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Summary

During the initial phase of the project (including the proposal phase) established researchers, regional organizations and NGOs were asked to take part in an advisory board. The basic idea is to get advice on deliverables and on future work including what must be assessed due to the development in the reform process of the CFP.

For a number of deliverables from the first reporting period until May 2013, especially on the management measures in the regional seas and the work done on sustainability objectives, the scientific coordinator asked the advisory board for comments on the work done and suggestions on what to take into account for the future work in the case study areas.

The deliverable 1.6 is a compilation of the comments of the members of the RAB. Attached to the comments are descriptions of the action(s) which will be taken by the coordinator. The aim is to incorporate the suggestions of the RAB members in the future work. The members of the RAB will also be contacted to explain in some cases the background of the documents, to clarify especially misunderstandings regarding the work programme of the overall project.

Unfortunately only four members commented on the deliverables which were sent to the RAB. From two members comments are still missing but the coordinator will further contact them for a feedback.
Introduction

The Reference User and Advisory Board (RAB) of the SOCIOEC project was formed to advice the project consortium on the research activities to achieve the project objectives, the transdisciplinary research (cooperative research with the stakeholders) and the dissemination of project results in the scientific community and broader stakeholder community. Already three contacted established researchers/stakeholder representatives agreed before the start of the project to take part in the RAB. At the beginning of the project further researchers and organizations were contacted to take part in the RAB. The following researchers/organizations are now member of the RAB:

- Nils Arne Ekershovd (University of Bergen, Norway)
- GFCM (General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean, represented by Federico De Rossi, GFCM Secretariat)
- WWF Europe (represented by Tony Long, Director European Policy Office)
- Barry Deas (UK National Federation of Fishermen’s Organizations)
- Christian Tritten (DG Mare)
- Sean Pascoe (CSIRO, Australia)

For the first reporting period it was decided to send two to three deliverables to each member of the RAB. The members were asked to provide comments on the actual version and recommendations on further work. As in several cases the work performed in the deliverables will be continued these comments are very valuable suggestions for the work program for the next months. In case of questions it was proposed to have an additional Skype meeting with the member of the RAB instead of having one with the whole RAB together during the second project meeting.
The following detailed comments were provided for Deliverable 3.1, 6.7 and 6.12:

Deliverable 3.1: Literature review on incentives.

The report rightfully acknowledges that fishermen’s behaviour is influenced by conflicting goals and incentives. The same can be said of the fishery policies. This is a common feature of stated policy goals, not just the CFP, but also the Norwegian fisheries are based on four main objectives:

1. Increasing the profitability of the fisheries sector
2. Protection of the resource base
3. Securing employment opportunities in coastal communities
4. Maintenance of the settlements along the coast.

The number does not imply order of priority and the goals can at times be in conflict with each other.

Reading about the problem with creating incentives that leads good management decisions, I came to think about an experimental study that found despite perfect property rights, subjects consistently overinvested leading to an average overcapacity of 60%. The subject included people that in theory should know better and the result was explained by their misperception of feedback. The study was performed by Erling Moxnes, published in 1998: “Not only the Tragedy of the Commons: Misperception of Bioeconomics”, Management Science vol. 44(9): 1234-1248.

Deliverable 6.7: Management measures in the Baltic Sea

The fisheries management in the Baltic Sea is particular interesting as it can be seen as a “laboratory” test of EUs CFP. However, what I missed was a discussion on how conflicts of interests between union members on fisheries management issues are resolved. For instance, I expect there are conflict between those how benefit from MPA and those how do not, i.e., those that are shut off from fishing opportunities. What about anadromous fish species (salmon) in the Baltic, are there conflict of interests between off shore fishing versus coastal/inland fishing, or between commercial interest and recreational interest? How does the CFP deal with these issues?

---

**Action:** Sending the reference to the WP leader (LEI)  
**Responsible:** TI  
**Timeline:** 15.09.2013

**Action:** Discussion with CS partners how to incorporate the comments in the future work  
**Responsible:** TI  
**Timeline:** 15.09.2013
Deliverable 6.12: Management measures in the Pelagic Fisheries

The report on the pelagic fisheries gives a good description of past and current status of the management of herring and mackerel in the North East Atlantic. Here I might add that blue whiting is an important species for most pelagic off shore fishing fleets in the area. I would also like to draw your attention to a recently published report on the cost of production in North Atlantic pelagic fisheries. The report “Analysis of cost of production in North Atlantic fisheries”, written by Alena Lappo for a project I am leading. The analysis is undertaken for pelagic fleets from Scotland, Norway and Iceland, and documents substantial differences in value creation and cost of production. Enclosed you will find a copy of this report.

| Action: Sending the references to the WP leader (FOI) | Responsible: TI | Timeline: 15.09.2013 |
GFCM

General comments:

“We have found very interesting the document of Turkey fisheries since it gives figures for black sea only, not for the whole Turkish coast which is not very commonly seen.

The second document entitled ‘Critical Report of current fisheries management measures implemented in the Mediterranean sea’ in our opinion focuses too much on EU rules and reviews very slightly other management measures set up by GFCM. The introductory part is very interesting with figures on profit, costs, wages, employment not seen very often, but only for the eight European Mediterranean countries. In some paragraphs it should be clarified that when it states ‘Mediterranean’ is only euro-Mediterranean.

We have detected some missing information regarding the GCFM that we have highlighted in the text with Track Changes and comments have been inserted” (Author: see detailed comments below).

“The Project objectives are very relevant to our work and we would be most grateful when you can keep us posted of future outcomes. It would be very interesting that some of the project representatives could participate in the meeting of the Subcommittee on Economic and Social Sciences (SCESS) to be held next February. The complete information on dates and venue of this meeting will be available in our web site.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Explanation of the work programme of SOCIOEC to the GFCM (concentration on EU fisheries policy etc.)</th>
<th>Responsible: TI</th>
<th>Timeline: 15.09.2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action: Sending the comments to the CS leader (HCMR) and discuss possible adjustments in the work program</td>
<td>Responsible: TI</td>
<td>Timeline: 15.09.2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action: Sending a representative of SOCIOEC to the Subcommittee meeting (probably Coordinator or CS leader)</td>
<td>Responsible: TI</td>
<td>Timeline: February 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Comments on the Mediterranean Report (Deliverable 6.10)

Page 17 Text Deliverable: A second case of multi-level management in the Mediterranean basin concerns the management of shared stocks; this is different from the first, because of complete lack of management measures within the Mediterranean Sea¹. This absence is a direct consequence of the specific nature of Mediterranean, due to the division of marine waters according to the principles

¹ Parts in italic are the comments which were attached in the original documents.
established by the international Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III); the jurisdiction of coastal states in the Mediterranean is limited, with few exceptions, to just 6 or 12 nautical miles from the coast (territorial waters). In the present situation, therefore, the management of resources is outside the responsibility of the individual states. All fleets have equal fishing access rights in the absence of regulations capable of ensuring efficient action to protect resources.

Comment GFCM: GFCM has issued some management and conservation measures. Visit our web site and the Compendium. In 2013 a Multiannual management plan for the Adriatic Sea has been adopted.

Page 17 Text Deliverable: As of 2010, the Italian fishing fleet active beyond the 12 mile limit, where stocks are shared, is composed of about 2,500 boats (around 18% of the national fleet) and is made up essentially of trawlers, seiners and longliners. The same is the case with Greek trawlers, seiners and longliners in Ionian and Aegean Seas. It follows that in many areas of the Mediterranean there is strong competition between fleets from various countries, which exploit the same stocks but are not subject to the same regulations regarding management, monitoring and control. Several attempts have been made in this context, both by the European Union and the GFCM, to adopt a shared management system, organised on various levels. With Recommendation 34/2010/2, the GFCM has set itself the objective of strengthening its capacity to control fishery activities. The recommendation is only binding for EU Member States and not for the other Mediterranean countries, therefore, the effectiveness of the management tools proposed by the GFCM for shared management of Mediterranean fisheries still remains very limited.

Comment GFCM: This is not correct. GFCM recommendations are binding to all its Members. Recent resolution GFCM/37/2013/2 provides guidelines for the management of fishing capacity. See the report of the 37th session of the Commission.

Page 18 Text Deliverable: Within the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), the structure and market policies have been applied and enforced in the Mediterranean in an equivalent manner to other Community areas. This is also the case for control policy. However, the conservation policy has traditionally been carried out differently than in other areas. For example, in the Mediterranean basin the CFP’s main conservation instrument, the total allowable catches (TACs) and quota system, have been not applied in the same way. Only since 1998 a fish stock has been subject to such a system in the Mediterranean: bluefin tuna. In addition, certain elements of the CFP, such as the logbook, have been introduced in the Mediterranean later than in the Atlantic.

Comment GFCM: Rec GFCM 35/2011/1.

Page 19 Text Deliverable: Technical measures foreseen in the Mediterranean Regulation touch different issues, including: protection of sensitive habitats, prohibition to use dangerous fishing practices, improvement of the selectivity of trawlers, minimum hook size, limitation of the maximum dimensions of passive fishing gears, limitation of the active fishing gears operations (e.g. trawlers, purse seines, dredges etc.) in coastal areas (distance to coast, depths etc), limitations on the minimum size of fish and other marine organisms which can be caught and prohibition to use professional fishing nets for recreational fishing.

Comment GFCM: Most of these measures are also established by GFCM, and applicable to all
Mediterranean and Black sea countries.

Page 21 Text Deliverable: In general, apart from the restrictions included in Reg EC 1967/2006 – the most important measures also indicated below – the major national restrictions are the following:

a) **Minimum mesh size**: is set according to EC 1967/2006 (Article 9).

b) **Minimum landing size**: is set according to Annex III of the EC 1967/2006.

c) **Closed season**: following the Greece legislation, trawling is prohibited from June 1st till September 30th. Correspondingly, purse-seining during night is banned from December 15th till February 28th. Additionally, operation of purse-seines is banned two days before and after fullmoon.

d) **Closed areas**: there is a large number of areas (mainly gulfs) where fishing is prohibited based on national legislation.

Comment GFCM: GFCM has established 4 Fisheries Restricted Areas in the Gulf of Lions, off Santa Maria di Leuca, Italy (deep sea corals), in the Nile delta area, Egypt (cold hydrocarbon seeps) and off the Eratosthenes Seamount, Cyprus and towed dredges and trawl nets fisheries are prohibited at depths beyond 1000 metres in the whole Mediterranean.

Page 21: Text Deliverable on Selectivity of trawl nets: The minimum mesh size of the *cod-end of towed nets will be* a 40 mm diamond mesh up to the 30 May 2010; from the 1 June 2010 it is envisaged that nets will be replaced by ones with a 40 mm square mesh in the cod end or, on receipt of a duly substantiated request by a boat owner, by a net with a 50 mm diamond mesh as specified in Article 9, paragraph 3 and Article 14 of Reg. (EC) 1967/2006 governing measures for sustainable exploitation of the fishery resources of the Mediterranean.

Comment GFCM: And also to Rec 33/2009/2 on the minimum mesh size in the codend of demersal trawl nets.

Page 21 Text Deliverable on Areas where the use of towed nets is prohibited: The use of towed gear will be prohibited within a distance of 3 nautical miles from the coast or within the 50 m depth contour where this depth is reached at a shorter distance from the coast.

- A derogations in accordance with Article 13 paragraph 5 of Reg. (EC) 1967/06 has been agreed for the fishing area of Calabria and Sicily.

- The use of towed nets on Posidonian meadows and meadows of other marine spermatophytes will be prohibited.

- The use of towed nets will be prohibited for fishing at depths in excess of 1000 metres.

Comment GFCM: Rec GFCM 29/2005/1.

Page 24 Text Deliverable: The EU Mediterranean countries, including Italy and Greece, are subject to the EU system for fisheries control, compliance and monitoring. There are various tools that the EU employs to this end. The vessel monitoring system (VMS) is a satellite-based monitoring system.
which at regular intervals provides data to the fisheries authorities on the location, course and speed of vessels. According to the Commission Regulation (EC) No 2244/2003, fishing vessels larger than 15 meters in total length, are obligated to be equipped with Vessel Monitoring System (VMS), which at regular intervals (at the moment every 2 hours) provides data to the fisheries authorities on the location, course and speed of vessels.

Comment GFMC: VMS; Rec GFMC 33/2009/7

Page 26 Text Deliverable: The most recent information with regard to trends in selected indicators is coming from the Ad-hoc expert WG of STECF/SGMED 12-21. Given that the assessments carried out were based on data up to 2008 only, STECF considered that the results should only be taken to be an indication of the trends in exploitation status and stock biomass over the historic time series and may not be representative of the current status.

Comment GFMC: GFMC assesses the status of demersal and small pelagic stocks since 1985 and their reports are available on the web site. There is work in progress in the definition of reference points. None of this works is mentioned here.

Page 27 Text Deliverable: The fisheries management in the Mediterranean has progressed substantially but there is still space for improvement in various areas. Both EU and non-EU countries share the Mediterranean waters and this makes the coordination and management of the fisheries resources challenging. The management of Mediterranean fisheries suffers from data limitations, limited coordination and the lack of common management strategies and measures between EU member states and non-EU countries. The new Mediterranean Regulation currently enforced has yet to deliver the requested balance between the long-term socio-economic profitability of the fishing industry and the sustainability of the resources. An increase in stakeholders involvement, an improve in scientific coordination alongside better science and a simplification in administrative and governance procedures is urgently needed in the area.

Comment GFMC: Great progress is being achieved during the last two years with the reform process of the Agreement and the adoption of sub-regional approach to address the implementation of multiannual Management Plans.
WWF Europe

The coordinator was informed by WWF that the deliverables were distributed inside the organization. Unfortunately, there was only little response on the request to comment from people familiar with the issues. The coordinator had then two telephone conversations with a German representative on the work done and the process inside of WWF to obtain comments. The coordinator especially asked what the German representative was thinking on the objective deliverable 2.1. The reaction was that in general they are pleased with the discussion on the objectives but that from the perspective of an environmental NGO the objectives in the ecological sphere could be a bit stronger (because that is their field of expertise). However, they acknowledge that this is clearly a broader discussion and not a purely concentrated on ecological issues.

The following comments (translated from German) were given on two other deliverables: North Sea and Mediterranean management measures.

North Sea Report (Deliverable 6.8):

- interesting and good description of the status quo
- could be a bit more critical

Mediterranean report (Deliverable 6.10):

- the focus is too limited on Italy and Greece
- too fragmented

Especially interesting and from the side of the NGO important for future reports:

- concrete management proposals: what shall be done and what shall be changed
- Mediterranean: there should be more countries around the Mediterranean Sea included in the report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Responding to the comments of WWF explaining the work programme of SOCIOEC and the future work</th>
<th>Responsible: TI</th>
<th>Timeline: 15.09.2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The coordinator was informed by WWF that the deliverables were distributed inside the organization. Unfortunately, there was only little response on the request to comment from people familiar with the issues. The coordinator had then two telephone conversations with a German representative on the work done and the process inside of WWF to obtain comments. The coordinator especially asked what the German representative was thinking on the objective deliverable 2.1. The reaction was that in general they are pleased with the discussion on the objectives but that from the perspective of an environmental NGO the objectives in the ecological sphere could be a bit stronger (because that is their field of expertise). However, they acknowledge that this is clearly a broader discussion and not a purely concentrated on ecological issues.

The following comments (translated from German) were given on two other deliverables: North Sea and Mediterranean management measures.

North Sea Report (Deliverable 6.8):

- interesting and good description of the status quo
- could be a bit more critical

Mediterranean report (Deliverable 6.10):

- the focus is too limited on Italy and Greece
- too fragmented

Especially interesting and from the side of the NGO important for future reports:

- concrete management proposals: what shall be done and what shall be changed
- Mediterranean: there should be more countries around the Mediterranean Sea included in the report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Responding to the comments of WWF explaining the work programme of SOCIOEC and the future work</th>
<th>Responsible: TI</th>
<th>Timeline: 15.09.2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
UK National Federation of Fishermen’s Organizations (Barrie Deas)

Comments on Deliverable 6.8:

“This is an interesting and relevant piece of work based on a sophisticated understanding of fisheries management systems operational in the North Sea.

I have two criticisms of substance:

My main criticism is that the report fails to adequately reflect the significance of publically funded decommissioning schemes (in Denmark, Netherlands, Scotland, England, France and Belgium) in the regeneration of demersal fish stocks in the North Sea. (It is also worth considering that everywhere where ITQs have been successfully established, including New Zealand, this has been preceded or accompanied by substantial public expenditure to achieve capacity reductions). It fact reductions in fleet capacity is probably the single most important factor and although ICES has difficulty in weighting all the different reasons for the observed reductions in F, reducing fleets by up to 50% must, in my view be afforded a central role.

A second criticism is that the report fails to take into account STECF’s conclusion that there is a weak link between a reduction in fishing effort and a reduction in fishing mortality and that effort constraints can and do generate perverse fleet behaviours. It is arguable that effort controls has had very little, and perhaps no direct positive effect, in reducing F.”

Specific Comments

4.3.3 It might be preferable to talk about RAC advice rather than resolutions

It may be useful to discuss the Commission’s limited capacity to deal with the large amount of advice produced by (7) RACs given its place at the apex of the command and control system. This may change under a regionalised CFP where the main interlocutor for the RAC will be cooperating member states at regional seas level. At present the arrangements give rise to parallel monologues rather than a dialogue.

4.3.5 A further aspect of the discussion on implementation drift is that under the current arrangements the Commission pays very little attention to the practicalities and costs of implementation because it has no responsibility in this area. The result is legislation that is difficult for member states to implement.

NGOs do play a valuable role as watchdogs but tend to be constrained by lack of knowledge when the issues are technical. In these circumstances their role tends to be limited to injunctions of the faster, further variety.

Footnote 9 probably understates the significance of regulatory discards. One of the main obstacles to
discard reduction has been the shape and content of CFP legislation itself.

| Action: Sending the comments to the WP leader for WP 4 (IFM) to be included in the further work on regionalization. | Responsible: TI | Timeline: 15.09.2013 |

4.3.5.2

There is, I think, a need to recognise that the Commission and member states (Council), when setting TACs do sometimes depart from ICES advice (which is mainly provided on a single stock basis) to take into account mixed fisheries and discard reduction dimensions. This is necessary as an antidote to the view that the gap between science and TAC decisions is ministerial irresponsibility and the industry lobby. And there can be a range of options consistent with scientific advice anyway.

| Action: Sending the comment to the CS leader (DTU-Aqua) and discuss inclusion in the work on the discard ban. | Responsible: TI | Timeline: 15.09.2013 |

7.1

The report could usefully point out that inflexibilities in the management plan led to a large increase in regulatory discards of mature cod – a new development in this fishery and one that has impeded recovery.

| Action: see comment on 4.3.5.2 | Responsible: TI | Timeline: 15.09.2013 |

Effort

The nominal reductions in effort are closely related to fleet capacity reductions.

Finally, the report, perhaps because of its terms of reference is somewhat retrospective in focus. It would be of greater utility if its conclusions were written in relation to what we know about of the shape of the reformed CFP.

| Action: Explaining to the commentator what were the background of the report (past/present management measures) | Responsible: TI | Timeline: 15.09.2013 |

Comments on Deliverable 6.9:
1. Again the role of publically funded decommissioning in securing reductions in fishing mortality, improvements in profitability and compliance seems to be under-stated.

2. The description of the evolution of the FQA system and quota trading in the UK seems broadly accurate, although I might have emphasised different aspects.

3. I am surprised however that the report does not mention the Dutch Quota Company, a community quota initiative associated with the Cornish Fish Producers Organisation.

| **Action:** Sending the comments to the CS leaders (AZTI & UBO) and discuss what adjustments of the work programme may follow. | **Responsible:** Ti | **Timeline:** 15.09.2013 |
European Commission DG Mare (Christian Tritten)

Shortly after the start of the SOCIOEC project the coordinator sent a letter to DG Mare and asked for a representative within the advisory board as DG Mare is the responsible institution for the implementation of the CFP. It was not clear until spring 2013 which concrete person is now delegated to the RAB. During the EAFE conference in Edinburgh Christian Tritten told the coordinator that he will take part in the RAB. He was then contacted for comments and answered that he will do it in due time. Unfortunately, until the end of August no comments were received but the coordinator will further get into contact and will follow up on every suggestion Christian Tritten will give.

Christian Tritten took part in the special session at the EAFE conference and gave already valuable comments on Deliverable 2.1. However, as no minutes were taken it is now not possible to repeat the comments here. It is, however, planned to publish deliverable 2.1 as a paper in a special issue of the conference.

CSIRO (Sean Pascoe)

During the phase of the writing of the proposal Sean Pascoe (CSIRO) already agreed to take part in the RAB. He attended the IIFET conference and gave a paper in the SOCIOEC special session on objectives for social sustainability from an Australian experience. The coordinator contacted Sean Pascoe several times but received no response. This is a bit surprising as Sean Pascoe seemed to be very interested in the project and the upcoming results. The coordinator will go on trying to get into contact with Sean Pascoe and will follow up on every suggestion he may give.