This position paper is based on research undertaken within the INTERREG 2 Seas project ‘GIFS’ (Geography of Inshore Fisheries). The GIFS project addresses the challenge of incorporating the socio-economic and cultural importance of inshore fisheries to coastal communities along the English Channel and Southern North Sea more explicitly into fisheries and maritime policy, coastal regeneration strategies and sustainable community development.

The research on governance has been undertaken by Kathy Belpaeme (Coordination Centre ICZM, Belgium), David Picault (Agrocampus Ouest) and Johanne Orchard-Webb (University of Brighton) and coordinated by the Flanders Marine Institute (VLIZ), with contributions of the GIFS partners. Ann-Katrien Lescrauwaet and Marleen Roelofs (VLIZ) are co-authors of the governance reports within this project. The executive summary and extensive reports can be found at www.gifsproject.eu.

For more information, visit www.gifsproject.eu
Inshore Fisheries
too important to ignore?

Coastal or inshore waters are crucial to the life cycle processes of marine organisms: the hatcheries, nurseries and spawning and reproduction areas of most commercial fish species are located in coastal zones and estuaries. In most European fishing nations, coastal fisheries have played a historical role as a stable and reliable provider of food, resources and employment. For instance, commercial fisheries in Belgium’s small strip of inshore waters provided over 20% of all landings over the last century, and even 60% of all molluscs and crustaceans landed by its commercial fleet.

Defining Inshore Fisheries (IF)

Across the EU Member States the terms artisanal, small-scale and shore-based fisheries have quite different and distinct meanings, and a plethora of terms is used to describe the diversity of artisanal and subsistence fishing, beachcombing, shellfish gathering, and small-scale fishing and gathering activities. There is no agreed definition for coastal or inshore fisheries in Europe. Different criteria are used in different Member States: vessel size, trip length, activity patterns, fishing gear and target species. The GIFS project used the following definition of inshore fisheries: vessels operating within 12 nautical miles (nm) off the coast and for a typical duration of 24 hours per fishing trip.

Globally, an estimated 75% of the world’s fishing operations are artisanal or small-scale in nature and take place in coastal, inshore waters. These small-scale fisheries (SSF) are estimated to account for 80% of the European Community fishing fleet while representing 40% of the workforce in the fisheries sector for most Member States. Taken together, SSF and IF generate a diverse range of inter-dependent livelihoods and provide significant indirect employment. Therefore, they make a vital contribution to the local economies, food security and trade as well as the social and cultural identity of Europe’s coastal communities. In the UK, the vessels under 10 m represent 75% of the fishing fleet, while they have access to 4% of the fishing quota. In France, 80% of the fishing fleet are vessels under 12 m. Belgium’s commercial fishing industry does not include SSF; yet fishing operations of vessels under 10 m in inshore waters are not subject to reporting or registration. Despite the significance of the inshore fleets, governments have largely ignored this sector and its importance, and its activity was left unrecorded. As a result, the importance of inshore fisheries has become invisible to the wider public, public services and authorities, and they are largely absent in national policy and decision-making. The time has come to reverse this situation.

WHAT DOES THE EU COMMON FISHERIES POLICY SAY ABOUT INSHORE FISHERIES?

The historical and current importance of inshore fisheries to the livelihoods and development of coastal communities is increasingly recognised. The European Commission (EC) has acknowledged this and repeatedly expressed its concerns for the protection of inshore fisheries within the 12 nm zone, stating that Member States should endeavour to give preferential access to small-scale, artisanal or coastal/inshore fisheries. This preferential regime is based on rules restricting access to resources within the 12 nm zones of MS for large-scale fisheries (LSF). Also, the EC has increasingly recognised the vital role that coastal fisheries may play in delivering policy objectives in coastal waters such as the Habitats Directive, the Marine Strategy, Marine Spatial Planning, offshore energy infrastructures and marine protected areas. Inshore/small-scale fisheries (IF/SSF) and large-scale fisheries differ in their environmental, social and economic impacts. The Green paper on the reform of the CFP (22.4.2009 – COM(2009) 163) therefore puts forward the idea of differentiated management: one management regime for LSF with capacity adjustment and economic efficiency, and one for SSF in coastal communities with a focus on social objectives. The Regulation of the new CFP (EU) No 1380/2013) entered into force in December 2013. The new CFP briefly refers to inshore fisheries, stating that the Regulation shall promote coastal fishing activities, taking into account socio-economic aspects. Its aim is to contribute to increased productivity and to a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector including SSF and IF. According to the CFP, decisions that affect local communities should be taken as closely as possible to these communities. The CFP also explicitly states that recreational fisheries can have a significant impact on fish resources, particularly in coastal waters where inshore commercial fisheries occur as well. It urges MS to ensure that recreational fisheries are conducted in line with the objectives of the CFP. This means according to the principles of the ecosystem approach and including the collection of data needed in support of a robust stock management of resources.

1 Council Regulation (EC)1106/2008 defines small-scale coastal fisheries as ‘fishing carried out by fishing vessels of an overall length of less than 12 metres and not using towed gear’.
3 NIFIA, UK (website consulted July 2013)
4 Système d’Information Halieutique SIH-FREMER Information system consulted July 2013
5 DEFRA (UK) (website consulted July 2013)
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Key opportunities for inshore fisheries governance

Inshore Fisheries inherently have potentially strong linkages with other sectors and interests (culture, tourism, food, environment and nature). This offers key opportunities for inshore fisheries governance:

**INSHORE FISHERIES ARE POTENTIAL GUARDIANS OF COASTAL ENVIRONMENTS**

If management implicitly links a number of cornerstone policies and principles in the EU, both at sea and on land, inshore fisheries are also more specifically affected by these policies (e.g. the EU Marine Strategy, the Maritime Spatial Planning Directive, Nature2000) because their activities are strongly connected to specific inshore waters and conducted within a long-term perspective. Given their strong connection with, and knowledge of, particular inshore ecosystems and resources, they are partners or ‘guardians’ which can strengthen the delivery of current marine and coastal policy objectives to ensure the sustainable use of the coastal environment in the long run.

**INSHORE FISHERIES EMBODY THE STRONG CONNECTION BETWEEN LAND AND SEA**

Nearby coastal communities and populations benefit from the extraction of marine resources from inshore waters, often restricted to between 3 nm and 12 nm from the shore. For instance, high-quality and fresh fish, generally produced in a short market chain (‘from the vessel to your plate’), is highly valued in restaurants, culinarily traditions, educational initiatives and many other local quality experiences. In particular, women play a key role in linking fishing activities at sea with the shore-based support and the wider distribution of benefits in the community.

**INSHORE FISHERIES OFFER OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARTNERSHIPS IN CO-MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES**

Co-management involves the sharing of management responsibility for and/or authority over fishing resources between e.g. fishers and government. Co-management leads to a higher level of involvement and understanding among the parties involved. Agreements, formal or informal, can be used to formalise and clarify the roles.

**FERTILE GROUND FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN FISHERMEN, SCIENTISTS AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT**

Fishermen have strong local ecological knowledge (LEK) and can provide valuable additional information to scientific research, monitoring programmes and management plans. Examples of this cooperation already exist in self-sampling programmes. Fishing vessels can also serve as valuable ‘platforms of opportunity’ from which observations and monitoring programmes are conducted.

**INSHORE FISHERIES HAVE UNIQUE IDENTITIES AND TRADITIONS THAT CAN CONTRIBUTE TO CULTURAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC REGENERATION**

If they have advantages over large-scale or industrial fisheries in terms of their ecological impact and particularly their social, cultural and economic contribution to the local community sense of place, the coastal economy and visitor experience. Within an appropriate planning framework, they offer new and unique opportunities for economic regeneration in communities that are impacted by the downward trend in fishing activity or income from fisheries.

**Barriers to fishing community engagement**

Inshore fisheries require a different management regime because of their diversity, local specificity and strong connection with local identity and resources. They provide key opportunities for forging partnerships to achieve cornerstone policy objectives for marine waters and coastal zones. During the development of new collaborative and co-management approaches to fisheries and coastal governance, it is important to take into account the barriers to engagement that were identified through interviews with 78 key stakeholders throughout the Southern North Sea and Channel area.

Policy makers and governance stakeholders should consider the following issues to overcome the barriers to effective engagement with fishing communities:

**SOCIAL/POLITICAL CAPITAL DEFICIT**

A lack of IF community member social/political capital or an absence of a culture of active political engagement can manifest itself in either indifference to or fear of formal governance and management. Alternative approaches to governance that are inclusive, empowering and meaningful to the industry are required.

**STAKEHOLDER INDIVIDUALISM**

Because of the acknowledged individualist nature of fishers, achieving a business approach that is better attuned to shared future responsibility of marine resources and community sustainability can be a challenge. This individualism is amplified by geographical isolation and distance between fleets. Efforts to bring communities together to build and participate in collaborative governance must overcome both issues.

**CONFLICT-PRONE AND FRAGMENTED IF INDUSTRY VOICE**

The often fragmented IF industry voice and the history of disfranchisement at European and national governance level (fisheries management at these levels has historically focused on the offshore fleets) has created a legacy of uneven efforts to secure a collective voice. This makes engagement with the industry more challenging for other sectors and dilutes the effectiveness of their political lobbying and influence at all levels. This is aggravated by local conflicts within and between fishing communities.

**DISEMPOWERMENT OF THE IF VOICE AT NATIONAL / EC LEVEL**

The widespread perception (with noted exceptions) that the IF fleet has limited influence at national or European level has created a feeling of disempowerment that has been propagated by the top-down hierarchical science-led governance of the CFP that makes engaging this sector all the more problematic.

**THE ALIENATING NATURE OF BUREAUCRATIC AND TECHNOCRATIC GOVERNANCE NORMS**

The purpose of governance structures imposed by national or EU authorities is often suspected to be the expansion of monitoring. The scale of bureaucracy in these structures repels fishers and other private sector members who feel the slow pace and prescriptive nature of the processing of grants and policy changes are incompatible with the immediate pressing needs of the fishing industry.

**Notes:**

1. Interviews in Newport (RI), Amersfoort (NL), Bay of St. Brieuc, Bay of Granville (France), Hastings, Northern Devon, North Norfolk, Falmouth and Scilly Isles (England).
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A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF TIME AND INCREASED LOCAL AUTONOMY ARE NEEDED IN MODELS OF COMMUNITY-LED/ COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE

The time needed to build trust between stakeholders in order to secure the relationships required for a more positive experience of collaboration is often underestimated. This approach also requires increased autonomy (both political and financial) as well as sensitivity to the specific socio-political and economic context. Each community will start from a different position and faces different challenges.

LOW POLITICAL PROFILE/PRIORITY AND LACK OF FISHERIES KNOWLEDGE IN POLICY MAKING

A low political profile can result in regional policy makers giving a relatively low priority to fisheries. In some cases, this is amplified by the fact that strategic development authorities have limited fisheries expertise and therefore underestimate their direct and indirect contribution to coastal economies and communities.

Action is required: steps towards ensuring the future of Inshore Fisheries

• Develop specific policy and management approaches to Inshore Fisheries: Because of their specificity, IF require focused and strategic planning, and IF policies have to be tailored to the local situation and needs. This includes specific IF management tools and instruments such as permits, co-management of fishing resources, co-management of conservation areas, joint research programmes, differential quota management and support to different marketing schemes, quality labels, etc. Diversity of fishing activities as well as cultural, economic and social specificity of place should be acknowledged as an asset when inshore fisheries strategies and plans are developed, and decisions should be taken as closely as possible to local communities. These approaches can be developed as part of a general or dedicated IF policy.

• Strengthen the connection of Inshore Fisheries to other relevant policies: IF play an important role in delivering policy objectives in coastal and marine environments. Explicitly linking fisheries to other relevant policies in marine and coastal areas (in particular the Marine Strategy, Natura 2000 and the Marine Spatial Plan) and to local and regional regeneration strategies, should raise the profile of IF and improve the dialogue with other sectors. This can be achieved by incorporating IF policy objectives in other policies, by translating policy objectives into local targets or goals, etc.

• Make sure the voice of Inshore Fisheries is represented in (fisheries) consultation bodies: Depending on the situation, IF should be represented by an independent body, or fisheries representatives should at least consult with and consider the interests of inshore fishermen and attend to specific IF issues. Effective representation increases commitment and compliance, builds a relationship of trust with authorities, and generates more transparency and visibility towards the wider public.

• Invest in stakeholder involvement and make use of local ecological knowledge (LEK): Strengthen and improve the involvement of fishers and value their unique knowledge for purposes of policy development, advice and wider societal interests. LEK is a valuable cultural ecosystem service.

• Strengthen the existing collaboration and involvement of community-led local development structures (like Fisheries Local Action Groups) with fishers’ organisations: FLAGs are local partnerships bringing together private and public stakeholders as well as environmental organisations. They play a crucial role in IF in several ways, e.g. by focusing on local needs, ensuring vertical and horizontal integration, and helping with IF industry consultation, communication and awareness raising. FLAGs will also be instrumental in the management of EU financial resources (e.g. the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund or EMFF) to support co-management projects and community-led local development.

• Organise specific educational and training programmes: Include new opportunities in fishing techniques and skills and work with local fishers to encourage new entries into the IF sector. Including students and younger generations will help address the issue of an ageing population in the IF sector.

• Develop monitoring programmes for Inshore Fisheries: In most cases monitoring and trend analysis for Inshore Fisheries are absent or insufficient and are carried out on an ad-hoc basis. Systematic IF monitoring programmes – in partnership with the IF industry - are required to increase the visibility of the past, current and future situations and trends, and conduct an impact analysis of the effectiveness of policies and measures. Whenever possible and relevant, these analyses can be integrated in existing monitoring programmes, for example the programmes for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive or the monitoring of compliance with Marine Spatial Plans. Economic, ecological and social aspects should be included to obtain an extensive set of data for integrated analysis purposes. The evaluation of the effects and impacts can be used to support a differentiated management regime and apply adaptive management.

• Create conditions to support the transition from recreational fisheries to professional fisheries activities, where appropriate: The CFP states that recreational fisheries can have a significant impact on fish resources, particularly in coastal waters where inshore commercial fisheries occur as well. It urges Member States to ensure that recreational fisheries are conducted in line with the objectives of the CFP. This means according to the principles of the ecosystem approach and including the collection of data needed in support of a robust stock management of resources. Many forms of fisheries in the Southern North Sea and Channel area are not subject to reporting obligations: this results in underreporting and may ultimately lead to unequal regimes and conditions for similar fleets fishing in the same areas. From a conservation perspective and for effective fisheries management, appropriate legal conditions should be created to integrate the recreational fleet more quickly into the professional fishing fleet, where appropriate. This would not represent a new or additional fishing effort but formalise existing efforts and increase transparency.