Feasible sustainable fisheries development is dependent on a range of political, social, economic and ecological factors, but to date most debate informing fisheries management and fisheries development policy in the Pacific has tended to address only one or two of these factors in isolation from the others. For example, Pacific Islanders’ aspirations for development of tuna industries using their tuna resources have often influenced by resource nationalism and a desire to translate Islanders’ identification with the sea into commercial fisheries success, whereas economic analyses tend to discount these kinds of factors. Governance constitutes a third strand in this debate. Not governance narrowly defined as the presence or absence of corruption, but broader questions about the development, implementation and effectiveness of policies in fisheries resource management in the particular environment of small island states in the Pacific. The aim of this paper is to analyse aspiration discourses together with economic feasibility and governance issues to consider what tuna industry development might look like if it took account of political, social, economic and ecological factors. The final section of the paper will look at the possibilities for this kind of development under the regime of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.
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Transdisciplinary Problem

- Sustainable fisheries development = ‘triple bottom-line’ development?
- Ecological, economic, social, political factors
- How to do fisheries development taking all these factors into consideration?
  - Systems theory?
  - Teamwork necessary (beyond capability of individuals)
Fisheries Governance

“Governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest.”


“the processes and institutions, both formal and informal, that guide and restrain the collective activities of a group.”

Aspirations

- More wealth from the tuna catch, sustainably and equitably
  - K Barclay & I Cartwright 2007 *Capturing Wealth from Tuna: Case Studies from the Pacific*, Asia Pacific Press, Canberra
- Expanding longline, processing (cannery and non-cannery), expanding shore base activities, small-scale development, expanding purse seine
- Resource (economic) nationalism
  - T Stephens 2008 *Ocean Development and International Law*
Disparate Analyses

- **Economic**
  - Coordinated effort by PICs = more wealth
- **Social**
  - Onshore tuna developments are causing inequity, breakdown, pollution
- **Ecological**
  - Skipjack OK but bigeye & yellowfin ‘overfishing’
- **Political**
  - Coordination between PICs historically rare, difficult to achieve in tuna since interests are at odds (purse seine vs longline countries)
Teamwork?

- Ecology and economics
  - Together in SPC & FFA work
- Economics and politics
  - Very different discourses, not institutionally brought together
- Social and ecology
  - Sometimes brought together, but often not well informed about the fisheries
- Political ecology?
- Social and political and economic?
Triple bottom-line tuna developments

- More sustainable processing/port areas
  - Facilities for crews & service businesses: Health (physical & mental), education/awareness, accommodation, recreation, protection from violence
  - Internal migration, allowing ‘hubs’
  - Market based measures for social and ecological sustainability