

<b>Institution:</b> Queen Mary University of London		
<b>Unit of Assessment:</b> 17 Business and Management		
<b>Title of case study:</b> Improving International Fisheries Trade Relations for Development		
<b>Period when the underpinning research was undertaken:</b> 2004-2020		
<b>Details of staff conducting the underpinning research from the submitting unit:</b>		
<b>Name(s):</b>	<b>Role(s) (e.g. job title):</b>	<b>Period(s) employed by submitting HEI:</b>
Liam Campling	Professor in International Business and Development	Sept 2009-present
<b>Period when the claimed impact occurred:</b> 2014-2020		
<b>Is this case study continued from a case study submitted in 2014?</b> N		
<b>1. Summary of the impact</b>		
<p>Professor Campling's research on the global value chains in tuna, international fisheries trade and development, and his ongoing policy work with international agencies, provided the bases for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• contributing to the official thinking and positions of six Pacific Island members of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in the negotiations of prohibitions on fisheries subsidies, as reflected in formal textual submissions and a draft WTO agreement</li> <li>• successfully advising the Pacific Islands Forum (14 countries) to not enter into a trade arrangement with the US, saving financial resources and personnel time</li> <li>• successfully recommending more development-friendly 'rules of origin' for local fish processing to the East African Community in its trade agreement with the EU</li> <li>• informing the decision by the United Nations General Assembly to grant an extended transition to the Solomon Islands in its graduation from Least Developed Country status, preserving ~1,800 fish processing jobs.</li> </ul>		
<b>2. Underpinning research</b>		
<p>Campling's research since 2004 on the articulations of international fisheries trade, global value chains (GVCs) in tuna and the political economy of small island developing states (SIDS) have drawn on interviews with almost 1,000 people in 20 countries. His theoretically-informed, but empirically-driven research has fed into policy making to improve fisheries trade for development at national, regional and international scales.</p> <p><b>Advancing political economy analysis of marine capture fisheries</b></p> <p>Campling's research has intervened critically into siloed, technician scholarship on fisheries and brought the field into conversation with debates in development studies [3.6; 3.7] and economic geography [3.4; 3.5; 3.8; 3.9]. This includes a long-standing collaboration with Elizabeth Havice (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill). The main findings include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Historicizing fisheries trade and development patterns and relations to understand the potential for developing countries to negotiate change to contemporary trade rules in bilateral and multilateral economic relations [3.1; 3.2; 3.3].</li> <li>b) Mapping and identifying principal drivers in fisheries GVCs that were otherwise 'hidden', including how nature shapes GVCs based on natural resources and vice versa [3.8] and how environmental governance is used by dominant firms as a business strategy to capture value from, and pass on risks and costs to, other firms [3.4].</li> <li>c) Theorising property relations over mobile living resources, and how state control over resource access can be leveraged for development outcomes [3.5; 3.6; 3.9].</li> </ol> <p>Campling's academic research and policy work have developed iteratively. His expertise is world-leading as evidenced in invited contributions for policy advice and commissioned research by international agencies. These have included: the Commonwealth Secretariat (<a href="#">2016</a>, <a href="#">2017</a>, <a href="#">2017</a>, <a href="#">2018</a>), FAO (2018), UNCTAD (<a href="#">2016</a>), International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF, <a href="#">2013</a>, <a href="#">2014</a>), International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD) and World Economic Forum where he served as an invited expert (<a href="#">2014-2015</a>) and produced original analysis of <a href="#">fisheries tariff structures</a>; WWF (2019); the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (2014). He carried out official work in the Pacific Islands delegation at the WTO from 2007-2011 and from 2018 to</p>		

2020; and for the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA, 2005 to-date), producing the bi-monthly [FFA Trade and Industry News](#). He has conducted original research as lead or co-investigator in research teams examining [market and industry dynamics in tuna GVCs](#) (2011, 170 interviewees in 12 countries), [non-traditional canned tuna markets](#) (2015, 14 telephone interviews), [regulatory, industry and market dynamics in the tuna longline/sashimi industry](#) (2017, 114 interviewees in 5 countries), [corporate strategy in the global canned tuna industry](#) (2018, desk study).

### **Understanding how the international trade regime and the private governance of global value chains (GVCs) in tuna articulate and contribute to unequal outcomes for countries and firms**

The global tuna industry is worth an estimated annual USD42,000,000,000 in sales. In a stream of work on EU-Africa, Caribbean and Pacific group (ACP) relations, Campling has shown that current rules of origin associated with EU trade preferences for tuna products are designed to benefit French and Spanish fishing interests. However, at the same time these preferences were a central component in one of the very few success stories of industrial upgrading in 40 years of EU-ACP trade relations [3.1; 3.3; 3.5]. He has shown that to improve economies of scale and investment-potential in ACP-based processing, more flexible EU rules of origin are needed, but negotiations must contend with mercantilist interests in the EU. Further, preferences are a necessary but not sufficient component in this upgrading process (see below).

A second stream of research is on multilateral negotiations at the World Trade Organisation (WTO). Here Campling showed the tensions inherent in the much feted 'triple win' rhetoric of WTO negotiations since 2001 on proposed rules to end fisheries subsidies. Instead, Campling argued that negotiators should start by teasing out the commercial interests at stake among the various ad hoc negotiation blocs and how each use, in different ways 'sustainability' discourse to advance these interests [3.2].

### **Understanding how small island developing states (SIDS) can leverage their sovereign rights over fisheries resources to enhance trade and development**

Many SIDS are dependent on fisheries-based revenue and employment, but the odds are against these politically-marginal, fiscally-weak polities that suffer from diseconomies of scale. Campling's research has shown the actual and potential policy mechanisms available to SIDS in leveraging improved socio-economic development outcomes from their articulations with tuna GVCs and trade regimes. This includes the use of sovereign rights under the Law of the Sea to capture revenue [3.6; 3.9] and/or to encourage onshore investment [3.5]. He has shown that trade preferences and sovereign rights are necessary but not sufficient developmental tools, and the interplay of broader ecological, regulatory and commercial factors need to be understood in understanding SIDS policy articulations with tuna GVCs [3.1; 3.4; 3.7].

### **3. References to the research**

- [3.1] Campling, L. (2016). Trade politics and the global production of canned tuna. *Marine Policy*, 69, 220-228. [doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.02.006)
- [3.2] Campling, L., & Havice, E. (2013). Mainstreaming environment and development at the World Trade Organization? Fisheries subsidies, the politics of rule-making, and the elusive 'triple win'. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(4), 835-852. [doi.org/10.1068/a45138](https://doi.org/10.1068/a45138)
- [3.3] Campling, L. (2015). Historicising trade preferences and development: the case of the ACP-EU canned tuna preference. In Ervine K., Fridell G. (Eds.), *Beyond Free Trade* (pp. 57-75). Palgrave Macmillan, London. [doi.org/10.1057/9781137412737\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137412737_4)
- [3.4] Havice, E., & Campling, L. (2017). Where chain governance and environmental governance meet: Interfirm strategies in the canned tuna global value chain. *Economic Geography*, 93(3), 292-313. [doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2017.1292848](https://doi.org/10.1080/00130095.2017.1292848)
- [3.5] Havice, E., & Campling, L. (2013). Articulating upgrading: island developing states and canned tuna production. *Environment and Planning A*, 45(11), 2610-2627. [doi.org/10.1068/a45697](https://doi.org/10.1068/a45697)
- [3.6] Campling, L., & Havice, E. (2014). The problem of property in industrial fisheries. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(5), 707-727. [doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.894909](https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.894909)

[3.7] Campling, L. (2012). The tuna 'commodity frontier': business strategies and environment in the industrial tuna fisheries of the Western Indian Ocean. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 12(2-3), 252-278. [doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2011.00354.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2011.00354.x)

[3.8] Baglioni, E., & Campling, L. (2017). Natural resource industries as global value chains: Frontiers, fetishism, labour and the state. *Environment and planning a: economy and space*, 49(11), 2437-2456. [doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17728517](https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17728517)

[3.9] Campling, L., & Colás, A. (2018). Capitalism and the sea: sovereignty, territory and appropriation in the global ocean. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, 36(4), 776-794. [doi.org/10.1177/0263775817737319](https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775817737319)

#### 4. Details of the impact

##### **Institutionalising more development-friendly rules of origin in the East African Community-EU Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)**

Based upon his research demonstrating that European Union (EU) trade preferences need more flexible rules of origin to benefit local fisheries industry [3.1, 3.3] and his analysis of the structure of the Western Indian Ocean fishing industry [3.7], Campling advised the East African Community (EAC) in 2012 to push for more 'development-friendly' rules of origin in trade negotiations with the European Union (EU). As the EAC's Director General, Trade and Customs put it, EAC negotiators used this research successfully to justify a position 'that more than doubled the prior derogation decision' [5.1] in its EPA with the EU [5.2], which was signed in October 2014 and authorised by the EU in June 2016 and provisionally applied.

##### **Pacific Island leaders decided not to enter into negotiations with the US on a new trade and investment arrangement**

Drawing on his single-authored and joint research on fisheries trade policy and its articulations with tuna global value chains (GVCs) [3.1, 3.2, 3.5], Campling was a named author on a 2014 report (led by Elizabeth Havice) that recommended against the 15 Pacific Island countries (PICs) entering into negotiations for a trade and investment arrangement with the US. The report found that US trade preferences would not offset high PIC cost structures for tuna processing because of the combination of existing global competition and low-profit US retail markets. As fish products are among the very few PIC exports that might benefit from preferential goods trade with the US, the report advised that a deal offered limited gains. This was not the anticipated outcome, but the research persuaded leading figures in the region such as the Director General of the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency who, at a meeting of senior PIC officials in July 2015, 'urged the meeting to weigh the reality and practicality of PICs ability to access US markets and to determine the feasibility of pursuing such an arrangement' [5.3]. The final PIC decision to not enter into negotiations with the US saved considerable financial and personnel resources for very small, fiscally-squeezed states [5.6].

##### **Influencing World Trade Organisation fisheries subsidies negotiations, especially Pacific Island positions**

Global commitment to reach agreement on fisheries subsidies rules at the WTO by 2020 was re-affirmed in 2015 by Heads of State in UN Sustainable Development Goal 14.6. Campling's research on the political economy of WTO fisheries subsidies negotiations [3.2] and international fisheries trade and GVCs more generally [3.1; 3.4], feeds into his impact on the oral and text-based positions and thinking of Pacific Island and other WTO members in these negotiations. There are (a) public-facing and (b) confidential dimensions to Campling's impacts on this negotiation process.

(a) The public-facing dimension uses Campling's research to develop independent policy briefs (with Havice) for [UNCTAD](#) (2016) and [Commonwealth Secretariat](#) (2017) on the developmental implications of proposed WTO rules, which were presented by Campling in high-level policy seminars at the WTO (4 October 2016) and the Commonwealth Small States Office, Geneva (23 March 2017). This work translated abstract proposed trade rules into implications for real-world fisheries development [5.4; 5.7] and recommended an approach to negotiating Special & Differential Treatment (S&DT) that simultaneously provides developing Members with low levels of fisheries capacity the policy space to develop their fisheries into the future, while disciplining

the most harmful subsidies and subsidising Members (which include larger developing Members). The recommendation seeks to bypass the ‘differentiation problem’ between divergent developing countries by focusing on the volume of catch (i.e., SDT based on a ‘de minimis’ provision) rather than self-declared Developing Country status at the WTO. This developing country ‘small fishing nation’ exemption appeared in a formal submission to the WTO by the African, Caribbean and Pacific group (ACP) in February 2020, was picked up in a subsequent formal submission by India in March, and mirrored in the Draft Consolidated Text produced by the Chair of the WTO Negotiating Group on Rules in June 2020, which formed the basis for negotiations from September 2020 [5.7; 5.10].

(b) The confidential dimension is funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DfID, (now FCDO)) since July 2018 and involves working with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) Geneva Office that represents six Pacific Island WTO Members (‘the Pacific Group’). Campling is directly informing the negotiation positions and thinking, and textual proposals of these countries in their relations with their allies – the ACP – and in bilateral and multilateral settings in Geneva and online. Impacts include:

- Additions and revisions to official ACP room documents submitted to the WTO membership. These included proposed text in February 2020 that seeks to preserve the policy space made available to coastal states by virtue of their sovereign rights over marine resources [3.6; 3.9], in part through the charging of access fees and variable licencing arrangements for domestic vessels. Campling’s research has also informed a Pacific Group submission to WTO Heads of Delegation in July 2020 which elaborates conceptually on access fees and domestic vessel licencing. These were successfully introduced as (i) unbracketed text on access agreements in the third draft of the Chair’s negotiating text in December 2020, (ii) mention of variable licencing arrangements as a topic for ongoing negotiation in 2021 in the Chair’s explanatory text to all Members in December 2020 [5.8]; and (iii) the developing country ‘small fishing nation’ SDT noted above [5.10].
- Capacity building of the Pacific Group in relation to the implications of proposed WTO rules on the diverse fishing interests from artisanal to industrial scale, and the threats and prospects for Pacific Group in particular. As Permanent Representative & Ambassador Falemaka, Permanent Delegation of the Pacific Islands Forum in Geneva put it, Campling’s ‘depth and breadth of knowledge and expertise on fisheries economics and global fisheries development ... has greatly assisted the Pacific negotiating team, who are essentially trade experts, in Geneva and in capitals, to better understand the interface between trade rules and the fisheries sector. This has helped to sharpen the focus of our negotiations on key elements and outcomes that are beneficial to the Pacific’ [5.4].
- Capacity building of the Pacific Group to act as a distinct entity, especially in enhancing its engagement in bilateral meetings with leading WTO members in January, May, and November 2019, and February and March 2020 negotiation clusters, and online during the Covid-19 pandemic [5.4; 5.5]. As Ambassador Falemaka explains this heightened ‘sensitisation [of] the WTO membership to Pacific-specific concerns, especially as they relate to threats to our fisheries management systems and development policy space, access agreements and government revenue, and the role of variable fishing licences in underpinning our domestic fisheries development both now and into the future’ [5.4].
- Enhancing national level engagement with the negotiations, especially among national delegates from capitals in Fiji and Papua New Guinea, and their subsequent taking of concrete national positions on a negotiation issue [5.4; 5.5]
- Drawing on his recommendations [5.6], FFA submitted a statement to the annual Pacific Islands fisheries ministers meeting in 2019. This set out the policy objective of achieving a balance between supporting a global reduction in fisheries subsidies for environmental and economic reasons with that of ensuring ‘that any outcome should not unnecessarily constrain the ability of SIDS [small island developing states] to develop their tuna fisheries and that appropriate and effective special and differential treatment for SIDS should be an integral part of these negotiations’ [5.9].

### **Extending Solomon Islands’ graduation from Least Developed Country status**



Campling's research [3.1, 3.4, 3.5] underpinned a 2018 [Commonwealth Secretariat investigation](#) of the socio-economic impacts on the Solomon Islands of its graduation from Least Developed Country (LDC) status. This informed the Solomon Islands' government request and recommendation by the UN Committee for Development Policy (CDP) to offer an extended transition period [5.7]. Tuna exports from the Solomon Islands depend upon duty-free access to the EU market under its 'Everything But Arms' initiative (EBA) for LDCs. The investigation made clear that the trade effect of the removal of LDC status would result in the cessation of onshore tuna processing. The United Nations General Assembly agreed to the CDP recommendation and granted 'on an *exceptional* basis [...] an additional preparatory period of three years [to 2024] before the start of the three-year preparatory period leading to graduation' ([Resolution 73/133, 13 December 2018](#)). The earliest possible year for graduation was 2021, which means that ~1,800 fish processing jobs are more likely to remain secure for an additional six years, buying the government time to pursue alternative EU market access arrangements. In addition, Head of Section, International Trade Policy, Commonwealth Secretariat noted that this 'study had a major impact with the Secretariat as well as with the other development partners (United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and the Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)) and donors (Australia).' [5.7]

## 5. Sources to corroborate the impact

[5.1] [Testimonial] Director General, Trade and Customs, East African Community

[5.2] Economic Partnership Agreement Between The East African Community Partner States, Of The One Part, And The European Union. COM/2016/064 final - 2016/038. See: Protocol I, Article 40(7): <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52016PC0064>

[5.3] [CONFIDENTIAL] Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat Regional Workshop on the Joint US Study, Suvavou House, in Suva, Fiji, on 15 July 2015; Special Pacific ACP Trade and Fisheries Officials Meeting (PACPTFOM), 16 July 2015; and Special Pacific ACP Trade and Fisheries Ministers Meeting (PACPTFMM), 17 July 2015

[5.4] [Testimonial] Ambassador, Permanent Representative & Ambassador, Permanent Delegation of the Pacific Islands Forum to the United Nations, WTO and Other International Organisations in Geneva. 31 July 2020. [corroborator 1]

[5.5] [Testimonial] Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Trade, Tourism and Transport of Fiji.

[5.6] [Testimonial] Director and Fisheries Development Adviser, Fisheries Development Division, Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency. [corroborator 2]

[5.7] [Testimonial] Head of Section, International Trade Policy, Commonwealth Secretariat. [corroborator 3]

[5.8]

(a) RD/TN/RL/122, 3 February 2020, Communication from the Delegation of Jamaica on Behalf of the ACP Group of States to the WTO; FS-ST-200721-R1 Statement by the Pacific Group on the Chairs Text, submitted to the WTO, 21 July 2020;

(b) RD/TN/RL/126/Rev.2, 18 December 2020 Draft Consolidated Text (footnote 2); and

(c) RD/TN/RL/126/Rev.2/Add.1, 18 December 2020, Chair's Explanatory Note (para. 70).

[5.9] Ministers Communique FFCMIN16, Statement of Outcomes from the Sixteen Annual Session of the Forum Fisheries Committee Ministers Meeting (FFC Min16), 18-19 June 2019.

[5.10] (a) Article X.1 provides for an exemption from capital and operating cost subsidies for 'developing country Members that individually account for less than [2] percent of global marine capture fishing'. RD/TN/RL/96/Rev.1, 3 February 2020, Communication from the ACP Group of States to the WTO. This concept was adapted in

(b) TN/RL/GEN/200/Rev.1, 5 March 2020, Communication from India to the WTO, and in turn reproduced in Article 5.6

(c) ii. of RD/TN/RL/126/Rev.2, 18 December 2020 Draft Consolidated Text (see 5.8 (c)).