



# Governing SSF

## FishMPABlue2 Objectives:

- a) identify at **national level** the **gaps and hindrances** in terms of legal and administrative framework for a successful implementation of the “governance toolkit”
- b) propose the inclusion of some **principles** of this new governance approach in national juridical frameworks
- c) propose new **concepts and procedures** (starting from the “Governance toolkit”) for associating conservation (MPAs) and sustainable fisheries (FRAs) tools in the International Institutions - initiatives recommendations or decisions.

# The Issues 1: Fishing

Small scale fisheries (SSF) account for:

- 84 percent of the fishing fleet (70 000 vessels)
- 26 percent of total revenue (US\$ 633 million)
- 60 percent of total direct employment (150 000 people)
- Important resource for tourism and employment in coastal areas
- 78 percent of Mediterranean and Black Sea stocks assessed are currently fished at biologically unsustainable levels
- GFCM Regional Plan of Action for SSF



## The Issues 2: Protecting the marine environment

The Aichi targets aim for 10% of the oceans to be protected.

Marine protected areas are created under a variety of legal instruments:

- EU Natura 2000
- Barcelona Convention (SPAMI)
- UNESCO biosphere reserves and world heritage sites
- GFCM FRA's
- IMO PSSAs
- And nationally specific laws to create marine nature reserves and protected landscapes

Most marine protected areas include fishery no-take zones or fishery restricted zones to protect ecosystems, habitats and species.

## The Issues 3: MPA/Fishing interactions

Designating sites is not enough. They must be managed.

Fisheries is an important activity in most sites, which creates two issues:

1. Fishery rules in the MPA should be enforced by adequate surveillance and applying effective sanctions
2. Local fishers should be involved in developing such controls, to:
  - make effective use of local knowledge
  - avoid unintended consequences and
  - encourage fisher compliance.

These principles are well established, but we consistently find barriers to their implementation, largely because Fishery and Nature laws are not integrated

This is a problem at Regional (Med), EU and National levels.

Main problem is **conflict of competencies between different Ministries** that have legal competencies at sea, which leads to confusion:

- **identification and legal designation of MPAs** (including legal designation of no-take zones / fully protected areas): problems of incoherence of different laws - it's clear for terrestrial protected areas but not when it comes to the sea
- **difficulty to clearly identify and designate the authority in charge of management:** terrestrial protected areas are managed by Ministries of Environment - when it comes to the sea, cooperation/dialogue with authorities in charge of fisheries is essential;
- **not enough shared understanding** of benefits for fisheries of well-designated/co-managed/enforced MPAs and no-take zones, leading to slow implementation and "deligitimating" of the MPA tool

In addition, there are significant gaps regarding management of fisheries in MPAs:

- **control/enforcement:** local enforcement capacity is limited and usually not invested in the MPA management unit
- **no/few national framework enabling co-management model:** involvement and engagement of stakeholders is critical to effective fishery management

## The Issues 4: Divided functions

At **Regional (Med) level** Fishery management is driven by GFCM whilst Nature protection is driven by Barcelona Convention

At **EU level** fishery management is driven through the Common Fishery Policy and nature management through the Habitats and Birds Directives (Natura 2000 network) and Marine Strategy Framework Directive

At **National levels** it is common for Fisheries and Nature functions to be in separate Ministries.



# Practical problems

The practical problems that we experience as a result include:

- Deficiencies in informing and involving fishers in MPA management
- Vertical and horizontal coordination is lacking, so information exchange is very poor
- Surveillance and enforcement powers are often insufficient at local level
- Territorial use rights for fisheries are lacking and so hampering good MPA management
- Resources for enforcement and monitoring are not available or insufficient locally
- Recreational fishing controls are lacking, undermining management efforts



## FishMPABlue2 activities

FishMPABlue2 aimed to contribute to solutions to these problems by:

1. Demonstrating and testing governance tools in real situations
2. Testing fish stock monitoring techniques
3. Surveying socio-economic benefits of improved governance
4. Sharing good practices and disseminating them widely