Abstracts

Session 1: North Sea fisheries – an introduction to the issues

Reviewing the Research and Technology Frameworks, past and present: solved problems and new research agenda?

Marios Lopes dos Santos (DG RTD EC "Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Aquaculture")

The development and successful implementation of the CFP is highly dependent on research and objective advice provided by scientific institutions. In the 2002 CFP reform, the Commission has emphasised the crucial role of research and scientific advice for improving decision making. Research in support to fisheries and aquaculture at EU is fully integrated in the context of the European Research Area (ERA) and the new Maritime Policy. In the 6th Framework Programmes for Research (FP6 - 2002-2006) several key research domains were covered: scientific basis of fisheries management, scientific basis of fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance, integration of environmental requirements into the CFP, synthesis and dissemination of results to end-users. A review of past and present RTD projects funded in the field of fisheries under FP6 will be presented. Information on recently selected projects for funding under the new FP7 programme (2007-2013) will be also given, regarding in particular Theme 2 - Food, Agriculture and Fisheries and Biotechnology and Theme 6 - Environment including Climate change.

EU -co-financing opportunities for research projects in the field of fisheries

Fisheries research community within Europe needs to grow further to be capable of addressing the new challenges facing Europe. New frontiers should be explored and new methods and tools should be developed to ensure the future of sustainable fisheries within a healthy ecosystem. Opportunities offered in the new 7th Framework Programme (2007-2013) to financially support fisheries research will be presented. Focus will be on the Specific programmes and domains of major interest for the fisheries sector.

Short CV

Mario Lopes dos Santos, works for the Unit "Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Aquaculture" of DG Research of the European Commission, where he is responsible for fisheries and aquaculture research under the EC Seventh Framework Programme for Research. He has a degree in general aquatic sciences and an MSc in “Applied Fish Biology” as well as past experience at DG MARE and as a researcher and lecturer in Portugal.

Contact details: Marios Lopes dos Santos, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium [e-mail: Mario.Santos@ec.europa.eu].

What are the research agendas from the fishing industry’s point of view?

Hugo Anderson (NSRAC)

Contact details: Hugo Anderson, NCRAC, Skäftesfall, SE-61292 Finspång, Sweden [e-mail: Hugo.andersson@lio.se].

What are the research priorities from the science managers point of view?

Martin C. Th. Scholten (President EFARO, Director IMARES (Netherlands))

As the European association of 25 national fisheries and aquaculture research institutes involved in scientific policy support with 3000 researchers, EFARO is often consulted to advice on the future research needs form a fisheries management point of view.

During the FP5 and FP 6 period, EFARO organized as a concerted action various expert workshops to define the research priorities in fisheries and aquaculture research. This has in 2006 been summarized in a report "Trends in European fisheries and aquaculture research". A synopsis will be presented.

At this moment EFARO coordinates the FEUFAR project (under FP6), aimed to define the research required in the medium term (10-20 years) to permit exploitation and farming of aquatic resources for sustainable production of required seafood. The final workshop with stakeholders has been held in Crete last week (17-18 June 2008). The main conclusions of that workshop will be presented.

From the various position papers EFARO produced the last years on request of the European Commission and European Parliament, an overview will be given on the trends and related research priorities we have identified in marine fisheries, finfish mariculture and shellfish production in the North Sea region.

Contact details: Martin Scholten, IMARES, Postbus 68, 1970 AB Ijmuiden, Netherlands [e-mail: Martin.Scholten@wur.nl].

A future Common Fisheries Policy and the role of science

Poul Degnbol (EC)

The Common Fisheries Policy has so far not delivered the outcomes which were hoped for after the last reform in 2002. Most European fish stocks are still overfished, there is considerable overcapacity, poor contribution of products to European consumers and low resilience in the industry to external pressures (such as oil price increases) as a result. This is to a large extent a result of an institutional framework which is conducive to a short-term perspective in decisions and implementation.

In considering a reform of the policy one needs to address the need to clarify the objective hierarchy with ecological sustainability as the core, to change the institutional framework for decision-making and implementation so that it becomes conducive to a long-term perspective and to make industry responsible. European fishery management will furthermore need to better integrate environmental concerns and to be supportive to the Marine Strategy to ensure an ecosystem approach to marine management. These developments will have important governance implications and change the way research based advice interacts with policy and the substance of research based advice

Contact details: Poul Degnbol, Scientific adviser, European Commission Poul.DEGNBOL@ec.europa.eu].

Session 2: North Sea fisheries – its role today and in the future

The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management – implications of climate change

Simon Jennings (CEFAS)

The environment is always changing. Against this background of change, policymakers develop objectives that reflect societal views about desirable states of fisheries and the ecosystem and managers seek to control fishing pressure to achieve these states (or to avoid undesirable ones). A changing environment contributes to uncertainty about the effects of alternate management actions on progress towards objectives. While methods of accounting for this uncertainty are increasingly sophisticated the methods of dealing with the implications are not. I consider how the outputs of recent scientific research projects might be used to develop methods for dealing with the implications of uncertainty and to support future developments in monitoring, assessment, and management. These changes would complement and support the move towards an ecosystem approach, and arguably improve our capacity to adapt to environmental change.

Contact details: Simon Jennings, Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, Lowestoft & School of Environmental Sciences, UEA, Norwich, UK [e-mail: simon.jennings@cefas.co.uk].

PROTECT: Area-based management of North Sea ecosystems and resources – concepts and tools

Thomas Kirk Sørensen (DTU-AQUA)

PROTECT - Marine Protected Areas as a Tool for Ecosystem Conservation and Fisheries Management - is an EU FP6 policy-oriented research project that aims to strengthen the tools and the foundation on which decisions are made regarding the selection, development, management, and evaluation of marine protected areas (MPAs) in temperate seas.

The project work is anchored in three different MPA scenarios with objectives spanning across ecosystem conservation and fishery management. Case studies include cod closures in the Baltic Sea, deep-sea corals in the Northeast Atlantic, and area-based management of sandeel fisheries in the North Sea – the latter relating to important commercial interests as well as a key species in the ecosystem.

Sandbanks distributed throughout the North Sea serve as essential sandeel habitats, from where the eggs and larvae of this mostly sedentary species are passively dispersed via e.g. water currents. PROTECT scientists have evaluated the effects of different configurations of MPAs as a tool to manage fisheries on North Sea sandeel populations. Physical-biological coupled modelling results indicate that sandeel populations on different North Sea sandbanks are interconnected through dispersal pathways, with individual sandbanks playing different roles in relation to the replenishment of the North Sea sandeel population as a whole. Results also indicate that closing relatively small, isolated areas of sandeel habitat can provide relatively large benefits to the sandeel fishery on the North Sea scale.

Implications of these results for management of sandeel fisheries and conservation of sandeel habitat through North Sea-wide, integrated, area-based management will be discussed.

For more information please visit www.MPA-EU.net.

Contact details: Thomas Kirk Sørensen, National Institute of Aquatic Resources (formerly DIFRES), Technical University of Denmark [e-mail: tks@aqua.dtu.dk].

UNCOVER. How to define recovery strategies that work

Christopher Zimmermann and Christian von Dorrien (vTI-OSF)

A number of commercially important fish stocks in Europe are at very low levels and some are in danger of collapse. For many of these stocks, management advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) has been a closure of the fishery. **UNCOVER** (2006-2010) is a scientific research project funded by the European Union that tries to find the right strategies to rebuild these stocks. The objectives of UNCOVER are:

- to identify various changes experienced during the decline of fish stocks in order to understand the prospects for their recovery,
- to enhance the scientific understanding of the mechanisms of fish stock recovery, and
- to formulate recommendations for fisheries managers how to best implement stock recovery plans.

UNCOVER has begun by examining existing research relevant to develop recovery strategies. Changes experienced during a stock decline will be identified as well as key processes that might impact upon the potential for stock recovery. These results provide the basis for a series of models that can be used to develop and evaluate recovery strategies. The models will combine biological, ecological and economic information so that all of these factors can be taken into account. These activities will lead to recommendations for rebuilding stocks and to the development of more effective alternatives to existing recovery plans, if severe unforeseen problems in achieving their goals have been identified.

The recovery strategies developed in UNCOVER will be specific to particular areas, each with its own ecosystem, important fish species, and ways of fishing. The **four case study areas** chosen represent ecosystems that **vary significantly** in structure and productivity due to differences in climatic influences, physical proper- ties, species composition and species interactions. The North Sea is one of these case study areas, with cod, herring and plaice as the main investigated fish stocks. The other case study areas are the Barents Sea, the North Sea and the Bay of Biscay.

For more information visit http://www.uncover.eu

Dr. Christopher Zimmermann is senior scientist and deputy director of the vTI-OSF. His main scientific interest in the last 10 years has been on fish stock assessments, mainly on pelagic fish (herring, mackerel, horse mackerel) until 2005, and on cod since 2005. He has been involved in all kinds of scientific surveys (trawl, acoustic, plankton), in data processing and management as well as in management implication of fishery research, in the North Sea, the Northeast Atlantic and recently the Baltic Sea.

Dr. Christian von Dorrien is a studied fisheries biologist with broad experience in different ecosystems, ranging from polar to tropical regions. During his work for an environmental organization, he gained extensive knowledge of EU fisheries policies. Since 2004, he works at the Institute for Baltic Sea Fisheries Rostock. Dr. von Dorrien is the project manager of UNCOVER.

Contact details: Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institute (vTI), Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Baltic Sea Fisheries (OSF), Alter Hafen Süd 2, D-18069 Rostock, Germany [e-mail: christian.dorrien@vti.bund.de].

Developing environmental indicators for assessing sustainability of fisheries

Indrani Lutchman (IEEP)

The Institute for European Environmental Policy is an independent not-for-profit institute. IEEP undertakes work for external sponsors in a range of policy areas. We also have our own research programmes and produce the Manual of Environmental Policy: The EU and Britain www.mep-online.com. For further information about IEEP, see our website at http://www.ieep.eu or contact any staff member.

Contact details: Indrani Lutchman, Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP), 28 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AB, UK [ILutchman@ieep.eu].

Regional perspectives on the role of fisheries in employment and regional economies

Søren Eliasen (IFM, AAU)

Fisheries activities and regional development interact in many ways. The presentation will from different angles highlight some of the dynamic fields where region and fisheries interact.

The regional perspective has been coupled to identification of fishery dependent regions. Results and experiences from the latest studies are presented. But the dynamics between fishery and region are broader. Other perspectives on fisheries role on regional development are discussed based on examples from project cases. Finally a first attempt to model the role of employment and regional economies (and other socio-economic factors) on fisheries and the fishery pressure on the eco-system will be presented.

IFM, Innovative fisheries Management is a research centre at Aalborg University.

Contact details: Søren Eliasen, Innovative Fisheries Management – an Aalborg University Research Centre, Aalborg Universitet København, Lautrupvang 15, room H 1.032750 Ballerup, Denmark [se@ifm.dk].

Economic Assessment of European Fisheries (EAEF)

Pavel Salz (FRAMIAN)

The main objective of the EAEF was to produce an Annual Economic Report on Economic Performance of Selected European Fishing Fleets (AER) and to implement the EIAA model (Economic Interpretation of ACFM Advice). In 2004 EAEF reported on 89 fleet segments in 20 countries, representing 60–70% of the total value of the European production.

Significant attention was given to the communication with the users. Popularized results were annually presented in flyers and articles were published in the professional journals in various countries. Users were invited to provide feedback. Unfortunately very few comments were received. Communication with the users (industry and administrations) proved more difficult than expected.

The experience from EAEF on communication with the users shows that:

1) Communication with users is difficult on topics outside the accepted paradigm, which for CFP centres around stock assessment.
2) Non-specialists cannot assess the quality of the presented data and may dispute it for a variety of reasons.
3) Economic data and analysis undermine the argument of 'socio-economic importance' of the European fishery sector. The potential users prefer to follow convenient beliefs rather than accept inconvenient data.
4) Information is only relevant when it is available at the right time and place.

5) Communication is a specialist activity, possibly beyond scope and ability of a research project.

6) The resource allocation of a research project is not flexible enough to allow development of unforeseen tools to respond to newly arising information needs of the stakeholders.

Despite the implementation of the Data Collection Regulation, EAEF has not yet been followed up by a new structure which would produce comparably concise statistics and reports. Development of effective communication means has been consequently delayed.

Contact details: Pavel Salz, Framian, Netherlands[p.salz@framian.nl].

PRONE: Precautionary risk methodology for fisheries

Sakari Kuikka (Helsinki University)

Improved quantitative and qualitative information on the biological, social, and economic consequences of current and alternative actions and tools available to fishery managers are required to better manage the various risks inherent in EU fisheries. The main objective of PRONE project is therefore to investigate the ways of adapting risk analysis theory, as currently developed and applied in a variety of fields, can be adapted to European fisheries, embracing the full process from stock assessment, projection, and advice, via management decisions, to the practical implementation of the management measures, including control. This will also include improved communication of such information to stakeholders and fishery managers making it easier to achieve the long-term goals of fishery management.

The components to be incorporated include risk identification and probabilistic evaluations of the potential consequences of alternative management actions (risk assessment), the formulation of a variety of tools to manage the risks (risk management), and the development of mechanisms to ensure that the outputs of risk assessment and the risk management options available are adequately understood by stakeholders (risk communication).Four contrasting case studies will be used to evaluate the results of the project through stakeholder interviews: Greece (no TAC), North Sea (TAC), Faroes (ITE) and Iceland (ITQ). This will allow current risk methodologies to be tested and compared to alternative methods. Formulation of international agreements should deal with risk management. The elements of the fisheries systems that have an impact of the overall risk will be identified and the need and possibility to control them will be evaluated.

A close cooperation with advisory bodies and management bodies will ensure that practical feedback is obtained. If successfully implemented, the project recommendations will improve the economic profitability of European fisheries.

Contact details: Sakari Kuikka, Helsinki University, Finland [e-mail: skuikka@mappi.helsinki.fi].

Session 3: North Sea fisheries – how can research programmes help advancing fishery management?

IMPACT FISH: Impact assessment of the FP4 and FP5 research programmes on fisheries, aquaculture, and seafood processing research area and the fishery industry

Benoît Caillart (Oceanic Développement)

European aquaculture, fisheries, and seafood processing development have benefited from considerable efforts in EC RTD projects through the successive Framework Programmes (FP) adopted by the Council. Between 1994 and 2002 (FAIR programme under FP 4 then Quality of Life (QoL) programme under FP5), the EC contributed 381 M€ investment in 389 research projects supporting the development of the Fisheries, Aquaculture and Seafood processing sectors.

The IMPACT FISH project was designed (i) to collect information on dissemination and perceived impact from project coordinators having received funding from the EC under the QoL programme in order to compare answers with a similar survey that had been previously carried out on FAIR coordinators, and (ii) to survey the opinion of various groups of stakeholders on the actual impact of the research carried out under the framework programmes.

The main points arising from the first survey are that research the programmes produce a number of publications of various types (from posters in Conference to publications in peer-reviewed journals) that are a useful mean of communication between scientists. However, coordinators of research programmes felt that, although the research carried out was useful to understand sustainability issues, the results have not all been used to design Community policies, nor have they been sufficiently used in the formulation of legislation.

The survey of stakeholders, potential users of the outputs of the research programme, led to contact more than 1800 entities across Europe and EFTA countries. Out of the 209 responses received (18% response rate), more than half originated from the scientific community, with other types of stakeholders (individual companies, professional associations, government agencies or NGOs) providing less feedback. The main findings are that there is a satisfactory awareness of Community effort in promoting research among the potential users. However, awareness of the results of the research programmes is lower, especially for the respondents of the private sector. The contribution of research to a better understanding of aquaculture systems and seafood safety is acknowledged, but a more neutral opinion is given for research supporting fishery management.

The private sector is less enthusiastic than its institutional partners on the extent to which research contributed to a better understanding of the main issues.

The relevance of the results of EC research to stakeholders is perceived differently across the various categories. While it is estimated as highly relevant by the scientific community although not sufficiently taken up by policy-makers, the private sector feels that relevance is moderate, especially by stakeholders from Southern Europe who regret that research effort is concentrated on Northern areas. The private sector considers also the outputs of the research moderately understandable as per the dissemination mode privileged under FP4 and FP5.

The IMPACT FISH study provides a number of recommendations, notably on improving communication and creating awareness in the private sector.

Contact details: Benoît Caillart, Oceanic Développement, 28 Quai de la Douane, 29200 Brest, France [e-mail: b.caillart@mail.oceanic-dev.com].

Participatory Fisheries Management Evaluation Frameworks and example of use for fleet based MSE in North Sea mixed fisheries, EU-FP6-EFIMAS

J. Rasmus Nielsen (DTU-AQUA)

To facilitate the development of better fishery management regimes, a European research project, EFIMAS, was launched to develop and integrate a set of new tools into a robust framework within which to simulate and evaluate the biological, social, and economic consequences of a range of fishery management options and objectives within different management regimes. The project involves cooperation between 30 research institutions from all over Europe covering the disciplines of fishery biology, economy, and sociology. The project, its results, and publications are described at the EFIMAS Web Site www.efimas.org, the EFIMAS DokuWiki http://wiki.difres.dk/efimas, in the EFIMAS Project Folder as well as in the EFIMAS Policy Implementation Plan and the two EFIMAS-PROFET Technical Leaflets. The Operational Evaluation Tools for Fisheries Management Options developed under EFIMAS are implemented in nine different types of European case study fisheries, where Case Study 2 (Mixed roundfish consume fisheries in the North Sea) aims to evaluate different management strategies under mixed fisheries conditions. The tools that are being developed take account of the dynamics in the fisheries systems (including fleet and mixed fisheries interactions and fisheries behaviour) as well as effects of using, e.g. alternative stock and fishery assessment models, economic based fishery models, and also considers uncertainties in the dynamics and in the data collection, assessment, modelling, advisory and management processes. For the North Sea roundfish fishery management advice has traditionally been given on stock-by-stock basis. Recent problems in implementing this advice, particularly in mixed fisheries, have highlighted limitations of the approach. When a TAC for one species caught in a mixed fishery is exhausted, vessels continue to fish for other species that are caught in the same fisheries for which they still have quota available. As a result the first species is still caught and the TAC does not have the intended affect of limiting fishing mortality. Here are described parts of an approach to giving management advice on mixed fisheries that uses information on fishing fleets and their activity to quantify the extent to which different species are caught together and to permit the development of management advice that accounts for mixed fishery effects.

Contact details: J. Rasmus Nielsen, Technical University of Denmark, National Institute for Aquatic Resources, Charlottenlund Castle, DK-2920-Denmark [e-mail: Rasmus Nielsen [rn@aqua.dtu.dk].

Comparative Evaluations of Innovative Solutions in European fishery management

Douglas Clyde Wilson (IFM)

CEVIS assesses potential innovations for European fishery management regimes in respect to four general management objectives: biological robustness, economic efficiency, the cost-effectiveness of management operations, and social robustness, understood as both the legal foundation and broad social acceptability of the innovations. CEVIS makes use of the evaluation tools that have been developed by other Framework projects to evaluate potential innovations in European management regimes. CEVIS examines four types of "regime-level" innovations, meaning that they affect the operations of the entire management regime from the scientific system, through the decision-making, implementation and enforcement systems. These four types are: the use of participatory approaches in fishery governance; rights-based regimes; effort-control regimes; and decision-rule systems. The central research objectives of CEVIS are met by four work packages that evaluate these innovations, in respect to the general management objectives, in four case studies in Europe. Before the European case studies begin, however, CEVIS will take a close look at fishery management regimes in other developed countries where these types of innovations have been implemented. These visits will learn how these innovations have been carried out, what the problems have been, and identify best practices. Examining these regimes will also allow CEVIS to identify indicators

of success of management outcomes as that are used in these regimes which will inform the development of a suitable evaluation tool for assessing the suitability of innovative system introductions in the EU fisheries. This evaluation tool will then provide the framework that will ensure both internal coherence and comparability among the European case studies that make up the largest part of the research activities. CEVIS has two final products. The first is an Innovation Evaluation Framework made up of indicators of inputs and outcomes in relation to the four general management objectives that will be an aid to fishery managers wishing to assess the suitability of possible changes in European fishery management practice. The second is a report based on the case studies that evaluates this specific set of regime-level innovations for possible use in European fishery management.

Contact details: Douglas Clyde Wilson, Innovative Fisheries Management – An Allborg University Research Centre, North Sea Centre, PO Box 104 Willemoesvej 2, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark [e-mail: dw@ifm.dk].

SAFMAMS: Scientific advice for fishery management at multiple scales

Jan Thulin (ICES)

Contact details: Jan Thulin, H. C. Andersens Blvd 44-46, 1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark [e-mail: jan@ices.dk].

Fisher's behaviour with individual vessel quotas— Over-capacity and potential rent – Five case studies

Håkan Eggert (UIS)

Internationally, individual vessel quotas (IVQ) have become an increasingly popular management tool. The main attraction of IVQs is the incentives they create for cost savings, autonomous capacity adjustment and, subsequently, rent generation. In this paper, the extent to which different IVQ systems have facilitated resource rent generation and capacity adjustment in five European countries—Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and the UK—is examined. The potential economic rents and the capacity reduction necessary to achieve these rents in each of the fisheries are also estimated. Reasons why IVQs have not achieved their potential economic benefits in these fisheries are also examined.

Contact details: Håkan Eggert, Associate Professor (Docent), Department of Economics, University of Gothenburg, PO Box 640, 405 30 GÖTEBORG, Sweden [e-mail: Hakan.Eggert@economics.gu.se].

Policy and knowledge in fishery management - the North Sea cod case

Douglas Clyde Wilson (IFM)

The overall objective of the PKFM project was to identify and understand the knowledge production and related decision-making processes within the fishery management system and the role played therein by stakeholders.

Findings in respect to stock assessment models: The period from around 1987 to 1995 was characterized by good performance of the VPA. However, assessments since 1997 have been characterized by a substantial bias, whereby mean fishing mortality in the most recent year has been underestimated by around 30%, and stock numbers have been overestimated. Similar biases were observed for North Sea plaice. Bias in haddock and sole is less pronounced.

Findings In respect to institutional influences: We found systematic pressure on scientists to expand the range of issues that can be legitimately resolved through scientific findings. Stock

assessment work also has several negative impacts on the scientists involved in it. Scientists working directly with the assessment of fish stocks for scientific advice have lower average job satisfaction than other marine fishery scientists. This greater dissatisfaction is linked to travel demands, frustrations about their chances to produce peer reviewed publications, and having their results changed by the management system into something they no longer see as science.

Findings in respect to the policy-science interface: The "TAC machine" is a mechanism with severely limited capacity to predict and adapt to non-exceptional changes in the ecosystem within which it operates. When put under pressure, for instance by a resource crisis, the capabilities of the TAC machine deteriorates even further. It may work well when the stock is healthy and fishing pressure is light, it will tend to break down when it is most needed, when fishing pressure is high and the stock is threatened.

Findings in respect to the public debate: The public debate is to a large extent a national scene. There is little evidence of an active debate across national borders. The question of "fishing versus other factors" as responsible for the decline of the stock is at the core of the debate. The scientific basis for the management advice is not at the core of the public debate, and thus the reference points used for management are not widely discussed. The uncertainty associated with the reference point gets a lot of attention as means to contest the validity of the scientific advice.

Contact details: Douglas Clyde Wilson, Innovative Fisheries Management – An Allborg University Research Centre, North Sea Centre, PO Box 104 Willemoesvej 2, 9850 Hirtshals, Denmark [e-mail: dw@ifm.dk].

The reformed ICES advisory service

Hans Lassen (ICES)

Contact details: Hans Lassen, H. C. Andersens Boulevard 44-46, 1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark [e-mail: hans@ices.dk].

CEDER: Findings on estimating catches, effort, and discard in near real time

Ulrich Kroener (IPSC Maritime Affairs)

Results obtained in CEDER will be explored. The primary objective of the CEDER project was to harness modern technologies in fisheries (VMS, electronic logbooks) to provide more accurate and timelier information on catches, effort, landings, discards and quota and TAC uptake, and to assess the benefits of this information for fishery management.

Contact details: Ulrich Kroener, IPSC Maritime Affairs, JRC TP051 (Bldg 05A), Via E. Fermi, 2749, I-21027 Ispra (VA) [e-mail: ulrich.kroener@jrc.it].

Session 4: Communication of Research Results

Communicating research results (Keynote)

Professor Jacqueline McGlade, Executive Director, European Environment Agency

The EU marine/maritime policy agenda is becoming more and more integrated. We are moving from talking about fisheries policy, environment policy or transport policy in relative isolation from each other to developing and implementing an integrated maritime policy, covering all economic, social and environmental aspects of the European seas, coastal zones and even related interests further inland. Earlier initiatives such as Integrated Coastal Zone Management, the Water Framework Directive and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive all reflect an integrated approach, but not so comprehensively as the Integrated Maritime Policy. Though the Integrated Maritime Policy is only 'soft law', a greater degree of integration may eventually be achieved at sea than generally on land.

As a consequence of this, "new" players — seen from the point of view of fisheries or the environment — are entering the scene, for example Ministers of Enterprise, Employment, Transport, Energy, Defence, and – just as importantly – their constituents: the business/industry and social actors they represent.

There is, therefore, a need to create a "new", common language and methodology to tie all these stakeholders together, and to ensure that the good intentions of towards an integrated framework also materialise in practice. Taking an ecosystem-based approach to the management of human activities in the marine environment, and accounting for the goods and services that ecosystems supply, will provide this overall framework to bring the different interests together in a common understanding to protect the common good, and to exploit it in a sustainable way.

Science/research (e.g. fisheries or environmental research) needs to be able to communicate to this broader community in the 'language of others'. This requires relating its work to the overall ecosystem framework, using or linking to the language and methodology of ecosystem goods and services. 'New' science should be able to build this into the design of research projects, but also 'existing' science should make the effort to build bridges to the integrated regime. Increasing the visibility of scientific outputs through, e.g., the Shared Environmental Information System, and focusing more on protecting the common good than protecting Intellectual Property Rights would also be major steps forward. There are enormous amounts of data from publicly-funded research that never see that light of day and are effectively lost when the project closes down. The European Environment Agency would be happy to discuss with interested members of the scientific community how to improve this state of affairs.

Contact details: Jacqueline McGlade, EEA, Kongens Nytorv 6, 1050 Copenhagen K, Denmark [e-mail : jacqueline.mcglade@ eea.europa.eu].

How to communicate your research results through CORDIS

Christine Michaut (CORDIS)

CORDIS: possibilities for research projects to use a free and easy-to-use communication platform for all types of project-related information.

Contact details: Christine Michaut, CORDIS, 2 rue Mercier, 2985 Luxembourg [e-mail : christine.michaut@publications.europa.eu].

Communicating results to stakeholders - Experience from the fishers

Doug Beveridge (Sustainable Fisheries Partnership)

Doug Beveridge joined SFP after nearly a decade of work at the UK National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations. Prior to that, Doug was at the Marine Laboratory in Aberdeen, Scotland, Fisheries Resources Section. He also studied at Hull International Fisheries Institute. Doug has been involved in the reform of the EU Common Fisheries Policy, developing the interface between the fisheries science community and the industry via science partnerships and the evolving European Regional Advisory Councils. Doug will be expanding the SFP European operations and co-ordinating the relevant FIPs.

Contact details:Doug Beveridge, SFP in c/o: TCI, 423 Washington Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111, USA [e-mail : doug.beveridge@sustainablefish.org].

The role of NGOs and their involvement in communication

Sabine Christiansen (WWF)

Contact details:Sabine Christiansen, WWF, Hongkong Str 7, 20457 Hamburg, Germany [e-mail: christiansen@wwfneap.org].