David Thomson - Fishing Industry & Community Papers

Go to Index

David Thomson is a former East Coast trawlerman and, subsequently, an international fisheries consultant to over 50 countries of the world.

In 1998-9 I (Alastair McIntosh) co-authored with him 3 articles for the fishing press (see 97, 99 & 102 at http://www.alastairmcintosh.com/publications.htm).

In 2008 these publications led to the Scottish Government and the Economic and Social Research Council approaching me to re-present these ideas, updated, at a conference on the future of the Scottish fishing industry in Aberdeen on 11 March 2008.

The material below has been generously provided by David and is posted here on my personal website with his permission so that they can be used for reference. My own conference submission, *Sea Change for Scottish Fishing,* drawing heavily on David's insights, will be posted in due course at the above web link.

Now online at http://www.alastairmcintosh.com/articles/2008-scottish-fishing-esrc.htm

This document comprises the three items written by David Thomson indexed as follows, and also an appendix of third party relevant material that has been sent to me.

Index to this Page

1. *Evidence to the House of Lords' Review of the Common Fisheries Policy*, 19 Feb 2008
2. *A Sustainable Future for Small Coastal Fishing Communities*, Simon Fraser Uni., 2006
3. *The World's Two Marine Fishing Industries – How They Compare*, FAO, originally c. 1986
4. Appendix: *Evidence to the House of Lords' Review of the Common Fisheries Policy* from the Fishermen's Association Ltd, 21 Feb 2008 …. this is included as background on the position of FAL and is not necessarily endorsed by David Thomson or Alastair McIntosh.

Go to Index

CALL FOR EVIDENCE

Review of the Common Fisheries Policy

Submission by David Thomson, 19 February 2008

To: Julia Labeta
Clerk to the EU Env & Agr Sub-Comm
House of Lords
London SW1A 0PW e-mail labetaj@parliament.uk

copy to : Alistair Dillon
Committee Specialist
House of Lords e-mail dillona@parliament.uk

Submitted by: David Thomson
International Fisheries Management Specialist
(currently with the UN / FAO in Indo-China)

UK residence : W. Covesea Farm, Duffus, Morayshire, IV30 5QX

Overseas telephone : 00855 (0)92 620 981
E-mail address : wcovesea3@yahoo.com

Brief bio-data – David Thomson : former Assistant Professor, University of Rhode Island, USA; former Lecturer, College of Fisheries, Canada; former Fisheries Industry Officer, FAO Rome, Italy; former consultant to the World Bank, the EU, UNIDO, ADB, and to bilateral aid programmes of the USA, UK, Japan, Germany, Iceland, Italy; former fisherman and skipper, UK and Ireland. Visiting lecturer / conference speaker, Edinburgh University, Oregon State University; Stirling University; Marine Laboratory Aberdeen, Simon Fraser University Canada, University Pertanian Malaysia, SEAFDEC Bangkok, Kanagawa International Fishery Centre,Tokyo, Latin America Fisheries Symposium, Cancun, Mexico; etc.

Author or joint author of : *An Assessment of Marine Fishery Management Regimes (UK); Global Patterns of Fish Industry Development (UNIDO); Scientific and Intuitive Fishing (USA); A Sustainable Future for Small Coastal Fishing Communities (Canada)*; *Commercial Fishes Biology (FAO); Fish Production and Markets (Ireland); Fisheries Manpower Planning (FAO); Fishing Grounds and Fishing Charts (FAO); A Fisherman's Reflections on a Beautiful but Troubled World (Canada); The Sea Clearances (UK); Coastal Fisheries Management (UK);*
The Seine Net (UK); Pair Trawling and Pair Seining (UK); Global Creels Study (UK); Strategic Planning Manual (UNIDO); Fishing Vessel Design (Norway); Intermediate Technology and Alternative Energy Systems for Fisheries (FAO); etc.

Evidence Submitted

Conservation and Management

1. To what extent have the CFP management measures, and recovery plans been effective in ensuring conservation and sustainability ?

A review of the past 30 years, or just of the period in question since 2002, reveal that the impact of CFP management on UK fisheries has been almost entirely negative. Whether we look at annual stock assessments, continuing fleet decline, or the stagnation of the economies of the coastal fishing towns and villages, there is almost no sign of recovery. Neither the fish stock, nor the harvesting fleets and shore industries, have been sustained. The decline in fish industry benefits has been especially hard on the more remote and island coastal communities. These traditional fishing villages have no comparable resource on which to base a sustainable economy. Continuing calls for further quota cuts and additional fleet reduction, are ample evidence that the whole policy and its related measures are failing, year after year.

2. What are your views on : total allowable catches; effort limitation; marine conservation areas; rights-based management; and technical conservation measures.

Total allowable catches are based on the scientists' best estimates of stock size, plus the judgment of fishery administrators, and also the lobbying of national governments for a greater share for their respective fleets. The end result rarely satisfies any party. It should also be noted that the estimates are based on 2 year-old data, and in some cases on
bogus statistics, as for example from the years of false reporting of monkfish east and west of the 4 degree line, - the result of scientists and administrator's failure to recognize a reality that reflected badly on their management. The colossal amount of discards – up to 600,000 tonnes a year, was never calculated accurately, by volume or species, and so not included in the estimates of production. Other governments and fishery regimes take a more flexible attitude to stock assessment, and consider estimates provided by fishers and independent observers of the marine environment. UK researchers have often complained in private about the political pressures under which their estimates are made.

Effort limitation is a much more reliable tool than TACs or quotas for managing the operations of the harvesting fleets. The Faeroe Isles for example has abandoned fishery management by quotas in favour of effort limitation, which can be achieved by limiting the number and power of vessels, the gear they may use, the seasons when they may fish, and where appropriate, the number of days they may spend at sea.

Marine conservation areas are good in principle, but suffer from hijacking by interested groups, each with their own agenda, and often motivated more by a desire for power or influence. Green and wildlife NGOs know that their involvement in and potential control of, conservation areas, will add to their public profile and increase the opportunities to draw income from the general public and from government. Some of them have no interest in the welfare of fisher-dependent communities, and a few have indicated their wish to put an end to most forms of commercial fishing. The tension between fishing communities and groups promoting MCAs is a global phenomena. Members of the Indigenous People's Forum on Bio-Diversity from South Africa, India, Latin America and Pacific states, and supporting NGOs from UK, USA and Europe, walked out of the CBD meeting in Rome Italy on 14 February 2008, protesting that they were marginalized and silenced by the Commission despite the importance of the recommendations to their lives, lands and waters, and the critical impact of protected areas on their rights.

MCAs work best when there is meaningful involvement by the communities affected who should have a right to veto extreme measures that would destroy their livelihoods. A few countries like Japan and the USA have developed useful examples of MCAs or similar reserves designed to both protect resources and sustain local economies. They give substantial fishery management authority to their coastal cooperatives. Fishermen on Scotland's west coast fear that the proposed Marine Park, if imposed on their area would simply allow the already bloated seal population to expand at the expense of the local fleet. The seals there currently consume 4 times as much fish as are caught by the local west coast and islands fishing vessels.

There are three fundamental principles that WWF and IUCN seek to apply abroad with considerable diligence when considering possible marine parks or sanctuaries. These principles are : 1. there must be sound scientific evidence of the need for such a measure, and also reliable indications that the measure will have the

desired result; 2. there must be full and open consultation with the local fishers and their communities, whose agreement must be obtained before proceeding with the venture; 3. if some fishers or stakeholders are to lose income as a result of the intervention, then there must be adequate compensation or alternative employment provided. The UK would do well to apply these principles firmly to every Marine Park or MCA proposal.

Rights-based management is being developed in many of the world's fisheries, and can be an excellent tool to ensure some justice and equity in the allocation of resources or in ensuring continuing access for vulnerable groups. The main danger facing the UK from EC / CFP interpretation of rights-based management, lies in the assumption by some that these very rights might be bought and sold on an open market. Once that is permitted the system ceases to be rights-based and becomes market-based, with fishery sector jobs and community's economic futures being traded like any other commodity. That is exactly what will happen if ITQ arrangements are developed to their ultimate end. Several governments have allocated rights-based access to fish resources, in perpetuity, to indigenous groups that would be vulnerable if their rights were to be made a marketable entity. So community quotas and other special arrangements have been organized in the USA for native Americans, and in New Zealand for Maori peoples. Canada's Fishery Minister recently lifted the ban on cod fishing for inshore fishers using open boats, to ensure these persons and their out-ports, have a modest livelihood throughout the year.

Technical conservation measures can be good or unhelpful. Most of them have some side-effects that are unfortunate. They are most difficult to apply in mixed species fisheries such as the UK demersal or white fish sector where the size of a legitimate target fish can vary so much. The mesh size suitable for mature whiting is smaller than that for haddock, which is smaller than that for cod, and so on. But if your boat's quota allocation includes all three species, what do you do ? Fishery administrators then introduce more measures to address the side effects, such as enforced discarding, but the end result is an unsatisfactory mix of conflicting regulations that only frustrate the fishermen while doing nothing for stock conservation. It should also be borne in mind that most skilled fishers can get around technical measures. The answer must be to have the industry fully involved in all the decisions taken and to avoid any technical measure that does not have general support from the harvesters themselves.

3. To what extent has current management increased discard and by-catch ? How could these problems be tackled ?

I have seen **no evidence that measures since 2002 have increased the amounts of discards or by-catch**, but certainly the past 3 decades, the illogical fixation on single species quotas in a mixed species fishery, has been the key element that has resulted in the enforced discarding of over half a million tonnes of good fish each year, in the North Sea. By any measure of fishery management assessment, this has been a travesty for the fish stock, the markets, and the fishers, and has probably caused more damage to the resource than any degree of excess fishing pressure.

How can this problem be tackled ? First and most importantly, by scrapping the whole concept of single species quotas for the demersal and mixed fish / prawn fleets. Do what many wise fishery administrations have done from Namibia to the Faeroe Isles, and instruct the fishers to land everything they catch. Second, ban discarding completely.

Namibia, which unlike Faeroes, still has a basic quota system, uses an arrangement of levies to limit targeting of non-quota species. All fish caught must be landed. On-board inspectors monitor and police that. Any fish landed excess to quota or not included in the quota, are sold. The proceeds are returned to the vessel, - minus a levy. The levy is finely balanced to achieve two purposes : one is that the fishers do not lose money by keeping, storing, and landing the fish; and the other is that they make no profit on that part of the catch. Each year when total landings are assessed and compared with the previously set TACs or species quotas in Namibia, there is little disparity, and so the system has been seen to work well.

4. Do fishery policies need to adapt to climate change ?

None of us know yet **how climate change will affect our fisheries**. It would be foolish and presumptuous to adapt fishery management policies before we know what changes are definitely taking place in the marine environment. There are indications that some species are migrating northwards. We see some sub-tropical species in our southern waters, while cold water fish like cod appear to moving north from their former grounds.

Control and Enforcement

5. To what extent has the CFCA assisted in improving matters ? What are the efficacy of systems in place ?

The CFCA systems are too often self-defeating and alienating the fishers. Too many rules and penalties appear to the stakeholders to be perverse and illogical. Ill-conceived laws and regulations bring the whole law into disrepute. Many fishery officers have expressed their disgust and resentment to me, at having to punish fishers for failing to follow measures that are of no benefit to the resource. The CFP has failed to give the fishery stakeholders a meaningful say in the regulations drafted. International meetings have noted that illegal fishing and landings, wasteful discarding, rules beating, and misreporting can to some degree be a direct result of badly-conceived management rules. Some such rules may be the product of flawed science, others of political or factional preferences, and still more of disregard of advice or ignorance of fishing technology. Many skippers and observers maintain that the system has made criminals out of otherwise honest men.

6. What is your view of different penalties for serious infringements in EU States

Difficult to control given the intransigence and resistance by France, Spain, etc

Structural policy

7. To what extent have Member States adjusted their fleets to balance capacity with opportunity ?

Low-impact small scale fleets have shrunk while powerful high capacity units have mostly increased in fishing power if not in number. This has been an indirect result of the CFP measures which have failed to protect the small scale fleets which have minimal impact on the resource, and have few negative effects on the marine environment.

UK has the most productive EEZ of any of the EU members, yet its fishing fleet has lost more vessels than any other state, - all in conformity to EC demands to decommission more and more boats. What is left of our fleet is faced with many more restrictions than their predecessors, - so instead of “opportunity”, UK fishers are faced with a massive constraint on their operations.

8. What is your experience of the new fisheries structural fund, EFF ?

No comment

9. What are your views on the possible impact of WTO-level discussions as regards subsidies in the fishing sector ?

Subsidies in the fishing sector are an emotive issue which is often subject to claims that have little factual basis. While agriculture is heavily subsidized in Europe, fisheries are not (and should not) be subsidized. But we see a growing number of programmes and quangos established, each with a claim to manage part of the industry, and all wanting to be paid for by the industry, since their services are “a subsidy” ! Far better to have our fishing industry manage and finance these services, - and select which ones they really need. Why should government undertake advertising on behalf of the fish merchants and processors ? That is an example of something the industry can do itself. Fish product development and fishing gear development are also things the industry can do quite well.

The main work on global fisheries subsidies and fleet over-capacity, was written by Dr Francis Christie, for FAO and the World Bank. He was aware that his papers did not address the situation of the smaller scale inshore and coastal fishing fleets of the world, so he asked Dr John Kurien to investigate the subject further. Prof. Kurien’s paper, which can be found on the internet, concluded that the most heavily subsidized fishing fleets were the large scale industrial fishing units. Apart from a modest fuel subsidy in some countries, most small scale fleets operate with little financial aid from their governments. Many fear that the WTO will take a sledgehammer to crack a peanut, and may fail to discriminate between the different fishing fleets, each of which has its own particular raft of taxes, facilities, and technical support programmes. WTO recommendations may also favour the large scale, high-impact commercial fleets over the small scale coastal sector.

Ref : Kurien, John; 2006, *Untangling Subsidies, Supporting Fisheries: The WTO Fisheries Subsidies Debate,* ICSF. DR F. Christy's calculations which are the basis of much of the WTO position can be found in Appendices 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the FAO *State of Food and Agriculture 1992 report, Rome 1993.* A shorter summary of Kurien's paper, *Over-capacity, Over-fishing and Subsidies,* is available from the U.S.A secretariat in NMFS of the Pacific Fisheries Forum. The shorter version was presented at the 2006 Forum in Hanoi.

One should also take a hard look at EC fishery subsidies which are continuing and which mostly benefit Spain and France, and which have often been used to support EC fleets in their operations off West Africa and elsewhere, - usually with tragic results for the local fish stock and fishing communities. Senegal is a country whose fishing grounds and fish stocks are of great interest to European fleets. But their intervention there, while agreed to by Senegalese Ministers, and assisted by the EU, has seriously hurt the local fishing fleets and reduced some stocks to a level of concern.

Governance

10. What is your view on the future evolution of Regional Advisory Councils ?
No comment

11. How do you consider EU fisheries should ideally be governed ?
How appropriate and feasible do you consider a regional model to be ?

EU Fisheries governance : Is a regional model appropriate ?
It could be, but only within strict limitations. Fisheries governance above all should be transparent, based on clearly stated objectives, and be participative, involving fully the fishing communities and the fishing industry stakeholders. Too often, consultations have been empty PR gestures with no genuine attempt to listen to those affected. (The writer has seen fishermen's leaders publicly insulted by government representatives at supposed consultation meetings). Fisheries governance should also be open to review and critique by competent, independent bodies.

There are a number of international examples. These include the SADC and ASEAN countries which have agreed regional fishery management policies. The USA has similar arrangements with Canada, Mexico, and the small states of the Caribbean and the Pacific. None of these countries have yielded their EEZs to any central management like the EU CFP. There are also the 3 main regional Tuna Commissions of the Indian, Pacific, and Atlantic Oceans, plus 2 in the Americas. (see www.tuna-org.org).

In each of those cases, the participating governments retain full control over their 200 mile EEZs and their own fleets and their national fishery management systems. But they meet annually to agree on common approaches to the management of shared stocks. That works very well, guaranteeing cooperative management but preserving sovereign rights.

In contrast the EC / EU, under the Lisbon treaty will have unlimited control over all "marine biological resources" (the part referring to joint EU/national control of fishing does not reflect the reality). Marine biological resources extend by definition from whales and basking sharks to the last frond of seaweed. This control, to be exercised from the desk of the Fisheries Commissioner in Brussels, will extend from the Baltic through the north-eastern Atlantic, North Sea, Mediterranean, Aegean and Adriatic seas to the Black Sea. It takes little account of the vast differences in regional fish species, different fishing methods, local consumption patterns, local fisheries culture and local social and employment structures. That kind of centrally-controlled regional model is a recipe for inflexible and undemocratic management from a distance that is insensitive to local needs and local situations requiring tailored responses to particular issues.

The best fishery management system by far is one that is locally based and which the local stakeholders largely operate themselves with government taking only a supervisory role and providing the overall policy. Some examples can be found in the USA and Japan, where specific fisheries form their own rules and enforce their own members. The UN Agencies and several bilateral organizations and NGOs assist a number of developing countries to adopt this model. In no part of the world that I know, has any group of fishing states considered or adopted a centrist EU type model that requires them to give up their sovereign rights over their national fisheries.

David B Thomson 19 February 2008

Go to Index

Go to Index

A Sustainable Future for Small Coastal Fishing Communities

Paper presented at A.R. Scammell Academy, Change Islands, Newfoundland
at the Change Islands / Simon Fraser University workshop conference
Oceans and the Future of Endangered Coastal Communities

August 8 – 10 2006

by

David B Thomson
international fisheries and coastal consultant
e-mail contact *wcovesea3@yahoo.com*

Contents :

Coastal Communities;

global threats to their future

their value and importance

national and international efforts

Sustainability Issues;

resource sustainability

economic sustainability

social sustainability

Conclusions

Precis : The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation has estimated that small scale coastal fisheries support the livelihoods of over 200 million persons worldwide. Most of this fisher-dependent population lives in small villages scattered along the coast of the world's continents and islands. The bulk of them are found in South Asia and South-East Asia. A significant number are located around the shores of North and South America and Europe. Practically all these communities are under threat from globalisation, centralisation, and from the growing demand for access to fishery resources and coastal lands. But these small villages are of enormous national, cultural, economic, and social importance. They have a strategic value in their presence and protecting influence over the coast and coastal assets. Their loss would impact on their countries for generations to come, and if allowed to die, their restoration could require huge investments in effort and capital. This paper examines the issues related to a sustainable future for small coastal communities, with particular reference to the Change Islands, and argues that wise administration and modest support could ensure they become or remain viable and continue to be a valued asset to their province or nation.

Coastal Communities

global threats to their future

The agricultural revolution of the 18th century and the industrial revolution of the 19th century resulted in a huge shift of population from rural to urban areas as mechanisation made it possible to replace farm labour with machines. This naturally had a huge impact on rural villages, most of which declined in size and significance. Some communities were brutally affected when mechanisation

and amalgamation had dreadful unforeseen results in the 20th century; - in the dustbowl of America's wheatlands, and the collectivisation of previously viable private farms in the Soviet Union. The process of urbanisation hit the industrialised countries first, but is now continuing apace in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Some see the trend as irreversible and to be accepted. Others believe that priceless elements of our culture, our links to nature, social cohesion, and even national security, may be lost unnecessarily by our failure to protect what is beneficial and important in our blanket acceptance of all that technology and markets have to offer.

Fishing communities have suffered less from urbanisation and mechanisation, but are now faced with serious threats to their very existence from market forces and legal measures that weight the dice against them. The specific form these threats take varies from country to country. We shall consider them as they affect Newfoundland, North America, Scandinavia, Europe and south and south-east Asia, to provide us with a global background to the issue.

Other looming threats are more environmental in nature. Fish stocks are under greater pressure than ever before. Global warming may result in sea level rises that could endanger some coastal areas. Deforestation and industrial pollution are contributing to the number of factors that could destroy the coastal zone environment in the long term. Other parts of the world have witnessed extensive damage and loss of life from sudden tsunami waves created by seabed earthquakes, that may have occurred hundreds of miles away. Tropical storms and hurricanes appear to be on the increase, as seen recently in the Gulf of Mexico.

their value and importance

Coastal villages have a value that can not be assessed in monetary terms alone. They are a national asset for tourism, for rural sustainability, and for strategic issues like security of our shores and remote locations. When I was discussing these issues 38 years ago with New England fishermen and academics, fisher leader Jake Dykstra defended the continuance of small harbours and landing places from a wider economic perspective. He said that tourists have no wish to see dead or stagnant villages. They want to see a few boats, some fishers mending their gear, and stalls where they can buy fish and lobster, fresher than any they see in the city. These communities also have a cultural and historical significance. Nowhere is that more true than in Newfoundland. The Province's wealth of traditional songs, jig tunes and sea shanties, was born and nurtured in hundreds of small outports and bays that made up for their lack of urban sophistication by their enormous poetic and musical talents which expressed the heart and soul of Newfoundland, its traditions and its values.

The fisher communities and the small scale fisheries in general, are based on a way of life rather than on economic opportunity. Newfoundland knows well from bitter experience how some companies and corporations have a 'get-rich-quick' mentality that grabs resources and concessions in the initial period, but abandons the community once these benefits start to decline. In contrast, small fishers and their communities are in their business for the long haul. They have generational roots in their way of life and these are valued more than temporary affluence. This is at variance with modern economic development theory that worships the power of the market place. But it provides a stability that is absent from most profit-motivated enterprises.

national and international efforts *to protect and nurture coastal communities*

While some who have boundless faith in market forces and technological progress opine that small scale businesses and rural villages should be allowed to "wither on the vine", most governments recognise their importance and try to afford them some long term protection. Interestingly, this is happening in both the industrialised and developing parts of the world. America has provided "community quotas" to ensure that aboriginal communities will have legal ownership of and access to their local fish stocks. Japan developed an intricate and sophisticated series of fishery cooperatives that are empowered to manage local fisheries and to decide on their particular direction of development. Indonesia could harvest its huge 3.5 million ton fish production with powerful vessels and agro-business fish farms, but it has chosen instead to protect its 3.0 million small scale fishers and fish farmers because their continued employment is critical to social stability. When the effect of the EU Common Fisheries Policy, and ICES advice on quotas and fleet sizes, threatened to close many small coastal ports, Norway made a significant policy decision to maintain its coastal

communities regardless of cost. Being in the EEA, but outside of the EU, though respecting ICES advice, it was more free to do so, and so today along its NE coast and the Lofoten Islands, those small villages remain active and viable. The first requirement then for a sustainable future, is political will on the part of national and provincial authorities.

The United Nations Agencies have played a part in the promotion of schemes to protect the resource base and enhance the economic opportunities for rural, coastal, and island communities. One of the schemes encouraged has been 'TURFS', territorial user rights in fisheries, which is designed to give communities continuing legal access to and management authority over, their local fishery resource. The World Bank and the Asian Development Bank are also committed to assisting rural communities, though this is not always well expressed in their development loans. The writer has just completed a coastal project for ADB in central Vietnam where poor coastal communes are being assisted to ensure their future viability.

Sustainability Issues

resource sustainability

- fresh water, forests and wildlife

Some 18 years ago the writer was part of a team that examined FAO fishery projects in Africa, Asia and S.E. Asia, to determine what approaches worked, and which ones had less success. Two elements that were concluded to be vital in ensuring success, were an integrated approach to rural development activities, and treating all of a community's natural resource in totality rather than looking piecemeal at single sectors like fisheries. Fish are a major resource for a coastal or island community, but wildlife, forests, fresh water, and mineral resources are also important, both as economic assets, and as part of the whole
ecosystem. The integrated, total-ecosystem approach sits well with small communities where income-earning may involve several skills and different products. Newfoundland fishermen have traditionally been skilled carpenters, usually constructing their own houses and boats. Their fishing activities involved cod, flounder, capelin, salmon, and lobster. Hunting was a seasonal affair involving seal, moose, seabirds, and other game. Outport and island communities traditionally had a multi-resource, multi-activity economy, much like the crofting villages of the Hebrides in Scotland.

- the coastal environment

Coastal zone management is a relatively new science that has developed rapidly in response to concerns that this unique area bordering land and sea, which has so much to offer us, is under threat, and in need of careful study and wise protection. Universities like Simon Fraser, Rhode Island, Memorial / Marine Institute, and many others, are now focusing attention and effort on CZM. I leave it to the biologists and environmentalists to give us a detailed account of the zone and the threats it faces, but a personal view of my home coast may stimulate thought and discussion.

I live at Covesea on the Moray Firth in Scotland. This coastal area has supported fisheries and communities for centuries. As far back as Viking and Roman times, fish were a mainstay of the population, and a vital winter food in its salted or dried state. As a boy I loved to explore the rocky pools and beaches where marine life abounded. There were sandeels, saithe, rockfish, conger eels, dabs, mackerels, hermit crabs, brown and velvet crabs, and lobster. Both rock pools and sandy beaches were full of sea life. Today, they are bereft of all but a few hardy limpets, mussels and the occasional small crab. That is the situation all around our coast. What has happened ? Nobody has an answer, but it would appear that a combination of industrial, agricultural and urban pollution and excessive fishing effort has had a disturbing impact. I hope Newfoundland's coasts are in better shape. Perhaps we can get some feedback on that during discussions.

fishery threats

- grab for access to and control of fish stocks

Fifty years ago almost anyone who could obtain a boat and a net, line or trap, could proceed to sea and catch fish. Today the situation is extremely complex, with permission to fish and access to

particular species, bound up in a maze of regulations. The most restrictive measure is the application of quotas or limits to fish catches. In the North Sea, the application of single species quotas in multi-species demersal fisheries has resulted in the dumping or discarding of 600,000 tons of fish at sea. These discards are dead, - lost to the stock, to the fishers, and to the market. Now ITQs or individual transferable quotas, has created a trade in the very entitlement to fish. This trade is not just a trade in fish (fish that have not yet been spawned or hatched or grown to maturity), - it is a trade in fishermen's jobs and communities' futures. Others here may disagree, but it is indisputable that where ITQs have been applied, whether in Newfoundland, Iceland, New Zealand, or Europe, their introduction has been followed by massive stock reduction and concentration of fishery activity and profit into fewer and fewer hands. The victims have largely been the small scale traditional fishers and their communities.

- introduction of restrictions that damage the local economy

A healthy rural or coastal community requires certain minimal facilities to function well. These include access to resources and to markets, local sources of fresh water, and regular supplies of energy whether electricity, oil, gas, or fuel wood. Where fishing is a key basic economic activity, it supports a range of secondary and tertiary business, including boat repair, marine engineering, processing or preservation, ship chandlery, transport, and also, grocery stores, banks, post office, and fuel supplies. These facilities and services in turn justify the provision of local health services, public transport, garages, guest houses or hotels. But if the basis of the local economy is removed, as has happened in a number of cases, then the remaining business and social components begin to die or be much reduced in activity. A fleet of one or two dozen boats can keep a village alive, but once they go the secondary industry dies from lack of business, and the tertiary services also suffer. Government may then consider closing the local post office and medical clinic, and public transport services can also be curtailed.

This is what has happened to some small fishing harbours in the Hebrides and west coast of Scotland. Government measures reduced the fish quotas the fleet depended on, and in some cases denied the port official landing status, so that catches had to be transported to larger ports some distance away. Local fish merchants and processors had to cease trading due to lack of raw material. It is important for Newfoundland's small communities that Provincial governments exercise care to ensure that there are no legislative measures that might penalise vulnerable outports or put them at an unfair advantage vis a vis big business.

- imposition of sanctuaries that deny community involvement

Fish sanctuaries, marine parks and closed areas can be a useful tool to help facilitate the replenishment of fish stocks, if carefully designed and managed on the basis of extensive solid research. One difficulty with the case for such sanctuaries is that the stock reduction has usually been brought about by large impact fleets, yet the fishers who must sacrifice grounds and access to resources, are the coastal small scale operators. In some cases such as the recent marine parks introduced for the Great Barrier Reef off Australia, and proposed for the southern Hebrides off south-west Scotland, there were no prior scientific studies and no genuine attempt to consult the local communities.

There are three fundamental principles that WWF and IUCN seek to apply with considerable diligence when considering possible marine parks or sanctuaries. These principles are :

1. there must be sound scientific evidence of the need for such a measure, and also reliable indications that the measure will have the desired result.
2. there must be full and open consultation with the local fishers and their communities, whose agreement must be obtained before proceeding with the venture.
3. if some fishers or stakeholders are to lose income as a result of the intervention, then there must be adequate compensation or alternative employment provided.

These guidelines are adhered to in most but not all situations as indicated above. It is important that Newfoundland's communities are protected from any such conservation measures that might have negative unintended impacts on the local economy.

- economic bias in favour of high impact fleets

One would have thought that authorities and governments in their efforts to reduce pressure on fish stocks, would restrict and control the operations of the large-impact fleets, - the huge stern trawlers, purse seiners, midwater trawlers, and ocean going long liners. But no, - in most cases the tactic is to reduce the low-impact fleets, to penalise the small operators, and in some cases to allow their fishing rights to be acquired by the big companies. I can provide several recent examples. The common excuse for such policies is that it is done to achieve economic efficiency. What do they mean by that ? I have quizzed government, bank and fishery management authorities on the question. Ultimately in their view it appears that they believe more profit in fewer hands is indicative of economic efficiency, while the same profit shared among a larger number of operators and their communities, is indicative of poor economic performance. Generally speaking, the poorer developing countries take a different view, as does Norway, Japan, the Faeroe Isles, and the Pacific states. In the USA, although quotas and licenses are strictly applied, they are usually qualified in ways that protect the smaller scale operators. But generally today, governments tend to favour high-impact fishing units, viewing them as 'more economically efficient'.

A more subtle bias in favour of large scale fishing units is seen in the application of current efforts to remove all subsidies from the fishery sector. As with attempts to reduce fishing effort, the first target is the small scale sector. There is a general fallacy that small scale fleets are subsidised and large scale ones are not. What a government describes as a subsidy can be interesting. At present the UK fishery sector receives no direct subsidies. But as a civil servant informed me recently, any government service can be regarded as a subsidy. By that he meant to include all fishery research, protection, statistical, and administrative services. I have yet to hear such a suggestion made for any other sector. A recent paper by Professor John Kurien, in a response to Dr Francis Christy's one fishery subsidies, examined these from a global perspective. He found that the most subsidised part of the global fleet by far, was the large scale sector. This parallels the situation in business where large companies and corporations can lobby effectively for government support, while small businesses in general have little clout in the corridors of power.

economic sustainability

- the effect of unrestricted market forces

A successful modern observer of global markets has wisely remarked that, - "*Markets are designed to facilitate the free exchange of goods and services among willing participants, but are not capable on their own, of taking care of collective needs. Nor are they competent to ensure social justice. These "public goods" can only be provided by a political process."* Coming from the country that produced the economist Adam Smith, I must respect and appreciate the power of market forces, but I should not be deceived into thinking that their 'hidden hand' has any moral authority or sensitivity. And I can assure you that Adam Smith did not think that capitalism in itself could resolve social inequalities.

My 30 years in Asia and Africa have brought me into direct contact with the impact of unrestricted market forces on vulnerable communities. One witnesses the 'dual economy' that prevails in most cities of the third world. Then one comes across thousands of small villages that stagnate in perpetual debt or poverty as they sell their labour and raw produce at low prices, and purchase manufactured goods at prices they can scarcely afford. What we see in the third world is but an extreme example of what can happen in Europe, Canada or the USA, if safeguards are not put in place. Here we have comprehensive welfare systems and safety nets that cushion the effect of market forces. But that should not cloud our judgment or blind us to the need to afford some economic protection to small communities.

- small-is-appropriate technologies and facilities

Small communities and small scale enterprises can use simple low-tech and low-cost technologies which would be of little value to large enterprises. There are several examples of this principle in the energy field. Wind power produces modest amounts of electricity and the output varies with the weather, so it is hardly relevant to industries with high energy consumption. For smaller production

units, however, whether boats or processing plants, a modest power source may be adequate much of the time. Power can be obtained from other renewable sources like wood which may be used to fuel a steam engine or a diesel motor through a pyroletic digester. Biogas can be made from animal waste, vegetation, or even fish offal. There is a large pork processing plant in the Philippines that is run wholly on biogas produced from the waste of pigs and chickens. The gas fuels Toyota car engines which drive the generators that produce the factory's electricity.

Some very modern technologies are suited to small-scale and low-cost operations. Cell phones, satellite navigators, computers and refrigerators require only modest amounts of electricity. A combination of solar and wind power sources could provide ample current for such items. Ice manufacture requires more substantial power, but in that case it is possible to drive a compressor directly from a rotary windmill, without having to convert the movement into electricity. While some may argue that it is much easier just to use gasoline or diesel, one should bear in mind that oil fuel cost is high for remote communities which have to pay for the additional transport cost.

- integrated economies

For small or scattered rural communities, integration with other local economic activities offers much promise. Traditionally this has been achieved through farming and fishing cooperatives or associations. The type of vehicle or structure utilised is less important than the commitment of the various stakeholders, and the degree of trust built up between them. The common criticism of small villages is that they lack the volume of business activity to be viable. This can be overcome partially by working in concert with other small producers within reasonable distance. The goal of this cooperation can be two-fold : first, lower marketing and transport costs, and lower processing or storage costs where facilities are shared; second, the stimulation of new activities or added value to existing products, through sharing of ideas and proposals. The whole community can be involved, with even schoolchildren assisting, since in this electronic age, most of them are computer literate, and can scan the internet for data or information required to advance or expand existing local enterprises.

- added value

It is vital that small producers add maximum value to their products and services. Every business seeks to do this to a greater or lesser degree. It can be a general goal for all of the community's activities, - product quality and product value. Some communities decide to focus on a single product which together they can produce in quantity, while others may prefer to remain diversified. Two examples of single added value products, from opposite sides of the globe, may suffice for illustration. The prawn creel fishers of west Scotland catch *nephrops* prawns or 'Norway lobster'. The best market for these is in Spain where top prices are paid for live prawns. Inverness airport lies 2 hours away by road from the creel fisher outports. To catch the Monday morning market in Spain, the prawns must be loaded on to the aircraft by 7. am. This would normally mean hauling the creels on Sunday and driving to the airport very early next day. But the west coast fishers traditionally will not work on a Sunday. So they haul their creels on Friday and Saturday, and painstakingly place each individual prawn in a tube in floating cages near the shore. After midnight Sunday the prawns are removed from the tubes and put into polystyrene boxes with seaweed to keep them damp and alive. These boxes are then delivered to the airport in time to catch the best markets in Spain that same morning. This maximises the value of the produce.

Island communities in the Pacific are able to grow a range of fruit including orange, grapefruit, pineapple, banana and coconut. But they are unable to compete in quantity with the large volume producers in S.E. Asia and Indo-China. So they look for niche markets. Following negotiations with outlets in the USA, they made juices from the fruit, and put them in sealed cellophane tubes. The tubes are later frozen by the retailers in America and sold as ice lollipops, - but ones with a difference. Instead of coloured water and sugar, the kids get genuine healthy fruit juice in an acceptable form.

social sustainability

- empowerment of local communities

In order to make the decisions about the future direction of the community and have the authority to make changes for the better, the people must be free from over-control by Provincial or District authorities. Higher bodies can determine policy but the community ought to have the freedom to decide on details of local expenditures and to adapt general plans to fit better the local situation.

- devolution and decentralisation

In my involvement in development work in over 50 countries I have rarely come across a government that does not claim to be in favour of devolution and decentralisation. That is the transfer of powers from the centre to the more remote parts of the country, and the parallel empowerment of rural communities so they can have some say and some control over their futures. But, in my travels I have seen little evidence of genuine progress in that direction. It is beginning to happen now as democracies are strengthened. One odd result is that rural districts and provinces in countries like Vietnam, Indonesia and Thailand, are beginning to experience an empowerment that in some areas exceeds what provinces in Europe and UK know at present. Devolution and decentralisation can only help the small coastal and island communities. Without the empowerment they bring, the small village is at the mercy of higher authorities and distant bureaucracies where individual officials may lack knowledge of the situation or genuine motivation to listen and assist.

Conclusions

strategies for effective action

We close with a few suggestions to guide the local community and its entrepreneurs, in their efforts to develop a robust and sustainable local economy.

- develop local networks

Form partnerships with other communities in the area. Link together wherever it is profitable to share facilities or transport. This could lead to the development of a critical mass or a volume of produce that justifies

- add value wherever possible

Avoid selling raw produce wherever possible, whether dealing in fish, timber, milk, meat, or handcrafted items. Remember that live fish, particularly live shellfish, are a more valued product than processed ones. And I should not have to remind Newfoundland that salt fish or stock fish are still a prized high-value product in southern Europe, West Africa, and the Caribbean.

- identify niche markets

When you cannot compete with big volume producers, then do what the big factory cannot do, - go for quality and variety and specialised items. Fishermen can make nautical items from rope and netting and wood, that tourists love to buy to decorate homes or bars or clubs. Seasonal berries can be made into jams or pies. Dried, salted fish products sell well all over the world. Small fish like capelin make excellent bar snacks, and split, dried cod or ling or haddock, can fetch top prices in Iberean and West African markets. And do not forget the humble fish head or crab claw. These can be made into bisques, chowders or soup bases to which restaurants can add their special flavours. The soup bases are sold in sealed flexible plastic containers.

- maximise all possible opportunities.

It is unlikely that any one economic activity will support the community in the long term. But one or two reasonably profitable activities can be supplemented by three or four additional money earners that could make a huge overall difference. In addition to the traditional fishing, hunting and timber activities, tourism, leisure and sports activities,

- select technology with care

A penny saved is a penny earned. Invest in systems that can be repaired and maintained locally. Look at low-energy cost systems. Wind and solar produced electricity can reduce the cost of power over a period.

- speak up for your community

Change Islands already has its own web site. Cash in on it. Publicise what you have to offer. Keep elected officials informed of your situation and of any urgent matters. Write to the press. Send recorded pieces to local radio and television. Remember the old ditty :

"The fish it never boasts about its thousand eggs or so,
The hen is quite a different bird, - one egg and hear her crow !
The fish we spurn, but crown the hen, which leads me to surmise,
Don't hide your light, but blow your horn, it pays to advertise !"

Go to Index

Go to Index

THE WORLD'S TWO MARINE FISHING INDUSTRIES - HOW THEY COMPARE

	LARGE SCALE	SMALL SCALE
Number of fishermen employed	AROUND 500,000	OVER 12,000,000
Annual catch of marine fish for human consumption	AROUND 29 MILLION TONNES	AROUND 24 MILLION TONNES
Capital cost of each job on fishing vessels	$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$ $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$ $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$ $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$ $ 30,000 - $ 300,000	$ $ 250 – 2,500
Annual catch of marine fish for animal feed and industrial reduction to meal and oil.	Fish Meal AROUND 22 MILLION TONNES	Fish Meal ALMOST NONE
Annual fuel oil consumption	14 - 19 MILLION TONNES	1 – 2.5 MILLION TONNES
Fish caught per tonne of fuel consumed	= 2 – 5 TONNES	=
Fishermen employed for each $ 1 million invested in fishing vessels	5 – 30	500 – 4,000
Fish destroyed at sea each year as by-catch in shrimp & trawl fisheries	6 – 16 MILLION TONNES	NONE

ICLARM: David Thomson's illustration above created widespread awareness of the efficiency of small-scale fisheries; however, some donor agencies still feel obliged to "upgrade" them into inefficient large-scale fisheries! The table above has been brought up-to-date by courtesy of Dr. Armin Lindquist, Assistant Director-General (Fisheries Department), using latest (1986) FAO fisheries statistics and economics data at 1988 prices. (table re-formatted by Kim Ang, FAO project I.T. mapping and data specialist, 2007)

Go to Index

Go to Index

***Special Note to Appendix:* The FAL document that follows was sent to me (Alastair McIntosh) by Roddy McColl, the FAL's Secretary, asking if I might consider including it with these other fishing industry resources on my website. I do not know Mr McColl and have not worked with him. I therefore do not feel able to comment on or imply endorsement of the FAL position in its entirety. But I can see that there are points of clear overlap with the material that is otherwise shared on this page, and I am therefore happy to make it available without prejudice as the following appendix.**

THE FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION LIMITED

Evidence to
European Union Committee
Sub Committee D (Environment and Agriculture)

Review of the Common Fisheries Policy

Introduction

"I cannot recall another example in history of a free country without compulsion from outside entering on an arrangement so damaging to itself. " *Peter Shore 22 February 1972 Col 1164 Hansard.*

Equal access to the common resource…. a non discriminatory principle ….. is the real Common Fisheries Policy.

The decisions made at the December 2002 Council meeting were not designed to change that fundamental priniciple.

There is a very great misunderstanding of what the Common Fisheries Policy really is. The European Court of Justice has made it absolutely clear that the community system of national quotas and the regulations governing these quotas at the end of each year is a derogation from the principle of equal access to fishery resources and non-discrimination laid down in Article 40, clause 3 of the Treaty of Rome. Article 40, clause 3 is a very simple Article which says there must be no discrimination between producers or consumers within the Community.

It is entirely misleading to refer to reform of the CFP. The CFP is equal access to the common resource not the management regime (the transitional derogation) introduced in 1983 under which the discriminatory principle of Relative Stability was introduced in the allocation of fish quotas .to Member States. However it is naïve to believe that other Member States are going to be content for all time to allow a discriminatory principle to over ride EU law of equal access to the common resource.

The CFP has been a social and environmental disaster. For the sake of European Union integration, the environmental and social price which has been paid throughout Europe and beyond has been enormous. That policy – the real CFP -- can not be reformed.

The real CFP of equal access to the common resource has caused a Sea Clearances for Scotland and other parts of the UK. This was not unexpected. The Commission had warned the industry on 11 June 1992 that the way forward, as envisaged by the Commission for the re-structure of the industry, would involve thousands of fishermen losing their jobs.

- **196 vessels over 10 metres in length left the Scottish fleet between 2001 and 2004.**
- **165 were unnecessarily scrapped as a result of the 2001-02 and 2003 decommissioning schemes**

- **Almost 1100 boats have left the fleet in the 20 years since the UK joined the then Common Market.**

The political end game for the EU is an integrated EU fleet, operating in EU waters under the central control of the EU Commission being told where, when and with what to fish.

The economic loss to Scotland and the UK

Scotland

The effects of the CFP on the Scottish fishing industry:-

- The annual loss of direct income to the catching sector of a minimum of **£334 million**. Of this, £110 million would have been crew wages, with the remaining £224 million lost to the vessel services like fuel, repairs, gear, insurance, banks, groceries, harbours, etc.
- Added value, fish processing and marketing, etc., raise the economic value of the annual loss considerably. The recognised GDP impact ratio for fisheries is 2.35 times the landed value. So, the direct economic impact of the reduction of the Scottish fishing fleet in 1975-2003 is now **a current annual loss to the Scottish economy of a staggering £785 million**.
- The costs to public funds of unemployment and other social benefits as well as broader economic consequences, including loss of tax income, probably bring the total loss nearer to £900 million **every year**.
- This exceeds by a huge margin any economic benefits Scotland receives from the European Union and funds like the European Fisheries Fund

DEFRA stated that the UK catching industry lands over £540 million pounds in catches each year, resulting in between £800 – £1200 million of economic activity in the UK.

However the value of fisheries products, at landing values, extracted annually from the British Exclusive Fishing Zone, amounts to £2.5 to £3 billion pounds, of which a mere £540 million goes to the British Industry.

That represents a loss of between £ 2.0 billion and £ 2.5 billion to the UK economy.

Specific Issues

FAL has had the opportunity to see the excellent submission of David Thomson and endorses his comments. We have however the following additional points

Conservation and Management

FAL assumes that the Committee would agree with the following statement

A sustainable and profitable sea fisheries industry must be well-managed, with effective communication and understanding between fisheries managers and regulators, catchers and processors. This will lead to policies and rules which are better understood and better reflect day to day reality. This in turn leads to high levels of compliance, to everyone's benefit

FAL fully supports responsible well managed fishing. But the CFP (equal access to the common resource) is not a system designed to ensure responsible fisheries management but one that has been the antithesis of conservation and it is the CFP that drives the UK and Scottish Marine Directorate's future fisheries strategy.

Conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources requires compliance.

It appears that compliance is a one way street. The rules are there and you <u>must</u> comply even if they are illogical. The aim of simplifying the current morass of rules and regulations does not mean a weakening of controls.

Disproportionate action will not convince fishermen that compliance is in their best interests and that they should take responsibility for their actions and the consequences thereof.

Full compliance needs full viability. Fleet viability is imperative to a sustainable and viable fishery. Full compliance can only come at a price if there is not full viability in the existing sectors of the fleet.

If vessel operators are being forced to bankruptcy due to inadequate quota allocations or limited days at sea or the inability to access the resource due to marine closed areas what recourse do they have?

How are the vessels to be treated that are currently viable but then find they are unviable due to a cut in certain species in the future and so unable to realise sufficient turnover due to inadequate quota allocations? The deep water fleet that operated to the West of Scotland is a graphic example of what can happen.

TACS: They have not worked. It is an immoral practice to dump perfectly mature fish dead back into the sea on a science which is 60% accurate at best.

Current management tools: They are not working as science is disproportionate to what skippers are finding on the grounds.

RIGHTS BASED Management Tools and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

Fishermen have for many years supported temporary closed fishing seasons and areas to allow fish populations to grow to optimum size provided there is scientific advice that supports such closures unlike the so called west of Scotland "windsock area" that was closed without any scientific justification to appease the EU Commission's cod recovery ambitions.

However there is a growing concern within the fishing community that advocates of MPAs as a management tool actually wish to close vast portions of the sea to all forms of fishing on a permanent basis. They want these areas declared off-limits to fishing without scientific proof that permanent no-fishing zones would actually produce more fish. Bio-diversity and sustainability are only two of the arguments used to support such proposals and Marine Nature Reserves

Fishermen are easy targets and if MPAs/Marine Nature Reserves are to be introduced then the customary **rights** of fishermen have to be given priority. They are not just stakeholders and they must not be denied access to the resources that have supported them and their communities for centuries. They must be protected from pollution, marine transport threats, pipelines, gravel extraction, telephone networks, and eco-tourism if it displaces the fishermen's access to local grounds.

The key principles, at least in the opinion of the EU Commission, for setting up MPAs were spelled out by John Farnell Director Conservation Policy in the European Commission at a Conference organised by The Sustainable Development Intergroup of the European Parliament inNovember 2005 and chaired by Struan Stevenson MEP. These are:

(a) Such areas should not include a complete ban on fishing.
(b) MPAs must be built on a solid scientific basis, although the precautionary approach may be necessary.
(c) MPAs must demonstrate economic and social equity, particularly where fishing communities rely on the areas in question.
(d) The governing authorities must ensure careful monitoring to measure the impact on bio-diversity.
(e) There must be full consultation with stakeholders at all stages, including the design, operation and review of MPAs.

To each of the above principles, we would comment:

(a) Neither should they include a partial ban, unless there is clear scientific proof that it is absolutely needed to protect the stocks.
(b) The scientific basis must be sound long-term research with the onus of proof on the proposer. The fishing community should be entitled to present alternative scientific opinion if such exists.

(c) We fully agree with this principle.
(d) The monitoring should be initiated before the MPA is set up.
(e) The consultation must be genuine and meaningful, and not as often occurs, a mere sampling of fishermen's views which are then ignored

Control and Enforcement

Community Fisheries Control Agency

FAL understands that the CFCA was established *to ensure a level playing field of enforcement across the EU.*

A level playing field is a much misused phrase. Whose ball will we be playing with? If the Commission achieves its objective then an EU fleet operating in EU waters on a non discriminatory basis and run by a centralised agency will be the outcome.

The Commission has little regard for the UKs criminal justice system as being too ineffective in securing compliance with its targets and wishes to see severe administrative penalties as the norm.

FAL cannot support such an Agency particularly as we know so little about it at present.
As for the Commission being sceptical about the systems currently in place the introduction in the UK of the Registration of Sellers and Buyers legislation has eliminated the trade in over quota in this country.

Structural Policy: Has removed 165 whitefish vessels from the Scottish fleet.

European Fisheries Fund

The European Fisheries Fund (EFF)

The Scottish Government has secured 40 per cent - £38.83 million - of the UK budget for a new European grants scheme for Scotland's fishing and aquaculture industries.

The new European Fisheries Fund is designed to help modernise and secure the sustainability and international competitiveness of the fishing industry.

The £38.83 million will be split between the Scottish Highlands and Islands Convergence area (£12.41 million) and the Lowland Scotland Non-Convergence area (£26.42 million).

Details of the timetable and how to apply for grants will be announced by the Scottish Government Marine Directorate, following a UK wide consultation on priorities for the funds early next year.

The European Fisheries Fund replaces the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance (FIFG) grant programme which ran between 2000 and 2006.

EFF is programmed to run until 2013

The UK money has been allocated as follows:

- England £26.42m
- Scotland £26.42m
- Northern Ireland £12.76m
- Wales £1.07m

Separate funds will be available for Cornwall (£7.3m), West Wales (£10.68m), and the Scottish Highlands and Islands (£12.41m).

We still await advice on the timetable and information on the priorities that have been agreed

Governance

Regional Advisory Councils (RACs)

RACs were established ostensibly on the basis that they would provide for a more devolved fisheries management However subsidiarity does not exist under the CFP. Competence for fisheries was transferred to Brussels. It would be contrary to the legal and institutional framework of the Treaty to grant RACs increased responsibilities in the decision making process. They are purely advisory bodies and do nothing to transfer decision-making power away from Brussels. In fact the Amsterdam Treaty explicitly rules this out.

The real nature of RACs is a different matter

- RACs can not provide for a more devolved fisheries management.
- Subsidiarity does not exist in the CFP
- They will remain advisory
- They will not have a role in management.
- They will not become management organisations.
- Competence for fisheries has been transferred to Brussels.
- They do nothing to transfer decision-making power away from Brussels. In fact the Amsterdam Treaty explicitly rules this out.
- They are designed to promote the development of the CFP equal access to all Member States to the common resource

However, if there was national control, a repatriation, then the principle of an Advisory Council, in fact a management council, would not only be welcomed but should be implemented.

Conclusion

The fishing industry provides tens of thousands of jobs and generates hundreds of millions of pounds for the UK economy. It also provides the heart of many of our coastal communities who depend on the success of that industry.

FAL suggests to the Committee that in taking evidence it considers the views of the fishing communities throughout the UK perhaps even visit a cross section of ports.

It is important that the Committee understand that it is not only an industry which is a provider of employment but also a historic part of Scottish and UK heritage and culture.

Communities through out the UK that are dependant on this unique industry can not tolerate any further decline. They are still suffering the aftermath of decommissioning in 2003 /4.

Although fish prices have high for most of the last 18 months any profit made has been spent on leasing more quota and days in order to catch the fish. So there has been no real improvement to the industry and its communities. As long as the UK remains in the CFP that will continue.

Roderick McColl
For FAL Secretaries
21 February 2008

Go to Index