

UPDATE ON MSEP

- **BLUE NEW DEAL Action Plan** – ‘Turning back to the sea’ <http://neweconomics.org/turning-back-to-the-sea/> and summary document: http://neweconomics.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/BND_BULLETIN_E.pdf
- **MSEP legacy: A marine economics handbook for NGOs**
- All the freely available creative commons resources from the last 3 years of the MSEP project are available for download here: http://b.3cdn.net/nefoundation/fd13ca36cea4cb53b7_xhm6b9tzq.pdf
- **The Infographic Impact Assessment for MCZs** <http://www.mseproject.net/infographic-ia>
The purpose of our this Infographic Impact Assessment (IIA) is to present trade-offs in a visual way and lay out a much more holistic range of criteria to be considered.
- **MCZ summary & Methodology**

RELEVANT INFO

- **We need to find common ground on sustainable fisheries – greener UK**
<https://greenallianceblog.org.uk/2017/02/15/we-need-to-find-common-ground-on-sustainable-fisheries/>
- **Coastal Futures** – Brexit & Environment / Brexit & fisheries briefings
 - [Brexit & Env Regulations Briefing CF2017](#)
 - [Brexit-Fisheries Briefing CF2017](#)
- **EU – Environmental Country Reports**
The European Commission published its first ever comprehensive report on how environmental policies are implemented across the Member States. In general the policies are working but there is wide variation in how they are applied. More information here:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eir/country-reports/index_en.htm
- **Seafish Common Language Group - presentations on IUU fishing**
 - Defra http://www.seafish.org/media/1681379/clg_mar2017_iuu_defra.pdf
 - IUU Watch http://www.seafish.org/media/1681382/clg_mar2017_ngocoalition_ejf.pdf
- **Global Fishing Watch reveals world's transshipping hotspots.** Fishing vessel location data collected by satellites and run through advanced algorithms have drawn back the curtain on transshipping, a common method of mixing illegally caught fish with legal fish to slip it into global markets. The report pinpointed probable locations and frequency of transshipping. Fishing vessels can lengthen their time at sea and save on fuel costs by meeting other vessels to transfer seafood, fuel and supplies. During such transshipments, illegally caught fish can be mixed with legal fish, and brought to market. The report shows Russian waters were a hotspot for transshipping, accounting for half of all transshipments recorded by Global Fishing Watch. Russia also had the highest number of suspected transshipping meetings per vessel. Overall, 40% of transshipping took place on the high seas, often just outside national waters. Vessels hailed from various countries, frequently flying flags of convenience. Two other hotspots were in the waters just outside the exclusive economic zones of Argentina and Peru, while a third hotspot was in the

national waters of Guinea-Bissau.

- **[EU backs investigation into climate change on fish and shellfish in Irish Sea.](#)**

Researchers investigating the risks posed by climate change on the sustainability of fish and shellfish in the Irish Sea are being given more than seven million euro in EU funding to carry out two projects. Around 5.5 million euro will support the Bluefish marine science partnership, led by Bangor University in partnership with Irish and Welsh organisations. It will investigate how climate change is affecting the health of fish stocks, the migratory movement of commercial fish, and risks from new non-native species. A further 1.8 million euro will go to the piSCES project, which aims to improve the quality and security of energy supply for fisheries businesses in remote locations while minimising their exposure to energy price peaks and reducing their carbon footprints.



- **Data analysis for social impact [\(12th April\)](#)**

Quantitative data is the raw ingredient in understanding how much impact you have created. This one-day workshop will help you to organise, analyse, interpret and visualise your primary data. We will use a live case study and create space for those who have their own sample datasets to discuss and explore data analysis options.

- **Measuring Social Impact [\(26th 27th April\)](#)**

How do you know you are making a difference? Proving social impact is not just critical to funders and investors, it is a guiding light for most socially driven professionals. But too often people are put off by complex tools or dry approaches.

- **The socio-economics of adaptation in EU fisheries: Lessons from the new Common Fisheries Policy and beyond**

The XXIII Conference of the European Association of Fisheries Economists (EAFFE) will be held at Dublin Castle from the 25th to 27th April 2017. Hosted by the Fisheries Economics Group of Bord Iascaigh Mhara, the Irish Sea Fisheries Board, the conference is intended to provide a forum for the dissemination of recent advances in capture fisheries and aquaculture economics and management to promote discussion amongst researchers, managers, policy makers and other stakeholders in the fisheries sector. The conference intends to assess the socio-economic impact of the initial introduction of management measures from the most recent Common Fishery Policy (CFP) in order to find examples of best-practice in adapting to the new institutional setting within EU fisheries. <http://www.bim.ie/eaffe/>

- Estuarine & Coastal Sciences Association and Poole Harbour Study Group Conference **Marine Protected Areas: Science, Policy & Management** 15th-17th May 2017, Poole <http://www.pooleharbourstudygroup.org.uk/>



- **Who gets to fish?** <http://neweconomics.org/2017/03/who-gets-to-fish/>

NEFs new report analyses the systems of fishing rights in 12 EU Member States (Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the UK) by providing the first comprehensive descriptive account of the systems, evaluating the success of the systems in use, and prescribing policy recommendations for each Member State.

To assess whether the systems of fishing rights are successful, NEF developed a framework of 12 objectives which ensure that the system of fishing rights is good for fishers (secure, flexible, accessible, viable, equitable and fair), good for society (publicly owned, meets government objectives, limited public expense, and captures resource rent), and has a good process (transparent and accountable, objective, and at the right governance level and representative). These 12 objectives are considered foundational to any fishery, while the objective for 'meets government objectives' allows for additional outcomes that are nationally specified (e.g. maintaining coastal employment, maximising output, minimising environmental damage).

Using a series of indicators to measure each objective, a ranking is assessed for each of the 12 objectives across the 12 Member States. Our results reveal varied, though frequently poor, performance across the Member States analysed.

Some [conclusions](#) stand out:

- Most fisheries operate at a significant public expense (particularly with costs of research and management as well as implicit fuel subsidies) little revenue generation from the fishing industry;
- New fishers face additional barriers to entry with few Member States implementing measures to accommodate them;
- There is frequently a lack of transparency and accountability surrounding the method of allocation and the final recipients of fishing quotas;
- The financial viability of fleets is often mixed, most frequently because the large-scale fleet is highly profitable while the small-scale fleet is unprofitable;
- The allocation of fishing opportunities often do not meet many government objectives, such as wider social and environmental outcomes;
- In a few Member States, there is a risk of lost public control over allocation where fishing opportunities have been gradually privatised.

The results reveal that the UK system has low performance on many of the objectives. In general, the UK quota system preserves a status quo in fisheries by guaranteeing quota rights to those with large, historical track records. This system benefits those who have acquired the track records, but it does not incentivise fishing that protects the ecosystem and fishing communities, nor does it help young fishers enter the industry, nor does it help small-scale fishers that were not required to record their catches, nor does it benefit the public purse.

There are several proposed reforms that could improve this situation:

- **Fishing quotas should be public.** As fish stocks are public resource, fishing quotas should have a period of validity and treated like a lease from the state.
- **Fishing quotas should be reallocated.** As the small-scale sector was disadvantaged in the initial allocations and continues to struggle financially, reallocation is needed for fairness and to protect small-scale fishing communities. Fishing quota should also be set aside for young fishers to enter the industry.
- **Fishing quotas should incentivise better fishing practices.** Using sustainability and socio-economic criteria in quota allocation, not dissimilar from emerging practice in farm subsidies, can encourage the development of an industry that delivers wider benefits while also ensuring security in planning and investment.
- **Fishing quotas should be controlled by fishers.** New industry institutions, particularly for the small-scale sector can manage some quota functions for its members and an online peer-to-peer quota swapping platform can help fishers manage the species they have and the species they need.
- **Fishing quotas should help pay for management.** The costs of managing fisheries is high, and the fishing industry should share in this cost through a tax on the value of landings.

Read the blog and full report here: <http://neweconomics.org/2017/03/who-gets-to-fish/>

- **The certification of small-scale fisheries**

Eco-labeling is a market-driven mechanism to promote sustainable fisheries. The most widely used certification scheme for seafood eco-labeling is issued by the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), but the MSC has been criticized for favoring large-scale industrial fisheries. The benefits from eco-labeling can potentially be significant, ranging from price premiums to enriched understanding of fisheries management among fishers; however, anecdotal evidence from MSC-certified fisheries across various countries highlights the struggle of many small-scale fisheries to meet the costs of certification. The lack of environmental awareness in domestic markets can impede the spread of MSC eco-labeling among small-scale fisheries. In the absence of consumer preferences for seafood sustainability, and without subsidies, the certification may not be an appropriate tool for small-scale seafood producers. Examination of the case of an MSC-certified small-scale fishery suggests some efforts to achieve economies of scale; multi-species fisheries can apply for MSC certification as a single unit of assessment, and fisheries can cooperate with neighboring fisheries that target the same fish stock to share assessment costs. In a market where no price premium has been generated, effective face-to-face marketing is pivotal. The MSC will need to be committed to pursuing price premiums in new markets if it is to extend its reach further to small-scale fisheries.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X16308260>

- **Assessing the Implications of the Landing Obligation on MSC Certified Fisheries in Europe**

If the LO is fully implemented, including through catches being monitored at sea at significantly high levels, it will drive improvements in gear selectivity to reduce the catch of undesirable species and sizes, whilst it is likely that fishing operations will change to maximize the use of the space on board vessels and quota available for high value species and sizes. Nevertheless, improvements in data collection through rigorous monitoring of all catches of commercial stocks will be required, as low levels of at-sea monitoring that result in weak implementation of the LO would undermine progress. In recent years, significant efforts and various consumer-led approaches have also been attempting to drive greater sustainability and legality in European fisheries. The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification scheme is one of these approaches and has achieved a high level of penetration. However, non-compliance with the LO would introduce illegality into the supply chain, which could lead to the loss of MSC certification and, with it, access to key markets. Evidence to date suggests weak LO implementation, continued discarding, and the likely degradation of catch data quality. This study assesses how strongly the LO interacts with the MSC Standard, based on a comparison of the LO specifications with the Scoring Issues (SIs) that are used to assess fisheries within the default Version 2.0 MSC assessment tree. A review of 25 MSC certified EU fisheries (covering demersal trawl, demersal static gear and pelagic fisheries from the Baltic Sea, North Sea, North Western waters and South Western waters) was also undertaken to determine if weak implementation of the LO could lead to their future suspension or reassessment failure.

<http://fundingfish.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Implications-of-the-Landing-Obligation-on-MSC-certified-fisheries-in-Europe.pdf>



- **Follow the MSEP on twitter @MarineEconomics**

- If you have any research, articles or information that relates to socio-economic studies in the marine environment please share them with the network

Thanks, Chris @ NEF