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Zambian water resources:
- Approx. 145,200 Km² of water area
- Have catchments containing vast human establishments
- Provide local food security (food, income and employment)
- High potential for supporting economic growth and dev’t thru fisheries

Fig. 1: Map of Zambia showing major fishery areas [Courtesy of FAO (2006)]
Issues with fisheries:
- Operate under open access regimes
- Progressive decline in average catch and size of fish caught
- Declining profitability of fishing fleet

Co-management conceptual genesis (1990s):
1. Inability of DoF
2. Multi-party political dispensation
3. SADC initiative
4. Lessons from CAMPFIRE
5. Pressure from international donor agencies
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Common functions of local-level institutions:
i) implementation of by-laws
ii) monitoring of fishing regulations
iii) sanctioning law breakers
Assessment results of local-level management regimes:

- they are generally weak
- have inconsistent rules, widely ignored and poorly enforced
- lack of know-how among fisher communities
- inability to organize for long-term sustainability
- Limited empowerment of the local fishing communities

©2015 L. Haamibiya
Sources of (co-)management challenges in Zambia:

- Poorly understood decentralization reforms
- Poor incentives for fishing communities
- Indistinct physical boundaries to resources
- Low sense of ownership
- High dependence on the fisheries
- Extreme mobility and conflict
- Scepticism by fishers
### Arguments about co-management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In support of co-mgt</th>
<th>In opposition of co-mgt</th>
<th>Not taking sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need to address destructive behaviour towards natural resources.</td>
<td>• Co-mgt is expensive to initiate and not worth the investment.</td>
<td>• There is complete dependence on fishery resources by thousands of full-time fishers – we don’t care about mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to promote interaction between resource users and their environment.</td>
<td>• Anticipated results take too long or are never achieved at all.</td>
<td>• Fishery resources are God given, human intervention is not necessary – catch can only fluctuate, will never deplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for sufficient knowledge, skill and resources (be they financial, material and human).</td>
<td>• Co-mgt is a political gimmick.</td>
<td>• How do you deal with ethical dilemmas of key players involved in co-mgt? e.g. while TAs are vital in resource protection, they also have interests to fish for subsistence during closed seasons and in some cases using illegal means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need a variety of stakeholders with influence on decision that affects them.</td>
<td>• Bottom up models are a nightmare with co-mgt in fisheries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need equity, social justice and democratic involvement.</td>
<td>• Tensions among stakeholders remain a challenge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to constantly address conflict among stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Co-mgt is not panacea to solving the collapsing fisheries resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mechanisms for conflict resolution need to be given high priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusion

Primary legal framework classifies all water bodies as property of the state.

No sustained financial resources to support management and enforcement.

Ad hoc involvement of most stakeholder groups - mainly organised by DoF or projects.

Sense of ownership of most communities is quite low amongst members.

Most rules created by communities depend on other institutions, e.g. Police and DoF for enforcement.

Conflict has undermined the (co-)management process.
Recommendation

• A form of MoU is suggested to formally set out a process that acknowledges each stakeholder’s interests providing forums to facilitate discussion, consultation and monitoring of management activities.

  – Policy must conform to society’s prevailing codes of ethical behaviour

  – Objectives guiding implementation of co-management should be jointly developed by all stakeholders

  – Responsibilities given to institutions, groups and individuals should match means put at their disposal
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Thank you!!!