

# FFA FISHERIES TRADE BRIEFING

Volume 1: Issue 5 April 2008

By Liam Campling<sup>1</sup>

## Negotiations on Rules for Fisheries Subsidies at the WTO

### Overview of PIC Issues at the April Fisheries Subsidies Meeting<sup>2</sup>

At the April 2008 cluster on fisheries subsidies,<sup>3</sup> the focus of the discussions were on (1) small-scale fisheries and programmes (2) elements of a fisheries management system under Article V of the fisheries text, and (3) the issue of a peer review mechanism for the evaluation of compliance with Article V conditionality.

The session on small-scale fisheries was targeted towards gaining a more precise understanding, through identification and definition, of the nature of the 'small-scale fisheries' and 'small programmes' in the developed country members, and the intention behind their call for special treatment in this category. In general, these discussions were disappointing as Members received little insight from the interventions from developing country members as to the nature and purpose and intended beneficiaries of these programmes.

Canada presented a proposal for the addition of a de-minimis provision to Article II (general exceptions) of the fisheries subsidies text. This proposal would allow Members to provide a certain level of subsidies to fishing activities within waters subject to their national jurisdiction, as long as the annual amount of such subsidies per member does not exceed a certain percentage of the average landed value of fish harvested in these waters (for the three preceding years for which data is available). In response, all developing country Members and even some developed members, such as US and Australia, were critical of such a proposal having a wide scope of carve-out only to cover a handful of programmes, in the interest of only a small number of large producers.

On fisheries management systems, discussions covered the role of regular science-based stock assessments, capacity and effort management measures (including harvesting, licensing or fees); vessel registries; establishment and allocation of fishing rights or allocation of exclusive quotas; vessel monitoring (which could include electronic tracking and on board observers); systems for timely, reliable reporting of data on effort, catch and discards to national authorities and competent international bodies in sufficient detail to allow sound assessment; and research and other measures related to conservation and stock maintenance and replenishment.

A detailed intervention was made by Solomon Islands on behalf of the Pacific Islands Group, with hands-on technical expertise provided by a senior FFA staff member. On a general level, the statement



FFA

## Contents

### Negotiations on Rules for Fisheries Subsidies at the WTO

Overview of PIC Issues at the April Fisheries Subsidies Meeting  
World Wide Fund for Nature intervention small scale vessels

### Preferential and Free Trade Agreements

Deadline for applications to EU GSP+ scheme  
Overview of new China-New Zealand FTA  
Tensions continue over Philippine-Japan FTA

### Tuna Markets

Greenpeace direct action as part of tuna campaign  
Environment NGO Oceana highlights role of EU subsidies in Mediterranean bluefin fishery  
Strengthening Euro works in favour of EU tuna buyers  
Wal-Mart demands suppliers meet new higher quality standards  
Palau suggests an end to tuna fisheries in its EEZ  
US government launches new consumer information website for fish  
Somali pirates seize Spanish purse seiner in Indian Ocean  
New guide to exporting fish to the EU

**Members received little insight into the nature and purpose of small scale programmes in developed countries**



**FFA**

noted that Pacific commercial fisheries are generally well-placed to meet the elements of a fisheries management system as outlined above. However, these conditions are too onerous for small-scale fisheries where sophisticated management tools are currently not being used in the PICs and where management methods typically include only stock assessments, licensing and vessel registries, and simplified statistical collection and national rather than regional-level reporting. In this light, PICs proposed that the disciplines could contain a comprehensive set of management requirements for large scale commercial fisheries, a more simplified system for small scale commercial fisheries and greater flexibility for commercial artisanal fisheries (subsistence fisheries benefit from broad flexibilities in the Chair's text), which, for the latter, would only offer indicative management conditionality reflecting local conditions and indigenous institutions. An alternative approach was suggested by the Pacific on the lines of outlining a small set of core mandatory management tools (which developing country Members are able to comply with) supplemented by a list of additional *indicative* measures. Such an approach, it was pointed out, would also require differentiation for the commercial artisanal sector.

On the issue of a peer review mechanism, PICs as part of the ACP and Small and Vulnerable Economies (SVEs) groupings noted that such a review should be limited to only those elements that are absolutely required to be reviewed under Article V. In this context it was pointed out that there were several areas where a review might not be necessary as they are already carried out elsewhere. For instance, stock assessments conducted by scientific agencies are *already* subject to a transparent review process in several countries and regions. PICs also took the view along with most other developing countries that assessments should be done within the WTO rather than be outsourced to other international organizations such as FAO. On the legal status of the review, the ACP and SVE groupings maintained that granting or maintaining a subsidy should not be preconditioned on a review, instead it should be carried out for the sole objective of achieving enhanced transparency. Both groupings emphasised the need for adequate technical assistance for capacity-constrained developing countries to meet with the ambitious sustainability criterion and management conditionality pursued under these negotiations.

### **World Wide Fund for Nature intervention on small scale vessels**

WWF has been the most active and influential NGO in pushing for WTO disciplines on fisheries subsidies. It released a short analytical brief in April called *Small Boats, Big Problems*, which targeted arguments on the need to provide sufficient policy flexibilities to small scale fisheries under proposed disciplines.<sup>4</sup> It is likely that the primary target of this new report is those large developed countries that have argued for the need for special flexibilities for their small scale fleets (e.g.

**The Pacific joined several other developing countries in arguing that while sustainability criteria may be necessary they should not be so complex as to be impossible to apply**

**WWF has targeted arguments on the need to provide sufficient policy flexibilities to small scale fisheries under proposed subsidies disciplines**



Canada, EC and Japan), but WWF also points out the weaknesses of the arguments for improved S&DT made by some developing countries. For example, under the heading ““Small” Does Not Mean “Local””, WWF draws upon research by Robert Gillett to point out that around 50 percent of the landings of large pelagic stocks in the Indian Ocean are caught by ‘non-industrial’ vessels (generally under 24 metres in length), and that globally, nearly 10 percent of all tuna are caught by vessels categorised as ‘non-industrial’.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, under the heading ““Small” Does Not Mean “Sustainable””, the WWF report cites research undertaken on the socioeconomic determinants of overfishing in small scale reef fisheries in PNG and argues that PNG ‘reef fisheries are being overexploited by small-scale and artisanal fishing’.<sup>6</sup> In fact, WWF takes this research somewhat out of its context as the same paper states that PNG is ‘the *only* place in the centre of marine biodiversity [comprising Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and PNG] where sites with low fishing pressure are widespread, but pockets of overfishing are present’.<sup>7</sup> In other words, while overfishing can (and sometimes does) occur in PIC waters, the intensity of overexploitation is much lower than in many other countries, as with the case of PNG – a situation that the WWF appears to misrepresent. WWF also makes clear that ““Small” Does Not Mean “Weak”” by pointing out that the most resilient and profitable fishing sectors can sometimes be those categorised as ‘small scale’.<sup>8</sup> Contrary to the implication that ‘not being weak’ is a negative development, the latter is surely a positive thing given the fact that domestic capital in PICs is too small to purchase large industrial vessels, that an aggregate small scale fleet will generate more direct employment than the industrial equivalent, and even if the capital were there it would not be able to compete with – highly subsidised – distant water fleets.

Although the target of *Small Boats, Big Problems* is not the Pacific islands (most likely far from it), it may be that WWF is missing the point: The claim by PICs and several other developing countries is not that small scale is *necessarily* sustainable or unprofitable. In terms of sustainability, the Pacific has accepted that a form of sustainability criteria should accompany fisheries subsidies. The PIC position is simply that commercial artisanal and small scale vessels need to be allowed access to the policy space necessary for their development: it is not in PIC interests for fisheries resources to be overexploited. As the recent PIC statement to the April cluster on fisheries subsidies makes clear:

The development of environmentally-sustainable small scale fisheries is a major source of economic hope in several Pacific islands. Given the re-emergence of the importance of economies of scale as a determinant of competitiveness in the contemporary world economy, these fisheries are one of the few areas where businesses in the Pacific islands exhibit an actual competitive advantage. To significantly limit policy options for the

**To limit policy options for the development of small scale fisheries would in effect put a limit on national development, thereby freezing the Pacific islands in their current stage of socio-economic development for generations to come**



**FFA**

development of small scale fisheries would in effect put a limit on *national* development, thereby freezing the Pacific islands in their current stage of socio-economic development for generations to come.

## **Preferential and Free Trade Agreements**

### **Deadline for applications to EU GSP+ scheme**

The current cycle of the EU Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) regime has three components and runs from 2006 to 2015: 1) the 'standard' GSP which is available to most developing countries; 2) the Everything But Arms initiative, available only to LDCs; and 3) the GSP+ which is provided to developing countries that meet a measure assessing economic vulnerability (all PICs meet this criteria) and that have ratified and implemented 27 conventions on labour standards, the environment and good governance (it is not known how many PICs would qualify under these criteria).<sup>9</sup> The GSP+ offers duty free access to EU markets for a wide range of products, including fish, but it is subject to stricter rules of origin than available under the interim EPA signed by Fiji and PNG.

The GSP+ was perceived by several ACP non-LDCs as a potential alternative to EPAs.<sup>10</sup> However, the EC maintained that applications for utilising the GSP+ were closed until end-2008, which would clearly have resulted in a year of trade disruption for ACP exporters, making the GSP+ a non-alternative to an EPA. Several analysts have pointed out that by closing applications for the GSP+ the EC was contravening WTO law.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, if PIC governments wish to apply for the GSP+, applications need to be submitted to the European Commission by 31 October 2008. The EC will then establish a new list of GSP+ recipients in December 2008.<sup>12</sup>

**Overview of new China-New Zealand FTA:** China and New Zealand signed a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) in April 2008, which will have important implications for their trade in seafood. The total value of New Zealand seafood exports to China (including Hong Kong) was at over NZ\$250 million in 2007. Currently, New Zealand exports are hit by tariffs of over 10 percent, but the new FTA will phase tariffs out with an expected corresponding rise in exports of higher value products.<sup>13</sup> New Zealand and Australia are also in talks to sign an FTA with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN),<sup>14</sup> although this will reportedly be less comprehensive than the deal with China.<sup>15</sup> As an interesting aside, despite New Zealand's commitment to end subsidies in some areas (especially those that contribute to fisheries overcapacity and overfishing), the government has agreed to inject NSD700 million over the next 10-15 years into the national food exporting sector. This support programme called 'New Zealand Fast Forward' will focus on 'the long-term science base, capability, environmental performance and global competitiveness of New

**If PIC governments wish to apply for the GSP+, applications need to be submitted to the European Commission by 31 October 2008**

**The new China-New Zealand FTA will phase tariffs out and should result in more exports of higher value seafood products**



**FFA**

Zealand's pastoral and food industries'.<sup>16</sup> This serves to re-iterate one of the core the offensive interests of the New Zealand government in FTA negotiations – market access for food.

**Tensions continue over Philippine-Japan FTA:** The Japan-Philippines Economic Partnership Agreement (JPEPA) has been under critical scrutiny by Philippine fishers since it was signed in September 2006, but remains to be ratified. A bone of contention in the text of the agreement is the reported fisheries access that it would provide to the Japanese distant water fleet in the Philippine EEZ. According to one report, if ratified, the JPEPA would provide 'an estimated 200,000 metric tons of tuna [to] be fished annually by the Japanese under the agreement. This would amount to \$970 million ... annual losses for the fisher folk sector'.<sup>17</sup> Protests by anti-FTA activists included a group (predominantly fishers) swimming across Manila Bay to lobby senators to vote against ratification of the JPEPA.<sup>18</sup> A combination of this and several other factors (such as trade in refuse and the awarding of constitutional rights to Japanese citizens) has resulted in the ratification of the agreement being deferred for potential further negotiation.<sup>19</sup>

## **Tuna Markets**

### **Greenpeace direct action as part of tuna campaign**

As reported in last month's *Fisheries Trade Briefing*, Greenpeace International has launched a campaign around the sustainability of certain tuna fisheries on a global scale (in particular bluefin, bigeye and yellowfin), including a call for a 50 percent reduction in the volume of global tuna fisheries catch. It has since staged a series of direct actions to highlight this campaign. This action was strategically targeted at two sections of the tuna value chain: fishing vessels active in the WCPO and tuna trading in the EU.<sup>20</sup>

The Greenpeace vessel *Esperanza* engaged in its first operation protesting against tuna fisheries in the WCPO in 2008 by targeting a purse seiner (the *Olympus*) owned by the major Korean firm Dongwon Industries. In addition, a fish aggregating device (FAD) was removed because of their impact on the intensification of fishing effort. Activists then reportedly displayed a banner next to the hull of the *Olympus* calling for 'marine reserves now'.<sup>21</sup> (For a Greenpeace map of the sites of proposed marine reserves, click here: [http://www.greenpeace.org/pacific\\_marine\\_reserves\\_map](http://www.greenpeace.org/pacific_marine_reserves_map))<sup>22</sup> Four days later the *Esperanza* moved on to target a US flagged purse seiner (*Cape Finisterre*) on 21 April. Greenpeace activists apparently painted the side of the vessel with the words 'tuna overkill' while holding the same banner calling for marine reserves. While the Greenpeace press release recognised that the terms of the US Treaty have 'more positive benefits for local people', this US vessel was targeted because it was in a pocket of international waters between PIC EEZs (north of the Solomon Islands).

**New Zealand will inject NZD700 million into the national food exporting sector, complementing market access strategies in new FTAs**

**Ratification of Philippines-Japan FTA has been deferred with implications for access to tuna fisheries**

**Greenpeace activities targeted Korean and US purse seiners in the WCPO and tuna trading companies at the European Seafood Exposition in Brussels**



Greenpeace argues that fishing operations should be limited to within PIC EEZs and off the high seas.<sup>23</sup> The effect that this demand would have on the economics of tuna fisheries is unknown, but it would certainly impact the short-term ability of vessels to 'follow the fish'. The next day activists boarded a Taiwanese longliner (*Nian Sheng 3*), which was also reportedly active in the same donut hole and allegedly had 110kg of shark material on board (mainly fins and tails). The *Esperanza* then escorted the vessel out of international waters.<sup>24</sup>

Just two days later after these events in the WCPO, but on the other side of the planet in Brussels, Greenpeace activists chained themselves to stands at the European Seafood Exposition; an action that reportedly involved 80 people. Banners reading 'Time and Tuna running out' were displayed in thirteen different languages, while an announcement by activists on the exhibition hall's PA system called on participants at the Exposition 'to buy only sustainably-caught seafood'. Five exhibition stalls were shut down by the action: Mitsubishi Corporation (Japan), the world's largest trader in sashimi grade tuna; Ricardo Fuentes (Spain), which reportedly 'controls an estimated 60 per cent of Mediterranean bluefin tuna production'; Dongwon Fisheries, which has a dominant share of the Korean market for tuna; Azzopardi Fisheries (Malta) the largest tuna farming firm based in the Mediterranean; and Moon Marine (Taiwan) which is reportedly 'heavily involved in tuna longline fisheries in Indonesia'.<sup>25</sup>

It is worth highlighting the logistical and organisational feat coordinated by Greenpeace in these almost simultaneous activities. These elements have contributed to Greenpeace raising significant media attention to its tuna campaign, which might translate into effects on tuna markets. (Any Internet search of 'Greenpeace' and 'tuna' demonstrates the wide media coverage of Greenpeace direct action on its tuna campaign this month. For example, the top 25 hits on Google found reports by the BBC, The Times (UK), Guardian (UK), Telegraph (UK), ABC (USA) and Radio Australia.)

This direct action was complemented by lobbying of PIC governments, in particular the Solomon Islands when the *Esperanza* docked at Honiara on 22 April. Activists called on government to push for a 'sustainable and profitable' future of the resource by providing official support for converting the high seas areas (or donut holes) in the middle of interconnecting PIC EEZs into marine protected areas. A representative of Greenpeace Australia Pacific also called on the government to develop the Solomon Islands 'fishing industry domestically instead of allowing foreign industrial fleets to fish in their waters under rip-off access agreements'. The Oceans Campaigner at Greenpeace International argued that PICs 'are in a prime position to provide these products. First they need to work together and take a stand against the industrial fishing nations that are threatening the future of their region'.<sup>26</sup> It is important to note that Greenpeace has demonstrated a degree of sensitivity to the concerns of PICs and by

**The effect that the Greenpeace demand for marine protected areas in the WCPO would have on the economics of tuna fisheries and trade in the region is unknown**



**FFA**

**Greenpeace called on the Solomon Island's government to support marine protected areas in WCPO 'donut holes'**

highlighting the possibility of domestic tuna industry development it has reflected a long standing aim of PICs since the 1970s. The major problem is that this position is simply rhetoric until the necessary private capital and associated marketing requirements are available to effectively develop the sector; until this is the case, a number of PICs will continue to rely on the generation of revenue through access agreements with distant water fleets.

### **Environment NGO Oceana highlights role of EU subsidies in Mediterranean bluefin fishery**

A different international NGO, the US-based Oceana, has highlighted the negative contribution of EU fisheries subsidies to over capacity in the Mediterranean bluefin fishery, thereby extending the campaign by WWF on this fishery discussed in last month's *Fisheries Trade Briefing*. Oceana claims that overcapacity in this fishery has been subsidised by the EU to the tune of over €16 million (not including other forms of support such as fuel subsidies). To combat this problem Oceana recommends a series of fishery closures to avoid fishing on spawning grounds and excessively targeting juvenile fish.<sup>27</sup> Along with WWF, Oceana is one of the most important environment NGOs advocating an end to fisheries subsidies at the WTO negotiations. Oceana has held multiple meetings with WTO Members on the issue (including PICs) and is attempting to influence the agenda through a combination of media campaigns and behind-the-scenes lobbying.

The sum problem of these campaigns for PICs is the potential impact that they might have on tuna sales in general. It is unlikely that most consumers with an interest in the issue will effectively differentiate between species and as such they may no longer purchase products that are sourced from less problematic fisheries. This concern has been highlighted by EU industry representatives in informal communications, but it remains to be seen whether or not these NGO campaigns will significantly impact sales.

**Strengthening Euro works in favour of EU tuna buyers:** The strengthening of the Euro to the US dollar (which traded at €1: USD1.60 for the first time since 1999 in April 2008) has shifted the balance of buying power in the trade of whole frozen tuna and processed tuna products. This has two sets of implications. First, EU buyers are able offer a higher price for whole frozen tuna than processors based in Thailand. Second, Spanish processing firms are increasingly attracted to sites of production in economies based on the US dollar in Latin America (such as Ecuador) as labour costs become relatively cheaper, which has negative implications for investment flows to other regions.<sup>28</sup>

**Wal-Mart demands suppliers meet new higher quality standards:** Wal-Mart is a member along with several other international retailers of the Global Food Safety Initiative (GFSI), which was established in 2000 and it coordinated by the International Committee of Food Retail Chains



(or 'CIES'). GFSI standards go beyond the audit process demanded by the US Department of Agriculture and Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Wal-Mart has announced that it expects suppliers to meet GFSI standards.<sup>29</sup> Details on GFSI standards are available here: <http://www.ciesnet.com/2-wwedo/2.2-programmes/2.2.foodsafety.asp>. This is not to be confused with the new FAO and WHO Global Initiative for Food-related Scientific Advice (GIFSA), which was set up to undertake work on nanotechnology and risk-benefit assessment of fish consumption.<sup>30</sup>

**Palau suggests an end to tuna fisheries in its EEZ :** The president of Palau announced a proposed bill in mid-April that will put an end to distant water fleet activities in its EEZ and ban the commercial export of tuna. The bill was intended as a mechanism to reduce over-exploitation of tuna species and form one of the largest protected areas for highly migratory fisheries in the world. The proposal allows the continuation of current activities until 2012. The revenue loss is hoped to be supplemented by donations from environmental organisations, which will be placed in a trust fund.<sup>31</sup>

**US government launches new consumer information website for fish:** The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has set-up an educational website called *Fish Watch* for consumers on the 50 most commonly purchased fish in the US. The website gives species-specific information on population dynamics, management, trade data and implications for human health. The rationale is to provide consumers with science-based information to clear-up confusion arising from flaws in popular media reporting.<sup>32</sup> The website is available here: <http://www.fishwatch.noaa.gov>

**Somali pirates seize Spanish purse seiner in Indian Ocean:** The vessel, *Playa de Bakio*, was engaged in fishing for tuna around 250 miles from Somalia when it was boarded by 'pirates' yielding grenade launchers on 20 April. It is probable that the pirates are demanding a ransom to release the vessel and its crew. A French navy frigate active in the region was sent to pursue the attackers. According to the International Maritime Bureau, there were 31 actual or attempted pirate attacks off the coast of Somali in 2007, an increase from 10 in 2006 and only 2 in 2004.<sup>33</sup> The implications of this particular attack may be an increase in perceived risk in targeting tuna around the Horn of Africa with a potential rise in insurance premiums for vessels active there.

**New guide to exporting fish to the EU:** The International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO) has produced a summary guide on the exporting of seafood to EU markets. The guide is very accessible and provides a practical overview of a range of issues, including on the role of health certificates, the EC Food and Veterinary Office (FVO), approved countries and establishments, official controls and guarantees, labeling, and so on.<sup>34</sup> The details contained within the guide will probably be well known to more experienced exporters, but it could offer useful insights to new entrants. The report can be downloaded from: <http://www.intracen.org/eqm>



## **Coming in the next issue (May 2008, Vol. 1: Issue 6)**

- Overview of PIC issues at the May fisheries subsidies meeting at the WTO
- Analysis of draft EC Regulations on Illegal, Unlicensed and Unregulated (IUU) fishing (NB: this topic was held over from this issue to May to allow for more detailed research)
- Climate change measures and fish exports
- UK Competition Commission ruling on the supermarket sector
- New seafood safety legislation in the US
- Allegations of corruption in African marine fisheries



## References

- <sup>1</sup> Liam Campling is Consultant Fisheries Trade Analyst, FFA. The contents of this briefing (including all analysis and opinions) are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions or thinking of the FFA Secretariat or its Members. The author would like to thank two individuals for their invaluable input on this briefing.
- <sup>2</sup> This sub-section is adopted from Manleen Dugal (May 2008), 'Summary Report for April 2008', Geneva: Permanent Delegation of the Pacific Islands Forum to the WTO. The author would like to thank Ms Dugal and Ambassador Sisilo for their permission to use their work here.
- <sup>3</sup> For additional reporting on this meeting see ICTSD, 'Calls for Exempting Small-Scale Fishing from Subsidy Rules Divide WTO Members', 12(15), TITLE 30 April 2008. Available at: <http://www.ictsd.org>
- <sup>4</sup> WWF (April 2008), 'Small Boats, Big Problems', Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature. Available at: <http://www.panda.org>
- <sup>5</sup> WWF April 2008, p.4. WWF cites Robert Gillett, 'Global Study of Non-Industrial Tuna Fisheries', in Bayliff et al, (eds.), Second Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee of the FAO Project "Management of Tuna Fishing Capacity: Conservation and Socio-economics". Madrid, Spain, 15-18 March 2004. FAO Fisheries Proceedings. No. 2. (2005).
- <sup>6</sup> WWF April 2008, p.5
- <sup>7</sup> J. E. Cinner and T. R. McClanahan (2006), 'Socioeconomic factors that lead to overfishing in small-scale coral reef fisheries of Papua New Guinea', in *Environmental Conservation*, 33(1): pp. 73–80. p. 73 (emphasis added).
- <sup>8</sup> WWF April 2008, p.3
- <sup>9</sup> For a detailed overview of the GSP with particular reference to the EU and implications for PIC fish trade see Part I, Chapter 5 of Liam Campling, Elizabeth Havice and Vina Ram-Bidesi (2007), *Pacific Island Countries, the Global Tuna Industry and the International Trade Regime*. Available at: <http://www.ffa.int/node/891>
- <sup>10</sup> The current beneficiaries of the GSP+ are four Andean countries (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru); seven other Latin American countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama and Venezuela), two from Eastern Europe (Moldova and Georgia) and two countries from Asia (Sri Lanka and Mongolia).
- <sup>11</sup> Bartels, L. (2007). "The WTO legality of the EU's GSP+ program". Obtained from: <http://www.worldtradelaw.net>
- <sup>12</sup> EC (April 2008), 'On the scheme of generalised tariff preferences (the GSP) in the years 2009-2011', European Commission, Brussels, 8 April 2008.
- <sup>13</sup> 'FTA with China opens opportunities for seafood', *Fishupdate.com*, 8 April 2008
- <sup>14</sup> ASEAN includes Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.
- <sup>15</sup> 'Minister: New Zealand-ASEAN free trade deal close', *bilaterals.org*, 23 April 2008
- <sup>16</sup> '\$700m for research and improvement to NZ's export food produce', *Fishupdate.com*, 14 March 2008
- <sup>17</sup> Abigail Kwok, 'Filipino fishers JPEPA's biggest losers, says leftwing group', *Inquirer*, 17 April 2008. Posted on <http://www.bilaterals.org>
- <sup>18</sup> Camille Diola, 'Activists brave murky Manila Bay to rail vs JPEPA', *Inquirer*, 28 April 2008. Posted on <http://www.bilaterals.org>
- <sup>19</sup> Veronica Uy, 'Santiago defers sponsorship of JPEPA', *Inquirer*, 28 April 2008. Posted on <http://www.bilaterals.org>
- <sup>20</sup> For an overview of current Greenpeace thinking on the role of WCPFC, see Greenpeace (April 2008), 'Briefing to Forum Fisheries Committee Sixty-Seventh Meeting (FFC67): 12 – 16 May 2008, Koror, Palau – Changing course Now to safeguard our Fisheries and our Future'. Available at: <http://www.greenpeace.org>



<sup>21</sup> This is not the first time Greenpeace has been involved in campaigns around PIC tuna fisheries. Activities worked together with fisheries inspectors from Kiribati in 2006 to board the Korean vessel *Dongwon 117* (also owned by Dongwon Industries), which left the Kiribati EEZ after Greenpeace reportedly 'discovered discrepancies in its documentation and reporting'. See 'Greenpeace takes action to end overfishing of Pacific tuna', *Fishupdate.com*, 17 April 2008; Greenpeace press release, 'Greenpeace Takes Action to End Overfishing of Pacific Tuna', Pacific Ocean, 17 April 2008

<sup>22</sup> Greenpeace claims that the marine reserves 'would protect tuna spawning areas and migration routes, seamounts and close a loophole that allows tuna pirates from operating in these areas and stealing tuna from the Pacific'.

<sup>23</sup> Greenpeace press release, 'Greenpeace Paints Stern of US Tuna Fisher', Pacific Ocean, Sunday, 20 April 2008; 'Greenpeace activists paint stern of US fishing vessel', *Fishupdate.com*, 21 April 2008

<sup>24</sup> Greenpeace press release, 'Greenpeace Boards Sharkfinning Longliner in the Pacific', Pacific Ocean, 21 April 2008.

<sup>25</sup> 'Greenpeace stages tuna protest at Brussels show', *Fishupdate.com*, 23 April 2008; Greenpeace News Release, 'Tuna Traders Shut Down at World's Largest Fish Market', Brussels, 23 April 2008.

<sup>26</sup> 'Greenpeace calls on Pacific countries to turn the tide on tuna business', *Fishupdate.com*, 22 April 2008

<sup>27</sup> 'Oceana claim: EU funds used in tuna exploitation', *Fishupdate.com*, 18 April 2008. See also Oceana, 'Who finances and who promotes the disappearance of bluefin tuna?', press release, 16 April 2008. Available at: <http://www.oceana.org>

<sup>28</sup> 'Euro Traded At USD 1,60 For First Time, Shifts Tuna Balances', *Atuna*, United States, 22 April 2008, Available at: <http://www.atuned.biz/>

<sup>29</sup> 'Wal-Mart suppliers must meet GFSI-approved standards', *Fishupdate.com*, 6 February 2008.

<sup>30</sup> INFOFISH, 'Codex adopts new food safety and quality standards', *The Fish Inspector*, No. 73, December 2007. Details on GIFSA are available here: <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/codex/gifssa/en/index.html>

<sup>31</sup> *Atuna*, 'Palau Proposes Tuna Fishing Ban For Foreign Vessels', 15 April 2008. Available at: <http://www.atuned.biz/public/ViewArticle.aspx?ID=5394>

<sup>32</sup> 'NOAA launches new seafood site', *Seafood International*, April 2008, p.8.

<sup>33</sup> Fiona Govan and Mike Pflanz, 'Nato alert as Somali pirates seize tuna boat', *The Telegraph* (UK), 23 April 2008.

<sup>34</sup> F. Blaha (2008), *Exporting Seafood to the EU*, Export Quality Bulletin No. 84, Geneva: International Trade Centre. Available at: <http://www.intracen.org/eqm>