

Report of the MAREFRAME STAKEHOLDER MEETING for the North Sea Case Study

The North Sea Case study MAREFRAME STAKEHOLDER MEETING was held on 14th May 2014 at DEFRA, Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P. The agenda is shown at appendix 1 and the stakeholders who attended the meeting together with other stakeholder unable to attend are listed at appendix 2.

1 Welcome and Introduction to Mare Frame

The Convener, John Pope, welcomed the participants and opened the meeting by thanking DEFRA for kindly providing the meeting place and facilities. He also thanked Verena who had agreed to act as rapporteur and Lorna who had agreed to steer the whiteboard. He pointed out that the major agenda task was to agree on a suitable case study for the North Sea. To explain the background to MAREFRAME, the Convener presented the slides CETMAR had provided stressing the central role of Stakeholders in the co-creation process.

2 The Case Study in a nutshell

John showed slides he had prepared showing first the main criteria he thought important for choosing a case study. These were that it should focus on an EAFM problem with which the stakeholders would need help with formulating an agreed and acceptable proposal in the next 4-10 years. Regulations that need to be complied with will have to be considered. It would need to be technically feasible, and everybody would need to help develop decision support frameworks for the case study.

He then showed a brief summary of the parts of the MAREFRAME description of work that related to the North Sea Case Study. He also showed some ideas he had for presenting complex models in a form that stakeholders could use themselves and which could inform them of EAFM issues at a fleet level.

3 Co-creation

In order to keep as much time as possible for choosing the case study John did not show the CETMAR slides on Co-creation but mentioned that these were available, explained Co-creation was a tool developed by businesses to get customers to define what they really wanted. It might be described as the opposite of Henry Fords dictum that “you can have any colour as long as its black!”. Stakeholders were central to the process and the important thing was to keep them involved and informed throughout the development of the project. John who leads the North Sea case study promised to keep the stakeholders informed by several approaches but particularly by attending NSAC and Pelagic AC meetings when they are held in places he could attend in a cost effective fashion.

4 Choosing the best: defining a needed and feasible North Sea Case study

4.1 Choice of Case Study

It was explained that the North Sea Case Study needed to be useful and worthwhile, preferably looking at the entire North Sea, one species or a fishery covering more than one species. Since the Commission and other bodies are moving more and more towards an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management choosing a multispecies fishery would be a good idea. The timeframe was about 4 years and therefore a topic should be chosen that will be highly relevant in 4 years from now.

John explained that he envisaged developing a model which could be used by stakeholders and policy makers directly rather than that these groups have to rely on scientists running the model for them. The model should allow exploring possible trade-offs and outcomes both in the short and in the long term and thereby help making informed decisions regarding fisheries management. It will attempt to include stakeholder knowledge which is not yet in the database. Besides biological information other kind of information, such as economic information might be included as well. However, there was some reservation on this from some stakeholders who feared that the more factors are being built in the less credible the outcomes will be.

During the discussion several factors were mentioned that should be taken into account, e.g. the landing obligation and MSY. Some stakeholders pointed out that the landing obligation could have an enormous effect on the parameters chosen in the model. John thought that a considerable amount of information was available on discard levels in the North Sea. However, if stakeholders doubted those numbers efforts must be undertaken to construct more realistic data. It was also mentioned that the discard ban will cause a change in fishing operation and legislation which will have to be taken into account. An important point to emerge in discussion was that catch data were now reported honestly. It was thought very important to maintain this ethos under the new regime. Consequently it would be useful if the case study could detail where the landings obligation and/or MSY etc. lead to problems with the existing legislation that might discourage this ethos.

In terms of MSY it was clear that it should be considered as a range since it is impossible to achieve MSY for each species at the same time. The model should provide information on these kind of trade-offs. The need to comply with the MSFD and the BD was emphasized and that often effects which matter are in relation to threatened species, such as sharks and rays, food webs and bottom disturbance. John said that he will try to include all trade-offs considered relevant by the stakeholders. One way of dealing with trade-offs would be to avoid the worst rather than meeting the optimum. At the same time the need for a more ecosystem-based model was stressed by some participants since focussing on commercial species will not help with descriptors on biodiversity. It was suggested that there could be a difference between models that informed AC advice and those that will influence policy decision.

A list of possible case studies was compiled:

- Mixed fisheries in multi-species model
- Pelagic, industrial and demersal fisheries all together (North Sea commercial system)
- Interaction sprat, herring and sandeel (climate change effects on plankton assemblages that effect sandeel)
- Recruitment issues of North Sea herring
- Mixed fisheries sole and plaice fishery (including dab etc.)
- Effect of new energies on fishing patterns

After discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each potential case study it was decided to focus on the North Sea multispecies commercial system in which the pelagics as a subset might then be treated in more detail than the main model.

4.2 Detailed Discussion of DSF Factors for chosen Case Studie(s).

John introduced the list CETMAR had provided to help with the identification of the case study problem. This was designed to encourage the discussion of issues and get information relevant to WP6 at the meeting. Main points discussed have been

Case study	North Sea case study	
Case study problem	Pelagic, industrial and demersal fisheries all together (North Sea commercial system) - which fisheries will be favoured: demersal or pelagics? Political choice which cannot be made by science. However, science can increase the quality of the information that leads to the choice. Outcome should be presented on fleet rather than national level. Species: cod, haddock, whiting, plaice, hake, saithe, herring, mackerel, nephrops (species covered could have area implications).	
Features of the chosen case study problem		
Governance setting	Nations involved	EU, Norway (Norwegian support needed)
	Regional bodies for cooperation on resource management or environmental issues	NSAC and Pelagic AC. ICES. Depending on the species included NEAFC could become relevant (mackerel)
	Relevant international conventions in place	OSPAR
	Who has the power to make decisions related to the management problem?	Member States, COD

	What is the decision-making process?	Commission drafts proposal, Council and Parliament approve or reject proposal (COD); Commission delegated act
Policies and objectives	Main Policies relevant for EAF problem/issue	CFP/MSFD/BD, in the future possibly the Marine Spatial Planning Directive
	Key reference points linked to relevant main policies	MSY/ Bpa
	Other ecological, environmental, social, economic policies with possible relevance for the issue addressed	Economics in multispecies context have to be taken on-board at least in a simple way.
Major ecological and fisheries resource considerations	Bycatch and landing obligation are central considerations. Environmental change should be regarded as a risk rather than something that we can handle.	
Specific stakeholder concerns, risks or priorities voiced by stakeholders	Eco-labelling is becoming more significant and MPAs might be established under regional aspects.	

5 Summary, AOB and Closure.

John summarised that the North Sea multispecies commercial system would be the main case study with Pelagics treated in greater detail if this was possible. He assured the stakeholders that he would maintain close links with them and others who had not been able to be present. He thanked the stakeholders again particularly Lorna and Verena who had both helped with setting up the meeting and with its conduct. He thanked DEFRA again and particularly Iain Glasgow who had made the arrangements. There was no AOB and the meeting closed shortly after 1400h.

Appendix 1

AGENDA

MAREFRAME STAKEHOLDER MEETING 14th May 2014

Room 821. DEFRA. Nobel House, 17 Smith Square, London SW1P

09.30	Pre- Meeting Coffee.	
10.00	1). Introductions, Agenda, Introducing Mareframe.	[15 minutes]
10.15	2). The case study in a nutshell.	[5 minutes]
10.20	3). Co-creation: why and of what?	[15 minutes]:
10.35	4). Choosing the best: defining a needed and feasible case study. [2 h 40 m]	
	4.1) Choice of Case Study [All]	[60 m]
	• Presentation of Factors to Consider.	[JGP]
	• List of potential Case Studies to score against factors?	[All]
	• Choice of Best Case Study(s).	[All]
11.35	4.2) Detailed Discussion of DSF Factors for chosen Case Studies. [All]	[40m]
	• EAFM impact	
	• Focus {management issues, policy and regulatory constraints}	
	• Governance Landscape	
	• Risks	
12.15	LUNCH	
12.45	4.2) Continue Detailed Discussion of DSF Factors for CS. [All]	[30m].
13.15	4.3) Specification of CS in detail {factors, species, fleets, factors etc}.	[30 m]
13.45	5). Summary and AOB.	[15 m]
14.00	Closure.	

Appendix 2

Stakeholders Attending Meeting

Name	Organisation	Main Concerns	email
DEAS, Barrie	NFFO	DEMERSAL	barrie@nffo.org.uk
DUGUID, Lorna	NSAC	DEMERSAL	lornad@nsrac.org
DUNN, Euan	RSPB	ENVIRONMENT	euan.dunn@rspb.org.uk
MYNES, Sander		DEMERSAL	sander.meyns@rederscentrale.be
O'BRIEN, Carl	CEFAS	ALL	carl.obrien@cefas.co.uk
OHMS, Verena	Pelagic RAC	PELAGIC	v.ohms@pelagic-rac.org
PARK, Mike	SWFPA	DEMERSAL	mike@swfpa.com
POPE, John	NRC(Europe)Ltd	MAREFRAME	PopeJG@aol.com
RANDALL, Andrew	DEFRA	ALL	andrew.randall@defra.gsi.gov.uk
SPARREVOHN, Claus	DPPO	PELAGIC	crs@pelagisk.dk
VAN BALSFORT, Gerard	PFA	PELAGIC	gbalsfoort@pelagicfish.eu

Stakeholders who could not attend and further potential stakeholders

Name	Organisation	Main Concerns	email
ANDERSEN, Michael	DKFISH	DEMERSAL	ma@dkfisk.dk
BIRGER JORGENSEN, Jan	Norwegian Fishermens Association	DEMERSAL	
BRECKLING, Peter	DEUTSCHER-FISCHEREI-VERBAND	DEMERSAL	info@deutscher-fischerei-verband.de
BROUCKAERT, Emiel		DEMERSAL	emiel.brouckaert@rederscentrale.be
GAMBLIN, Caroline	COMITE-PECHES	DEMERSAL	cgamblin@comite-peches.fr
HOPKINS, Peter	EU	ALL	
SVERDRUP-JENSEN, Esben	DPPO	PELAGIC	
VISSER, Pim		DEMERSAL	