



Improving accountability and efficiency of EU aid to fisheries

The case of Africa

Presentation LDAC, Béatrice Gorez, March 2015

10 biggest recipients of Aid in Africa

Country/Region	Original Amount (US\$)	Adjusted (2011)
Mozambique	400.533.192	635.806.432
Mauritania	393.072.063	616.035.844
Senegal	355.595.328	653.330.696
Angola	299.656.691	574.372.949
Ghana	249.662.118	340.218.432
Tanzania	224.624.647	414.667.090
Nigeria	205.530.961	476.302.369
Guinea	191.778.562	336.599.791
Mali	184.888.210	237.996.337
Uganda	184.674.066	354.530.442

EU + EU Member States aid to fisheries in Africa: biggest donor

Donor	Original Amount	Adjusted (2011)
World Bank	1.148.007.084	2.024.622.459
AFDB Group	901.428.447	1.435.774.979
Japan	821.154.584	1.162.662.307
EU	400.946.877	600.380.723
GEF	367.562.226	397.967.669
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	305.148.187	493.792.692
Sweden	265.001.107	481.161.556
Italy	225.868.740	455.710.163
Norway	225.080.609	560.669.947
France	224.481.221	419.256.400
Arab Bank for international development	155.883.865	308.374.951
Spain	136.615.406	173.311.814
Canada	125.504.153	299.236.804
Germany	96.972.174	140.568.141
Netherlands	72.138.802	145.015.061

Use and impact of EU aid to fisheries

In 2014, Ms Lowri Evans told African Ministers at CAMFA II that since 2007 the EU has provided 126 million Euros for fisheries development in Africa and that has **“significantly improved the sustainability of resources”**.

><

World Bank, in *The political economy of fisheries aid in Africa* (2010), looking at Ghana, Mozambique, Senegal, Uganda said that, despite aid: **‘the sector is in a weak and vulnerable condition, characterised by declining catches and incomes, high levels of over-exploitation and associated weak management’**.

WHY?

- **Multiplicity of channels of aid** has overwhelmed the **capacity** of recipient countries to coordinate and make good use of aid, leading to inefficiencies , corruption, etc
- The failure of development planners to consider **the economics of unsustainable fishing** (ex: Mozambique)
- **No ownership of the development process** by governments and fishing dependent communities, lack of consultation at the various stages

WITHOUT CHANGES, MORE MONEY (like impact investments, debt for nature swaps) WILL NOT IMPROVE FISHERIES SUSTAINABILITY

Discussion: promoting change in EU Aid to Fisheries

- Coordination between EU and MS for improving capacity to use aid:
 - EU Fisheries Development Advisers Network (EUFDAN)
 - Use of technical expertise of MS/EU agencies (GIZ, AFD, EFCA, etc)
- EU Policies Coherence for sustainable fisheries Development
 - Need to know cumulated impacts of policies => need for independent evaluations of aid impacts
 - Focus on sustainable fisheries – role of SFPAs?
- Transparency and Consultation of stakeholders, to create ownership of development process
 - Improve public information about EU aid in fisheries and encourage public discussions about its impacts, best practices, etc
 - Promote permanent consultative mechanisms of stakeholders

For more information

CFFA Discussion Paper: More sunken billions?

Accountability in fisheries aid to Africa, August 2014

<https://cape-cffa.squarespace.com/new-blog/2014/8/5/cffa-report-on-aid-to-the-fisheries-sector-in-africa>

TransparentSea database on Aid to African Fisheries, April 2014

<https://cape-cffa.squarespace.com/new-blog/2014/4/29/transparentsea-fisheries-database-on-aid-projects-in-africa>

Will private investments save fisheries?, CFFA blog post, February 2015

<https://cape-cffa.squarespace.com/new-blog/2015/2/17/mih5udn3l2yscmdsj0v7va9v4tss5>



Thank you
Merci