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This report constitutes *D 4.3: Minutes from the high level round table [M 33]* of the SOCIOEC project. The empirical material of this report can be publicly available but has not been analyzed and only structured in a quite simple manner. In this way its content is closer to raw scientific data than an actual publication. This material will feed into publications under WP4.

The ‘high level round table’ (HLRT) was held in Paris on 21\textsuperscript{st} November 2014, following a SOCIOEC project meeting taking place 19\textsuperscript{th}-20\textsuperscript{th} November. The HLRT was held in the premises of the Aquarium Tropical Palais de la Porte Dorée.
Background, objectives and plan

The HLRT organised under work package 4 (WP4) of the SOCIOEC project responds broadly to two objectives of WP4, namely objective 2 and objective 4 as these are described in the Description of Work (DoW) for the project:

“2. Investigate constraints and opportunities associated to decentralisation/devolution of governance authority to stakeholders/user-groups (self- or co-management possibilities) in general and in relation to the specific case-studies.”

“4. Assess the acceptability of changed governance options among the key stakeholder groups covering the EU, the RACs and Member States.”

Specifically, the HLRT is the sole activity under the DoW’s “Task 4.6: High-level round table discussion with policy-makers including representatives from RACs”, which is described in this way:

“Consultation with stakeholders is an on-going process in WP 4 as well as SOCIOEC as a whole. The management scenarios developed in WP3 and the results coming out of tasks 4.3 and 4.4 in WP4 will be tested with stakeholders and particular in relation to how management responsibilities can be delegated to users/stakeholders. Did we manage to integrate the different interests and is the outcome acceptable or does something else need to be considered? This gives policy-makers and representatives from users/stakeholders the possibility to provide a second round of directions on how co-management or self-management structures can be implemented in the EU.

In practical terms, we foresee a 2 days meeting with 20 to 25 participants, incl. key-informants from case-studies areas, RACs and EU policy-makers.

The participants will in advance receive relevant background information (either as working document written in a popular scientific form or a short DVD) needed to participate in the discussions. This approach is chosen because relations to stakeholders are well established and discussions can thus concentrate on its core purpose: discussion rather than scientific presentations. The outcome of the round table discussions should be a consensus (as far as possible) on how in practice to introduce genuine co-management or self-management in EU fisheries.”
Preparations

Planning and organization of the HLRT took place from the beginning of September and until the event on Friday 21\textsuperscript{th} November 2014. The current section outlines in brief the activities of the planning period.

The first major step of the planning process was a joint meeting over Skype of WP4 partners on 11\textsuperscript{th} September 2014. At that time the venue and date of the meeting had already been decided, as it had been agreed to have the back-to-back with a SOCIOEC project meeting in Paris, which was under preparation. This decision was made primarily for cost-efficiency reasons but it was also agreed that Paris would be an attractive place to visit for many of the potential participants – especially as the HLRT was planned for a Friday.

In preparation of the planning meeting, the leader of WP4 had made some considerations regarding the structure of the meeting, which was discussed during the meeting. The proposal was broadly supported and while it had not found its final form, it basically formed the backbone of what was to become the program.

Similarly, it was agreed that at least one case study from each region should be presented at the workshop and in the following weeks the exact case studies for presentation was decided through e-mail correspondence. Likewise, some ideas on how to structure the presentations were agreed, first at the meeting and later in mail correspondence.

Based on the intention with the HLRT, the profile of a suitable participant was agreed at the planning meeting as the following: “persons with knowledge of and / experience with governance at the level of Advisory Councils and above (CFP-level): fisheries sector representatives, NGO representatives, public officials”. It was furthermore agreed that “[e]ach partner should ASAP (based on the profile above) suggest minimum 2-3 candidates from the case study area / region, which they have reason to believe would be qualified and interested in participating.” During the following weeks invitations were sent out and partners were encouraged to broaden out their efforts if they were not successful with their first candidates. Securing participants turned out to be a more challenging task than anticipated and it basically was ongoing until as late as a week ahead of the meeting.

Alongside the preparation of the scientific content of the HLRT, a significant amount of ‘administrative’ planning regarding participants and the venue etc. took place.

Two days before the HLRT all participants received the introductory presentation to the morning sessions (incl. updated program) together with two journal articles related to case studies under WP4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Hatcher</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Leocádio *</td>
<td>Marine Fisheries Research Programme Manager, Defra - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arina Motova</td>
<td>EC JRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgit de Vos</td>
<td>Fisheries Researcher, LEI, Waageningen UR, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Shortt</td>
<td>AquaTT, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derk Jan Berends *</td>
<td>Secretary, Nederlandse Vissersbond, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eibhlin O'Sullivan *</td>
<td>CEO, Irish South and West Fish Producers Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ertug Duzgunes</td>
<td>Fisheries Management Expert, KTU, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnar Haraldsson</td>
<td>Institute of Economic Studies, University of Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Labat *</td>
<td>WWF, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyre Goti</td>
<td>Institute of Sea Fisheries - Research Unit Fisheries Economics, The Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute, Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta Malvarosa</td>
<td>Researcher, Nisea - Fisheries and Aquaculture Economic Research, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Aranda</td>
<td>Senior Researcher, AZTI Tecnalia, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Researcher, Socio-Economic Marine Research Unit, J.E. Cairnes School of Business and Economics, National University of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niels Wichmann *</td>
<td>Managing Director, Danish Fishermen’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris Vasilakopoulos</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Researcher, Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal Le Floc’h</td>
<td>Head of Department, University of Brest, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina Ramirez-Monsalve</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Researcher, Innovative Fisheries Management, Aalborg University, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pim Visser *</td>
<td>Chief Executive, VisNed, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralf Doering</td>
<td>Teamleader, Institute of Sea Fisheries - Research Unit Fisheries Economics, The Johann Heinrich von Thünen Institute, Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Feldthaus *</td>
<td>Head of Section, Centre for Fisheries, AgiFish Agency, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Søren Qvist Eliasen</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Innovative Fisheries Management, Aalborg University, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troels Jacob Hegland</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Innovative Fisheries Management, Aalborg University, Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verena Ohms *</td>
<td>Executive Secretary, Pelagic Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youen Vermard</td>
<td>IFREMER, France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* External participant
Outline of the HLRT

The HLRT (related to TASK 4.6 of the SOCIOEC project) was held back-to-back with, on one side, a SOCIOEC project meeting and, on the other side, a SWOT meeting intended to evaluate the new Art. 18 structures (related to TASK 4.5 of the SOCIOEC project). To the participants the HLRT and the SWOT meeting was organized as one meeting on ‘governance’, but in the frame of the SOCIOEC project there is actually talk of two separate meetings. The program for the HLRT (and the rest of the day) can be examined beneath.

Programme for the SocioEC High-level Workshop on Governance

Venue: Paris, France
Aquarium Tropical Palais de la Porte Dorée – 293, avenue Daumesnil 75012 Paris
Date: Friday 21st November 2014

9.30–9.40 Coffee and registration
9.40–12.30 Session I on how to facilitate more co- or self-management under the CFP
   9.40–9.50 Presentation of the SocioEC project (Raif Döring)
   9.50–10.00 Brief intro to the day and the concepts of co- and self-management (Trond Helgland)
   10.00–11.00 Presentations of examples of co- and self-management from the SocioEC cases – emphasis on problems encountered and/or successful solutions (Pascal Lefebvre, Birgit de Vos, Saren G. Elsen, Lorette Malvarosa, Leyre Goñi)
   11.00–12.00 Participants work in groups on how co- and/or self-management can contribute to the implementation of the landing obligation (discard ban)
   12.00–12.30 Participants groups present their conclusions, incl. discussion
12.30–13.30 Buffet lunch
13.30–16.00 Session II on regionalisation (Art. 18 of the new CFP) as a path towards co-management
   13.30–14.00 Presentation of regionalisation as laid out in Art. 18 of the CFP regulation and initial attempts at implementing Art. 18 (Trond Helgland & Saren G. Elsen)
   14.00–15.30 Participants work in groups discussing the benefits and possible shortcomings of the style of regionalisation adopted in the North and Baltic Seas (using a SWOT-approach)
   15.30–16.00 Participant groups present their conclusions and the session will be rounded off with a joint discussion of the perspectives and challenges of making this kind of regionalisation a generic model for the EU
16.00–16.10 Closing remarks and goodbye
16.00–19.00 Own time or departure (Aquarium open until 17.30)
19.00 - Dinner for those staying
After people had been registered and seated, the HLRT started with a brief presentation of the SOCIOEC project by project leader, Ralf Döring. Subsequently, Troels Hegland presented the program for the day with particular focus on the morning session and the concepts of co-management and self-management (presentation attached as Annex 2). After this presentation came five short presentations, each relating to a specific case study under WP4:

- Presentation 1: A voluntary agreement as a co-management instrument for the German gillnet fisheries in the Fehmarn island MPAs (presented by Leyre Goti)
- Presentation 2: Cod avoidance in Danish nephrops fishery in Kattegat: Selective behaviour (presented by Søren Q. Eliasen)
- Presentation 3: Dutch fishermen’s culture: barrier or catalyst for chain collaboration? (presented by Birgit de Vos)
- Presentation 4: Fisheries management measures: incentives and governance issues implemented in European Western Waters in the context of the CFP (presented by Pascal LeFloc’h)
- Presentation 5: Co-management system for the clam fishery in the Adriatic Sea (presented by Loretta Malvarosa)

Following the case study presentations, the external participants (and selected project participants) were divided into two groups (see last page of the attached Annex 2 for details), which were asked to discuss the following questions with the help of a facilitator:

1. In what way does or doesn’t the new CFP facilitate a move towards more co- or self-management in the implementation of measures?
2. What have the experiences been so far with the new CFP in relation to co- or self-management during implementation?
3. Do you see a(n) (unrealised) potential for co- or self-management in relation to the implementation of management measures of the new CFP?
4. What would be the main advice in order to increase the role of co- or self-management in the implementation of the measures of the new CFP?

After having worked in groups, all participants (external as well as internal) in the HLRT met for a joint presentation and discussion of the main points that had come out of the discussions.

During the group work and the joint sections notes were taken and the discussions were furthermore recorded.
Adjustments compared to the DoW

Although all planning was from the outset based on the description of the HLRT in the DoW, a number of adjustments were made along the way; some were the result of unforeseen developments and others were deliberate choices to get the most out of the HLRT. In this section the deviations from the DoW are described.

Number and composition of attendants

The number of external participants became considerably lower than originally planned. Although we were aware that it could prove challenging to get people to sign up, we were nonetheless surprised that it was as difficult, as it turned out to be. Our strategy for getting participants involved placing the event in (supposedly attractive) Paris and using our professional networks to reach out to stakeholders and policy-makers etc., which in practice meant that each substantial partner in WP4 were charged with attracting two participants to the HLRT. In this way the plan was to have roughly 20-25 external participants, who would come from all over Europe, as indicated in the DoW.

This task, however, proved difficult for most partners. Main reasons for this appear to be ‘stakeholder fatigue’ as well as competition from other meetings (including meetings of other research projects) and engagements such as for instance Norway–EU negotiations, which were ongoing. Similarly, widespread discussions and significant meeting activity on the implementation of the ‘landing obligation’ coincided with the meeting. As a result, the number of external participants to the meeting became limited to eight persons. Furthermore, the group of external participants had a bias towards the north of Europe, as well as a bias towards the fishing sector, although there were two representatives of relevant ministries and one from an environmental NGO.

As the HLRT was placed in connection with a SOCIOEC project meeting, the number of internal SOCIOEC participants was considerably higher than anticipated, namely 17 persons. Although it would clearly have been preferable with more external participants, the significant number of internal participants made it possible to nonetheless carry out a HLRT, which both the internal and external participants indicated was useful.

Duration of the HLRT

The DoW anticipated a meeting over two days (i.e. an afternoon and a morning session). However, in practice we opted for a shorter version where the morning session was dedicated to the issues of the HLRT and the afternoon session was dedicated to a SWOT analysis of the new Art. 18 structures following the recently reformed CFP. This decision was made in light of the anticipated challenges (which we became increasingly aware of along the way) of getting people interested in participating if they had to spend two days, as well as the one-to-one overlap of the kind of participants that would be interested in the two topics (morning focusing broadly on co- and self-management and afternoon focusing narrowly on the Art. 18 structures). Having the two topics in the same meeting (which was framed as one joint meeting to the participants) resulted in a slightly higher turn-out, as we experienced that some participants were primarily interested in the morning session whereas others were primarily coming for the afternoon session – though in reality there was significant
overlap between the issues discussed in the morning and the afternoon.

Preparatory documents

Given the limited number of participants (and the time hence spent on trying to attract additional participants) and the fact that they were all fluent in English and used to reading scientific material qua their positions, we decided – instead of preparing a dedicated preparatory documents in a non-scientific format – to supply the participants with two scientific articles from WP4 related to respectively the North Sea and the Western Waters, published in Marine Policy. In addition, effort was put into making an introductory presentation (attached as Annex 2) to set the scene for the discussion and group work.
Main points of the group work

The following provides an insight into the discussions during the group work of the HLRT; in the end an attempt is made to draw some preliminary conclusions.

The group work was organized around four questions related to the role of co-management in the recently reformed CFP:

1. In what way does or doesn’t the new CFP facilitate a move towards more co- or self-management in the implementation of measures?
2. What have the experiences been so far with the new CFP in relation to co- or self-management during implementation?
3. Do you see a(n) (unrealised) potential for co- or self-management in relation to the implementation of management measures of the new CFP?
4. What would be the main advice in order to increase the role of co- or self-management in the implementation of the measures of the new CFP?

Although the discussions departed from these questions, they did in practice move back and forth between them and address multiple questions at the same time. Therefore, the following will not be structured according to the questions but rather according to statements, which seemed to have general or substantial backing from most of the participants.

Almost all participants had been part of the regional processes in relation to the coming implementation of the landing obligation. Consequently, the experiences with the regional processes towards the implementation of the landing obligation form the empirical background of many of the issues. These regional processes follow from Art. 18 (‘Regionalisation’) of the new basic regulation of the CFP; the text of Art. 18 can be examined Annex 1. Finally, it deserves to be mentioned that there was a general consensus that it was in fact premature to pose questions around the performance of the newly adopted CFP in relation to co- and self-management, as the new CFP is only just in the process of being implemented.

Co-management requires incorporating advice from partners as far as possible

Based on the experiences related to the landing obligation, one of the dominating perspectives of the participants was that there was a lack of willingness to take onboard the advice of the industry and/or the regional governance structures. There appeared to be different perspectives on whether the bottleneck was at member state level or if it was at the level of the Commission; the described experiences seem to indicate that this might differ from region to region and process to process.

The most referred to example of this was the significant work that the Pelagic AC had put into developing input to the relevant member states on the issue of the pelagic landing obligation. Participants who had been involved in the process stated that they had been strongly encouraged to put a lot of effort into this and that they had worked hard to actually arrive at a compromise that was acceptable to all the members of the AC. However, the input from the Pelagic AC was not at all reflected in the report that was sent from the member states to the Commission. It was described as highly demotivating to experience that the input did not appear to be taken serious, although it
represented a compromise of all the relevant actors. The feeling was that the consultation process had in fact been treated as a ‘ticking the box exercise’.

This experience was not only something that had left the pelagic actors disillusioned. Representatives from the demersal sector argued that this was the worst possible start of the regional governance process, because if any, the pelagic sector is seen upon as the one, which should really be capable of providing implementable input. As a consequence, it was argued, there was now very little belief in the demersal sector that anything positive could come out of the process towards the implementation of the landing obligation in their case, where perspectives within the sector and between the sector and other interests groups were perceived as even more diverse. In relation to the case of the Baltic Sea, it was questioned how the long report, which was sent from the member states to the Commission, could result in so little content when it came to the discard regulation for the Baltic. These supplemented by other experiences led many participants to question if there was actually sufficient willingness 1) from member states to listen to the stakeholders input and 2) from the commission to listen to the input from the regional governance structures. In this way, the experiences from the discard process have left many of those involved with severe doubts as to whether input from stakeholders will actually find its way into legal acts under the CFP through the new regional structures.

Co-management requires a space for taking different decisions

Experiences from the landing obligation process also highlight that when talking about co-management, it is of vital importance that there is actually a space for arriving at different policy-outcomes. If the frames around what is supposedly co-managed are so tight that the outcome is more or less given from the outset, then it is better to treat it - and frame it - as top-down management. Alternatively there is a risk of devaluing the term co-management, which will negatively impact future processes. This was also a perspective that was put on the process towards the landing obligation, where there was among several participants a suspicion that there had possibly never been a real intention of opening up for alternative and innovative approaches on how to implement the landing obligation.

Some expressed a certain skepticism in relation to the actual influence that input from the regional governance structures would have on delegated acts of the Commission (subject to Art. 18(1), see Annex 1), i.e. suspecting that the delegated acts would likely look more or less the same in the end irrespectively of whether there was a regional process or not.

Co-management requires sufficient time for a thorough process

Several participants indicated that it had been a problem that the timeframe had been so tight in relation to the implementation of the landing obligation. To do co-management well, there needs to be sufficient time for a thorough consultative process and subsequent incorporation of inputs. This was in the case of the landing obligation compromised by the tight time schedule and the Commission’s threat to go ahead without regional input in the case that the time schedule was not respected. This both meant that stakeholders became pressed for time but possibly also that member states were pressed to find fast agreements – possibly at the expense of incorporating stakeholder’s inputs, which might very well have provided for prolonged negotiations between member states. It was speculated that this was part of what happened in the pelagic case, namely
that the member states felt pressed to come up with a plan – and fast, instead of a good plan over time.

**Co-management though regionalization requires feedback processes**

It was also stressed during the discussions that there is a general need to build in some systematic feedback processes in the Art. 18 structure: on one side between the forum of member states and the regional AC/stakeholders in general, and on the other side between the regional governance structures and the Commission. In both instances it was considered problematic that it was unclear what happened to input once it had been delivered to the ‘other side’. Similarly, structured feedback mechanisms would also allow for solving of misunderstandings and uncertainties.

**The Commission needs to go actively into the role as facilitator of the regional co-management process**

It was stated by the participants that the Commission has an important role to play in terms of acting as a facilitator of the regional process following Art. 18(2) (see Annex 1). To ensure that there is not too big difference from region to region and process to process, the Commission needs to find a uniform way in which to perform this role. This issue was also linked to the above issue of the need for a feedback process between the Commission and the regional governance structure. The perception was that currently the issue of how the Commission acted as facilitator or gave feedback was highly dependent on how individuals approached their own role.

**Increasing ‘policy complexity’ is a challenge to true co-management**

Without going further into how the issue could be tackled, it was mentioned by some industry representatives that fostering genuine co-management in fisheries policy is increasingly challenged by the complexity of the issues that make up modern fisheries policy. Whereas fisheries policy was originally about quotas, technical measures and other issues that made intuitively sense to the fishermen, fisheries policy is today increasingly about Natura2000 areas, ecosystem based management, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, other environmental issues etc. Those who represent fishermen are therefore to an increasing degree challenged by the distance between what fishermen feel matter and what they are forced to deal with in policy.

**A need for clarification of the role of the Advisory Councils**

Some participants argued that the current Art. 18 set-up has created an ambiguous structure in which the role of the ACs is unclear. This was perceived as a result of the fact that the AC is not designated as the advisory structure for the cooperating regional member states, which are on the contrary to some extent building up their own structures alongside the position that the ACs have following the provisions of Art. 18(2) (see Annex 1). This means that stakeholders have to first be present in the AC to carve out a common position and then in practice again in the forum of the regional structure where the AC’s position can be challenged - even by stakeholders who signed up to it in the first instance. This was argued to reduce the value of input from the ACs - be it consensual or with minority reservations - and in general create an unclear governance structure.
Regionalization might have to materialize through Art. 18(7) and 18(8)

Some participants suggested that rather than Art. 18(1), it was actually in Art. 18(7) and 18(8) that real potential for regionalization (and possibly also co-management) should be found. Where the policy-space for different solutions in relation to delegated acts might be too small to really foster regionalization and co-management, it was instead argued that Art. 18(7) and Art. 18(8) (see Annex 1) were the ones that could really foster a movement towards regionalization and possibly co-management. There were examples mentioned on issues where member states were already trying to reach agreements on issues outside Art. 18(1) but within the regional cooperative structures.

Opportunities for co-management at national level related to the common marked organisation (CMO)

Especially the industry pointed at opportunities for co-or self-management related to elements in the CMO. The Producer Organisations (or Quota Pools in Denmark) administer in some states allocation of quotas between larger groups of vessels, likewise such organisations can manage market activities. It was emphasised that the industry needs to be properly organised to be able to handle this type of co-management arrangements. Not all industries are organisationally ‘fit’ for this yet.

The implementation of the landing obligation remains a challenge

Slightly beside the main point of the workshop it nonetheless came out as a major message from most of the assembled participants that there are major problems in the planned implementation of the landing obligation. Generally most participants felt that the uncertainties around the implementation were significant and unlikely to be solved prior to implementation. The rules as they look now are perceived as unworkable. These participants therefor strongly urged the Commission to consider how the landing obligation could be implemented without leaving the active fishermen in an uncertain and unacceptable legal situation. One participant compared the whole process towards the implementation of the discard ban with a failed visit to the hospital: You go to the hospital in the hope that you will start in the laboratory, where they do all the tests to figure out what is wrong and how to solve it. However, instead you are sent directly to surgery without anesthesia.

Co-management under the new CFP requires that actors show a ‘spirit of co-management’

A general comment, which in a way captures many of the other comments under one heading, from most of the participants of the workshop involved the fact that the current Art. 18 structures - despite regionalization originally being framed as both moving down to the regional level as well as moving out to stakeholders (i.e. co-management) – do actually not oblige much involvement of stakeholders in the process. As a consequence, there was a call from most participants on all the parties in this new structure to adopt a ‘spirit of co-management’ in the implementation of Art. 18. Hence calling for a more ambitious approach in terms of involving stakeholders than what are the minimum requirements of the regulation. One industry respondent argued that there was still an attitude of formal ‘hearing’ of the industry, instead of actually listening to the industry.
Concluding summary: The need to adopt a ‘spirit of co-management’

The intention of the HLRT was to arrive at “a consensus (as far as possible) on how in practice to introduce genuine co-management or self-management in EU fisheries”. Although no consensus was arrived at as such, the following appears to be at the core of the recommendations, which found broad support among the participants of the event.

Art. 18 basically outlines a ‘soft’, voluntary process of regionalization, which has in most cases been framed as also involving a co-management element at the regional level. Importantly, however, the legal provisions for this co-management element of regionalization are weak in Art. 18 (see Annex 1). One of the issues that this event highlighted is how such a voluntary process is highly reliant on the presence of a ‘spirit of co-management’. Much of the ‘best practice’ of co-management is not hardwired in legislation, which for instance means that the success of co-management (as part of regionalization) is much more reliant on specific persons and attitudes than it would be if the process was hardwired in the legislation. In this way the voluntary approach put much higher requirements on the different actors in the process to act in the ‘spirit of the regulations’. Potentially, the new article 18 regulations opens up for a variety of co-management developments, not least in respect to the more open Art. 18(7) and 18(8), but for this to materialize a shift of attitude on behalf of involved parties, incl. parts of the Commission and member state administrations, is required.

However, early indications are unfortunately that the implementation of Art. 18 has not gotten off to a good start and there appears already to be some mending to do between the involved actors. Likely much will depend on what will happen in 2015 when the landing obligation is intended to enter into force. The question is if a solution can be made so that the industry can still see themselves as partners to a co-management process under development. If the current fears of a completely unmanageable landing obligation system materialize, it appear as a risk that it will be an uphill battle to get the industry committed to future processes of co-management as a part of regionalization.
ANNEX 1

REGULATION (EU) No 1380/2013 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

of 11 December 2013


...
following requirements:

(a) they are compatible with the objectives set out in Article 2;

(b) they are compatible with the scope and objectives of the relevant conservation measure;

(c) they are compatible with the scope and meet the objectives and quantifiable targets set out in a relevant multiannual plan effectively;

(d) they are at least as stringent as measures under Union law.

6. If all Member States do not succeed in agreeing on joint recommendations to be submitted to the Commission in accordance with paragraph 1 within a set deadline or if the joint recommendations on conservation measures are deemed not to be compatible with the objectives and quantifiable targets of the conservation measures in question, the Commission may submit a proposal for appropriate measures in accordance with the Treaty.

7. In addition to the cases referred to in paragraph 1, Member States having a direct management interest in a fishery in a defined geographical area may also make joint recommendations to the Commission on measures to be proposed or adopted by the Commission.

8. As a supplementary or alternative method of regional cooperation, Member States will be empowered, in a Union conservation measure that applies to a relevant geographical area, including in a multiannual plan established pursuant to Articles 9 and 10, to adopt within a set deadline measures further specifying that conservation measure. The Member States concerned shall closely cooperate in the adoption of such measures. Paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 of this Article shall apply mutatis mutandis. The Commission shall be associated and its comments shall be taken into account. Member States shall only adopt their respective national measures if an agreement on the content of those measures has been reached by all the Member States concerned. Where the Commission considers that a Member State’s measure does not comply with the conditions set out in the relevant conservation measure, it may, subject to providing relevant reasons, request that the Member State concerned amend or repeal that measure.
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WP4 OVERALL AIM AND APPROACH

Aim:
To investigate constraints and opportunities associated to decentralisation / devolution of governance authority to stakeholders/user-groups (self- or co-management possibilities) in general and in relation to the specific case-studies. [As a response to some of the challenges of the 2009 Green Paper]

Research approach:
WP4 approaches this aim by means of reviews, in-depth interviews and workshops/focus groups carried out in relation to a number of case studies.

In addition, a number of cross-regional research efforts are made to facilitate learning across regions and from differences and similarities (e.g. this workshop...).

Project output consists of reports / articles for specific / local case studies, and synthesis paper(s) on co- and self-management efforts and potential.
WP4 LOCAL / SPECIFIC CASE STUDIES

- Western Waters: France: Bay of Biscay sole fishery
  English Channel/ISW English mixed demersal fishery
  Spanish Basque trawlers & purse seiners
  Celtic Sea Herring
- Baltic Sea: Fehmarn Island
- North Sea: Voluntary measures to avoid cod in Kattegat (DK)
  Netherlands; influence of markets in management
- Med. & Black Sea: Italy; Adriatic clam
  Turkish purse seiners in the Black Sea
  Greek demersal fishery
- Pelagic fisheries: North East Atlantic Herring fishery; regionalisation
- Regionalisation: The new CFP Art. 18 structures

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Aaron Hatcher
Artina Mohora
Brieta de Vos
Christine Shortt
Ertug Doganbek
Gunnar Harsdottin
Lars Golt
Lometta Melverson
Martin Amade
Miles Fitzpatrick
Peri Voulkopoulos
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Aalborg University Denmark
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TODAY’S PROGRAM IN BRIEF:

8.40 – 12.30
Session I on co- and self-management under the CFP
- Introductory presentation
- Case-study presentations
- Group work on the possibility of moving to co- or self-management (in relation to the discard ban and tender)
- Brief presentation of main points

12.30 – 13.30
Lunch break

13.30 – 16.00
Session II on Regionalization (Art. 18 of the new CFP)
- Presentation of Art. 18 and the initial efforts to implement it in the North and Baltic Seas
- Group work on the benefits and shortcomings of Art. 18-style of regionalization
- Brief presentation of main results

16.20 – 18.10
Closing remarks and goodbye (Aquarium open until 18.30)

18.00
Dinner
CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS IN SESSION 1

Presentation 1:
Fehmarn Belt (Jørgen Goli)

Presentation 2:
Cod avoidance in Kattegat (Jaan O. Ilmsan)

Presentation 3:
Management by the market in the Netherlands (Birgit de Vos)

Presentation 4:
German waters co-management (Pausor liPeus ?)

Presentation 5:
Adriatic clam co-management (Laura Molvensa)

GROUP WORK IN SESSION 1:

Overall theme: How to introduce more co- or self-management into the CFP?

1. In what way does or doesn’t the new CFP facilitate a move towards more co- or self-management in the implementation of measures?

2. What have the experiences been so far with the new CFP in relation to co- or self-management during implementation?

3. Do you see any (unrealized) potential for co- or self-management in relation to the implementation of management measures of the new CFP?

4. What would be the main advice in order to increase the role of co- or self-management in the implementation of the measures of the new CFP?
WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ‘CO- AND SELF-MANAGEMENT’? (1)

A definition:
“a collaborative and participatory process of regulatory decision-making between representatives of user-groups, government agencies, research institutions, and other stakeholders” (Jentoft 2003)

An observation:
“the proper design principles depend upon the context and conditions under which the co-management arrangement must operate” (Hjertend, Ounabian & Raakjar 2012, following Sen & Raakjar 1996)

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY ‘CO- AND SELF-MANAGEMENT’? (2)

Co-management remains an ambiguous term but could be understood as “a continuum range over various visions of co-management from little or no involvement to ultimately self-management” (Hjertend, Ounabian & Raakjar 2012)

Top-down

Self-man.

Co-man. variations
A TYPOLOGY OF STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

1. ‘Top-down hierarchical management by the state’, where mechanisms for dialogue with users and stakeholders might exist, but only minimal exchange of information takes place and EU/national governments decide what information to share.

2. ‘Co-management by consultation’, where extensive formal mechanisms for consultation (and feedback on use of recommendations) with users and stakeholders exist, but all decisions are taken by EU/national governments.

3. ‘Co-management by partnership’, where EU/national governments, users, and stakeholders cooperate as decision-making partners in various aspects of management.

4. ‘Co-management by delegation’, where EU/national governments have devolved decision-making power to users and stakeholders in relation to various aspects of fisheries management.

5. ‘Industry self-management with reversal of the burden of proof’, where the government has devolved wide-ranging management authority to users and stakeholders, who must demonstrate to EU/national governments that management decisions are in accordance with the group mandate.

TWO ‘TYPES’ OF POSSIBLE CO-MANAGEMENT IN THE CFP

Example: Baltic Sea discard regulation
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LET’S BE CREATIVE AND PRODUCTIVE!