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The European Continental Shelf
Jurisdictional regime (EEZs)
Atlantic vs. Mediterranean fishing

Atlantic

Mediterranean
Shared waters, shared resources
The CFP objectives (Treaty of Rome, 1958... and still today)

1. The objectives of the common agricultural policy shall be:
   • (a) to increase agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress and by ensuring the rational development of agricultural production and the optimum utilisation of the factors of production, in particular labour;
   • (b) thus to ensure a fair standard of living for the agricultural community, in particular by increasing the individual earnings of persons engaged in agriculture;
   • (c) to stabilise markets;
   • (d) to assure the availability of supplies;
   • (e) to ensure that supplies reach consumers at reasonable prices.

2. In working out the common agricultural policy and the special methods for its application, account shall be taken of:
   • (a) the particular nature of agricultural activity, which results from the social structure of agriculture and from structural and natural disparities between the various agricultural regions;
   • (b) the need to effect the appropriate adjustments by degrees;
   • (c) the fact that in the Member States agriculture constitutes a sector closely linked with the economy as a whole.
The CFP of 1983

• Triggered by declaration of EEZs in 1977 (Atlantic only)
• 6 years (1977-83) to agree on allocation of quotas!
• Management instrument: TACs single-stock, annual decisions.
• Emphasis on allocation of fishing rights among EU Member States (“relative stability”) more than stock management => higher TACs to facilitate agreement
• Mediterranean absent from conservation policy
• Accompanying policies: aid to vessel construction
• Unambitious fleet policy (capacity reduction offset by “technological creep”?)
A very criticized policy
The policy does not seem to be working
Decision making questioned
Favorite item for Euroskeptics

GUTTED
Tony’s business has been ripped apart by the EU.
Institutions and NGOs wanted reform
Was the policy so bad?
Evolution of average fishing mortality (Atlantic-Baltic)
Mediterranean - Evolution of fishing mortality

*Modelled value of the F/Fmsy ratio per year*

![Graph showing the evolution of fishing mortality compared to Fmsy from 2003 to 2013. The graph indicates the F/Fmsy ratio per year, with values ranging from 0.5 to 5.0. The years 2003 to 2013 are marked on the x-axis, and the ratio values are marked on the y-axis. The graph indicates that the fishing mortality has been overfished for most of the period, with some years showing a ratio close to 1.0, indicating a healthy population.](image-url)
The CFP reform of 2013

Why an ambitious reform (starting 2009)?
• Progress since 2000 but only ‘visible’ since 2007. Bad image remained
• Mediterranean, lagging behind
• No clear long-term goal (outside recovery plans)
• Discards, unresolved reputational issue
• Policy complexity: Low buy-in by stakeholders
• CFP shortcomings, favorite topic for Euroskeptics
The role of NGOs
The influence of public opinion
The reform of 2013

• Introduction of common long-term objective: all regulated stocks at Fmsy by 2020
• Ban on discards (phase-in from 2015 to 2019)
• Regionalized measures: end to “micromanagement by Brussels”
• Emphasis on multiannual, multispecies approaches (Annual TACs, mere implementation, not stand-alone policy instruments)
• ...but other proposals rejected: transferable quota management
The good headlines
Beyond headlines: The challenges (1) can discards be eliminated?
Challenges (2): Choke species and TACs
(Source: Clara Ulrich)

ICES MIXED FISHERIES ADVICE FOR THE NORTH SEA, 2014

"Potential Landings" 2014

47% reduction in revenue between Sq_E and min

Predicted landings for 2014, per stock and per scenario
overshoot (hatched) and undershoot (below zero)

Differences in scenarios imply:
- A mismatch between fishing opportunities
- A situation forcing changes in fishing patterns to occur

But these changes cannot be predicted
Challenges (3): Choke species and relative stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>TAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common sole</td>
<td>VIIf and VIIg</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solea solea</td>
<td>(SOL/7FG.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddock</td>
<td>VIIIb-k, VIII, IX and X; Union waters of CECAF 34.1.1 (HAD/7X7A34.)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4 838</td>
<td>1 613</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>7 258</td>
<td>7 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges (4):

Can we reach Fmsy in 2020 for **ALL** stocks?

The definition of success or failure, in a highly scrutinized policy
...and “Brexit”

### Whose hake is this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species:</th>
<th>Hake</th>
<th>Zone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merluccius merluccius</td>
<td>IIIa; Union waters of Subdivisions 22-32 (HKE/3A/BCD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2 762</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>2 997</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>2 997</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analytical TAC**

(1) Within the following overall TAC for the northern stock of hake: 108 784

(2) Transfers of this quota may be effected to Union waters of IIa and IV. However, such transfers shall be notified in advance to the Commission.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species:</th>
<th>Hake</th>
<th>Zone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merluccius merluccius</td>
<td>Union waters of IIa and IV (HKE/2AC4-C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>TAC</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>3 492</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>3 492</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Analytical TAC**

(1) Not more than 10% of this quota may be used for by-catch in IIa (HKE/*03A)

(2) Within the following overall TAC for the northern stock of hake: 108 784
Mediterranean challenges (1): streamlining scientific advice

- Revising stock structure
- Deciding on key species: can’t handle 300 stocks. GFCM’s 51 priority stocks?
- Ensuring continuity and systematization of assessment
Mediterranean challenges (2)

• Can we (dream of) achieving Fmsy by 2020?
• Can we motivate N. African countries to share efforts on management in GFCM?
• Can we establish a joint management scheme for the Black Sea (with Russia and Ukraine)?
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