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NEAFC 29th Annual Meeting Agenda item 15
Continuously Reviewing Ocean Governance and the EAP

- To assist the continuous review of a wider perspective of ocean governance especially the Ecosystem Approach, EAP, the Secretariat under this agenda item has tabled a number of notes on the NEAFC website under agenda item 15. They contain mainly reports from meetings in different forums.
International Meetings

- UNGA Biodiversity Group February, UN HQ
- ICPS-8 State parties to the UNFSA March, UN HQ
- Resumed Review Conference April, UN HQ
- Nordic Meeting Science and Management June Faroe Islands
- ICP 11 June, UN HQ
- Arctic Council PAME AOR September, Washington
- Global Record of Fishing
International Meetings

- Nordic Meeting Pelagic Complex September, Faroe Island
- OSPAR Ministerial Meeting September, Bergen
- IMO MECP61 September, IMO HQ
- ICES client commissions October, NEAFC hQ
- CBD COP 10 October, Nagoya
Further scientific contributions
Failing the high seas: A global evaluation of regional fisheries management organizations

Sarika Cullis-Suzuki *, Daniel Pauly

*Fisheries Centre, Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratory (AERL), University of British Columbia, 2202 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4
I must point out that you in your analysis have included two stocks for which NEAFC has no mandate. One is Herring (Norwegian/Swedish Spring Spawning). I am not aware of any such herring stock being under assessment and I am certain that is not under the mandate of NEAFC. NEAFC deals with one small haddock stock, Rockall Haddock, but most certainly not Haddock in the North East Arctic, which is regulated by the Mixed Norwegian-Russian Commission and is not fished in international waters. So two of the stocks you use in your Q score are irrelevant for NEAFC.
An assessment of the changes in the distribution and abundance of marine species in relation to changes in hydrodynamics and sea temperature. ICES 2008

- In addition to natural spatial and temporal variability in the direct and indirect effects of climate change, a number of other factors affect the abundance and distribution of individual species, population, and communities in the OSPAR marine area:

  - Fishing: This is the major non-climate anthropogenic factor. Removal of biota and habitat disturbance are two of the most prominent pressures, for fish and benthos, respectively, which have also shown increasing trends over the past few decades. Population sizes and geographic distributions of many marine species reflect responses to those pressures.

  - Oceanographic factors: These may be direct (increased or decreased mortality due to temperature, transport to new areas or arrival at different times, etc.) or indirect, mediated, for example, by a climate related change in the food available to predators.
An assessment of the changes in the distribution and abundance of marine species in relation to changes in hydrodynamics and sea temperature. ICES 2008

- The difficulty in identifying the cause of any of these effects may be confounded by:

- Buffering: many fish, marine mammals, seabirds, and some benthos are long-lived and therefore the effects of oceanographic conditions may be buffered at the population scale and integrated over time even at the scale of the individual.

- Complex life histories: most marine invertebrates and fish have complex life histories, with eggs, larvae, juveniles, and adults often in different places both geographically and in the water column. The effects of oceanographic conditions on the different life history stages of even a single species could be different by an order of magnitude, and possibly even in sign.
43bis. Risk assessments referred to in paragraph 43 (vi) above should take into account, as appropriate, differing conditions prevailing in areas where DSF are well established and in areas where DSF have not taken place or only occur occasionally.
The NEAFC measures
## Existing Fishing Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA of NEAFC Regulatory Area</th>
<th>Effective Fishing Area</th>
<th>Existing Area</th>
<th>New Fishing Area</th>
<th>Closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sq km</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>sq km</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Iceland</td>
<td>4.900.000</td>
<td>42.500</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>4.502.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Sea</td>
<td>326.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barents Sea</td>
<td>71.000</td>
<td>71.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic Ocean</td>
<td>275.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Area South of Iceland the closures are **54.2%** of the fishable area shallower than 2000 m
Challenges

The real challenge in world fisheries must lie in supporting governance and sustainable utilisation in inland, coastal areas, small scale and shelf fisheries, because of their huge importance in poverty alleviation, food security and employment and in addressing the perverse economic incentives in fisheries, which lead to a reduction wealth generation. (The sunken billions – World Bank).
Challenges

The RFMOs do not need global mandates. Their conventions already give them regional mandates and tools to perform their job according to international law. They do not need a UNGA resolution to prescribe to them, what they already are obliged to do and can be held to account for by their Conventions. Regional Fisheries Bodies, RFBs, which support states and regional cooperation, are also able to define their own priorities.
Fishing needs a community of practice – or face being marginalised

Speaking at the conference, Serge Michel Garcia, a former director of the FAO’s Fisheries Management Division, said that the fishing industry as a whole desperately needs to better respond to the growing pressures from biodiversity and ecosystem protection lobbies. He stressed that the fishery ecologists and scientists as well as other stakeholders, including the fishing industry, need to work more efficiently together as a ‘community of practice’ in order to play an effective role in the coming years in the implementation of an ecosystem approach to fisheries.

“With a series of conventions already at hand, including UNCED, and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) that to a great extent mimics the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),”

“Provision of seafood is one of those services’ and, based on existing experience, one should expect that among the various threats to biodiversity that IPBES will address, fishing will be prominent. It is to be assumed that in IPBES environmental NGOs will play a big role as they already do in the IPCC, although this is perhaps not generally known. With this new international focus on biodiversity, annual reports and analysis that concern fisheries impacts on biodiversity will be going all the way up to the United Nations General Assembly even more than they do today – and the risk is that they do so with insufficient input from the fisheries community.”

He said that in these conditions, fisheries which see themselves

SPEAKER: Serge Garcia said that environmental foundations can mobilise millions of dollars to support important scientific projects when the world fishing industry is not able to run a few thousand
Fisheries and advocacy

“The environmental NGOs are growing in number and level of influence and becoming more effective in using information. They are also very good at using the media to reach the public - which the fishing industry absolutely is not.”

His plea to the scientific community and to the fishing sector is to establish a real community of practice that could effectively play its role in a scientific and advocacy environment that is becoming more complex by the day.
The end