



FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE NEWSLETTER

September 2016

Dear readers,

September has been a relatively calm month in the EU front. You can read in this issue, among others, two studies from the European Parliament think tank and a summary of last developments from the EU Fisheries Advisory Councils.

You can also read a briefing on the UN BBNJ workshop which took place in New York and the IUCN World Conservation Congress Hawaii 2016, where important decisions were made regarding Marine Protected Areas. EBCD participated actively in this latter event.

Finally do not miss out on the upcoming events.

Despina Symons
Director,EBCD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**European
Parliament_____3**

Advisory Councils____5

Studies_____14

International_____15

Upcoming Events____18



European Parliament

Back to school

After the summer recess, the European Parliament has met to continue with its activities. Apart from the monthly Fisheries Committee meetings, below are the activities and meetings that will take place (on going dossiers and new issues to deal with):

- **Motions for resolutions (non-legislative):**
 - ⇒ Ms Dominique Bilde, Ms Marie-Christine Boutonnet and Ms Sylvie Goddyn (ENF Group) have tabled a motion for a resolution on whaling and dolphin hunting in the Faroe Islands– PECH committee decided to take no action on this
 - ⇒ Mr Dohrmann, rapporteur for the EU/Norway Agreement for reciprocal access to fishing in the Skagerrak [...], requested to table a non-legislative motion for resolution to accompany his draft recommendation.
- **Demersal Multi-annual management plan** (proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a multi-annual plan for demersal stocks in the North Sea and the fisheries exploiting those stocks and repealing Council Regulation (EC) 676/2007 and Council Regulation (EC) 1342/2008): This dossier has been attributed to the S&D Group (MEP still to be determined).
- **2017 Baltic TACs and quotas** (Proposal for a Council Regulation fixing for 2017 the fishing opportunities for certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks applicable in the Baltic Sea): No action to be taken on behalf of PECH committee.
- **Delegated acts under scrutiny** (deadline to object until 5 November 2016):
 - ⇒ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) .../... of 5.9.2016 establishing fisheries conservation measures for the protection of the marine environment in the North Sea
 - ⇒ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) .../... of 5.9.2016 establishing fisheries conservation measures for the protection of the marine environment in the Baltic Sea and repealing Regulation (EU) 2015/1778
- **Upcoming hearings:**
 - ⇒ Marine protected areas: valuing marine biodiversity and ecosystems for the blue economy. 9 November 2016 at 16h30. Speakers still to be confirmed (expected in October).
 - ⇒ Consultation of stakeholders on the consequences of Brexit for the CFP. To be set for either the October or November committee

meeting. Following this consultation, a discussion on an Oral question to the Commission will take place.

- ⇒ State of play of the implementation the landing obligation and allocation of quotas by the Member States. Planned for 2017
- ⇒ Information on the state and development of the biomass of fish stocks managed by the CFP. Planned for 2017

- **Missions/delegations:**

- ⇒ Delegation to Bangkok/Thailand (31 October-4 November 2016)
- ⇒ Delegations to ICCAT & WCPFC 2016
- ⇒ EFCA Agency in Vigo
- ⇒ Adriatic Sea/Italy
- ⇒ Madeira

- **AOB:**

- ⇒ It was agreed that the Chair would invite Mr Barange, FAO Director, to attend the next Committee meeting on 11 October
- ⇒ It was agreed that the Chair will write a letter to the Commission saying that the PECH Committee endorses the position reflected in a "Draft Note Verbale" from the Commission dated 13 July 2016 on snow crab fishing and access to Svalbard waters

Think Tank

The European Parliament Think Tank published this month two interesting documents:

- ⇒ **How to make fisheries control in Europe uniform**

The EU has exclusive competence for the conservation of marine biological resources under the CFP. It is indispensable for the conservation of common resources to ensure that EU fishing rules are properly respected, that national fishing quotas are not exceeded and that Member States act in a similar manner on fisheries control. In general, EU fishing vessels can operate in all EU waters. However, a vessel fishing in waters or landing in a port of another Member State falls under the control competence of that Member State. It is therefore also crucial that control activities are performed in such a way as to prevent any sense of inequity between operators, or mistrust among fisheries control authorities of different Member States.

With a proposal for a revision of the EU regulatory framework on fisheries control possible in 2017, the EP is set to give its views on the importance of uniform implementation of control measures across the Union.

Read the whole paper [here](#).

- ⇒ **In-depth analysis on the Common Fisheries Policy**

The EP think tank has released this month an in-depth analysis on the Common Fisheries Policy (only available in French).

In its opening remarks, it notes that the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) covers all activities of the fish industry.

It touches upon the need for a technical measures framework; exclusive competence of the Union, the sustainable exploitation of marine living resources is conditioned by technical rules that define how, where and when to fish species, especially to protect juvenile fish or marine habitats sensitive to certain fishing techniques.

Also, it discusses the system of total allowable catch (TAC and quotas) divided into quotas between Member States, establishing how many fish can be taken by fishing from a certain stock.

In addition, it analyzes the need for management of the capacity of all national fleets of fishing vessels in terms of available fish resources. These conservation and management measures must be based on the best possible scientific advice and be developed in consultation with interested parties, in particular at the level of the relevant maritime region. The effectiveness of these measures also depends on compliance by operators and requires an effective control system. The first proposals for implementing the new directions decided by the end of 2013, for a fishing based on maximum sustainable yield (MSY) and avoiding discharges of certain catch at sea have shown the difficulties in translating these objectives conservation measures and management, particularly in multi-annual plans based on multi-species approaches. However, other legislative initiatives are expected in the near future to continue the EU's policy for the sustainable use of biological resources of the sea.

[I invite you to read the in-depth analysis here \(available only in French\).](#)

Advisory Councils

NWWAC talks MCZs

This month, the North Western Waters Advisory Council met in Dublin to deal with its regular work. Worth noting was that at this meeting, the UK national administration presented its proposals for future Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs). This was done in order for the UK to meet its international obligations and set up a network of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).

The criteria used in the selection procedure for the MCZs are:

- ✓ The completeness of the UK's current network

- ✓ Ecological importance
- ✓ Evidence
- ✓ Social and economic considerations

The UK areas being looked at; to which the national administration has asked all stakeholders to provide input and information, are amongst others:

- East Meridian (Eastern Side); fishing vessels affected from the UK, Netherlands, Belgium and France
- South of the Isles of Scilly; fishing vessels affected mostly from the UK
- South-West Deeps (East); fishing vessels affected from UK, Spain and France
- North East of Haig Fras; fishing vessels affected from the UK, France and Belgium
- South of Celtic Deep; fishing vessels affected from the UK, France, Belgium and Ireland
- Inner Bank; fishing vessels affected mostly from the UK
- Cape Bank; fishing vessels affected from the UK, France and Belgium
- Goodwin Sands; fishing vessels affected from the UK
- Kentish Knock East; fishing vessels affected from the UK
- Offshore Foreland; fishing vessels affected from the UK
- Mud Hole; fishing vessels affected from the UK, Ireland and Belgium
- Slieve Na Griddle; fishing vessels affected from the UK
- South Rigg; fishing vessels affected from the UK
- Queenie Corner; fishing vessels affected from the UK

[This presentation can be seen here.](#)

The proposals have been published on the Scottish Government website

<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/marine-environment/mpanetwork/SACmanagement>

The shapefiles for each site, including the proposed measures, can be downloaded from the National Marine Plan interactive (NMPI) and JNCC websites;

<https://marinescotland.atkinsgeospatial.com/nmpi/>

http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/protectedsites/SACselection/gis_data/terms_conditions.asp

These documents will form the basis of discussions at the following regional workshops for member states and advisory councils.

NGOs pull out of SWWAC

A development in the EU fisheries sector took place this month, namely at a regional level and more specifically regarding the South Western Waters Advisory Council (SWWAC).

In July 2016, the SWWAC, via its General Assembly, adopted the application of 3 organisations in the 40% group (other interest group); Fundación Rendemento Económico Mínimo Sostible e Social (FREMSS) , Bluefish and AGLIA.

The other organisations of the same group of the SWWAC; namely Seas At Risk, Oceana, WWF, Sciaena, LPN, have argued that *"advice coming out of the SWW AC no longer represents a balanced stakeholder view as it lacks the voice of environmental NGOs and that as a result of the admission of these three new organisations, the signatories of the letter argue that the functioning of the AC has been crippled. They represent the fishing industry and as such should be designated within the 60% grouping"* and have addressed a letter to Karmenu Vella, EU Commissioner for Environment, Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, informing him that *"as of now we will suspend all activities in the SWW AC. We indicated this possibility in the letter we sent you on July 18th. Consequently, advice coming out of the SWW AC does no longer represent a balanced stakeholder view as it lacks the voice of environmental NGOs. If no appropriate solution is taken in the near future, we will consider leaving the currently malfunctioning SWW AC completely"* ([see letter here](#)).

Background info

The SWWAC covers the Atlantic zone running from the tip of Brittany in the North, to the Strait of Gibraltar in the south and including the outermost regions of Madeira, the Azores and the Canary Islands. 60% of the representatives of the fishing sector (fishermen, shipowners, producers' organisations, processors, wholesale fishmongers and market organisations) in five Member States (Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands) - 40% of the members of the civil society (aquaculture, consumer associations, environmental associations, seaman's wives associations, non-professional fishing associations, etc.).

The Advisory Councils (ACs) are stakeholder-led organisations that provide the Commission and EU countries with recommendations on fisheries management matters. This may include advice on conservation and socio-economic aspects of management, and on simplification of rules. Advisory Councils are consulted in the context of regionalisation. Advisory Councils should also contribute to data for fisheries management and conservation measures. Advisory Councils are composed of representatives from the industry and from other interest groups (with a 60% - 40% allocation of the seats in the general assembly and the executive committee). They receive EU financial assistance as bodies pursuing an aim of general European interest.

PELAGIC AC Workshop on the Landing Obligation (5 July 2016, Brussels)

The Pelagic AC organized a meeting to discuss problems encountered to date with the pelagic landing obligation and possible solutions. The meeting was hosted by the Commission and well attended by members of the Pelagic AC, Commission representatives, ICES, EFCA and representatives of the North Western Waters and North Sea regional groups. The meeting started with presenting and explaining problems identified to date without going into any discussions. Examples of such problems included impacts on labour conditions due to closed discard chutes and the question how a de minimis exemption is being applied, whether on individual vessel or Member States basis. Subsequently a brief presentation of the Pelagic AC's control recommendations to the regional groups followed. Most notably in relation to mandatory reporting of gramme sizes as proposed by the Pelagic AC. Afterwards there was a thorough discussion on the issues listed and progress has been made on a number of them. The most prominent discussion was in regards to bycatch of zero quota and zero TAC species and how this could be handled, e.g. through different flexibility mechanisms and quota swaps. At the same time it was pointed out that since the introduction of the landing obligation the willingness of Member States to swap quota has strongly decreased. However, there was general consensus that it was not the intention of the landing obligation to close a fishery early in the season that still has a lot of quota left and people agreed that common sense must prevail and that pragmatic solutions must be found. Another issue discussed included the use of technical measures, e.g. the new pelagic grid developed in Sweden to reduce saithe bycatch in the herring fishery. The Commission explained that in the short term it was not necessary to wait for a revision of the Technical Measures Regulation to implement such measures, but that this could be done through joint recommendations or pilot projects. The perceived conflict with the Animal By-product Regulation has also been resolved. The Commission explained that undersized fish is still edible fish and does not fall under the Animal Byproduct Regulation. However, there might be a point at which people themselves declare something to be an animal by-product and from this point onwards there is no way back. Other topics, e.g. in relation to tonnage increase for safety reasons, mandatory gramme size collection and others will have to be addressed again in future meetings. Overall people agreed that the workshop was very useful and that this forum should continue.

Source: [Pelagic AC Newsletter](#)

NWW Technical meeting: Choke species workshop (5-6 September 2016, Edinburgh)

PELAC representatives: Irene Kingma, Rob Banning Participants from: UK (Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland), Belgium, France, Spain, Netherlands, Ireland, NWWAC (Barrie Deas; Emiel Brouckaert; and Liane Veitch) & PELAC (Rob Banning and Irene Kingma)

Welcome and agenda overview

The UK chair confirmed that the NWW high level group (HLG) will meet at the end of September to discuss the developments the technical group have made in relation to choke mitigation.

Update from the ACs

- NWWAC industry representative: NWWAC representatives attended last TG meeting on 17 July, since then not a lot has happened (despite submission of some preparation for this meeting). Industry believes exemptions will be needed to make landing obligation (LO) work, interpretation of 5% of de minimis perhaps should be looked at again, high survival exemption will go a long way to making LO work and should be used where possible. Interspecies flexibility has potential to help with implementation, but how this will work still has to be determined. Other solutions should be looked into, such as management approaches other than TAC for some stocks/species.
- NWWAC industry representative: we appreciate invitations to these meetings; but more warning would help aid preparation. The Challenge now is moving from abstract to concrete. ACs also working on Technical Measures Regulation proposal and Multiannual management plan proposals, both of which are relevant to the implementation of the LO. The effective closure of fisheries by choke will lead to unknown displacement effects which will need to be addressed/controlled somehow so there aren't negative knock-on effects.
- NWWAC other interest group (OIG) representative: explained the areas of different industry/OIG opinions, e.g. restrictive use of de minimis and need for good evidence before granting high survival exemption.
- NWWAC industry representative: need to start thinking seriously about contingency measures. The faster we can come up with choke mitigation measures, the faster the AC will be able to support further implementation of the LO.
- PELAC: 18 months experience with the LO, so far workable. Main problems so far have been with freezer trawlers with boarfish and hake, despite lots of trials into avoidance (particularly net devices and acoustics (sonar and echosounders)).

- UK: hosted this meeting as there is a clear need for regional solutions to choke to be developed well in advance of 2019.
- Commission: planning a review of the TAC framework in 2017, looking at how it is working for each stock/fishery to determine if TAC management is achieving the objectives of the CFP for each stock, and if not, how this could be improved.

Assessment of various choke mitigation options

Participants were sent a 'homework assignment' (PELAC was added to the participant list too late for them to participate in this) which was based on the outcomes from the choke meeting in April. Participants were asked to score several potential choke alleviating solutions and come up with additional solutions of their own.

During the meeting all the positive and negative sides of the potential solutions were discussed.

Discussion of homework

Proposal 1: Review the number and type of TACs for highly mixed fisheries with particular consideration given to removing certain stocks from the TAC and Quota Regulation and treat some stocks as prohibited (and apply alternative management measures).

Some Member States:

- Want to have a new list with species that are treated as prohibited species but are not prohibited species (can be landed within quota but not sold for profit??). A special category would have to be created for these in the TAC and Quota Regulation.
- Concerns expressed:
 - There currently is no legal framework for a category like this, unclear how this could be applied (worked out examples needed).
 - Need for adequate and enhanced monitoring.

Proposal 2: Applying an "others TAC" to deal with unavoidable catches (example from the TAC and Quota Regulation: bycatch quota for Bluefin tuna).

Scotland: Tried to work up an example using deep sea stocks but ran into multiple issues.

- very difficult to sort out in a situation where some of the stocks you do not want to catch (low or 0 TAC) and others are targeted.

- How would relative stability apply?
- How could it be controlled?

European Commission: - There is a difference between others TAC and others quota.

Comments:

- When the CFP reform was done in 2013 others quota was considered but it did not go ahead because of relative stability issues.
- Looked at others quota for the Irish Sea but wouldn't be a sensible option. - Norway others category is for quite similar species caught in only 1 metier, most situations in Europe are different.
- The group TAC for skates and rays have proven to be very restrictive creating potential chokes situations.

Proposal:

- Proposed to look for and work up an example of a situation where this might work.

Proposal 3: Manage target species on basis of Fmsy, bycatch alternative for other stocks.

Proposed by Northern Ireland fleet, whiting and nephrops in Irish Sea used as example. Whiting has an 80 tons TAC but bycatch is 700 tons of whiting below MCRCs a year.

Additional:

- Should be combined with obligation to implement technical measures.
- Ireland: Fmsy cod VIa = 40 tons, catches 1800 tons!!

European Commission:

- Have to find workable solutions but MSY cannot be dropped as it is a policy objective of the CFP (agreed by EC, Council and EP). But Baltic plan shows the ranges concept allows for flexibility. Look at all possible solutions before you can start talking about a change of the regulation/objectives.

NWWAC:

- Brexit will change NWW TAC setting, will be more like a Norway negotiations situation. There MSY does not really feature in the way it does in the EU.

European Commission:

Even after Brexit the policy objectives will remain.

OIG representatives from the ACs were asked if they could envisage a situation where fishing above MSY would be acceptable after 2020:

- Answer: EU has to abide by international agreement, the objectives in art 2.2 are there for a reason, rebuilding biomass will lead to higher yield and profitability in the long run.

European Commission:

- Too early to start questioning CFP objectives but if it's clear that tailored solutions might be needed for certain species/gears/areas.

Scored same as suggestion "For identified metiers create leading TACs, remove non-target species TACs, establish a percentage of bycatch, with objective to reduce over X years and establish accompanying measures for the most sensitive species."

Proposal 4: Improve data collection on choke species to support appropriate uplifts.

UK: STECF already has a lot of data on catches and discards collected under the Data Collection Framework, this is the input for the calculation.

Scotland: this seems to be different from discussion yesterday when we were discussing sticking to Fmsy.

NL-scientist: for stocks without MSY assessment this could help.

Scotland: invest in getting the right proxies.

NL-scientist: yes, also the discard behaviour will change which will lead to an over calculation of uplift.

NL: improving data on data poor stocks can lead to improved fit for the TAC.

UK: that's a long term solution, short term uplifts will need to be set correctly.

Scoring: will not help in delivering MSY by 2020 but it is a useful and popular measure. Uplift is a short term solution anyway. Uplift only goes to Member States with a quota. In other words if a Member State has 0, and the uplift is 10%, than this Member State still has a quota of 0.

Proposal 5: Adjust the quota area split to reflect the current biological situation (for stocks that are biologically the same).

Ireland: this could work for cod, haddock and whiting in the nephrops fishery.

UK: hake > example from April Council, merit in combining the WW and NS stocks, and allow flexibility that (part of) the North Sea quota can be caught in the Western waters.

Spain: this example would change relative stability that is a different question

Belgium: there does not seem to be an adequate example to use this.

Proposal 6: Get guidance from STECF on how evidence for high survivability exemptions will be reviewed.

UK: worried that not all gears/species will be reviewed in time so will need to work closely with STECF/ICES on getting input on what questions need to be asked.

Proposal 7: Pooling the de minimis for the different pelagic species that constitute a bycatch of the demersal vessels to alleviate quota (example from France for blue whiting, herring, horse mackerel, boarfish). Reason: France does not have a quota for boarfish and the pelagic quotas of the other species belong to the pelagic companies in France.

UK: de minimis only for specific species in specific situations + this sounds like a pelagic others quota for demersal fisheries.

France: others quota would apply to the full fleet, not just the demersal. Temporary solution only.

UK: there is an example for the Skagerrak.

France: would be for the entire demersal fleet.

Proposal 8: Obligatory swapping of quota

Belgium: stimulate is better word, obligatory no.

UK: agrees.

NWWAC industry representative: swaps need to be reviewed on a case by case basis, but some choke situations will only be alleviated if the Member States do not move on certain swaps and transfers.

No scoring, will provide an overview of the discussion to the HLG.

Proposal 9: For identified métiers create leading TACs, remove non-target species TACs, establish a percentage of bycatch, with objective to reduce over X years and establish accompanying measures for the most sensitive species.

UK: so for one métier at a time?

Ireland: individual rules per métier would be a nightmare to set up and enforce, we don't want new catch composition rules.

Spain: want this for all fisheries, on a fleet by fleet basis, is already used in NAFO area and Norwegian waters. A TAC for unavoidable bycatches, for species which were discarded until now, F remains the same if fishing pattern remains the same.

Netherlands: we don't have a good grasp on metiers, changing all the time, so can't work with this.

Meeting adjourns with conclusion that this meeting was good for getting clarity on the questions, but not necessarily providing the answers hoped for. Next to that, it is more useful to work on the basis of case studies/practical examples, so to make it concrete. HLG will need to take some hard decisions on relative stability, fishing limits and number of TACs.

3 November 2016: NSAC workshop on choke species

Source: [Pelagic AC Newsletter](#)

Studies

Mass extinction in the oceans

The month of September brought us the publication of a study on the “**Ecological selectivity of the emerging mass extinction in the oceans**” ([find it here](#)).

According to the study, “to better predict the ecological and evolutionary effects of the emerging biodiversity crisis in the modern oceans, we compared the association between extinction threat and ecological traits in modern marine animals to associations observed during past extinction events using a database of 2497 marine vertebrate and mollusc genera. We find that extinction threat in the modern oceans is strongly associated with large body size, whereas past extinction events were either nonselective or preferentially removed smaller-bodied taxa. Pelagic animals were victimized more than benthic animals during previous mass extinctions but are not preferentially threatened in the modern ocean. The differential importance of large-bodied animals to ecosystem function portends greater future ecological disruption than that caused by similar levels of taxonomic loss in past mass extinction events.”

The author, Jonathan Payne associate professor and chair of geological sciences at Stanford University, states that “*if this pattern goes unchecked, the future oceans would lack many of the largest species in today's oceans, many large species play critical roles in ecosystems and so their extinctions could lead to ecological cascades that would influence the structure and function of future ecosystems beyond the simple fact of losing those species.*” “The link that we

found between body size and extinction threat in the modern oceans is quite strong,”

Co-author Noel Heim, also at Stanford, said: *“We see this over and over again. Humans enter into a new ecosystem, and the largest animals are killed off first. Marine systems have been spared up to now, because until relatively recently, humans were restricted to coastal areas and didn’t have the technology to fish in the deep ocean on an industrial scale. Historically marine protected areas have been small boutique affairs - more like the size of golf courses. In the past five years, however, the world has begun aggressively setting up very large marine protected areas. Recently Obama created the world’s largest protected area in Papahānaumokuākea, a protected area just over a million square kilometres in size. This is really good news as parks of this size will indeed provide meaningful protection for large vulnerable animals we highlight as being at risk.”*

The study overall paints a bleak picture. It reaches the conclusion that “[...] Without a dramatic shift in the business-as-usual course for marine management, our analysis suggests that the oceans will endure a mass extinction of sufficient intensity and ecological selectivity to rank among the major extinctions [...]”.

International

IUCN Congress Hawaii

The 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress took place in Hawai’i (1-10 September) and EBCD, a voting member of IUCN, was represented by Despina Symons, Serge Garcia and Jake Rice (respectively Chair and Vice-Chair of the IUCN Fisheries Expert Group, FEG). The Congress, under the theme “Planet at the Crossroads,” focused on the challenges of attaining the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) during the next 15 years and it was divided into the Forum and the Members Assembly.

The Forum is hub for public debate, bringing together people from all around the world, and consisted in a number of events of which 190 related to ocean and marine issues. EBCD and FEG participated actively by 1) leading one event on the mitigation of bycatch impact on marine biodiversity and another one on the wealth of integrated ocean assessments, 2) co-sponsoring the event on food security in marine protected areas, and 3) giving a key note speech on a workshop aiming to generate ideas and practical ways to achieve the SDGs¹⁴ on Oceans.

At the Members Assembly, the highest decision-making body of IUCN, the program for 2017-2020 was discussed and resolutions which will form the future policy were adopted. Serge Garcia, chair of the IUCN/CEM/FEG, was an invited panelist at the plenary session on fisheries and ocean governance. The Assembly also serves as an arena where motions are put forward by the IUCN Membership for consideration and adoption by the plenary. Among others (100 or so motions), there were three controversial motions of high relevance to ocean fisheries that were adopted by an overwhelming majority: 49 on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ); 53 on increasing Marine Protected Area (MPA) coverage where no extractive activities are allowed up to 30% for effective marine biodiversity conservation, and 61 on taking a greater account on Oceans in Climate Change.

EBCD actively participated and contributed in the debates, especially on motion 53. In this sense, FEG interventions focused on 1) the potential impact in densely populated rural/coastal communities and weakness of the scientific evidence in support of the measure; 2) broadening references to all types of IUCN MPAs and other effective area-based management measures referred to in CBD Target 6; and 3) the direct inclusion of fishing and coastal communities in decision-making about MPAs.

BBNJ New York

From the 26th August till the 9th September 2016, the Preparatory Committee of the UN tasked with making substantive recommendations to the General Assembly on the elements of a draft text of an international legally binding instrument (ILBI) under UNCLOS met in New York for its 2nd session.

EBCD invites you to check the agenda and the provisional work programme (as well as other relevant info to the meeting) here: <http://www.un.org/depts/los/biodiversity/prepcom.htm>

For your interest, EBCD provides you with a link to studies provided by the Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI) on this topic:

- High seas fisheries: what role for a new international instrument?
- An overview of vulnerable marine ecosystem closures
- The long and winding road continues: Towards a new agreement on high seas governance
- Advancing marine biodiversity protection through regional fisheries management: a review of high seas bottom fisheries closures

This meeting comes in parallel with the 2016 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) World Conservation Congress "Planet at the Crossroads" held in Honolulu, US from the 1-10 September.

Background

In its resolution 69/292 of 19 June 2015, the General Assembly decided to develop an international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction.

To that end, it decided to establish, prior to holding an intergovernmental conference, a Preparatory Committee, to make substantive recommendations to the General Assembly on the elements of a draft text of an international legally binding instrument under UNCLOS, taking into account the various reports of the Co-Chairs on the work of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity beyond areas of national jurisdiction.

Upcoming Events

1. 'FOOD 2030: RESEARCH & INNOVATION FOR TOMORROW'S NUTRITION & FOOD SYSTEMS', 12-13 OCTOBER, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

More information [here](#)

2. EUROPECHE'S ANNUAL SEAFOOD SHOWCASE, 11 OCTOBER, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

More information [here](#)

3. MARINE KNOWLEDGE - SUPPORTING MARINE RESEARCH KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE FOR BLUE GROWTH, 13 OCTOBER, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

More information [here](#)

4. LONG TERM MANAGEMENT OF THE EUROPEAN SEA BASS RECREATIONAL FISHERIES, 11 OCTOBER, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

More information [here](#)

5. GLOBAL OCEAN BIODIVERSITY GOVERNANCE - THE CONTRIBUTION OF SCIENCE, 17 OCTOBER, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

More information [here](#)



**EUROPEAN BUREAU FOR
CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT**