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Advisory Councils

who
The Advisory Councils (ACs) are **stakeholder-led organisations** that provide the Commission and EU countries (MS) with recommendations on fisheries management matters.

This may include advice on conservation and socio-economic aspects of management, and on simplification of rules.
As providers of experience-based knowledge and stakeholder opinions (in the form of advice)

As collectors, managers and providers of fisheries data needed for scientific advice

As aggregators of data from commercial fisheries and from surveys

As assemblers, sorters, analysers of the data provided by the Member States

As receivers (working groups) of processed data from member states

As providers of joint recommendations (through the Regional Groups)

As providers of legislative proposals to Council and EP

As providers of scientific opinions and recommendations used to inform the CFP decision-making process

As receiver of regional stock assessments (and corresponding advice)

As providers of regional stock assessment (and corresponding advice) for CFP stocks

- North-East Atlantic
- Baltic
- Mediterranean
- Mediterranean (demersal and small stocks)
- North-East Atlantic
- Mediterranean
- Mediterranean (all stocks except tuna and tuna-like)

Council of the European Union

European Parliament

European Commission

Joint Research Center

ICES

STECF

Fig. 2 Building blocks of the EU advisory landscape

Ramírez-Monsalve et al forthcoming
Carrots or sticks: How to improve EAFM advice within CFP – A policy brief

* All stocks but tuna and tuna-like
b Only tuna and tuna-like
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Why Not Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management?

What’s in an Acronym?

**EAFM**
- **Evolutionary** approach that systematically incorporates ecosystem considerations into the current management paradigm

**EBFM**
- **Revolutionary** top down approach seeking to achieve certain ecosystem level outcomes or states
An ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management needs to be implemented, environmental impacts of fishing activities should be limited and unwanted catches should be avoided and reduced as far as possible.

By applying an ecosystem-based approach to the management of human activities while enabling a sustainable use of marine goods and services, priority should be given to achieving or maintaining good environmental status in the Community’s marine environment, to continuing its protection and preservation, and to preventing subsequent deterioration.

Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) (Regulation 1380/2013)


Ecosystem-Based Approach to Fisheries Management
• Set of rules for managing a common resources (fish as jurisdiction of the EC) (and managing European fishing fleet; conserving (commercial) fish stocks, minimize impacts of fishing activities on marine ecosystems)

• First introduced in the 70s, went through successive updates (latest in force since Jan 2014)

• Framework for protecting the European marine environment (sustainable use of marine goods + environmental protection)

• Achieve Good Environmental Status (GES) of EU waters by 2020; GES is reached when 11 descriptors do not significantly deviate from the undisturbed state (descriptors describe natural environment and pressures related to it)

Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) (Regulation 1380/2013)

**Good Ecological Status**

“Environmental status of marine waters where these provides ecologically diverse and dynamic oceans and seas which are clean, healthy and productive (MSFD, 2008/56/EC art 3)”

GES is reached when 11 descriptors do not significantly deviate from the undisturbed state.

---

D1. **Biodiversity** is maintained

D2. Non-indigenous species do not adversely alter the ecosystem

D3. The population of commercial fish species is healthy

D4. Elements of food webs ensure long-term abundance and reproduction

D5. Eutrophication is minimised

D6. The sea floor integrity ensures functioning of the ecosystem

D7. Permanent alteration of hydrographical conditions does not adversely affect the ecosystem

D8. Concentrations of contaminants give no effects

D9. Contaminants in seafood are below safe levels

D10. Marine litter does not cause harm

D11. Introduction of energy (including underwater noise) does not adversely affect the ecosystem

---

This is how the marine environment will look like when GES* has been achieved.
Advisory Councils on their route towards EAFM in the EU
Ecosystem Approach

An integrated approach to managing fisheries within ecologically meaningful boundaries

Manage the use of natural resources, taking account of fishing and other human activities

Preserving both the biological wealth and the biological processes necessary to safeguard the composition, structure and functioning of the habitats of the ecosystem affected

Taking into account the knowledge and uncertainties regarding biotic, abiotic and human components of ecosystems

Consideration of collective pressures

Optimization of benefits among diverse societal goals

Achievement of good environmental status (Marine Strategy Framework Directive)

Regionalization

Stewardship for future generations

Trade-offs

Common Fisheries Policy (Reg. 1380/2013 art 4(9))

ICES AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT
Ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management means:

An integrated approach to managing fisheries within ecologically meaningful boundaries which seeks to manage the use of natural resources, taking account of fishing and other human activities while preserving both the biological wealth and the biological processes necessary to safeguard the composition, structure and functioning of the habitats of the ecosystem affected, by taking into account the knowledge and uncertainties regarding biotic, abiotic and human components of ecosystems.

Common Fisheries Policy Reg. 1380/2013 art 4(9))

What is EAFM?

MAFMC Definition:

- An Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management recognizes the biological, economic, social, and physical interactions among the components of ecosystems and attempts to achieve optimum yield taking those interactions into account.
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http://mareframe-fp7.org
Instruments within the CFP interpreted as “operationalizing EAFM”:

- Multi Annual Multi Species Management Plans*
- Landing Obligation
- Technical Measures

Four of the 11 descriptors are important in relation to EAFM:
D1 (Biodiversity); D3 (Commercial species); D4 (Food webs) and D6 (Sea-floor processes)

- First plan adopted (2016): Baltic sea (cod, herring, sprat); “role model”
- Commission proposals for: demersal fish stocks in the North Sea (2016); small pelagic stocks in the Adriatic (2017); demersal stocks in the Western Mediterranean (2018); fish stocks in western waters (2018)
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### Advisory Council’s role/capacity in providing advice in terms of an EAFM

**2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type of advice could we provide? What is EAFM?</th>
<th>😒 Overwhelming topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We don’t have resources; how could we do this; who is going to do it??</td>
<td>☹ Additional to the day-to-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other priorities; it will not come to the top of the list</td>
<td>😊 Improved and sustained communication with scientific community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No awareness among the members; scepticism</td>
<td>😊 Potential for regionalization in cooperation with MSRGs*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Member States Regional Groups*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Still the case...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What type of advice could we provide? What is EAFM?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is this? is it to close fishing grounds?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We don’t have resources; how could we do this; who is going to do it??</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lack of resources (time wise: no time to reflect)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are other priorities; it will not come to the top of the list</strong></td>
<td><strong>Landing obligation; technical regulations; MAMSP; BREXIT...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No awareness among the members; scepticism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yet another thing to find consensus about...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What type of advice could we provide? What is EAFM?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What is this? is it to close fishing grounds?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We don’t have resources; how could we do this; who is going to do it??</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lack of resources (time wise: no time to reflect)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are other priorities; it will not come to the top of the list</strong></td>
<td><strong>Landing obligation; technical regulations; MAMSP; BREXIT...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No awareness among the members; scepticism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yet another thing to find consensus about...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Members are (not consciously) thinking about it; “Penny has dropped”; understand the need of having a holistic approach</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still the case... but slowly getting into EA
Sub-groups within the ACs looking into EA-related topics (as published in their web pages – May 2018)
About the Pelagic AC

The Pelagic AC prepares and publishes the Common Operating Procedures (COPs) for the North Sea tuna fisheries. It covers the pelagic stocks of tuna under Dutch law.

The work is furthermore done in regions covered by the Pelagic AC.

General Assembly (GA)
The members of the GA are responsible for catching sub-sector (ship owners).

Other stakeholders are represented in the Executive Committee (ExCom).

Executive Committee (ExCom)
The ExCom is tasked with forming the first pelagic AC. 60% of the members were from the Netherlands.

Working Groups (WGs)

Most practical work is done by the working groups.

Working Group I is dealing with:
- Atlantic-Scandian Tuna
- North Sea Autumn Sardine
- Western Baltic Spring Sardine
- North Sea Horse Mackerel
- Blue Whiting

Working Group II is dealing with:
- Working group for ecosystem based management

BSAC Members

General Assembly 2018-2019
Executive Committee 2018-2021

BSAC Working groups

Demersal fisheries
Pelagic fisheries
Fisheries for salmon and sea trout

Working group for ecosystem based management

BSAC Resources

BSAC Statements and recommendations
Documents section

The Baltic Sea Area

Welcome to the homepage of the Baltic Sea Area

The BSAC was created in 2006 by the European Commission and Member States

Chairmen Of The Working Groups

Demersal
Barrie Deas

Skagerrak & Kattegat
Kenn Skau Fischer

Ecosystem
Euan Dunn
## Advisory Council’s role/capacity in providing advice in terms of an EAFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What type of advice could we provide? What is EAFM?** | **What is this? is it to close fishing grounds?** | **Realising: we have been working on it:**  
(i) Following CFP/MSFD “recipes”;  
(ii) Additional initiatives |
| **We don’t have resources; how could we do this; who is going to do it??** | **Lack of resources (time wise: no time to reflect)** | **Sub-groups within the ACs looking into EA-related topics; Seminars with external participants; Learning from other cases; [“Master plan” or ad-hoc?]** |
| **There are other priorities; it will not come to the top of the list** | **Landing obligation; technical regulations; MAMSP; BREXIT...** | **There will always be other priorities...** |
| **No awareness among the members; scepticism** | **Yet another thing to find consensus about...** | **Members are (not consciously) thinking about it; “Penny has dropped”; understand the need of having a holistic approach** |
Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) (Regulation 1380/2013)


Instruments within the CFP interpreted as “operationalizing EAFM”:
- Multi Annual Multi Species Management Plans
- Landing Obligation
- Technical Measures

Four of the 11 descriptors are important in relation to EAFM:
- D1 (Biodiversity)
- D3 (Commercial species)
- D4 (Food webs)
- D6 (Sea-floor processes)
(ii) Additional initiatives

“Implement an EAFM to ensure negative impacts of fishing activities on the marine ecosystem are minimized” (CFP art 2(3))

“it [CFP] has as a main objective ensuring that fishing activities are *environmentally sustainable* in the long-term *by means* of the implementation of the *EAFM*”

Quetglas, A et al (2017)

- Participating in projects (f.e ghost net retrieval)
- Mapping spawning grounds together with gravel extraction industry
- Assessment of wind farm zones
- Studies on effects of climate change on migration routes
“Ecosystem based management”

**Aim**
Deal with *interactions* between fisheries management and environmental conservation objectives

**Goal**
Broaden the scope of discussion in the BSAC by bringing topics for EBM to the table

**Priority issues**
- Management of fisheries in MPA
- Implementation of MSFD in the Baltic
- Marine Spatial Planning
- Marine litter

- Advantages in *establishing* a Focus Group rather than integrating this work into the existing framework
- Space (“*enough time*”) for discussing issues – meetings as an additional ½ day to ExCom
- “*Keeping the workload to the minimum*”
Ecosystem based management Focus Group

- ToR: adopted by ExCom on January 2017
- 1st meeting: March 2017
  - Marine Protected Areas (MPA)
  - Impact of seals on small scale fisheries (damage caused by seals to gear/catch)
- BSAC should have a clear position in order to advise MS on how best to establish, manage, evaluate MPA in the Baltic
- Draft a text to develop BSAC views and advice to MS
- Proactive application (extend invitation to address individual proposals for MPAs)
- Forum
  For exchange of information on current impact and existing management practices within the MS
  For open discussion and study of alternatives to solve the problem
  - For invited guests to share their knowledge

“EBM is a process
A balancing act between human activities and environmental impacts requiring a step-by-step approach”
Ecosystem Focus Group
- Established in March 2015
- ToR drafted (fall 2016); updated (spring 2017)

Set to become more involved in EAFM

Working with issues identified by the members as important when moving towards ecosystem advice (e.g. moving from single to multi-species management)

- Interactions in the pelagic complex (food web interactions)
- Setting of reference point in multispecies management plans
- Effects of density dependency

Other identified priorities:
- Adaptation to climate change

Provide a general overview of what EAFM means; how it could be implemented in a step-wise approach; challenges to implement EAFM;

“EA is not a one-size-fits all
Break it down into smaller units than can be dealt with more easily”
Memorandum of understanding developed and submitted to all MS involved with the PelAC

PelAC represented in ICES workshops for Food Webs (D4) and Commercial Species (D3);

PelAC participating in DG ENV/MARE workshop on GES and interaction with fisheries

PelAC initiative to map herring spawning grounds in the NS (fisheries, gravel extraction, scientists)

PelAC exploring other opportunities to continue with the workshops with other sectors which might have an impact on fisheries (wind mills, bottom trawling)

PelAC supported following MSY in cases where no management plan was available

PelAC produced document on Guidelines for Implementing the Landing Obligation

PelAC involved in the revision of management plans in order to make them sustainable

Actions taken so far by the PelAC to operationalize the EAFM (September 2015)

PelAC participating in the development of 3 models, under the MareFrame Project, which aim to explore possible trade-offs and outcomes -both in the short and in the long term, and help the PelAC members make informed decisions regarding fisheries management

PelAC responding to COM’s proposals

PelAC exploring how to handle the information from 6 eco-regions, as it will be the format for the new type of Ecosystem advice requested by ICES
Ecosystem overviews

These overviews provide a description of the ecosystems, identify the main human pressures, and explain how these affect key ecosystem components.

Choose your ecoregion to see the overview:

- Barents Sea
- Bay of Biscay and the Iberian coast
- Celtic Seas
- Greater North Sea
- Icelandic Waters
- Norwegian Sea
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What type of advice could we provide? What is EAFM?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Still the case... but slowly getting into EA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We don’t have resources; how could we do this; who is going to do it??</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are other priorities; it will not come to the top of the list</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No awareness among the members; scepticism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⏪ CFP/MSFD “recipes”: Boxed(?) (i) type of advice, (ii) where advice is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☝ Additional initiatives: small concrete steps on topics where members know –and agree it matters; practical experimentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☸/☹ finding motivators for exploring “carrots” (and not concentrating only on “sticks”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“it [CFP] has as a main objective ensuring that fishing activities are **environmentally sustainable** in the long-term by means of the implementation of the EAFM”

Quetglas, A et al (2017)
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