis of Regional and National EAFM Policy Framework | 11 |
| 4.1 Regional EAFM Development. | 11 |
| 4.2 National EAFM Legal and Policy Framework | 13 |
| 5. Practical Implementation of EAFM in Solomon Islands | 19 |
| 6. Summary of Challenges | 24 |
| 7. Summary of Opportunities. | 26 |
| 8. Conclusion and Recommendations | 28 |
| 8.2 Recommendations for Progressing EAFM in Solomon Islands | 28 |
| References. | 31 |
| Appendix 1 Individuals Interviewed | 33 |
| Appendix 2 Fisheries Legislation (FAO) | 34 |
| Appendix 3 Solomon Island Legislation and Policy | 41 |
| National Strategy for the Management of Inshore Fisheries and Marine Resources, 2010-2012. | 44 |
| Solomon Islands National Plan of Action (2010) | 44 |

I. INTRODUCTION

Solomon Islands has a marine water area of 1,340,000 km², and the GDP of fisheries is estimated to be approximately \$27.4 million USD (FAO 2009). The country's fisheries can be placed into six categories: coastal commercial, coastal subsistence, offshore locally-based, offshore foreign-based, freshwater, and aquaculture (FAO 2009). Offshore foreign-based fisheries are valued significantly higher than all other fisheries, estimated to be worth more than \$153 million USD (FAO 2009). Fisheries management in Solomon Islands is divided into inshore and offshore fisheries. The offshore fisheries are predominantly made up of the tuna fisheries, which have a strong international interest. The inshore fisheries are mostly small-scale subsistence fisheries. The fisheries are managed by the national government (Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources-MFMR) with some functions devolved to provincial governments. Recently, efforts have gained traction in enacting legislation that will enable the devolution of powers regarding inshore fisheries further to community based organisations.

The Solomon Islands is one of the CT6 countries that have signed on to the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) (FAO 2003a). In doing so, they have agreed to implement EAFM into national policy and fisheries management (USCTI 2011). Although there has been a significant time lag in its translation, there has been some progress more recently in this regard.

A review of the policy relevant to the national implementation of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) is presented here. It has been undertaken by a consultant to the WorldFish Center, funded by USAID under the Coral Triangle Support Program (CTSP). This report provides a summary of EAFM, including discussion on the strengths and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for and threats to (SWOT) the implementation of EAFM in the Solomon Islands. This report was used to provide input into the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) 3rd Regional Exchange on (EAFM) in Malaysia in May 2012.

I.2 METHODS AND REPORT STRUCTURE

A desktop review of existing legislation and EAFM literature relevant to the Solomon Islands was undertaken to assess which policies, laws, and regulations are already in place to support or hinder application of EAFM approaches in the country (Chapters 2 and 3). To complement this, a series of interviews with key informants (Appendix 1) was undertaken to better understand the practical application of EAFM on the ground (Chapters 4 and 5). Information on existing challenges (Chapter 6), as well as success stories, was collected.

Through the detailed discussions with informants, a solid understanding of how EAFM is being implemented through policy and programs was established (Chapter 5). A series of steps needed to remove any existing barriers (Chapter 6), and to create and support an enabling environment for EAFM to be applied at national and sub-national scales, were identified as opportunities (Chapter 7). A summary of these, with recommendations for further enhancing the progress of EAFM in the Solomon Islands, is provided in Chapter 8.

2. ECOSYSTEM APPROACH TO FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (EAFM)

The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) is a concept well developed within the literature; since its formal acceptance at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, its application is growing throughout the Pacific region (Sauni and Amos 2011). The Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) (2003a) set the principles and international standards of behaviour and practices to ensure effective conservation, management, and development of living aquatic resources, with due respect for the ecosystem and biodiversity. An ecosystems approach to fisheries management includes fishing operations, aquaculture developments, integration of fisheries into coastal-area management, post-harvest practice, and trade and fisheries research.

The FAO Code of Conduct (2003) states "The purpose of the ecosystem approach to fisheries is to plan, develop, and manage fisheries in a manner that addresses the multiple needs and desires of societies without jeopardizing the options for future generations to benefit from the full range of goods and services provided by marine ecosystems."

While EAFM is focused specifically on fisheries, it is but one of a number of approaches being developed as part of a worldwide shift to incorporate a more holistic form of management for natural resources (Fletcher 2008). EAFM is concerned with the relationship between fishing activities and the ecosystem as a whole, and as such includes the social and economic implications, as well as management requirements (FAO 2003b). An EAFM also considers non-target species, endangered species, minimising waste and pollution, biodiversity, and welfare of coastal states involved, including the interests of artisanal or small-scale fisheries (SSF) and subsistence fishers (Fletcher 2008).

The FAO (2003a) maintain that EAFM "strives to balance diverse societal objectives, by taking into account the knowledge and uncertainties about biotic and human components of ecosystems and their interactions and applying an integrated approach to fisheries within meaningful boundaries." EAFM is described as being analogous to any risk-management system where risks are identified and subsequent management systems are then developed (MFMR/FFA 2011).

There are 17 core EAFM guiding principles within the FAO's CCRF. Some of the key ones (FAO 2003a) include:

- The goal of EAFM is to maintain ecosystem health and sustainability;
- EAFM helps to align fisheries management with natural and human systems;
- Fisheries should be managed to limit their impact on the ecosystem to the extent possible;
- Ecological relationships between harvested, dependent, and associated species should be maintained;
- Management measures should be compatible across the entire distribution of the resource (across jurisdictions and management plans);
- The precautionary approach should be applied, particularly when the knowledge on ecosystems is incomplete; and

- Governance should ensure both human and ecosystem well-being and equity.

The FAO (2003b) Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries detail a range of management measures and approaches relevant to an ecosystem approach to fisheries. It is recognised that many of these are not new to fisheries management, but rather an extension in their scope. They provide tools in a broader management context and not only address a target species of concern, but also enhance ecosystem health and integrity. The FAO maintains that a coherent mix of management approaches should be used as part of EAFM.

A detailed description on these management mechanisms are provided in the FAO guidelines (2003b). A summary list is provided below and includes:

- Introducing Marine Protected Areas
- Gear modifications
- Energy efficiency and pollution
- Capacity and effort limitation
- Catch control
- Preventing habitat degradation including impact from fishing gear
- Rehabilitation
- Population manipulation (restocking and culling)
- Right-based management approach
- Education and research
- Incentives
- Protection and conservation
- Spatial and temporal controls on fishing

The detail and discussion in this chapter alone highlights the complexity of EAFM, both in definition and implementation. There is still much discussion on what EAFM entails, and how it overlaps with previous approaches to fisheries and ecosystem management. It is not surprising that this complexity and uncertainty around what EAFM is, is one of the biggest challenges to its implementation, as discussed further below.

3. INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL (EAFM) CONTEXT

3.1 FISHERIES (EAFM) CONVENTIONS

There are a number of key international conventions and instruments that provide an important foundation for the adoption and implementation of EAFM in Solomon Islands. A database of national legislation and international agreements concerning food and agriculture (including fisheries, forestry, and water) maintained by the FAO Legal Office is provided in the FAO Country Profile (Fishery Legislation) summary (Appendix 2).

A brief summary of the key international conventions relevant to EAFM is provided below.

UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON LAW OF THE SEA (1982)

The United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) is a declaration that obliges countries to protect and preserve the marine environment. It provides for measures to prevent, reduce, and control pollution of the marine environment from all sources and includes measures necessary to protect and preserve rare or fragile ecosystems and the habitat of depleted, threatened, or endangered species and other forms of marine life. The Cabinet Committee on Marine Affairs, which is headed by the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA), addresses any concerns with the implementation of the UNCLOS.

UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (1992)

The Rio Declaration (1992) is a non-binding statement that contains 27 broad guiding principles on environmental policy. It emphasizes, among others, the right of human beings to ecological security and environmental protection as part of economic development. Agenda 21 is a program that was approved during the Rio Summit and contains 40 action plans designed to promote sustainable development.

CANCUN DECLARATION, INDIA, MAY 1992

This International Conference on Responsible Fishing (organised by the government of Mexico, in close consultation with the FAO) led to the adoption of the Declaration of Cancun, which included a request to FAO to draft an International Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing. The principles embodied in the Declaration include: (a) cooperation by states on bilateral, regional, and multilateral levels to establish, reinforce, and implement effective means and mechanisms to ensure responsible fishing in the high seas; (b) that states fishing on the high seas should cooperate with other states to ensure conservation and rational management of the living resources; and (c) that states should cooperate to deter reflagging of vessels that violate or avoid conservation and management measures (FAO 2011).

THE FAO CODE OF CONDUCT FOR RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES, ROME, 20 OCTOBER TO 2 NOVEMBER 1995

The FAO Code consists of 12 articles and sets the principles and international standards of behaviour and practices to ensure effective conservation, management, and development of living aquatic resources, with

due respect for the ecosystem and biodiversity. The first five articles deal with nature and scope, objectives, relationship with other international instruments, implementation, monitoring and updating, and special requirements of developing countries. Specific subjects covered are fisheries management, fishing operations, aquaculture developments, integration of fisheries into coastal area management, post-harvest practice, and trade and fisheries research. The code gives emphasis to the role of regional and sub-regional fisheries organizations in its implementation (FAO, 2011).

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON STRADDLING FISH STOCKS AND HIGHLY MIGRATORY FISH STOCKS (UNFSA), NEW YORK, USA, JULY 24 TO AUGUST 4, 1995

The UNFSA aims to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of straddling and highly migratory fish stocks, and includes general principles for their conservation and management. Its provisions include the application of the precautionary approach, compatibility of conservation and management measures, cooperation for conservation and management, Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs), collection and provision of information and cooperation in scientific research, non-members of RFMOs, and responsibilities of flag states. Likewise, it provides for international, subregional, and regional cooperation in enforcement, procedures for boarding and inspection, measures taken by port states, special requirements and forms of cooperation with developing countries, and dispute settlement. The agreement establishes a set of rights and obligations for states to conserve and manage the two types of fish stocks, as well as associated and dependent species, and to protect the marine environment. The agreement entered into force in December 11, 2001.

THE REYKJAVIK CONFERENCE ON RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES IN THE MARINE ECOSYSTEM, UNIVERSITY CINEMA AND CONFERENCE CENTER IN REYKJAVIK, ICELAND, OCTOBER 2001

The conference resulted in the approved Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem. It states that in order to achieve sustainable and responsible fisheries in marine ecosystems, each nation must individually and collectively incorporate ecosystems consideration in the management of their fisheries. The declaration requires that scientific advice on fisheries management shall be based on an "Ecosystem Approach" by 2010.

THE MALAWI PRINCIPLES, LILONGWE, MALAWI, 26-28 JANUARY 1998

During a workshop on EAF, the international group identified the following twelve principles and characteristics of EAF:

1. Management objectives are a matter of societal choice.
2. Management should be decentralized to the lowest appropriate level.
3. Ecosystem managers should consider the effects of their activities on adjacent and other ecosystems.
4. Recognizing potential gains from management, there is a need to understand the ecosystem in an economic context, considering e.g. mitigating market distortions, aligning incentives to promote sustainable use, and internalizing costs and benefits.
5. A key feature of the ecosystem approach includes conservation of ecosystem structure and functioning.
6. Ecosystems must be managed within the limits to their functioning.
7. The ecosystem approach should be undertaken at the appropriate scale.

8. Recognizing the varying temporal scales and lag effects that characterize ecosystem processes, objectives for ecosystem management should be set for the long term.
9. Management must recognize that change is inevitable.
10. The ecosystem approach should seek the appropriate balance between conservation and use of biodiversity.
11. The ecosystem approach should consider all forms of relevant information, including scientific, indigenous, and local knowledge, innovations, and practices.
12. The ecosystem approach should involve all relevant sectors of society and scientific disciplines.

WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WSSD), JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, AUGUST 26 TO SEPTEMBER 4, 2002

The WSSD adopted a Political Declaration and a Plan of Implementation in relation to capture fisheries. In the Declaration, the Heads of States agreed to “develop and facilitate the use of diverse approaches and tools, including the ecosystem approach, the elimination of destructive practices, the establishment of marine protected areas...and the integration of marine and coastal areas into key sectors.” Destructive practices in fisheries include use of obnoxious substances and inappropriate fishing gears.

WESTERN AND CENTRAL PACIFIC FISHERIES COMMISSION (WCPFC) 2004

The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) was established by the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPFC Convention), which entered into force on 19 June 2004. The convention was concluded after six years of negotiation, which commenced in 1994. The period between the conclusion of the convention and its entry into force was taken up by a series of preparatory conferences that laid the foundations for the commission to commence its work.

The WCPFC Convention draws on many of the provisions of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) while, at the same time, reflecting the special political, socio-economic, geographical, and environmental characteristics of the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) region. The WCPFC Convention seeks to address problems in the management of high-seas fisheries resulting from unregulated fishing, over-capitalization, excessive fleet capacity, vessel re-flagging to escape controls, insufficiently selective gear, unreliable databases, and insufficient multilateral cooperation in respect to conservation and management of highly migratory fish stocks. A framework for the participation of fishing entities in the commission that legally binds fishing entities to the provisions of the convention; participation by territories and possessions in the work of the commission; recognition of special requirements of developing states; and cooperation with other Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMO) whose respective areas of competence overlap with the WCPFC reflects the unique geo-political environment in which the commission operates.

PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT (2010)

The Nauru Agreement is a subregional agreement on terms and conditions for tuna purse seine fishing licences in the region. The PNA brings together eight Pacific Island countries to sustainably manage tuna and increase economic benefits for their peoples. PNA members are Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, and Tuvalu. These countries own waters which supply 25 percent of the world's tuna, an estimated \$2 billion worth of fish every year.

The PNA have a tradition of innovative conservation and management measures such as the Vessel Day Scheme, a system whereby a set number of fishing days will be sold and traded to the highest bidding

fishing companies; closure of high-seas areas to fishing; and control of Fish Aggregating Devices or FADs, which are human-made devices to attract schools of fish that often result in high juvenile-fish catches.

3.1 REGIONAL EAFM INITIATIVES

There is significant regional support for EAFM and various initiatives underway, however, the most significant is the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) and specifically the CTI Regional Plan of Action (RPoA) (CTI 2009a).

CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE (CTI)

Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) is an endeavour of six countries composing the coral triangle. These countries, including Solomon Islands, have signed an agreement to ensure the conservation and protection of the coral triangle as the epicentre of global marine-life abundance and diversity. Several agreements have been entered into under CTI. There is the ten-year regional plan of action for Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security. This document will require the six governments under CTI to address the key drivers—economic, social, and ecological—that influence the management and conservation of marine and coastal resources at all scales and institutional levels.

In order to achieve sustainable management of marine and coastal resources for current and future generations, the CTI countries collectively and individually commit to: (1) Designate the sustainable management of marine and coastal resources as a high and urgent ongoing priority in our national agenda; (2) Mobilize high-level public and private sector leadership; (3) Achieve enhanced regional collaboration to address important regional problems; (4) Implement needed economic, policy, and legal reforms; (5) Establish a system of sustainable funding and orient these financial resources toward achievement of the CTI Plan of Action; (6) Rapid increase of institutional and human capacity; (7) Lead effective, highly participatory, multi-stakeholder alliances; (8) Integrate conservation, management, and development; and (9) Promote public-private partnerships.

During a conference in Metro Manila on 28 October 2008, the CTI countries agreed to promote approaches to managing the marine ecosystem and resources, including the ecosystem approach, and the precautionary principle. The goals in the plan of action covers (1) priority seascapes; (2) ecosystem approach to managing fisheries and other marine resources; (3) marine protected areas; (4) climate change adaptation; and (5) threatened species.

CTI's Regional Plan of Action (RPoA) (CTI 2009a) pushes for the adoption of EAFM in the member countries, and each member country is required to include EAFM in its national plan of action. The Solomon Islands has drafted its National Plan of Action (NPOA); this (CTI 2009b), together with the RPoA, is discussed further in the next chapter (4).

OTHER REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

The **Forum of Fisheries Agencies** (FFA), and **Secretariat of the Pacific Community** (SPC) play an important regional role with regards to EAFM. SPC are committed to building capacity within Solomon Islands Ministry for Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR), as well as supporting small scale EAFM projects with organisation like **The Nature Conservancy** (TNC), who developed community based EAF guidelines for the Pacific (SPC and TNC 2009). Likewise, the **Asia Development Bank** (ADB) and **Europe Aid** are funding EAFM related projects.

4. ANALYSIS OF REGIONAL AND NATIONAL EAFM POLICY FRAMEWORK

4.1 REGIONAL EAFM DEVELOPMENT

There has been solid progress in the development of EAFM in the region, with the CTI Regional Plan of Action (RPoA), a guiding document, which encompasses EAFM as one of the goals (CTI 2009a). Three Regional Exchange Workshops have facilitated an exchange of EAFM implementation in the region (USCTI-II) and the output is a draft Regional EAFM Framework that is currently being developed (CTI 2012).

As part of the Forum of Fisheries Agencies (FFA), Dr. Rick Fletcher (2008) produced guidelines to assist the introduction of EAFM to the management of tuna fisheries of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC). The objective was to help ensure that the communities in the region would benefit from the optimal utilisation of their tuna resources.

Despite the EAFM guidelines and RPoA providing a framework for EAFM initiatives, there are limited examples of complete implementation of EAFM within the Western Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO), including Solomon Islands (Sauni 2009).

A brief analysis of regional initiatives, considering their strengths and weaknesses and their relevance for Solomon Islands, is provided in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.I. PROGRESS ON REGIONAL EAFM INITIATIVES

| Regional Initiative | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|--|
| <p>CTI Regional Plan of Action (RPoA)</p> | <p>The second goal of the RPoA is “Ecosystem approach to management of fisheries and other marine resources fully applied.”</p> <p>Target 1 of the second goal of the RPoA is “to have strong legislative, policy, and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving EAFM.”</p> <p>The RPoA calls for “<i>collaboration to develop a common regional framework for legislation and policy that would strengthen regional and national legislation, policies and regulations.</i>”</p> <p>The RPoA provides good guidance to Solomon Islands.</p> <p>There have been three regional exchange workshops to support implementation of the CTI regional plan and to develop the CTI regional framework for EAFM.</p> | <p>Translation of information from the regional plan to national plan can be difficult, as in many cases it may not be applicable to the Solomon Islands</p> <p>There has been a breakdown in information flow from regional exchange workshops to national levels.</p> <p>The translation of EAFM regional objectives into national operational policy and subsequent implementation is not as progressed for inshore fisheries as for offshore fisheries.</p> |
| <p>CTI Regional EAFM Framework (draft)</p> | <p>A draft report has been prepared, with five key objectives, to help facilitate the development and implementation of EAFM.</p> <p>It addresses many of the challenges identified in this report and will provide an excellent resource once actioned.</p> | <p>The Regional Framework for EAFM is still not complete.</p> <p>There may be a delay in developing the regional guidelines (or other actions) which may impact nationally on progress.</p> |
| <p>A guide to implementing an EAFM for the tuna fisheries of the Western and Central Pacific Region (Fletcher 2008)</p> | <p>This provides an excellent framework and step-by-step guidelines for implementing EAFM.</p> | <p>The Solomon Islands’ focus has been on translating the regional guidelines for offshore tuna fisheries. The implementation process is still piecemeal and is not as progressed for inshore fisheries.</p> <p>There is significant academic ability required to apply these guidelines, which may not always be available to communities who are managing inshore fisheries.</p> <p>There are significant resource requirements required to implement the actions.</p> |

4.2 NATIONAL EAFM LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

There are a number of Solomon Island laws and policies that have relevance to EAFM or its principles (Appendix 3). An analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the key ones, with specific reference to core EAFM components, is provided below in Table 5.1. While there has been a more recent shift to include EAFM in several Solomon Island Government (SIG) policy documents, a significant limitation is that the current legislative instrument that is being used to manage fisheries (Fisheries Act 1998) is outdated and does not strongly or sufficiently reflect EAFM. Rather, it provides a stock assessment approach to fisheries management, with limited mention of the core EAFM principles. According to the SIG Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR), the revised Fisheries Act does incorporate EAFM principles; however, the document is still being drafted. Its completion has been delayed, but it is expected to be finished by the end of 2012.

TABLE 5.1 REVIEW OF SOLOMON ISLAND NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND POLICY

| National legislation or policy | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Fisheries Act 1998 Fisheries Regulations</p> | <p>There is some reference in the Fisheries Act to biodiversity conservation, the precautionary principle, and sustainability, which are all concepts recognised under EAFM.</p> | <p>The current Fisheries Act does not contain any specific reference to EAFM and many of its components are not addressed.</p> <p>There is no specific regulation pertaining to EAFM.</p> |
| <p>National Fisheries Bill (draft 2010)</p> | <p>The revised Fisheries Act incorporates EAFM principles and supports community based fisheries management initiatives.</p> | <p>The act is still in draft and has not been finalised. The goal to complete this was 2010.</p> |
| <p>The Environment Act (1988) and Regulations The Environment Act (1988) and Regulations</p> | <p>The Environment Act provides a legislative framework to establish <u>integrated systems</u> of development control, environmental impact assessment, and pollution control.</p> <p>The regulations could be used to safeguard important fisheries habitats (nursery grounds–mangroves) and migratory corridors from development projects.</p> | <p>The Environment Act is in effect; however, according to interviewees, it is not widely enforced.</p> <p>This instrument alone will not promote EAFM approaches.</p> |
| <p>The Wildlife Protection and Management Act (1998)</p> | <p>The objectives of the act are to provide for the protection, conservation, and management of wildlife in the Solomon Islands by regulating the export and import of certain animals and plants. This can be an important management mechanism for EAFM.</p> <p>The act allows for the Minister to declare by order a management program that is being, is proposed to be, or has been carried out as an approved management programs for the purposes of the act.</p> | <p>This review was unable to ascertain if there were any active management plans or programs, highlighting the fact that while there may be management tools suitable for EAFM, they are not always utilised.</p> |

| National legislation or policy | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|---|---|
| <p>SIG National Strategy for the Management of Inshore Fisheries and Marine Resources 2010–2012</p> | <p>The Inshore Fisheries strategy promotes taking an ecosystem approach to sustainable inshore management.</p> <p>It also includes other components of EAFM like CBRM, use of social and economic information, and stakeholder inclusion.</p> <p>The strategy has been a catalyst for all of the fisheries' incorporation into the CTI NPOA as well as the corporate planning exercise.</p> | <p>There are limited resources with the government to implement the strategy. However, the intent was that NGOs would work with government to implement the strategy as “arms of government” and that has been the case for some of the strategies (detailed below).</p> <p>There are limited external mechanisms to assess the level of implementation or effectiveness of the strategy with regard to published reports etc. However, the strategy has now been incorporated into the Corporate Plan and there is a monitoring and evaluation system in place for the Corporate Plan.</p> |
| <p>e.g. Specific strategies from SIG National Strategy for the Management of Inshore Fisheries and Marine Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor trends in key fisheries and species • Develop Management Plans | <p>Currently MFMR monitor the status of any key commercial species through export data.</p> <p>MFMR also have access to data from SPC on inshore stock and tuna and FFA for tuna.</p> <p>MFMR has a draft plan for Béche-de-Mer, and under the current work plan for this year will develop a coral and dolphin plan.</p> | <p>There is no regular biological data collected by the government on inshore fisheries.</p> <p>Plans are in draft.</p> <p>Implementation and enforcement limited by resources.</p> |

| National legislation or policy | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Protected Areas Act 2010</p> <p><i>The Protected Areas Act + Regulations were gazetted by the Minister of Environment on 27 February 2012. This brings the legislation into effect as from 10 February 2012.</i></p> <p>Protected Areas Act 2010.</p> | <p>The act provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the establishment of a system of protected areas, or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity; • promotion of the protection of ecosystems and natural habitats, and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings; • environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas, with a view to furthering protection of the protected areas. <p>These are all important principals and components of EAFM.</p> <p>Part 3 of the act allows for the declaration, registration, and management of protected areas, which can provide the legal basis for existing community based LMMA and CBRM (both components of EAFM).</p> | <p>On-ground implementation may be difficult for communities with limited resources or no support from NGOs.</p> <p>Some components of registering a management plan under the PA Act may require financial resources from central government that have yet to be budgeted for.</p> <p>As the PA Act is only four (4) months old (with regs), it is untested. It will take some time for some applications to test the process.</p> |

| National legislation or policy | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Provincial fisheries ordinances</p> <p><i>The Western Province Resource Management Ordinance 1994</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Western Province Coastal and Lagoon Shipping Ordinance 1991</i> • <i>The Guadalcanal Wildlife Management Area Ordinance 1990</i> • <i>The Isabel Province Wildlife Sanctuary (Amendment) Ordinance 1991</i> • <i>Isabel Province Resource Management Ordinance</i> • <i>Temotu Environment Protection Ordinance 1989</i> • <i>The Makira Preservation of Culture and Wildlife Ordinance</i> <p><i>Choiseul Province Resource Management Ordinance 1997</i></p> | <p>Provincial ordinances are developed under relevant Acts of Parliament (e.g. Local Government Act, 1980). To date, existing ordinances basically cover for the protection, conservation, and management of all resources in the respective province.</p> <p>They do provide a legislative framework to implement some of the EAFM management strategies.</p> <p>There are some components of EAFM captured across existing ordinances, such as the recognition of customary tenure and protected species.</p> <p>Recently drafted and yet-to-be-gazetted ordinances are expected to have a stronger EAFM focus (e.g. Central, Choiseul).</p> <p>Provincial ordinances can be really effective provided the same capacity at the national level is given to support implementation and enforcement at the provincial level.</p> | <p>One of the biggest challenges is enforcement of the provincial fisheries ordinances. The resources available for provincial fisheries officers to implement orders are varied across provinces.</p> <p>Generally, provincial fisheries officers do not have sufficient understanding of concepts or mechanisms to enforce them.</p> <p>The majority of the existing provincial ordinances are dated back to the early 1990s and do not adequately or comprehensively capture the broad principals of EAFM. However, more are being drafted.</p> |
| <p>Local customary/traditional practices</p> | <p>Under customary marine tenure system, land owners can declare any areas (reef, mangroves, or land) under their control, protected or tambu. This is normally based on a short-term closed and open closure.</p> <p>Under the Solomon Islands Locally Managed Marine Areas (SILMMA) network (a network of NGOs, CBOs, and national government), community based MPAs and locally managed marine areas are being established throughout the country.</p> <p>Extensive traditional knowledge is available on which to build management plans and identify indicators of management success at the community level.</p> | <p>Until the Fisheries Bill is gazetted there is little legislative support for community initiatives and they are left to handle enforcement on their own.</p> <p>SILMMA has yet to have a strong presence and place within inshore fisheries management in MFMR, and as such is not reaching its full potential</p> <p>Often there are limited or no scientific data to make management decisions about stocks.</p> |

| Key EAFM Policy Documents | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|---|--|
| SIG EAFM Framework | The concept is being progressed, initially with a focus on offshore fisheries. | The document is still a draft and there appears to be insufficient capacity within MFMR to leverage and allocate resources to focus on implementation. The focus so far is on offshore fisheries, and little attention has been directed to developing an EAFM Framework for inshore fisheries. |
| Solomon Islands EAFM Framework for Tuna Fisheries (SIG MFMR 2011) Solomon Islands draft EAFM Action Plan (Tuna) | A workshop was held to develop a Tuna EAFM framework. High-priority management actions were identified. Some actions already are in progress. | Draft report not completed. Draft report not progressed. Yet to be endorsed by cabinet. |

In developing the national and regional CTI Plans of Action, all CTI countries were required to form a National Coordinating Committee (NCC). In Solomon Islands the NCC has supported not only the CTI but has become an avenue for improved coordination of all marine conservation and fisheries management activities in the islands. The NCC is a technical coordination and advisory body that includes key stakeholders from government and non-government agencies including WWF, TNC, WorldFish Center, and Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International. The NCC is the key organisation for promoting implementation of the national and regional CTI National Plan of Action.

The strengths and weaknesses outlined in Table 4.2 are discussed further in Chapters 8 and 9 in the context of future opportunities and recommendations for progressing EAFM in the Solomon Islands.

5. PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF EAFM IN SOLOMON ISLANDS

Largely as a result of regional initiatives, there is an increased awareness of the concept of EAFM through government and non-government organisations in the Solomon Islands. However, there is less of an understanding of what implementation actually entails, largely due to the complexity of it as discussed in Chapter 2. While many of the “core” principles of EAFM are starting to be reflected in national policy (Table 4.1), its holistic implementation is somewhat more staggered.

EAFM implementation currently appears to be significantly more progressed for offshore tuna fisheries than inshore fisheries. The implementation of EAFM for tuna fisheries in Solomon Islands has commenced primarily with the support of the FFA, which provides fisheries management and development support to the SIG MFMR with an EAFM focus. There are draft policy and management plans for EAFM for tuna fisheries, and this is most likely as a result of the economic value and international interest and support for the tuna fisheries (Samasoni and Amos 2011). The 17 core EAFM guiding principles within the FAO’s CCRF (FAO 2003a) provided the basis for the Regional Framework for EAFM (US CTI 2011), on which the Solomon Islands government has based a draft national tuna framework (SIGMFMR 2011).

Although less progressed (from a national perspective), there are many small-scale projects or “initiatives” for inshore resources that are based on EAFM principles (Chapter 2). However, many of the existing “on-ground” initiatives described in Table 5.2 are currently “badged” under different names like **Community Based Resource Management** (CBRM) (WorldFish Center 2007, TNC/SPC 2009), **Integrated Island Management** (IIM) (Govan et al 2011), or **Locally Managed Marine Areas** LMMA (Govan et al 2009). These management initiatives are usually implemented by communities with the support of fisheries and environmental NGOs, and not by the Solomon Island government.

With the increased discussion around the desirability of implementation of EAFM, there is a tendency for these projects to be “retro-fitted” as an EAFM. However, while there are many synergies with CBRM, IIM, or LMMA and EAFM (MECM/MFMR 2010, US CTI n.d), a more detailed investigation would be required to understand to what extent these mechanisms adequately encompass EAFM principles for inshore fisheries.

There is an apparent disconnect between local initiatives and higher-level Solomon Islands government EAFM policy initiatives (like the National Inshore Strategy) in that existing localised projects are not adequately captured or reflected in national documents or policy. Much of the work that is being done is localised and valuable information and lessons learned are not being coordinated or applied nationally. Although both the National Plan of Action and the Inshore Fisheries Strategy promote community based initiatives (and a people centred approach), the system in place to coordinate the activities and collect or synthesise data at a national level is insufficient. This is disused in more detail below under Chapter 7: Challenges.

Table 5.2 provides examples of how some EAFM concepts are being used throughout Solomon Islands in inshore and offshore fisheries.

TABLE 5.2. THE USE OF EAFM MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS FOR INSHORE AND OFFSHORE FISHERIES IN THE SOLOMON ISLANDS.

| EAFM Concept (FAO 2003b) | In shore | Offshore |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Marine Protected Areas | <p>There are many locally managed marine protected areas. These are generally established by local communities under Customary Tenure. The SILMMA (Solomon Islands Locally Managed Marine Areas) network is a government-coordinated initiative made up of local communities, NGOs, and government representatives to try to coordinate LMMAs.</p> | <p>There are currently no national MPAs. However, the new Protected Area Act (2010) and regulations (2012) provide for legal recognition and protection of community established MPAs.</p> |
| Gear modifications | <p>There are some limits to fishing gears within the fisheries regulations including drift nets, SCUBA gear (spear fishing), and use of dynamite for in-shore fisheries.</p> <p>Some local communities may also place additional restrictions on the use of some fishing gears, particularly in MPAs, such as a ban on the use of large nets and bans on spear fishing at night.</p> | <p>The draft EAFM framework for tuna fisheries references gear modifications as a management response.</p> |
| Energy efficiency and pollution | <p>The Solomon Island Environment Act is in effect; however, it is not adequately enforced.</p> <p>Managing pollution is a challenge at all levels, from communities to large-scale logging and mining operations. Pollution and rubbish are impacting on inshore fisheries, and managing it is a potential target area for new EAFM initiatives.</p> | <p>Pollution is considered through the risk assessment in the <i>draft</i> EAFM Tuna Action Plan.</p> <p>The draft EAFM Tuna Action Plan recognises impacts of land-based activities on marine ecosystems and actions to address this. However, it is yet to be implemented.</p> |
| Capacity and effort limitation | <p>There are permits required for curio and the aquarium trades. However, no other national initiatives (like licences etc.) exist to limit capacity or effort for inshore fisheries.</p> | <p>Fishing effort is managed primarily through the PNA and through Vessel Day Schemes (VDS) and a Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).</p> <p>These are also identified in the draft action plan.</p> |

| EAFM Concept (FAO 2003b) | In shore | Offshore |
|--|---|--|
| Catch control | <p>Within the fisheries regulations, there are some limits placed on resources, including size restrictions on trochus and coconut crabs.</p> <p>Many communities have management plans that also cover rules including gear restrictions, catch limits, management targets (thresholds), rules around habitat destruction, and seasonal closures to fishing etc.</p> <p>e.g. Tetepare Adaptive Resource Management Plan 2012 (Tetepare Descendants Association).</p> | <p>There are catch controls for offshore fisheries; however, limits for target species may need to be modified for more vulnerable species (using EAFM).</p> |
| Preventing habitat degradation, including impact from fishing gear | <p>Local MPAs are the key tool used to protect habitat degradation and have been identified as the single largest contribution to achieving the NPoA goals.</p> <p>Logging (and mining) throughout the Solomon Islands is substantially contributing to habitat degradation on a national scale.</p> <p>There are limited restrictions on inshore fishing gear; however, destructive fishing techniques like dynamite and poison are uncommon in the Solomon Islands.</p> | <p>Some gear modifications to prevent habitat degradation are in place as part of EAFM for the tuna fisheries.</p> <p>However, purse seine nets and trawlers are still commonly used in the Solomon Islands.</p> <p>Logging (and mining) throughout the Solomon Islands is substantially contributing to habitat degradation at a national scale. It is identified as a threat in the national inshore fisheries strategy (SIG2010).</p> |
| Rehabilitation | <p>Some communities are doing mangrove rehabilitation. This is largely part of tsunami relief support and through climate adaptation projects.</p> | <p>According to this research, little rehabilitation work is being undertaken for offshore fisheries.</p> |
| Population manipulation | <p>There are some small-scale population manipulation projects in the coral aquarium trade being led by the WorldFish Center.</p> | <p>There are high costs involved with restocking programs.</p> <p>This management tool is not currently used in Solomon Islands.</p> |

| EAFM Concept (FAO 2003b) | In shore | Offshore |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Right-based management approach | The National Inshore Fisheries Strategy and NPoA recognise that successful management of inshore fisheries will be through right-based (people-centred) management approaches. However, as the new Fisheries Bill is still in draft, there are limited legal mechanisms to support this. | There are several different types of use rights including territorial use rights, limited-entry systems, or a system of efforts rights. These are utilised to varying degrees for the offshore tuna fisheries and are managed by the FFA. Infringements are the responsibility of the Solomon Island government. |

| EAFM Concept (FAO 2003) | In shore | Offshore |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Education and research | <p>NGOs are the key providers of conservation education for inshore fisheries resources. SPC and TNC have developed regional educational information on EAFM for inshore fisheries.</p> <p>SILMMA and the Provincial Fisheries Officers also have a role to provide education to inshore fisheries. However, they may not always have the resources or be given the direction to do so.</p> <p>EAFM education specific to the Solomon Islands has been limited to date.</p> <p>WFC, USP, UQ play important roles in undertaking research to support EAFM.</p> | <p>SPC are the lead research agency for offshore fisheries research.</p> <p>FFA and SPC both place an important role in education. However, EAFM education specific to the Solomon Islands is still limited for offshore fisheries.</p> |
| Incentives | <p>NGOs often use incentives (as donor support) to encourage communities to manage their inshore resources.</p> <p>Payment for ecosystem services, such as the global climate change carbon-trading market, has the potential to support rural communities in tropical countries to protect and restore habitats including forests, seagrass, and mangrove.</p> | No information was available. |

| EAFM Concept (FAO 2003) | In shore | Offshore |
|--|---|---|
| Protection and conservation | MPAs and LMMAs are the key for protection and conservation of inshore fisheries. The new Protected Area Act (2010) and regulations (2012) provides legal support to communities (Table 5.1). | The new Protected Area Act (2010) and regulations (2012) and the Fisheries Act will be the key tool to provide protection and conservation for offshore fisheries. International and regional agreements (Chapter 3) are also important protection for offshore resources. |
| Spatial and temporal controls on fishing | Locally MPAs use tambu areas or seasons to manage fishing pressure. However, enforcement can be difficult for communities. | The FFA helps implement a VMS and licences to place spatial and temporal controls on fishing. It has been raised that there could be tighter controls. |

Although national policies like the NPoA (CTI 2009b) and the Inshore Fisheries Strategy (SIG 2011) are trying to capture and recognise community based efforts as a national approach to resource management and conservation, they are not necessarily considered in an EAFM framework. For example, locally implemented and managed marine protected areas (MPAs) are considered in the NPoA as the key mechanism to manage inshore fisheries resources. The large majority of them have not explicitly been implemented as an EAFM initiative, but many do meet some EAFM criteria.

There are some key EAFM concepts (Table 5.2) for both inshore and offshore fisheries that are currently not being addressed, highlighting the adhoc and varied adoption of EAFM. The SILMMA (Solomon Islands Locally Managed Marine Areas) network is a government-coordinated initiative made up of local communities, NGOs, and government representatives to try and coordinate LMMAs and activities associated with them. However, implementing EAFM is not a core function of SILMMA.

The prevention of marine habitat degradation is also largely achieved through local MPAs, rather than through gear restrictions as part of EAFM. Similarly, the right-based approach to fisheries management for inshore fisheries is more closely associated with customary tenure than as part of an EAFM approach.

Offshore fisheries are also starting to actively utilise some of the EAFM management mechanisms. This includes gear modifications and catch and effort limitation, as well as the use of spatial and temporal controls on fishing. However, there is a notable absence of national (offshore) Marine Protected Areas as a part of the EAFM approach to tuna fisheries.

There are a number of important EAFM concepts, according to the FAO (2003b), that appear to be absent as a management mechanism or are not being used as effectively as they could for both inshore and offshore fisheries. These include addressing “energy efficiency and pollution,” and promoting “education and research.” The existing EPA Act is said to be in effect, but not effective in controlling and managing pollution. There are very little education and awareness resources or materials about what EAFM is, and what it means for the Solomon Islands.

There is some overlap between some of the EAFM Concepts in Table 5.2 and existing legislation/policy relevant to EAM outlined in Chapter 4. However, by comparing both it is possible to identify which supporting legislation or policy is required to make on-ground actions more effective. These are discussed further in Chapter 7: Opportunities.

6. SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES

The desktop review undertaken for this report revealed an excellent regional EAFM policy framework (CTI 2009a). There was also evidence of some national EAFM policy documents and initiatives in Solomon Islands (CTI2009b, SIG 2010, SIGMFMR 2011). However, it was evident through the interviews conducted in country that a number of challenges were hindering the implementation of EAFM, now and into the future.

The current EAFM initiatives in Solomon Islands--frameworks and new national and provincial legislation--do not appear to be a priority for the SIG. Draft documents have now remained that way for a number of years. This is not surprising as Sauni and Amos (2011) highlighted confusion over priority issues (as a result of national politics) as a key challenge to the implementation of EAFM across the Pacific.

It is clear that the translation of regional EAFM principles to national policy and operational objectives is further progressed for tuna fisheries than inshore fisheries. This is evident in there being a preliminary draft EAFM Tuna Management and Action Plan (SIGMFMR 2011), but no equivalent document for inshore fisheries.

While there is an external push for EAFM for offshore (tuna) fisheries, there is not an equally strong central drive to implement EAFM for inshore fisheries. Perhaps this reflects limited capacity within the Solomon Island government, or a poor understanding of what EAFM for inshore fisheries will mean on the ground for Solomon Islands and so what implementation should look like.

It is noted that there are some EAFM policy concepts in the National Strategy for Inshore fisheries (SIG 2010). However, there has been little effort to ensure the degree of implementation or "effectiveness" of them. There are few, if any, reports available for review.

Currently fisheries or resource management is being undertaken at a community level with NGO support as a Community Based Resource Management (CBRM) mechanism. A concept common to EAFM and CBRM regularly used by local communities to manage resources are Marine Protected Areas (MPAs). However, the legislation for communities to legally protect their MPAs is very new, and resources and skills to enforce the legislation are limited. Fisheries management and compliance is a recognised issue that remains to be adequately tackled for both inshore and offshore fisheries. Although the FFA plays a role in compliance for offshore fisheries, there are often resource and political limitations to enforcement, even for these commercially important fisheries.

There are a number of important EAFM concepts described by FAO (2003b) and Fletcher (2008) that are not being actively addressed or used to their potential for both inshore and offshore fisheries, including gear modifications, catch controls, the use of incentives, and pollution management.

Pollution management and its effect on fisheries is an important component of EAFM. However, only recently has there begun to be consideration at a national level of significant development projects in the Solomon Islands (such as logging and mining) and their potential impact on fish and fish habitats. The impacts that logging and mining have socially and environmentally are often tied in closely with fisheries; however, this connection is not apparent in SIG EAFM-related documents.

Education and awareness is one of the most significant of the EAFM concepts described by FAO (2003b) that there is a paucity of, particularly for inshore fisheries. It was reported that information from regional

EAFM initiatives and workshops--which largely comprises educational materials--is not effectively filtering down to national, provincial, and community levels. It is clear that provincial fisheries do not have a sound understanding of EAFM implementation strategies or mechanisms, nor the human or financial capacity needed to implement them once they do.

Through this review it was evident there is a lack of a clear understanding around the definition of EAFM or its boundaries. Many identify EAFM most closely with CBRM; however, there is not an understanding of how these resource-management approaches differ. This is an important differentiation, based around risk assessments, an ecosystem approach, and a fisheries focus.

EAFM has a strong focus on social and economic components of fishing (FAO 2003a, Fletcher 2008). However, in older CBRM initiatives in Solomon Islands the social and economic components of EAFM do not always appear to have been well considered, represented, or included. There is evidence that this is changing though, as EAFM principles have become more mainstreamed internationally (e.g. Kia District Marine Resource Management plan and others in Western Province).

Finally, while there are a number of small-scale inshore projects that meet EAFM principles or management mechanisms (e.g. CBRM), there is no effective overarching national mechanism for inshore fisheries that pulls together "existing projects" to manage a single fishery or region. The lack of a national coordination of initiatives was identified in the NPoA (CTI 2009b) and during a WorldFish Center-led workshop on CBRM (2007), and it appears to still be a significant challenge for EAFM. Sauni and Amos (2008) also identified uncertainty and conflict over government agency responsibilities regarding EAFM as a challenge across the Pacific.

This chapter has highlighted the many challenges in implementing EAFM in Solomon Islands. Equally, there are many opportunities and these are discussed in the following chapter.

7. SUMMARY OF OPPORTUNITIES

Previous chapters in this report outline the gaps and challenges in the existing Solomon Island EAFM framework. Opportunities exist to address these and further progress EAFM adoption and implementation; however, the drive to implement EAFM and the approaches adopted must come from within the country/community for it to be successful. The scope of opportunities may be through further policy development or alternatively be through on-ground actions, which are discussed below.

Firstly, it should be acknowledged that the progress in simply recognising EAFM in key policy documents is an improvement from reviews conducted in previous years (TNC/SPC 2007). There are components of a legislative framework for the implementation of EAFM; however, the finalisation of the new fisheries legislation has been identified by stakeholders as a priority action. Specific regulations developed under the new Fisheries Bill could usefully ensure that relevant traditional knowledge, customary marine tenure, and customary practises (Chapter 4) are recognised as important components of EAFM. The revised Fisheries Bill will provide power to the communities to manage their resources and this will require significant awareness-raising to enact it effectively.

There are excellent materials and resources available through regional initiatives and organisations. Although the Fletcher (2008) EAFM guideline is written for tuna, it is applicable to all fisheries. It provides five steps required to fully apply EAFM and outlines broad EAFM considerations including; target species; non-target species; the ecosystem; community outcomes; and fisheries administrations.

The current focus on offshore fisheries can provide a template and learning opportunity for inshore fisheries. The MFMR and FFA Tuna EAFM workshop (MFMR/FFA 2011) was a positive national example of how to start implementing (translating) the EAFM theory into practice. This could be used as a model for inshore fisheries.

The Solomon Islands government fisheries management structure, with a central ministry and provincial fisheries officers (PFO), is a good structure that is conducive to the implementation of EAFM. Enhancing the capacity of the PFOs through training and resources would be needed to implement EAFM for inshore fisheries; however, additional human resources and capacity building would be required.

Some interviewees in this study suggested that provincial ordinances should support community management plans whereby communities themselves enforce rules and laws and mandates on how they do fisheries management. Older ordinances tended to be drawn from national government policy rather than community-level or village-level initiatives.

Addressing the uncertainty around what EAFM constitutes through education and awareness, and through an open dialogue on how Solomon Islands wants to interpret EAFM, may help remove the apprehension to pursue EAFM approaches. Educational material is readily available, but it is likely that these would need to be revised to be readily transferable to the Solomon Islands situation.

There is evidence of EAFM management concepts like the use of MPAs, right-based approaches, and effort limits in existing community initiatives including CBRM, IIM, or LMMA. However, while there are many synergies with CBRM, IIM, or LMMA and EAFM (MECM/MFMR 2010, US CTI n.d), a more detailed investigation would be required to understand to what extent these mechanisms adequately encompass EAFM principles for inshore fisheries. Capturing the information from existing initiatives to feed into an

inshore EAFM Framework would also be valuable and assist at a national scale. There is also opportunity to integrate EAFM with other holistic initiatives including climate change adaptation initiatives.

Implementation of EAFM is usually across fisheries agencies (FAO 2003a), but as it cuts across other sectors it needs to be across agencies/organisations. By enhancing multiple agency collaboration by sharing resources, knowledge, and lessons SIG can strengthen the national approach to EAFM. The NCC can continue to play a valuable role in coordinating activities that support the implementation of EAFM nationally. However, owing to legislative responsibility the central role must still lie with MFMR.

There may be benefits in better harnessing the resources of various research institutions and NGO projects within the country to help implement EAFM for inshore fisheries. The WorldFish Center, for example, has an MOU with the MFMR to help it implement management of inshore fisheries. Many of the principles that WorldFish bases its small-scale fisheries management on draw upon EAFM principles. WorldFish is currently implementing a Europe Aid-funded research project in Malaita explicitly targeting the implementation of EAFM for an inshore fishery, and MFMR is a partner.

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fisheries of the Solomon Islands are under growing pressure from an increasing population and demand for fish. The FAO predicts that unless fisheries management is strengthened worldwide, the collapse of several fisheries is likely. EAFM offers a holistic management approach that is rapidly gaining acceptance as best-practice fisheries management. EAFM addresses the multiple needs and desires of societies without jeopardizing the options for future generations to benefit from the full range of goods and services provided by marine ecosystems (FAO 2003). However, Sauni (2009) maintains that unless transparency, accountability, and good governance are upheld, it would be extremely difficult to have a successful ecosystem approach to fisheries management.

This review has identified both opportunities and challenges to implementing EAFM for the Solomon Islands. Sauni (2009) discusses ways forward for progressing EAFM in the Pacific and identifies many similar issues. This report looks more specifically at Solomon Islands and suggests some steps for progressing EAFM from a national perspective.

The complexity of EAFM, both in definition and implementation, is one of the biggest challenges to its implementation. There is still much discussion on what EAFM entails and how it overlaps with previous approaches to fisheries and ecosystem management. It is not surprising that this complexity and uncertainty around EAFM exists.

While there is evidence of many of the “core” principles of EAFM starting to be reflected in national policy and practice there is still progress to be made on the implementation of it at a national scale as is aspired to in the Solomon Island Government EAFM Framework and National Inshore Fisheries Strategy documents.

It would appear that a key constraint to widespread implementation is additional resources and capacity to complete priority actions. However, consultations have highlighted that the drive to implement EAFM and to seek financial resources to do so must come from within the country/community for it to be successful. If the Solomon Island government chooses to pursue EAFM, it would appear that it needs to be a higher priority as a national strategy. This may require additional resources or capacity building; however, these are available through organisations like FFA and SPC, as well as many NGOs. Currently there are frameworks and tools available but they are not being utilised to their full potential.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRESSING EAFM IN SOLOMON ISLANDS

The current challenges and future opportunities for implementing EAFM in Solomon Islands are detailed in Chapters 7 and 8 of this report. A summary of recommendations, or actions to address these, is provided below.

LIST OF PRIORITY ACTIONS

1. The completion of key EAFM policy documents including;

- New Fisheries Act (Fisheries Management Bill)
- EAFM Framework Report
- EAFM Solomon Islands Tuna Fisheries Management Plan
- EAFM Action Plan for Tuna Fisheries

These documents have been produced as drafts and contain valuable information and a good framework to work from. However, it requires resources and intent to now finalise and implement them.

2. Increased education and awareness about EAFM

Ensure information provided at regional workshops and training is being translated into national workshops and dialogue to improve understanding about what EAFM means in an operational sense for Solomon Islands inshore fisheries management. The establishment of a regional platform for collection and sharing data and information was also identified as an objective in the Regional EAFM Framework.

It will be important to agree on the role of Provincial Fisheries Officers (PFOs) with regard to EAFM. If EAFM implementation is identified as a role for them in their job descriptions, designing materials resources and trainings for them will be important.

Ensure lessons from the WorldFish Europe Aid EAFM pilot project in Malaita, and any other EAFM initiatives are widely shared and discussed amongst stakeholders to contribute to the discussion of what implementing EAFM means for Solomon Islands inshore fisheries.

3. Increased national collaboration

Implementing EAFM requires a high level of collaboration (Sauni 2009). Identifying mechanisms to strengthen national EAFM implementation, and ways to better recognise existing initiatives, would be beneficial. During stakeholder consultations it was suggested that the Ministry of Environment should play a coordinating role, as it is the ministry responsible for promoting ecosystem-based concepts and tools. However, it was also proposed that MFMR should also play a lead role in the implementation of EAFM. Clear guidance of agency responsibilities was highlighted as a need by those interviewed.

4. Develop an EAFM Framework for Solomon Islands Inshore Fisheries

The draft regional EAFM Framework (CTI 2012) has identified “developing regional guidelines” as an action under one of the five objectives. These guidelines can assist the development an EAFM Framework for Solomon Islands Inshore Fisheries.

A workshop that involves all relevant stakeholders can minimise many of the challenges often faced developing such a framework (Sauni and Amos 2011). In the absence of the CTI regional guidelines and inshore framework could be based on the existing tuna EAFM Framework (SIGMFMR/FFA), and developed using other regional EAFM materials including the FAO (2003a and 2003b), and supported by Fletcher (2008).

Fletcher (2008) was used to guide the FFA/MFRM EAFM tuna workshop and creation of the subsequent plan. It would be useful for there to be a brief report on how useful these were as guiding documents for the Solomon Islands. What additional information would be required to make them more useable?

5. Implement pilot EAFM initiatives

Following completion of the EAFM Framework for inshore fisheries, pilot initiatives on identified inshore fisheries can be trialled using the implementation guidelines (Fletcher 2008). This has been identified as an action in the regional EAFM framework. A pilot may be on either:

- An entire fishery;
- Subset of a fishery (e.g. in defined geographical area-WorldFish);
- A collection of inter-related fisheries; or a
- Regional fishery.

6. Investigate overlap with EAFM and other resource management initiatives

Conduct a strategic “gap analysis” on existing projects that fit within an EAFM framework, or that utilise EAFM concepts like CBRM or climate change initiatives:

- Which CBRM approaches adequately encompass EAFM principles and are there strategies that could be developed to address ways that agreed approaches could be strengthened?
- Identify synergies amongst other holistic management approaches e.g. EAFM, climate change, and current CBRM approaches.

7. Build capacity of local communities

Increase awareness and understanding of EAFM in communities. Provide information to assist communities to understand how EAFM differs to what they are already doing. What additional components could they do (e.g. gear restrictions, fishing effort)? Provincial orders could be drawn from community management plans to increase their effectiveness and strengthen the relationship between national and community initiatives.

8. Improve connectivity between community initiatives

Through ongoing and existing initiatives (e.g. SILMMA, MSSIF, CTI) identify opportunities to improve connections between the community-level EAFM initiatives with national policies and strategies.

9. Monitoring

Following the implementation of the management actions listed above, it will be equally important to monitor their effectiveness. Hanich and Tsamenyi (2009) provide detailed discussion on measures for success of EAFM and specific guidance on addressing some of the challenges that have been faced across the Pacific.

NEXT STEPS

Through this review, a list of priority actions were identified that will assist with progressing EAFM implementation in Solomon Islands. It is recognised that these tasks require resources and skills that are not always readily available (Sauni 2009). However, they can be used as a basis to populate an EAFM Action Plan against a timeline and with responsible agencies. This action plan can be progressed as resources are available and if or when the government chooses to prioritise EAFM for Solomon Island fisheries.

REFERENCES

- CTI (2009a) Regional Plan of Action (RPoA). Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF). Released on 15 May 2009.
- CTI (2009b) Solomon Islands National Plan of Action (NPoA). Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF). Released November 2009.
- CTI (2012) A Regional Framework for Legislation and Policy to Support an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI). DRAFT Report.
- FAO (2003a) The ecosystem approach to fisheries. Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No 4, Suppl. 2. FAO, Rome.
- FAO (2003b) The ecosystem approach to fisheries. FAO technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No 4, Suppl. 2. Rome, 112p.
- FAO (2009) Country Profile (Solomon Islands) – National Fishery Sector Overview.
- Fletcher, R (2008) A guide to implementing an ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM) within the Western Central Pacific Region. Forum Fisheries Agency, Honiara, Solomon Islands.
- Govan, H. et al. (2009) Status and potential of locally-managed marine areas in the South Pacific: meeting nature conservation and sustainable livelihood targets through wide-spread implementation of LMMAAs. SPREP/WWF/WorldFish-Reefbase/CRISP. 95pp + 5 annexes. http://www.sprep.org/att/publication/000646_LMMA_report.pdf or <http://bit.ly/95EBh3> (or <http://bit.ly/H7o3Fq>). 2nd edition (minor edits). <http://bit.ly/IQrqiF>. ISBN: 978-982-04-0402-1 (print) 978-982-04-0403-8 (online).
- Govan, H., A. Schwarz and D. Boso. (2011) Towards Integrated Islands Management: Lessons from Lau, Malaita, Solomon Islands, for the implementation of national approaches to resource management. Report for WorldFish Centre and SPREP. 62pp. <http://bit.ly/kwA8ee>.
- Sauni, S (2009) Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management: Implementation Issues and Challenges for Pacific Island States In Navigating Pacific Fisheries: Legal and Policy Trends in the Implementation of International Fisheries Instruments in the Western and Central Pacific Region. Hanich, Q and Tsamenyi, M eds. 3302 – 318.
- MECM/MFMR (2010) Solomon Islands Coral Triangle Initiative National Plan of Action (NPoA), SIG. Honiara, Solomon Islands.
- US CTI (nd). Technical Brief: An Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) and the Coral Triangle Initiative.
- US CTI Support Program Document No 12-USCTI-II (2011) Activity Report: CTI regional exchange and policy workshop on ecosystem approach to fisheries management. Kota Kinabalu, Sabah Malaysia.
- Sauni, S. and Amos, M. (2011) Application of the Ecosystem- Based Approach to Fisheries Management in Tuna Fisheries at the Western-Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Solomon Islands.

Solomon Islands Government (2010) Solomon Islands National Strategy for the Management of Inshore Fisheries and Marine Resources 2010 – 2012.

Solomon Islands Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources and Pacific Forum of Fisheries Agency (2011) Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management for Solomon Islands Tuna Fisheries (draft report).

SPC/TNC (2009) The ecosystem approach to coastal fisheries and aquaculture in the Pacific Islands Countries and Territories (PICTS). SPC, New Caledonia.

WorldFish Center (2007) Community-based adaptive resource management in Solomon Islands: lessons learned.

APPENDIX I

INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

TABLE A.I LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED FOR THIS REVIEW

| Name | Title | Organisation |
|---------------------|---|--|
| James Teri | Director (Ag) | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources |
| Peter Kenilorea Jr. | SILMMA Officer | Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources |
| Anne-Maree Schwarz | Research Programme leader | WorldFish Center |
| Reuben Sulu | Scientist | WorldFish Center |
| Lysa Wini | Conservation Officer | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Management |
| Maruia Kamatie | Fisheries Management Officer | Forum Fisheries Agency |
| Rick Fletcher | Director | Western Central Pacific Fisheries Consortium W.A Department of Fisheries. |
| Robert Pomeroy | Professor | University of Connecticut-Avery Point |
| Willie Atu | Country Director | The Nature Conservancy |
| Seno Maui | Program Manager | The Nature Conservancy |
| Mia Rimon | Country Director | SPC |
| Hugh Govan | Regional Coordinator | World Commission Protected Areas - Marine-Marine |
| Lui Bell | Marine Species Officer | SPREP |
| Shannon Seeto | Country Manager | WWF |
| Peter Ramohia | Program Manager | Asia Development Bank |
| Bianna Priest | Australian Volunteers Abroad – Advisor | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Management |

FISHERIES LEGISLATION (FAO)

[Source](#) | [Citation](#) | [XML](#) | [Print](#)

[Search fisheries](#)



Fishery and Aquaculture Country Profiles Solomon Islands



[Profiles home](#)

[Fishery Thematic Databases](#)

[Fishery Production Statistics](#)

[Fishery Trade Statistics](#)

[Fishery Legislation](#)

[News and Events](#)

[FAO Publications](#)

[Other FAO Country Profiles](#)

Solomon Islands fishery legislation (from FAOLEX)

a database of national legislation and international agreements concerning food and agriculture (including fisheries, forestry and water) maintained by the FAO Legal Office and a link opening a window to retrieve all Fishery legislation for that country...[more](#)

FAO Lex



Search parameters: country=SLB

Records Returned: 29

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|---|--------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Agreement in the form of an Exchange of Letters on the provisional application of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Solomon Islands. | 2010 | | | European Union; Solomon Islands |
| Maritime Safety Administration Act 2009 (No. 8 of 2009). | 2009-05-08 | | This Act commences on a date appointed by the Minister, by Notice in the Gazette. | Solomon Islands |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Solomon Islands. | 2009 | | | European Union; Solomon Islands |
| Provincial Government Act, 1997. | | 2006-06-20 | | Solomon Islands |
| Council Regulation (EC) No. 563/2006 concerning the conclusion of the Partnership Agreement between the European Community and Solomon Islands on fishing off Solomon Islands. | 2006-03-13 | | | European Union; Solomon Islands |
| Partnership Agreement between the European Community and Solomon Islands on fishing off Solomon Islands. | 2006 | | | European Union; Solomon Islands |
| Framework Treaty guiding relations between the Independent State of Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands. | 2004-07-27 | | This Agreement entered into force on 27 July 2004. | Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |
| Basic Agreement between the Government of Solomon Islands and the Government of Papua New Guinea on Border Arrangements. | 2004-07-24 | | This Agreement entered into force on 27 July 2004. | Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Convention for the Conservations and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific. | 2000-09-05 | | This Convention shall enter into force in accordance with Article 36. | Australia; Philippines; China; United States of America; Papua New Guinea; Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa; New Zealand |
| Shipping Act 1998 (No. 5 of 1998). | 1998-09-03 | | | Solomon Islands |
| Fisheries Act (Act No. 6 of 1998). | 1998-07-10 | | The Act shall, come into operation on such date as the Minister may appoint by notice published in the Gazette. | Solomon Islands |
| Federated States of Micronesia Arrangement for Regional Fisheries Access. | 1994-11-14 | | The Arrangement shall enter into force on the date 30 days after last signature. | Micronesia, Fed. States; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands; Tuvalu |
| Delimitation of Marine Waters (Marine Scientific Research) Regulations (L.N. No 79 of 1994). | 1994-08-04 | | | Solomon Islands |
| Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of Certain Pacific Islands States and the Government of the United States of America, 1987. | | 1994-06-09 | | United States of America; Papua New Guinea; Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa; New Zealand |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Palau Arrangement for the Management of the Western Pacific Purse Seine Fishery. | 1992-10-02 | | The Arrangement shall enter into force 14 days following receipt of instruments of ratification by five signatories (Art. 11.2). | Micronesia, Fed. States; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |
| Niue Treaty on Cooperation in Fisheries Surveillance and Law Enforcement in the South Pacific Region. | 1992-07-09 | | The Treaty entered into force on 20 May 1993. | Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; New Zealand; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands; Tokelau (New Zealand); Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa |
| Protocol I to the Convention for the Prohibition of Fishing with Long Driftnets in the South Pacific. | 1990-10-20 | | This Protocol shall enter into force for each State on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification (art. 7(3)). | American Samoa (USA); Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; France; French Polynesia (France); New Caledonia (France); Wallis and Futuna Islands (France); Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; New Zealand; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Pitcairn (UK); Solomon Islands; Papua New Guinea; Tokelau (New Zealand); Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Protocol II to the Convention for the Prohibition of Fishing with Long Driftnets in the South Pacific. | 1990-10-20 | | This Protocol shall enter into force for each State on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification (art. 7(3)). | American Samoa (USA); Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; France; French Polynesia (France); New Caledonia (France); Wallis and Futuna Islands (France); Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; New Zealand; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Pitcairn (UK); Solomon Islands; Papua New Guinea; Tokelau (New Zealand); Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa |
| Second Arrangement Implementing the Nauru Agreement Setting Forth Additional Terms and Conditions of Access to the Fisheries Zones of the Parties | 1990-09-19 | | The Arrangement shall enter into force on the date of receipt of the fifth instrument of approval (art. III, para. 2). | Micronesia, Fed. States; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |
| Arrangement Implementing the Nauru Agreement Setting Forth Minimum Terms and Conditions of Access to the Fisheries Zones of the Parties. | 1990 | | The Arrangement will enter into force 14 days following receipt by the depositary of instruments of ratification by five signatories including Micronesia, Kiribati and Papua New Guinea. Thereafter it shall enter into force for any signing or acceding State 30 days after receipt by the depositary of the instrument of ratification or accession (art. 11, para. 2). | Micronesia, Fed. States; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands; Tuvalu |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Final Act of the meeting on a Convention to prohibit Driftnet Fishing in the South Pacific. | 1989-11-24 | | The Agreement shall enter into force on the date of deposit of the fourth instrument of ratification or accession (art. 13). | American Samoa (USA); Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Micronesia, Fed. States; Fiji; France; French Polynesia (France); New Caledonia (France); Wallis and Futuna Islands (France); Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; New Zealand; Niue (New Zealand); Palau; Pitcairn (UK); Solomon Islands; Papua New Guinea; Tokelau (New Zealand); Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu; Samoa |
| Agreement between the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Government of Solomon Islands concerning the administration of the special areas. | 1989-01-25 | | This Agreement entered into force on 5 March 2004. | Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |
| Fisheries (United States of America)(Treaty) Act 1988. | 1988-04-11 | | | Solomon Islands |
| Nauru Agreement Concerning the Cooperation in the Management of Fisheries of Common Interest. | 1982-02-11 | | The Agreement shall enter into force 30 days after receipt of the fifth instrument of ratification or accession (art. X, para. 2). | Micronesia, Fed. States; Kiribati; Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands |
| Fisheries (Foreign Fishing Vessels) Regulations 1981. | 1981-12-14 | | | Solomon Islands |
| Fisheries (Local Fishing Vessels) Regulations, 1981. | 1981-12-03 | | | Solomon Islands |
| Fisheries Act, 1972. | 1981-06-01 | | | Solomon Islands |

| Title of text | Date of text | Consolidated date | Entry into force | Countries |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Fisheries Regulations, 1972. | 1981 | | | Solomon Islands |
| South Pacific Forum Agency Convention. | 1979-07-10 | | The Convention shall enter into force 30 days after the eighth signature (art. X, para. 2). | Australia; Cook Islands (New Zealand); Fiji; Kiribati; Nauru; New Zealand; Niue (New Zealand); Papua New Guinea; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Samoa; Vanuatu |

APPENDIX 3

SOLOMON ISLAND LEGISLATION AND POLICY

(I) FISHERIES ACT (NO 6 OF 1998)

The purpose of this act is to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable utilization of the fisheries resources of Solomon Islands for the benefit of the people of Solomon Islands.

It provides for the minister to exercise his/her power and functions in relation to fisheries management and conservation and in exercising those powers have regard to:

- (a) the principle that Solomon Islands fisheries resources shall be managed, developed, and conserved so as to ensure through proper conservation and management measures that the maintenance of those resources is not endangered by overexploitation and is utilized at a level that ensures their optimum sustainable yield;
- (b) the principle that the marine biodiversity, coastal, and aquatic environments of Solomon Islands shall be protected and managed in a sustainable manner;
- (c) the application of the precautionary approach to the conservation, management, and exploitation of fisheries resources in order to protect the fisheries resources and preserve the marine environment;
- (d) the sustainable utilization of Solomon Islands fisheries resources so as to achieve economic growth, human resource development, employment creation, and a sound ecological balance, consistent with its national development objectives;
- (e) principle of sustainable yield and allowable catch, which may be supported or adopted nationally or internationally from time to time;
- (f) any relevant international obligations or bilateral or multilateral agreements which Solomon Islands is a party to, or applicable rules of international law, relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by Solomon Islands within its waters;
- (g) any customary rights holders over or in relation to any area within Solomon Islands waters; and
- (h) Any fisheries management and development plans made in accordance with this act.

(II) THE ENVIRONMENT ACT, (NO 8 OF 1998)

The purpose of the act is for the protection and conservation of the environment and the establishment of the Environment and Conservation Division and the Environment Advisory Committee. Specific objectives of the act are stipulated as:

- (a) to provide for and establish integrated systems of development control, environmental impact assessment, and pollution control;

- (b) to prevent, control, and monitor pollution;
- (c) to reduce risks to human health and prevent degradation of the environment by all practical means, including the following means:
 - (i) regulating the discharge of pollution to the air, water, and land;
 - (ii) regulating the transport, collection, treatment, storage, and disposal of wastes;
 - (iii) promoting recycling, re-use, and recovery of materials in an economically viable manner; and
- (d) To comply with and give effect to regional and international conventions and obligations relating to the environment. Where there is an inconsistency between this act and the provisions of any other act, the provisions of this act shall prevail.

Among the key functions of the act are to (i) promote coordination among Ministries and government divisions; (ii) revise and amend the national environmental strategies and program as necessary; (iii) develop, coordinate, and facilitate implementation of national policy concerning environmental planning, environmental impact assessment, and pollution control; and (iv) monitor and advise on international developments in environmental matters and to ensure the fulfilment of obligations of Solomon Islands under the relevant international and required treaties and conventions.

(III) THE WILDLIFE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT ACT, (CAP 10 OF 1998)

The objectives of the act are to provide for the protection, conservation, and management of wildlife in Solomon Islands by regulating the export and import of certain animals and plants. Under this act Solomon Islands is obliged to comply with the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species and wild fauna and flora (CITES).

The act allows for the minister to declare by order a management program that is being or is proposed to be, or has been carried out, as an approved management programs for the purposes of the act. The act spells out what should be contained in the management program; for instance it should contain the manner of taking and collecting of animal or plant specimens for breeding, propagation, growing, or exporting for scientific or commercial purposes. It also gives the minister power to make regulations relating to the manner in which the registers of approved management program are to be kept, fees and other charges that persons or organizations whose names are entered on the register are required to pay, etc. The act prohibits any export or import of plant or animal specimen without the relevant permit. The act also requires that any person exporting or importing a plant or animal specimen is required to produce the relevant permit to the Customs or Quarantine authorities. Possession of illegally obtained specimens is an offence and a penalty is prescribed.

The act contains two schedules. Schedule I contains the lists of animals and plants that are prohibited from exports, while Schedule II contains the lists of animals and plants that are regulated.

(IV) PROTECTED AREA ACT, (NO. 4 OF 2010)

- (a) to establish a system of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity;
- (b) to develop, where necessary, guidelines for the selection, establishment, and management of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity;

- (c) to regulate or manage biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity whether within or outside protected areas, with a view to ensuring their conservation and sustainable use;
- (d) to promote the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats, and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings;
- (e) to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in areas adjacent to protected areas with a view to furthering protection of the protected areas; and
- (f) to rehabilitate and restore degraded ecosystems and promote the recovery of threatened species, such as through the development and implementation of plans or other management strategies.

Part 3 of the act allows for the declaration, registration, and management of protected areas.

An area can be declared a protected area if that area:

- (a) possesses significant genetic, cultural, geological, or biological resources;
- (b) constitutes the habitat of species of wild fauna and flora of unique national or international importance;
- (c) merits protection under the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage; or
- (d) requires special measures to be taken to conserve biological diversity.

Accompanying regulations are currently being developed for this act.

(VII) PROVINCIAL ORDINANCES

At least five of the nine provinces of the Solomon Islands have developed some form of ordinances. The following are the current provincial ordinances:

- The Western Province Resource Management Ordinance 1994
- The Western Province Coastal and Lagoon Shipping Ordinance 1991
- The Western Province Public Nuisance Ordinance 1991
- The Guadalcanal Wildlife Management Area Ordinance 1990
- The Isabel Province Wildlife Sanctuary (Amendment) Ordinance 1991
- Temotu Environment Protection Ordinance 1989
- The Makira Preservation of Culture and Wildlife Ordinance

All provincial ordinances were developed under relevant Acts of Parliament (e.g. Local Government Act, 1980) basically for the protection, conservation, and management of all resources in the respective province. Under an ordinance, the Provincial Executive is empowered to declare an area in the province that is used by a “protected species” to be a protected place.

However, where an area is a customary land, the consent of the relevant landowners must be obtained before any such declaration. For example, the Arnavaon Wildlife Sanctuary was established under the Isabel Wildlife Sanctuary (Amendment) Ordinance, 1991 or the Western Province Coastal and Lagoon Shipping Ordinance, 1991 controls marine pollution and is designed to protect the coastal waters and lagoons.

The ordinances also give a customary land-owning group the power to make its own policy statements and plans regarding the resources within its customary land, and therefore it ensures landowners participation in the management of the area.

The ordinances also specify the procedures and matters that need to be taken into consideration when making a declaration, and appropriate fines for breaches relating to the ordinances. The ordinances may also control visitors to declared areas through use of permits.

(VIII) LOCAL CUSTOMARY/TRADITIONAL PRACTICES

Under customary marine tenure system, land owners can declare any areas (reef, mangroves, or land) under their control protected or tambu. This is normally based on a short-term closed and open closure

(IX) NATIONAL SANCTUARY AND LOCAL MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

No national marine sanctuary(ies) has been declared in the Solomon Islands Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) for marine animals such as whales, dolphins, marine turtles, and sharks. However, under the Solomon Islands Locally Managed Marine Areas, community based MPAs are being established throughout the country. Some of them (e.g. ACMCA and Tetepare Descendant Association) have management plans for the MPAs which also covers seasonal closures to fishing etc.

NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF INSHORE FISHERIES AND MARINE RESOURCES, 2010-2012.

The Solomon Islands National Strategy for the Management of Inshore Fisheries encompasses priorities and activities to meet national and international obligations towards sustainable management and utilisation of inshore resources. The vision is for “sustainable and secure inshore fisheries and resources by 2020.” It is based on five pillars or principles:

- Multi-Scale, Multi-Sectoral Governance;
- Community-Based Resource Management;
- Leadership and Institutional Strengthening;
- Markets and Trade; and
- Communication and Information.

The strategy is underpinned by an implementation plan.

SOLOMON ISLANDS NATIONAL PLAN OF ACTION (2010)

Through the Coral Triangle Support Program (CTSP) funding, the Ministry for Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) and the Ministry for Environment, Conservation, Meteorology and Disaster Management (MECMDM) joined together in 2009 to develop the Coral Triangle Initiatives (CTI) National Plan of Action (NPoA). It represents the first comprehensive planning tool for guiding marine resource management and conservation in the Solomon Islands. The NPoA document is now officially recognized by the Solomon Island government and is guiding the program development of the CTSP Solomon Islands work plan.

It is a people-centred approach to progress the national priorities of the government of the Solomon Islands. It enables the maintenance of marine resources for reasons of food security and supports people's livelihoods. It aims to be sustainable and workable, with visible impacts on the ground.



CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE

ON CORAL REEFS, FISHERIES AND FOOD SECURITY

