

FEIKE NEWS

November 2007

fisheries
aquaculture
ecosystems

natural resource management advisors

FEIKE

Welcome to the November edition of **Feike News!**. As always, we trust that you find our selection of important and hot issues worth reading. In this month's edition we probe Minister van Schalkwyk's decision to suspend commercial fishing in the abalone fishery. In particular we try and understand what motivated him and his department to completely ignore the industry and communities and rather thrust the decision on the legal industry. We also take a look at the recently released list of EU subsidised vessels, the potential for confusion in the aquaculture industry as the Western Cape Government issues its own draft aquaculture policy and we analyse the concept of **the plan** and how its genesis may explain much of what we confront each day.

Visit www.feike.co.za for **Breaking News**.

In this Month's edition:

1. Commercial Abalone Fishery Suspended
2. List of EU Fishing Subsidies Released
3. Western Cape Aquaculture Policy
4. What Happened to National Marine Week?
5. Defining Conservation in the Marine Realm
6. Review of Sub-Saharan African Aquaculture
7. Commercial Size Limit
8. The Plan

NEWS BRIEFS

- MCM Haemorrhaging Chief Directors?
- Using Spies to stop Whistleblowing
- Fishing Deal Between EU and Tanzania Stalled
- EU Plans to Get Tough with Deep-water Trawlers
- The Woes of the Mediterranean Continue
- Wind Power for Namibia?
- Another IUU Boat Gets Favourable Treatment on African East Coast



1. COMMERCIAL ABALONE FISHERY SUSPENDED

The wild abalone commercial fishery was suspended on the 1 November 2007. In a media release on the 25th October, Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Marthinus van Schalkwyk, said that the suspension will ensure the survival of the species and will also ensure that our children will know what abalone is. The reasons cited for the closure are the combination of poaching and the migration of west coast rock lobsters into abalone areas, which has resulted in significant levels of abalone recruitment failure.

Over the last decade, the TAC has been reduced annually from 615 tons in 1995 to 125 tons for the 2006/07 season, a record low. In the Winter of 2007 the Minister mentioned that if there was no drastic decline in poaching, the possibility existed of suspending the fishery for a period of 10 years to allow the resource to recover. For the previous fishing season, the TAC for 3 of the 7 zones was zero. There are currently 302 right holders operating in the sector, employing some 800 persons according to the Minister. The Minister claims that there have been consultations with the Department of Labour and a Social Plan to mitigate the impacts of the closure of the fishery will be developed. The plan allegedly includes the department's commitment to developing a sustainable aquaculture industry and issuing additional permits for whale watching and shark cage diving.

The **Social Plan** that the Minister speaks of can only be described as dishonest and insulting. Abalone fishermen were expecting to go fishing on 1 November for the 2007/2008 abalone fishing season. So unexpected was the Minister's decision, that South African marketers were in aeroplanes to Hong Kong to secure contracts for South African abalone when they heard the Minister's decision. Between October 2006 and July 2007, the abalone industry repeatedly sought urgent meetings with Marine and Coastal Management to discuss the consequences of a possible fishery closure, which many expected in 2008/2009. On the two occasions (one in 2006 and at the beginning of 2007) that MCM did see it fit to meet with the abalone divers, it steered discussion away from the possibility of closure.

The Minister now speaks of a social plan, which involves allocating more whale watching and shark cage diving permits to abalone fishermen and more fish farming rights. This is not a social plan, Mr Minister. Is your department going to provide each right holder with a million rand to buy a whale watching boat or R50 million to start a fish farming venture? Are you going to secure him a percentage of the tourist market? Are you going to negotiate berthing space for him? Are you going to train him in the art and science of tourism, whale biology and operating a whale watching business? **AND BY 1 NOVEMBER 2007? How are these fishers going to pay for mortgages, school**

fees and loan repayments on their abalone gear and vessels they were encouraged to invest in?

There is in fact no social plan. In fact, the boat based whale watching and shark cage diving industries must be thrown into a flat panic too. They have been waiting for more than 2 years for their sectors to be properly regulated but MCM has failed them too! And now the Minister has promised them 300 more competitors! If you thought the abalone had it hard, imagine what will happen to the sharks and the whales when 300 more boats come looking for them! What about us – the recreational and privileged sea bathers? With all that shark feeding going on to attract the sharks, the False Bay and Hangklip may see every shark in the Southern Ocean descend on our sunny beaches!

The Minister has also suddenly decided that from 1 November he will start enforcing the law and stop poaching so that abalone can recover. When asked for the **compliance plan**, his department said they cannot release the plan for fear that this may tip the poachers off! What nonsense. We are not wanting the details of "how and when". We are entitled to know what are the elements that comprise the plan, who will fund it, what its budget is, who are the government and social partners that will help enforce it... and what will we call it? After all, this is the same Minister that allowed the most successful anti-poaching unit – the MARINES - to fold in 2005. Then he promised us a new replacement compliance strategy, which never materialised. This Minister also allowed the Environmental Court in Hermanus to fold. If we recall, when he shut it down, it had a success rate of 80% and was responsible for incarcerating many poachers and their bosses, as well as stripping them of their poaching boats, cars and cash. Finally, of course MCM's compliance budget has – like the abalone TAC – fallen through the floor. So how will they fund their new compliance plan without the eyes and ears and assistance of right holders that gave R25 for every kilogram of abalone landed? There is no compliance plan either.

Finally, the Minister has promised greater levels of **research** into the fishery. Again, why now? But this plan too does not exist in reality because had it not been for the abalone industry, MCM could only undertake research in 1 zone (out of 7). The abalone industry regularly made available their boats, divers and time to assist MCM carry out research on abalone stocks in more than 1 zone.

So there is no social plan; no compliance plan and no research plan. However, what is clear is that MCM is now the sole marketer of wild abalone thanks to the illegal trade in abalone. The confiscated abalone from poachers is thought to be MCM's greatest single source of income. Although MCM will not reveal how much it is currently earning from the sale of confiscated abalone, Feike's research into the units of abalone confiscated and the market value of dried and canned product allows us to estimate



that during the past 12 months, MCM could have earned between R80 million and R100 million.

It is understood that meetings of the abalone industry on Friday in Hawston and on Sunday in Cape Town have resolved to interdict the Minister from implementing the suspension of commercial abalone fishing. Legal sources advise that the interdict appears a certainty since neither the Minister, nor his department, have in any consulted with the abalone industry. The failure to consult is a breach of the mandatory requirements of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, 2000.

The Cape Argus reported on 29 October 2007 that the Department will hold a 2 day meeting in the Eastern Cape to discuss the matter. Did anyone tell the Department's officials that commercial abalone harvesting affects people in the Western Cape and communities on the West Coast and in Hawston, Gansbaai, Hermanus and Cape Town need to be consulted?



Protesting Abalone Fishermen in Hawston, Cape South Coast. Posters read (clockwise, top left) 1. "MCM CAUSES POACHING" 2. "MINISTER RESIGN: WE SEEK A LEADER; NOT A TRAITOR" 3. "MINISTER, WE WILL SEE YOU IN COURT"

FEIKE natural resource management advisors



2. LIST OF EU FISHING SUBSIDIES RELEASED

The European Commission has released a list of fishing vessels that have received European Union (EU) fisheries subsidies between 2000 and the beginning of 2007, following an access to information request by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). This is the first time that the EC has identified by name vessels that are recipients of subsidies.

The 23, 828 payments amounted to some €1.2 billion (R12 billion) between 2000 and the beginning of 2007. Overall EU fisheries subsidies during the period are thought to be considerably higher than the €1.2 billion figure and early analysis of the data indicates that it may contain some flaws according to the WWF.

Spanish vessels identified in the EC list received the largest amount (almost €530 million), followed by Italy (€224 million) and Greece (€128 million). EU fishers received €179 million for modernizing existing vessels, and €393 million for constructing new vessels. Both subsidies are controversial because they promote unsustainable fishing effort. The top ten vessels received some €30 million. The top two vessels were the Spanish boats, *Albatun Dos* and *Albatun Tres*; each receiving €4,318,440 for their construction.

Notably, a number of subsidy recipients identified in the EC list have been cited with illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. Infractions included using illegal nets, misreporting catches in logbooks, and falsifying sales records. However, a full accounting of subsidy recipients who have been cited with IUU fishing is currently impossible, given that there is no public record of vessels that have been issued citations.

In a paper released in June 2007, the WWF called on the EC to establish a public database of EU vessels authorized to fish within and outside EU waters, which would include a history of any violations to fisheries regulations. The WWF has also recommended a more rigorous penalty regime, in which vessels cited with IUU fishing would be barred from receiving fishing subsidies, and must return any subsidies already received.

As the largest market and importer of fisheries products, EU fisheries subsidies and regulations have received special attention from concerned interest groups. Some 80% of the world's fish stocks have been pushed to their biological limits. Subsidies that promote over fishing have been blamed for contributing to the problem. People interested in obtaining the dataset which lists vessels that have received EU subsidies between 2000 and 2006 should contact Feike's David Arnott at damott@feike.co.za.



3. WESTERN CAPE AQUACULTURE POLICY

The Provincial Development Council of the Western Cape recently held an Aquaculture Policy and Strategy Follow-up Workshop in Cape Town. An overview of the Discussion Document titled "A Draft Western Cape Aquaculture Policy", was presented at the workshop.

What is immediately apparent is that the Western Cape Policy appears to have been written without regard to the National Aquaculture Policy, which was published in September 2007 (See Feike News, October 2007 for comment on this Policy, http://www.feike.co.za/frame_libr.jsp). The result is that there are a number of policy matters that are conflictual or raise ambiguities and will only further confuse potential investors.

The most notable of these policy matters include:

- ▶ The National Aquaculture Policy states that the duration of rights would be 20 years, while the Western Cape Policy states that rights will be awarded for 15 years. Feike has noted that the Minister does not have the authority to allocate 20 year rights in terms of the MLRA.
- ▶ The National Aquaculture Policy recognises that other activities may take place in identified aquaculture zones, while the Western Cape Policy does not recognise this as a possibility.
- ▶ In an attempt to streamline the aquaculture process, the National Aquaculture policy recommends changing administrative procedures while the Western Cape Policy points to developing fresh legislation to develop aquaculture in the Western Cape.

While it is commendable and indeed important for the sake of attracting further investments into fish farming in the Western Cape, it would be important for the Western Cape Aquaculture Policy to complement that National Aquaculture Policy.

4. WHAT HAPPENED TO NATIONAL MARINE WEEK?

National Marine Week was "celebrated" from the 15th to the 20th of October 2007. The stated purpose of National Marine Week is to create awareness of the marine and coastal environment, the promotion of sustainable use and conservation of these resources for the benefit of all. National Marine week has been celebrated during the third week of October since 2000.

As the custodian of the environment, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism is tasked with being the lead driver for National Marine Week. However,



National Marine Week 2007 passed by with barely a whimper. At such a critical time in marine, fisheries and coastal management and environmental concerns, the public need to know what is being done regarding fisheries and ocean management. The theme for National Marine Week 2007 was "*Opportunities in the Ocean*". It would have been helpful if Marine and Coastal Management could have informed students, coastal communities, South Africa's various regional and international partners what opportunities there are. But, sadly MCM thought it prudent to not raise these matters in public debate or in any public forum to raise awareness.

Perhaps the quiet passing of National Marine Week can be best summarised by logging onto the National Marine Week website (www.nationalmarineweek.org.za). It has not been updated since 2006. The website still displays Marine Week 2006 posters, competitions, even the theme of 2006, which was "collaboration" of which none has occurred since 2006 – just ask the abalone divers for example! Even the MCM website forgot to mention National Marine Week.

5. DEFINING CONSERVATION IN THE MARINE REALM

The IUCN is engaged in redefining the term "protected area" and is reconsidering its system of categorising such areas. The current categorisation system is familiar to many in the field of protected areas. It ranges from categories I and II, which are managed mainly for nature protection, to category VI, managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems by people.

It is important that the reworking of definitions and guidance on protected areas (PAs) does not preclude the core concept of the 1998 IUCN resolution that called for a global representative system of MPAs. In crafting its resolution the IUCN General Assembly envisaged very large MPAs to help meet the anticipated commitment of nations to sustainable use and conservation of their EEZs. Comprising, most if not all of a nations EEZs, these MPAs would provide a category VI management regime and contain significant conservation components through Categories I and II, as well as optional components of other categories.

Since then, PA practice and diplomatically creative ambiguity have created increasing divergence on how conservation is now envisaged. In one usage, conservation still means ecosystem scale regimes based on sustainability, along with mandatory strict nature reserve components. In another usage, "conservation" equals "preservation" and "protected area" means "national park".

There is often an implication that PA conservation exists where an agency can manage or exclude most uses or impacts, this is reasonable in the terrestrial realm where a protected area has an effective single-usage title and can be fenced. Very

few marine PAs are of a scale where conservation of nature can be achieved solely, or even largely, by a category I or II PA.

For the foreseeable future, there are likely to be few situations in which category I and II no-take MPAs are likely to be large enough to be managed effectively without managing significant effects from surrounding and up-current areas. This may be addressed by nesting and buffering such PAs within an area managed for multiple use, including sustainable fisheries with several agencies each responsible for different elements of management. Conservation may be the priority objective of one agency, but not necessary of others (although all would be linked by an overarching objective of sustainability of use/impact and maintenance of biological diversity and ecosystem processes). This would appear to meet the criteria for category VI.

The type and effectiveness of the management regime is the critical issue. The concept that conservation entails (a) biodiversity maintenance and (b) sustainable use can lead in the direction that all or most of a nation's EEZ should be managed through a multi-use, category VI-type regime, including and buffering no-take I/II areas and other zones. Such a regime could be managed by a PA agency, another agency or a partnership.

The "conservation equals preservation" PA concept, on the other hand, can lead to a focus on category I/II areas managed by a conservation agency. If that leads to targets of approximately 20% of all marine habitats in a nation's EEZ as no-take zones, it raises two questions:

- ▶ If the scale of unbuffered category I/II PAs is such that their internal management cannot reasonably be expected to address most ecosystem services associated with conservation of nature within them, do they qualify for consideration by IUCN as protected areas?
- ▶ If sustainability of use/impact and maintenance of biological diversity and ecosystem processes is an overarching objective for an ecosystem –scale area with embedded category I/II areas, but conservation is the major of only one agency in equal partnership of managing agencies, would such an area qualify for consideration by IUCN as a category VI protected area?

There are inevitably circumstances that lead to significant marine/terrestrial inconsistencies. Taking freshwater fish but not birds or mammals within category II terrestrial parks appears to be acceptable to terrestrial protected area managers. This is nonsensical in marine environments, where no-take fish, invertebrates, and algae is as core an element of category II marine PAs as no-take of mammals, birds, vegetation and logs is for terrestrial category II PAs.





There is risk for both terrestrial and marine PAs in the quest for a single approach. In principle a unifying approach is favoured, but there are concerns that it cannot be done without unacceptable and misleading compromises for marine sites.

6. REVIEW OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN AQUACULTURE

The following is a summary of a review of sub Saharan Aquaculture which was published in the Aquaculture Association of South Africa Newsletter (Volume 4, October 2007) and written by Thomas Hecht for the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.

Sub-Saharan Africa contributes 0.13 and 13.6 percent to total World and Africa aquaculture production, respectively. Total aquaculture production in the 17 target countries between 1998 and 2003 has increased by 61 percent from 44 962 to 72 334 tons. The contribution by aquaculture to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the target countries is negligible, ranging from 0.001 to 0.715 percent.

Farming technologies range from simple, low-input, low- output pond systems to high-density recirculating systems in Nigeria and South Africa. Cage culture is expanding rapidly in many countries. Mariculture technologies are generally more sophisticated and capital intensive. Production technologies in the non-commercial sector have not changed appreciably though some advances in the use of inorganic fertilizers and farm-made feeds were evident and the average production in this sector (0.95 tonnes/ha/year) remains low. The non-commercial sector makes an insignificant contribution to fish supply in the region but makes an important contribution to household or community livelihoods. It is unlikely to make any significant contributions to national protein supply in any of the target countries in the short- to medium-term. Mainly because of economic and bio-technical constraints, the transition from non-commercial to commercial fish farming is not common.

Fingerling availability, quality and distribution remains a serious constraint to non-commercial and commercial aquaculture development in all countries and this presents unique business opportunities. Feed availability, quality, distribution and acceptable food conversion ratios remain major constraints to both non-commercial and commercial producers. Most non-commercial farmers use protein limiting diets, the use of farm made feeds is increasing slowly, while manufactured feeds are generally of a low quality. High quality extruded feeds are only manufactured in South Africa. All shrimp feed is imported.

During the last five years, there has been a marked emergence of commercial aquaculture and this appears to be related to increasing fish price. It was estimated

that the commercial sector contributes approximately 65 percent to the total fresh and brackish water fish production, while nearly 100 percent of mariculture production is from the commercial sector.

The most significant advances seem to have been made in Anglophone countries, suggesting the need for a greater degree of capacity building in Francophone countries. Most government stations are abandoned or in a state of neglect and disrepair and cannot fulfil their intended mandate. Some stations have been successfully privatized, though in most countries privatization policies and strategies need to be developed and implemented to serve the interests of the commercial and non-commercial sectors.

Awareness campaigns of aquaculture business opportunities in some countries have resulted in a shift in emphasis to commercial farming and the emergence of progressive new small- and medium-scale investors. To increase fish supply, it is incumbent upon lead agencies to focus their support on the emerging commercial sector. There have been major paradigm shifts with respect to the promotion and development of the sector in several countries. In these countries, the sector has responded and made the most significant advances. This suggests that lead agencies should focus on facilitating the provision of enabling legislative and regulatory platforms for development and investment by the appropriate organs of state accompanied by the development of realistic national aquaculture strategic frameworks and the implementation of practical plans.

Aquaculture statistics in most countries are poor. Maintenance of databases is constrained by lack of capacity and financial resources. There is an urgent need to address this shortcoming throughout the region to provide better decision support. Little cutting-edge aquaculture research and development is noted in the region. Given the benefits of research and development, this is a major concern for the future of the sector as a whole. In most countries, the legislative and regulatory environment is weak and does not encourage the development of the sector. The problem is recognized and is being addressed by several countries in the region. As part of this process, a core of countries has now adopted strategic sector development plans, while others are following suite.

Extension services have not improved and in many cases have regressed, making delivery of satisfactory extension one of the overarching challenges. The most appropriate and successful extension method appears to be the on-farm participatory extension approach, which is currently used on a trial basis in several countries. The sustainability of the method however still needs to be demonstrated.



Financial institutions are poorly informed about aquaculture and access to credit by emerging commercial farmers is severely limiting in all countries. Lead agencies must promote aquaculture to lending institutions and assist farmers to develop bankable business plans.

Mariculture is generally underdeveloped, with current investment concentrated in Madagascar, Mozambique, South Africa and Namibia. It is nascent in all other countries where there is notable potential for responsible development. The advantages and opportunities offered by cage culture at different levels of scale and intensity are now widely recognized and are being adopted.

There is a need to build capacity to monitor environmental effects. Non-food aquaculture is restricted, in order of priority by value, to Nile crocodile, ornamental fish, seaweed and baitfish. Lead agencies need to create awareness of opportunities in this sector. The market for aquaculture products is generally poorly developed, except in urban and peri-urban areas, though sophisticated market chains exist for mariculture products. It is projected that aquaculture production in sub-Saharan Africa by 2013 will be between 208 600 and 380 400 tons per annum.

7. COMMERCIAL SIZE LIMIT

On the wall near the Portico di Ottavia, Rome, there is still visible a copy of the marble plaque (the original can be seen in the Musei Capitolini), whose length gives the maximum size of the fishes which could be sold whole. Those which were longer would have their heads cut off. These had to be given as a perquisite to the Conservatori (the town councilors of papal Rome), who used them to prepare a fish soup.

This plaque and the translation of the Latin script is mentioned in a book by John George Keyser: Travels through Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Switzerland, Italy and Lorrain dated 1757, itself a translation of the original in German dated 1740.

"...Before the entrance of the great hall is a large Sturgeon, six spans and a half long (equivalent to 1.5m), cut in white marble; the head of every fish of that species, exceeding this measure, being due to the Conservators of the city. This is a perquisite of a long standing, and which, it may be supposed, will never be given up; at least, compliance is strictly insisted on in the following inscription which translates to "The heads of fishes, as far as the fins inclusively, exceeding the length of this marble standard, are, without any fraud or prevarication, to be given to the conservators, and ignorance shall not be admitted as an excuse...."



Sources: Mr Peter Flewwellyn, Special MCS Advisor to the Ministry of Fisheries, Mozambique & Mr Svein Munkejord, Norwegian Government Advisor to the Mozambique Minister of Fisheries.

8. THE PLAN

In the beginning there was the plan
And then came the assumptions
And the assumptions were without form
And the plan was completely without substance
And the darkness was upon the faces of the employees:
And they spoke amongst themselves saying:
"It is a crock of shit and it stinks"
And the employees went unto their supervisors saying:
"It is a pile of dung and none can abide the odour thereof."
And the supervisors went unto their managers, saying:
"It is a container of excrement and it is very strong, such that none can abide it."
And the managers went unto their divisional heads, saying:
"It is a vessel of fertilizer and none can abide its strength."
And the divisional heads went unto the Directors, saying:
"It contains that which aids a plant growth and it is very strong."
And the Directors went unto the Chief Executive Officer, saying:
"It promotes growth and is very powerful"
And the Chief Executive Officer went unto the Board, saying:
"This new plan will actively promote the growth and efficiency of this organization."

And the Board looked upon the plan and saw that it was good, and the plan became official company policy.

NEWS BRIEFS

MCM HAEMORRHAGING SENIOR MANAGERS

South Africa's Marine and Coastal Management appears to be haemorrhaging chief directors. Feike has learnt that in the past 30 days two chief directors have resigned their posts as head of fisheries compliance (Adv Abeeda Mugjenkar) and head of coastal management (Dr Naomi Mdzeke). Earlier this year, the Chief Financial Officer resigned after the debacle that engulfed the fire sale of the patrol vessel, the *Eagle Star*. The post of Chief Financial Officer remains vacant.

USING SPIES TO STOP WHISTLEBLOWING

A page 3 report in the CAPE TIMES (Monday, October 29, 2007) exposes the extent to which the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism will go to try and silence staff who wish to expose wrongdoing at Marine and Coastal Management. The Cape Times exposes that when a senior official, Noel Williams, was accused of leaking information to the media, which helped expose MCM's mismanagement of public funds, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism had his telephone tapped and communications with members of the media were monitored by the NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY! We thought the spies were used to ensure that South Africa's national security interests were protected. The last time Noel Williams was considered a threat to national security was by South Africa's apartheid regime in the 1980's and then he spent months in detention with Trevor Manuel! Clearly it seems that the NIA can be brought in when you want to listen in on conversations between people you don't like and who cares about the rule of law. It might not have been a bad idea if MCM actually used the NIA to instead monitor the activities of TRIAD gangs and abalone poachers. Feike will be following developments in this case of abuse of power.

FISHING DEAL BETWEEN EU AND TANZANIA STALLED

A report reveals that disputes persist between the mainland and Zanzibar over revenue sharing and how to administer licenses to be issued to the European vessels that will be fishing in the country's EEZ under the deal. The agreement requires the EU to pay \$282,504 for control and surveillance, \$105, 931 for institutional support and \$162,426 to support local small-scale fisheries - a sum sources say is peanuts compared with the value of the anticipated catch. The EU will licence 39 tuna seiners and 31 surface longliners to operate in Tanzania waters to fish for migratory tuna species such as yellowfin, bigeye and skipjack as well as swordfish and possibly sharks. Shipowners will be given the right to harvest 8,000 tonnes of tuna and other migratory species per year. "The EU is concerned about the implications of continued differences and a lack of co-ordination between the two governments over jurisdiction, objectives of management, issuing of licenses, monitoring of fishing activities and legal follow-up to infringement proceeds," says the report.

EU PLANS TO GET TOUGH WITH DEEP-WATER TRAWLERS

Deep-water trawlers that fly European Union country flags and wish to trawl outside EU waters may soon face far tighter rules that aim to protect the environment. As species like cod and hake become depleted in the European Union by overfishing, deep-water species are an attractive catch as trawlers move to new fishing grounds. EU Fisheries Commissioner Joe Borg proposed stricter rules to control bottom trawling in an attempt to regulate EU-flagged vessels when they moved onto the high seas. For areas not covered regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs), the Commission wants all vessels to stop using what it calls "destructive fishing practices" in waters where there may be a sensitive ecology. Borg's idea is for the EU's bottom trawlers to

obtain a fishing permit from their national government before sailing, subject to strict conditions.

THE WOES OF THE MEDITERRANEAN CONTINUE

The Mediterranean is often called the world's most polluted sea. Environmentalists say that heavy metals and pesticides are discharged into the sea under government licenses, and the company responsible for the sewage of the area's 2, 5 million people is the biggest polluter in the eastern Mediterranean. "The state of Israel's coastal waters is appalling," the environmental group Zalul said in its State of the Sea Report for 2007. More than 100 permits for discharging wastewater into the sea are granted by the committee every year - sometimes very close to bathing beaches, Zalul says. Discharged into the sea every year with the committee's authorisation are 140 tons of heavy metals, 130 tons of pesticides, 5 tons of arsenic, 1 300 tons of ammonia and a ton of cyanide, the Zalul report said. The most recent United Nations report on the Mediterranean ranked the greater Tel Aviv area as one of the 10 most polluting urban centres in the Mediterranean

WIND POWER FOR NAMIBIA?

An international private company has joined the growing list of companies that want to set up wind power generating plants at Namibia's coast. The Namibian newspaper, *The Economist* reported that Elctrawinds NV, a Belgium company, has applied to the Electricity Control Board (ECB) for a license with plans to set up two wind farms with a total capacity of 100mW. Electrawinds is the leading independent renewable energy company in Belgium with further operations in Italy. Since its formation in 1998, Electrawinds has invested a total of €100 million, according to their website (www.electrawinds.be). Electrawinds plans to establish the wind farms at Walvis Bay and Luderitz and have a generation capacity of 55mW and 45mW, respectively.

ANOTHER IUU BOAT GETS FAVOURABLE TREATMENT ON AFRICAN EAST COAST

Feike has learnt that the IUU vessel, the *Chilbo San 33* (pictured below), docked in Mombasa harbour and offloaded more than 100 tons of Patagonian Toothfish without any of the requisite paperwork and documentation. The *Chilbo San 33* is a CCAMLR listed IUU vessel, which means that the Kenyan government ought to have impounded the vessel and seized the catch or at the very least refused it entry into any port.



FEIKE
natural resource management advisors

