

# The Local Dimension to European Maritime Policy

*Conference Report*



**Aberdeenshire**  
COUNCIL



EAST OF  
SCOTLAND  
EUROPEAN  
CONSORTIUM



NORTH SEA  
COMMISSION



**OPEN  
DAYS**

European Week of Regions and Cities  
Brussels  
5 - 8 October 2009



# The Local Dimension to European Maritime Policy

Boddam, Aberdeenshire, 18th -19th May 2009

Conference supported by:

European Commission

East of Scotland European Consortium

North Sea Commission

Hosted and managed by Aberdeenshire Council

Rapporteur, Lorna Duguid, Elle Dee Projects Ltd.



**Aberdeenshire**  
COUNCIL



## Contents

**Conference Report** **Page 4**

### Conference Report

1.0	Session 1 – The Strategic Dimension	6
2.0	Session 2 – Stakeholder Perspectives	11
3.0	Session 3 – The Way Forward	18

### Thematic Workshops

4.0	Spatial Planning	23
5.0	Governance and Democracy	24
6.0	Capitalising on Maritime Assets	27
7.0	Conference Summary and Key Themes	29
8.0	Conclusions and Next Steps	32
9.0	Conference Registration List	33
10.0	Conference Presentations	36

## Conference Agenda

### Monday 18 May

#### Session 1 – The Strategic Dimension

- 13:00 Welcome (Anne Robertson, Leader of Aberdeenshire Council)
- 13:15 Keynote Speech – The EU Maritime Policy (Maja Kirchner, European Commission)
- 13:45 A European Parliament Perspective (Elspeth Attwooll, MEP)
- 14:15 The OSPAR Commission (Sebastian Unger, OSPAR)
- 14:45 A Japanese Approach (Prof. Hideo Kojimoto, University of Hirosaki)
- 15:15 Panel Discussion

#### Session 2 – Stakeholder Perspectives

- 16:00 Welcome to Session 2 (Kate Dean, East of Scotland European Consortium)
- 16:15 Keynote Speech - The Scottish Marine Bill (Richard Lochhead, MSP)
- 16:45 Coastal Communities (Rhona Fairgrieve, Scottish Coastal Forum)
- 17:00 A Fisheries Perspective (Mike Park, Scottish White Fish Producers Association)
- 17:15 A Fishing Ports Perspective (Pim Visser, European Association of Fishing Ports and Auctions)
- 17:30 A Ports Perspective (David Whitehead, European Sea Ports Organisation)
- 17:45 An Offshore Energy Perspective (Iain Todd, Aberdeen Renewable Energy Group)
- 18:00 Panel Discussion and Conclusions

## Tuesday 19 May

### Session 3 – The Way Forward

- 09:00 Welcome (Anders Fasth, North Sea Commission)
- 09:15 Implementation and Maritime Spatial Planning (Lieselot Marinus, European Commission)
- 09:45 The Baltic Sea Strategy (Bo Löfgren, Baltic Sea Commission)
- 10:45 Thematic Workshops:
- Spatial Planning*
  - Governance and Democracy*
  - Capitalising on Maritime Assets*
- 11:45 Financing Maritime Projects (Christian Byrith, INTERREG North Sea)
- 12:05 Tackling Marine Pollution (Tom Piper, KIMO)
- 12:25 The Way Forward through Stakeholder Engagement (Hugo Andersson, North Sea Regional Advisory Council)
- 12:45 Conclusions and Next Steps

## 1.0 Session 1 – The Strategic Dimension

Session aim – To set out the strategic and international context behind the EU Maritime Policy.

Session Chair – Neil Mitchison, European Commission.

### 1.1 Anne Robertson, Leader of Aberdeenshire Council

Anne Robertson welcomed all attendees to the conference. She highlighted that the conference had been set to coincide with European Maritime Week and that European Maritime Day would be held every year on 20th May. She highlighted the importance of the marine environment to Aberdeenshire; it is of great importance to the fishing and energy sectors and also the transport pathways for trade with other countries.

She outlined the conference programme which would highlight EU maritime policy, explore the development of a bottom up approach to its implementation and examine a stakeholder led, way forward.

Partnership would be a key theme of the programme with a balance of public, private and academic organisations represented. Diversity would be the way ahead and a catalyst to implementing maritime policy.

### 1.2 Keynote Speech – The EU Maritime Policy – Maja Kirchner, European Commission

Maja Kirchner began her presentation by highlighting that all attendees had one area in common and that was integrated maritime policy. EU integrated maritime policy aims to allow all to equip and face the challenges of the future, e.g. climate change. Coastal regions and stakeholders have the knowledge and knowhow to influence maritime policy and there needs to be a long term forward policy in which there is a framework to implement a policy, avoid duplication and use resources effectively. An all embracing maritime policy that involves all sectors will protect natural assets for future generations.

The key to success will be knowledge and innovation. Through this industrial competitiveness need not be in competition with economic factors, they can work to enhance each other.

The EU Blue Paper has 5 areas for action:

- Maximise sustainable use of the seas
- Innovation
- Increase the quality of life
- Effective management of affairs
- Raise the visibility of EU maritime affairs

An action plan was developed before the economic downturn. This looked at issues such as climate change and examined current and future budgets in impacted areas. Actions involved all industries working together; energy, fishing and shipping. It also included a long term innovation programme.

In 2008 Maritime Planning guidelines were issued with guidance on governance and implementation. Following this a number of national plans were introduced including the Scottish Marine Bill.

The European Commission wants to increase stakeholder dialogue and motivate other countries to develop an integrated approach to:

- Maritime spatial planning – promote and develop the views of the communities
- Maritime surveyance – customs, border control, maritime safety
- Research and innovation – green knowledge and data

It was recognised that during the current economic crisis the maritime sector has been hit hard, however it was important to press forward with key projects including climate change projects and renewable energy projects. There is a need to invest in technology solutions and innovation and to strengthen the EU's expertise in these areas. It is important to make connections and networks and to shed bureaucracy, to be ready for the economic pick-up there was a need to plan now.

The EU is developing a method for assessing the effectiveness of marine planning. A report will be produced in October 2009 that will measure progress against the plan, identify how to move forward and assess budget requirements.

### **1.3 European Parliament Perspective – Elspeth Attwooll, MEP**

Elspeth Attwooll is the Vice Chair of the EU Fisheries Committee, the lead committee for the development of Integrated Maritime Policy.

Elspeth began by highlighting the cross sector nature of the policy. There had been collaboration as well as competition for inclusion in the resolution. Reaction from the European Parliament to the Blue Book had been favourable and they applauded the Commission's intention to make improvements. They were, however, critical of the action plan. They thought that it did not contain enough practical measures and it was not proactive enough. They wanted to see a more proactive approach for actions regarding climate change, asked for an initiative on the Arctic, and wanted more action in reducing emissions and more alternative energy. They would also like more actions regarding the reduction of land based pollution. They wanted innovation to be comprehensive and well-funded and the development of centres of excellence for marine research.

There was interest in the development of the Roadmap for Marine Spatial Planning balancing economic, territorial and social interests. This would need to take into account the diversity of the regions waters.

Elspeth mentioned that approximately one third of MEP's change following an election. Given the election in June 2009 it could be a difficult time to make progress as new representatives may take time to develop and understand various views and policies.

Her vision for the future was a spatial plan that has the coast and sea as its key; that allowed all users to operate in a safe and harmonious manner and also protects the environment. She recognised that this was not an easy exercise trying to balance all interests. Moving forward it was not enough to simply zone sites as we need a balance of all users. Spatial planning is a vision which will need cross sector and transnational co-operation.

## 1.4 The OSPAR Commission – Sebastian Unger, OSPAR

OSPAR is a vehicle to assist international co-operation for the protection of the north-east Atlantic. There are 16 contracting parties covering a large area from arctic coastal areas to the Azores. Members are obliged to protect against pollution. OSPAR origins were developed as a response to the Torrey Canyon disaster in 1967, the 1969 Bonn agreement, 1972 Oslo convention on sea based pollution and the 1974 Paris convention regarding pollution from the land. They completed a quality status report in 2000 with the next due in 2010.

The principles they follow are:

- An ecosystem approach
- Precautionary principle
- The polluter pays
- Best available techniques and best environmental practices

The aims of OSPAR are:

- To prevent and eliminate pollution
- To protect the seas against adverse effects of human activities
- Safeguard human health
- Conserve marine ecosystems
- When practicable restore marine areas which have been adversely affected

OSPAR focus on 5 thematic strategies; biodiversity and ecosystems, offshore industries, hazardous substances, eutrophication and radio-active substances. They measure impact by making assessments of human activities and species and habitats. They are moving to establish a network of marine protected areas and set environmental goals for the offshore oil and gas industry. The 6th strategy is delivering a joint monitoring and assessment programme to assess quality standards and progress in implementing strategies.

In September 2010 an OSPAR Ministerial meeting will be held. The quality standards report 2010 will be presented, there will be an assessment and evaluation of OSPAR targets, a redefinition of OSPAR strategies and they will examine synergy with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.

Moving forward they will promote and work to an integrated management and ecosystem approach, the regional implementation of the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive, continue to measure the effects of climate change on the Arctic and monitor and encourage biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

## 1.5 A Japanese Approach – Prof. Hideo Kojimoto, University of Hirosaki

Professor Kojimoto outlined Japanese interests in maritime governance. He explained that the Association of North East Asian Regional Studies had 300 members from Japanese universities, who all had an interest in sea rim activities. The Science Council of Japan promoted transnational opportunities. They worked to harmonise development and use of the oceans with conservation of the area.

Japanese progress to date has included the introduction of a Basic Act on Ocean Policy in July 2007, which has similar aims to the EU Maritime Policy. Presently, management of the seas is based around bilateral international agreements and there can be conflicts over boundaries and restricted areas. At the time of the enforcement of the Act, Tokyo University started to coordinate an ‘Ocean Alliance’ organized network that spans the entire range of the various fields of ocean research and provides a breeding ground for new ideas and innovations in ocean science and technology. They are holding an ocean alliance lecture series at Tokyo University and an Ocean Governance course starts next year.

He outlined the platforms of partnerships in the North Sea:

Stage of Development	Group	Actions of Group
Co-operation	NESFDP - North East of Scotland Fisheries Development Partnership	Local actions, lobbying.  Aims of partnership drawn up in a memorandum of understanding. Scientists invited to become part of the group.
Network Governance	North Sea Commission Fisheries Group	Access to regional and local authorities acquiring a leading role in co-ordinating political activities in the area.
Multi-level Governance	North Sea Commission Fisheries Partnership	Experience in dealing with European funding.
Cross scale meta Governance	North Sea Regional Advisory Committee	Fisheries advice and setting up pilot projects covering a wide range of North Sea marine issues.

Prof Kojimoto recognised the central role Aberdeenshire Council had played in setting up these groups.

## 1.6 Question and Answer Session

### Question 1

*As more Arctic shipping routes become open due to the impact of climate change is there a danger of economic incentive being in conflict with environmental impact?*

#### Response from Maja Kirchner

The European Commission published a communication last year regarding commercial passage and how to protect areas. The EC have applied to become a permanent adviser on the Arctic Council but their initial application was blocked. They will continue to try to become a member.

#### Response from OSPAR

The Arctic Council cannot define legally binding measures they can only issue guidelines. An Arctic Marine Shipping assessment has been produced with clear recommendations regarding shipping. The guidance on response to pollution needs to be furthered. Russia is a member of the Arctic Council but the Arctic waters next to Russia are not influenced by OSPAR, they are working with Denmark and Finland. An alternative approach is one taken by the IMO; they are working through insurers to define minimum standards of vessels before insurances can be given.



## 2.0 Session 2 – Stakeholders Perspectives

Session aim – To highlight stakeholder experiences and views on maritime policy.

Session Chair - Kate Dean, East of Scotland European Consortium.

### 2.1 Kate Dean, Chair, East of Scotland European Consortium

Kate explained the role and objectives of the East of Scotland European Consortium and welcomed the Cabinet Secretary Richard Lochhead to the conference.

### 2.2 The Scottish Marine Bill – Richard Lochhead, MSP

Richard Lochhead outlined the importance of the sea to Scotland. The surrounding seas are some of the most biologically productive in the world and they have the potential to produce significant levels of renewable energy. In the east of Scotland there is the energy capital of Europe, Aberdeen and the largest white fish port in Europe, Peterhead. The maritime heritage is positive for tourism. It is estimated that maritime activities contribute £2.2billion to the Scottish economy. He noted that through a period of reduced quotas Peterhead port had increased the value of landings to £130m, a 50% increase over 5 years. He attributed this to keeping abreast of changes and continuously investing highlighting the forthcoming £30m development. This will lead to increased competitiveness, maximising potential for energy and renewable activities.

He spoke of EU maritime policy and the positive aspects of having a joined up approach to management. A good example was how fishermen had risen to the challenge and developed an approach to fisheries and cod management.

He stated that Scotland will take a lead on planning and management of the marine environment for the area up to 20 miles offshore. This will be managed by Marine Scotland who will apply policy. Marine Scotland will work within the Common Fisheries Policy; they have brought together a panel of experts to look at alternatives for Scottish waters and will soon be holding a series of stakeholders meetings.

Scotland needs to promote a thriving economy and environment which reflects local needs. There needs to be a balance between competing demands of a clean and productive environment that is protected for the future. Scotland is acting as a leader in reducing emissions, working to exploit the energy potential of renewables and moving to become a low carbon economy.

The Marine Bill for Scotland was launched on 29th April, 2009. This will provide a statutory framework for marine development and protection. This will allow for identification of the best sites for renewable energy, identify opportunities for traditional industries such as fishing and improve strategic decision making. Marine Planning Partnerships will focus on local issues. Having an effective marine plan will encourage investment, reduce delays, manage competing demands and support a modern and streamlined licensing system.

The development of Marine Protected Areas will offer greater protection of Scotland's assets. It will allow new ways of management, and how to respond to global warming. It will be able to respond to local requests e.g. the protection of whales, dolphins and seals.

Future development must be sustainable and support growth of industry with the right management tools in place. This will be underpinned by innovative science and research. The Marine Bill contains an integrated science and management policy.

A coherent system of management must be developed to sustain species, make the planet richer, provide food, and energy through wind and wave. We can work together to manage challenges and make progress.

### **2.3 Coastal Communities – Rhona Fairgrieve, Scottish Coastal Forum**

Rhona Fairgrieve gave a presentation explaining the level of stakeholder involvement in the development of the Scottish Marine Bill.

The Scottish Coastal Forum was established in 1996 to reflect the views and aspirations of local coastal communities. A stakeholder can be anyone with an interest in the coast, their challenge is to reflect cross sector and pan geographical interests and views.

They have been involved in Marine Spatial Planning on an ongoing basis. In 2004 a vision for the next 25 years was published and in 2007 the Advisory Group on Marine and Coastal Strategy (AGMACS) policy framework was established.

In 2008 the 'Sustainable Seas for All' policy document was published. They were asked for more input and during 2008 held 21 consultation events which were attended by 750 people. They found that response was best when there was a personal touch in the delivery; they tried various formats of meetings including the 'town hall' approach and workshops. They used a network of local coastal partnerships and conducted a 'grand tour' of Scotland. They found having many meetings over a wide geographical area to be very challenging, it was difficult to organise speakers and consultees in the time given and they had to manage expectations.

In working to involve stakeholders the following recommendations were given; never underestimate the level of interest, there are many different types of communities speak to them all, be open about policy timescales, acknowledge potential negatives as well as positives, meet people on their own turf and use local groups.

Rhona concluded that stakeholder involvement has shaped and helped to deliver the Scottish Marine Bill. A statement of public participation is now a legal requirement within the UK and the Scottish Marine Bill.

### **2.4 A Fisheries Perspective – Mike Park, Scottish White Fish Producers Association**

The Scottish White Fish Producers Association is a representative organisation based in Fraserburgh. It currently represents 230 vessels and 1,100 fishermen. Collectively its members catch 70% of the Scottish demersal landings. They embrace the European Maritime policy and aim to deliver a profitable, sustainable and well managed fishing sector. They are dealing with the legacies of the past but now realise that they are not the only stakeholders in the marine environment. This has not been an easy move; fishermen have been sceptical of any regulations that have reduced their income and it has not always been seen as a process to deliver a sustainable future. They now understand that things had to change and they have introduced a number of proactive measures to increase sustainability of fishing.

Mike explained some of the measures they have been working with. They have introduced large escape panels in nets, they are using smaller nets measuring 3-5ft high, they are working with cod selective gear, seasonal closure of areas have been introduced and they are operating a system of real time closures of areas to protect cod. This year so far, 47 areas have been closed and it is expected that this will rise to 150 by the end of the year. It is estimated that the closures will have protected 4,500 tons of cod.

They are continuing to identify new ways of protecting stocks. They are discussing closures on the West Coast of Scotland to protect blue ling, and have introduced an 84 inch mesh net to protect cod stocks. They are constantly looking closely at DMS data and log books to identify areas where cod stocks are high so they can close the area. They are engaged in discussion with environmental organisations such as the WWF to protect at risk areas e.g. Rockall Bank and Darwin Mounds to protect cold water coral.

As a result of many activities two of the stocks, Scottish langoustine and North Sea haddock are currently going through the approval process for Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) accreditation.

All of these activities show a shift in attitude of the fishing industry. These actions have been delivered as a result of a bottom up industry approach.

Moving forward they recognise that other industries are using the seas but they have never fully engaged with them, perhaps due to a possible conflict of interest. There are more actions that they could take, for example improving their performance with discards.

There is concern that their views and opinions may not be fully taken into account by the EU. The EU maritime strategy suggests that a top down approach may be taken especially in cross border issues. The way ahead should entice the industry to implement the new systems, he would wish to see no duplication of policy, one regime would be useful and he has concerns about a multilayer approach. There is data available within the UK is satisfactory but less so from other member states. Until this is resolved the precautionary principle should be taken. He would like the EU to invite the industry to play a key role in the decision making process leading up to the development of Maritime Planning Action plans. The Regional Advisory Councils are the logical bodies to lead on such issues.

## **2.5 A Fishing Ports Perspective – Pim Visser, European Association of Fishing Ports and Auctions**

The European Association of Fishing Ports and Auctions promotes the importance of fishing ports and auctions, and is a not for profit organisation. The organisation is involved in community wide programmes and engages in international industry actions and initiatives. They sit on the Advisory Committee for Fisheries (ACFA) and are in regular dialogue with DG Mare. They are also represented on the Regional Advisory Councils. The role of the organisation is to facilitate the exchange of experience, identify opportunities of auction development and coordinate pan European studies and projects.

Pim explained how auctions are vital in the quality control and development of the fishing industry, they have a central role in market support and development and creating a sustainable industry. There are many issues facing the industry at the moment and auctions are impacted; a decline in catch results in reduced income. Current factors facing the industry are reduced income and cost increase, new legislation requirements, quality and traceability issues and globalisation of the supply of fresh fish.

He explained that the buying patterns of supermarkets and large processors demanded a regular supply of fish which was also encouraging the import of farmed species from Asia and South America.

In real terms the market value of demersal fish has fallen significantly over the last 20 years. Raising the value of the catch could be achieved through quality development and auctions will have a central role in this. He suggested targeting the upper quartile of fish consumption. Developing a practical and inclusive eco-label was suggested and an e-log book, we could look to the success of e-bay for best practice. He suggested developing traceability, giving the consumer all the information they required about where, when and by whom the fish was caught and finally co-ordinate markets and supplies, introduce a common standard and bar code.

In conclusion and moving forward he was concerned that there may be too many simultaneous changes in EU policy. Local importance has to be guarded, the fisheries policy position must be protected, the Producer Organisations to strengthen for a new role and regional member states to unite and safeguard fishing interests community wide. He highlighted that fish auctions and markets are central to this, they are a highly efficient interface, provide essential services and hold useful third party information which they are ready to share. They are the link where ship meets shore.

## **2.6 A Ports Perspective – David Whitehead, European Sea Ports Organisation**

David is an Executive Committee Member of the European Sea Ports Organisation. They are a political body lobbying and influencing, they take no active role in project delivery. Within the UK there are 120 ports and 1000 in the EU, they are all different. In the UK there is minimum government involvement with all but one member port in private ownership. The UK ports industry is the largest in Europe due to geographical factors i.e. it is an island but also due to the oil and gas sector and the large population. In Scotland there are 100million tonnes of ports traffic per year which represents approximately 20 tonnes per resident, far greater than 7 or 8 tonnes in England which demonstrates the importance of the sector to the area.

In Scotland ports policy is largely devolved. The European Commission is not very sure what to do with ports, therefore policy tends to focus on state aids and security. David considers the Blue Book to have a focus on transport, regeneration and fisheries. He thinks that the UK is ahead of the game in terms of policy and that the Marine Bill raises the profile of ports and the coast. In summary he thinks that the EU is feeling its way, the UK are ahead of the game and that the Marine Bill is good for ports.

## **2.7 An Offshore Energy Perspective – Iain Todd, Aberdeen Renewable Energy Group**

Iain informed the conference that in response to climate change the EU has legislated that 20% of all energy must be from renewable sources by 2020. This will include fuel energy for transport which is unlikely to meet this target so greater advances will have to be made in other areas such as electricity generation. Scotland has set a target to match this, they have rich resources in wave, tidal and wind. Electricity providers are obliged through a renewable obligation to reduce traditional forms of energy generation and increase their use of renewable energy.

Iain explained that in the UK there are currently 3 stages of development. Round one focuses on offshore wind farms that are close to shore, round 2 will provide farms further offshore and the third round will see deep water sites identified for further investigation, 2 of which have been identified in Scotland.

It is anticipated that offshore renewable energy will replace one third of the UK electricity supply.

In Aberdeen there is a focus of energy skills and expertise. The Aberdeen Renewable Energy Group (AREG) has been established to identify opportunities for development and to transfer skills and knowledge in the energy sector.

Iain outlined the proposal to develop an offshore wind farm off the coast of Aberdeen at 10-25 meters depth. The consultation process is complex as there are multiple users of the site and they all must agree a way ahead. There are various constraints around the site e.g. Aberdeen Harbour operates a 2 mile exclusion zone and there are flights to Aberdeen airport which have to be accounted for. Issues that have to be taken into account are shipping safety and vessel movements, environmental issues, leisure and tourism and fishing. They have also carried out a wider public consultation process.

AREG now wish to move forward the concept of a test centre being located offshore of Aberdeen. A viability study has shown that there is a good wind source, there is a large skills base, an academic centre, good access, a relatively benign environment and a range of water depths. The European recovery plan published in January 2009 identified a list of projects for wind test centres; the Aberdeen project was awarded an investment of 40m Euros. They will now move forward to gain a Crown Estate lease, consent application and involvement of the Scottish European Green Energy Centre in Aberdeen.

Scotland is leading in the development of offshore wind technology; the Beatrice project is the biggest in the world and will be highlighted at the 'All Energy' conference being held in Aberdeen on 20th May.

In moving forward wind farms will be an integral element of the European Maritime Policy.

## 2.8 Question and Answer Session

### *Question 1*

*How will the interface between town planning and marine planning work?*

Richard Lochhead responded

We will be looking to the Local Authorities to take a lead; this will involve Local Marine Partnerships. These will be set up to reflect local differences including geographical and environmental.

### *Question 2*

*What impact does dumping at sea in the UK have on Europe and European policy?*

Richard Lochhead responded

We must protect against pollution, many forums can come together to resolve. It is a European issue and we will work within that framework.

### Question 3

*Scotland is the green energy capital of Europe, what more can be done to support this?*

Richard Lochhead responded

In Scotland there is a disproportionate energy resource investment in renewables. The Scottish Government is discussing the development of a North Sea grid and this will need EU support. This will meet the energy needs of Scotland and allow us to export energy to others. It will allow us to meet our climate change obligations and have economic benefits with the creation of 60,000 new jobs.

### Question 4

*What can be done to reduce fish discards?*

Mike Park responded

We need to involve and ask the fishermen and identify what to do with juvenile fish. Introduce technology measures such as net amendments and escape panels but also move on policies. Moving an industry in economic crisis is difficult, need to develop a more intelligent policy and develop it through the Common Fisheries Policy.

### Question 5

*Are real time closures for UK vessels only?*

Mike Park responded

They are set in place by the Scottish fleet only; English vessels have respected the Scottish closures and are introducing their own. Other European owned vessels have respected the Scottish policy and to date have not fished in closed areas.

### Question 6

*Coastal locations are more important for renewable energy and they can diversify. Would a network of test centres and a joined up approach be a good idea, sharing actions such as hydrogen powered fishing vessels?*

Iain Todd responded

The renewable programme offers an opportunity for harbours and ports, those that have room for expansion for example Peterhead has space but not so much available in Aberdeen.

### Question 7

*There is a need for sustainable fisheries, what are the members of the SWFPA views on the sale of quota?*

Mike Park responded

What the members have they want to keep. Quota is now their biggest asset. International trading can be seen as a threat or an opportunity. They would wish for the status quo to be maintained and to do away with uncertainty; they are scared they might lose what they have.

### Question 8

*The Dogger Bank was mentioned as a good case for co-operation. What else could be done?*

Mike Park responded

Need to balance the fishing industry against other users, member of the EU must speak together before putting a policy in place and prioritise what to protect. Currently fishermen feel that they will always lose out.



### **3.0 Session 3 – The Way Forward**

Aim – To put forward solutions to implementing the EU Maritime Policy and better coordinate maritime activities.

Session Chair – Anders Fasth, North Sea Commission.

#### **3.1 Anders Fasth, North Sea Commission**

Anders Fasth is the Chair of the North Sea Commission (NSC) Marine Resources Group. The NSC covers 8 countries and 54 member regions. It was founded in 1989 and takes lead in regional development. It is a networking organisation with political influence and administrative co-operation. Further details regarding the NSC are available on its website [www.northsea.org](http://www.northsea.org).

Anders identified 2 big challenges that have to be taken forward; a response to the EU Common Fisheries Policy green book must be made and a North Sea strategy must be developed.

Anders then made a presentation to Elspeth Attwooll in recognition of her support to the NSC.

#### **3.2 Implementation and Maritime Spatial Planning – Lieselot Marinus, European Commission**

Lieselot introduced Maritime Spatial Planning, a key tool to implement the Integrated EU Maritime Policy. She explained that the Blue Book was published in October 2007 which explained the application of an integrated and holistic approach to maritime affairs.

She explained that we needed to manage the marine space due to increased activities, growing competition, limited space and environmental risk. Maritime Spatial Planning is a process, not a static map and has flexibility in it, an open process and an integrated approach involving stakeholders. For implementation it is essential to have good data, assess the process and constantly review and plan forward.

The benefits of having a European approach would be to strengthen competitiveness, establish a planning framework and build on an ecosystem approach. There are an increasing number of EU states using Marine Spatial Planning and there is a need for a common understanding at EU level.

She highlighted the 'Roadmap' for Marine Spatial Planning which gave 10 key principles for MSP in the EU. The EU will be delivering workshops this year throughout Europe which will encourage debate and promote MSP and the roadmap.

A study on the economic benefits of MSP is currently being undertaken and the final report will be available at the beginning of 2010. They are moving forward with a Mediterranean plan and there are 2 preparatory actions in the Baltic / North Sea and North east Atlantic. Through these they will develop the cross border aspects of MSP.

### 3.3 The Baltic Sea Strategy – Bo Löfgren, Baltic Sea Commission

The Baltic Sea area is small and sparsely populated. It covers 9 countries and 90m people. The area has a mission to become a best practice area by 2015.

The sea currently experiences heavy traffic, exports in oil are increasing, they have one major oil related incident every year, local communities bear the brunt of these incidents, it is a sensitive environment and the use of the sea and coastal zones is increasing.

Bo outlined the many policies and strategies that are applicable to the Baltic Sea area explaining it was difficult to navigate between them all and identify which was the most important one.

They have developed an integrated process which identifies needs and allocates resources based on environmental sustainability, prosperity, accessibility and attractiveness and safety.

The action plan identifies priority areas and actions and flagship projects to solve problems. Each priority area and actions will be managed within the individual regions.

The Baltic Sea Commission is supporting the Maritime Policy Implementation.

The main objectives are to:

- Highlight the local and regional perspective (not so much international)
- Undertake Marine Spatial Planning in some areas in partnership with other countries
- Enhance co-operation between Baltic Sea states which must include Russia
- Develop improved on-land response capacity to oil spills
- Enhanced pollution prevention from marine transport
- On land contingency planning
- Measures for a clean and safe Baltic
- Enforce safety
- Develop the potential of coastal management

Overall they must try to develop one system not nine (for each country). Moving forward they will monitor ship movement, develop the green corridor concept; increase the control function by improving and intensifying the supervision of ships carrying hazardous materials. Taking a ferry should become as easy as crossing a bridge.

### 3.4 Financing Maritime Projects – Christian Byrith, INTERREG North Sea

Christian gave an outline of the Interreg North Sea Region Programme. The aim of the programme is to make the North Sea Region a better place to work and invest in.

There are four priorities to the programme:

- Building on our capacity for innovation
- The sustainable management of our environment
- Improving the accessibility of places in the North Sea Region
- Promoting sustainable and competitive communities

Maritime issues are seen as cross cutting through all of these priorities. A number of projects were outlined.

To date 51% of the ERDF funding available has been allocated on a 50% grant fund basis. Applications for more projects are welcomed. They are looking for projects that are transnational in approach, create an impact for the North sea region, create lasting results, contribute to the Lisbon and Gothenburg agendas, link to European and national policies and contribute to a positive innovation orientated culture in the North Sea region.

### 3.5 KIMO – Tom Piper, KIMO

Kommunenes Internasjonale Miljøorganisasjon (KIMO) is the Local Authorities International Environmental Organisation. They cover 14 countries and have 110 Local Authority members.

The mission of the organisation is commitment to the development of sustainable coastal communities by:

- Preventing pollution of seas and coastal waters, preserving, improving and enhancing them for future generations
- Protect coastal communities from impacts of marine pollution and climate change
- Represent members at international and national level

Tom gave an outline of the work undertaken by KIMO. They lobby on behalf of their members, they have developed a vision and actions marine litter, maritime safety, nuclear pollution, offshore industries and decommissioning. They have a range of published materials available on [www.kimointernational.org](http://www.kimointernational.org). They drive forward the fishing for litter program where fishermen dispose of litter picked up at sea, at the quayside.

KIMO's view on the EU Marine policy is that the Marine Strategy Directive is the environmental pillar; they want environmental factors given equal weighting to economic and social considerations.

### 3.6 The Way Forward Through Stakeholder Engagement – Hugo Andersson, North Sea Regional Advisory Council

Hugo Andersson chairs the North Sea Regional Advisory Council (NSRAC). He explained that the NSRAC was an excellent model as it gave a regional approach with all the stakeholders in one organisation. This led to having a regional approach to fisheries policy. They were able to gather all different stakeholders' opinions on the Common Fisheries Policy and take a consensus on policy to the Commission. There are many lobbyists connected to the fishing industry, but the NSRAC avoids the traditional lobbying and dealing route and gives transparency.

Hugo gave an outline of how the NSRAC had been formed, its structure, management and working groups, 80 members and observers including scientists. The secretariat is hosted by Aberdeenshire Council.

The NSRAC has good cooperation with the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), fisheries managers from the Member States, Community Fisheries Control Agency, (CFCA) and compliance and fisheries protection agencies.

The only permanent resources are the secretariat, all other knowledge and resources come from the members and this is dependent on their level of engagement. If stakeholders do not see benefit in participating then it will not work. Most members are also members of other RACs; they input a lot of time and effort so they must see it as worthwhile.

RACs are a good example of stakeholder engagement however they suffer from a lack of resources, dealing with complicated beauracracy in the EU. He would like more assistance in making communication with the EU simpler. Looking at the way forward and discussing the new Common Fisheries Policy for 2013, a regional dimension is being discussed as a one sized approach will not work. Regional management will have a stronger focus however RACs should not converge to become regional management groups; they want to remain as advisory groups closely cooperating with regional management groups. Stakeholder involvement and engagement is built into the RACs and this should also be an element of a regional management group. There is a need to find a way to give fishermen more power in decision making in regional management, more rules will not help, they must be involved and understand the goals of the CFP and have space to interpret and apply them. Policy should be made and then they can identify how best to apply it.

Moving forward there must be an understanding of others positions and an acceptance of decisions, dialogue is good and will lead to a culture of compliance. The solution lies in not issuing more fishing rules, but having a simpler system for the CFP and its management. In future he hopes for a co-management model for fishermen and managers.

### 3.7 Question and Answer Session

#### *Question 1*

*In respect of Marine Spatial Planning are there issues with different countries planning mechanisms?*

#### Lieslot Marinus responded

Yes there are problems but it is left to the governments to find a way ahead, a system will not be imposed. This will stimulate development and a way ahead by showing best practice for adoption. However it will not be easy.

## Question 2

*The need for countries to work together has been highlighted. Are you aware that a Baltic Sea representative is working with KIMO?*

Bo Löfgren responded

Yes I know that KIMO is working in the Baltic. There may be too many organisations working in the area, it is a big area but there are at least 10 others with an interest. Greenpeace is also very important regarding climate change. Do not require any more plans want to see action and results.

## Question 3

*What buy in is there from shipping companies to Baltic Sea plan?*

Bo Löfgren responded

I am talking to them; a meeting was held last week with ship owners and they were invited to raise their concerns. They want to take part, they need to know the rules and link them into their long term investments e.g. build in requirements to new builds.



## Notes from Thematic Workshops

### 4.0 Spatial Planning

The aim of the workshop was to explore how best to effectively implement Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) in the EU. A particular focus of the workshop was the 'regional seas' and 'ecosystem' concepts and the interrelationship between them.

Some of the issues for focus were:

- How to ensure local accountability in a transnational planning system
- How to accommodate the needs of diverse maritime industries
- How to achieve a high standard of environmental protection

The session was chaired by Elspeth Attwooll MEP, who was supported by Ann Bell NSRAC.

#### Summary of session output:

*Operate in the same space but not at the same time*

*Should not try to transfer terrestrial planning out to the marine*

*If in doubt about issues ask the practitioners*

*Learning by doing (as is the system in Norway)*

*Don't re-invent the wheel*

*Accurate data is vital*

*Prioritisation – it is important to match priorities where possible and appropriate*

*Changing mind sets will be a challenge*

*Land boundaries can go out to sea*

*Regional approaches important (local, regional and national)*

*Consultation and participation*

*Time scales are important*

*Important to have everyone round the table on an equal footing*

*Monitoring and evaluation of the process and the plan*

*Mapping what already exists including established user rights*

*Plans need to be short, medium and long term*

*Funding for projects to gather data, identify and match priorities may be available*

## 5.0 Governance and Democracy

The aim of the workshop was to discuss the challenges of implementing a strategic cross-sectoral EU policy in a way which meets the needs of EU citizens. A particular focus of the workshop was the role of local and regional authorities in implementing key components of the EU Maritime Policy.

The workshop focused on:

- How to ensure that the Maritime Policy reflects local specificities
- How to identify and clarify the roles of different levels of governance in implementing the Maritime Policy
- How to engage with coastal communities and industries to ensure a wide range of participation

The workshop was chaired by Colin Mackenzie and supported by Martin Brebner, both from Aberdeenshire Council.

### Session output

Before debating the set questions, the group were given a presentation from Rolf Gydemo of the Baltic Sea Commission highlighting the experiences of operating a co-management project.

In 2005, a nationwide project with new forms for local influence and management in fisheries was launched in Sweden. More than 15 regional and local interest groups applied and 6 were selected. Gotland was one where the regional fishermen federation and fisheries research laboratory initiated the application.

In our project, based on that in order to managed fisheries, there are two prerequisites:

- What is the status of the stocks?
- What is the exploitation pattern?

As many stakeholders/interest groups as possible were involved; the fishing industry, sport fishing groups, household fishermen, NGO nature conservation groups, the Gotland University College fisheries research lab, County Administration and County Council. The national project lasted until end of December 2006.

The project was successful and the structure aroused particular interest due to the broad engagement. Stakeholder groups experienced a better understanding for other stakeholders views and constructive discussions, e.g. on how many fish do you need to land in a recreational fishery?, how to enhance local stocks etc. resulted in a few changes in fishery rules such as extended spawning-time protection for pike.

Although the project only lasted for a short time, the methods and results were well received by the government and implications are that the experiences could be used in the future national fisheries legislation, currently under revision. As they are waiting for a new legislation, the activity is low since there is no mandate as to what to do and no financing for doing whatever could be allowed to do. Still, the Gotland Co-management Initiative is frequently asked for their opinion in fisheries matters as well as other maritime issues such as the planned gas pipe-line from Russia to Germany.

Following Rolf's presentation, a general discussion on governance issues took place. Participants felt that new democratic structures may be required, or rationalisation of existing structures to make them more effective. Whatever structure emerges, it must be capable of co-ordinating horizontally (different stakeholders) and vertically (different levels of governance/geography). This is very difficult to achieve and can lead to complex structures being put in place, each focusing on different scales of activity and aspects of co-ordination.

In order to reflect different local interests and values, it was felt that there should be more demand for direct, bottom up engagement. If local empowerment is to be effective, a change of national policies is required. It is also important to consider the most appropriate level of governance, as some policies require a more strategic overview. For instance, managing sectoral conflicts is a challenge for local empowerment. Regional Advisory Councils were seen as a possible means of balancing international co-operation and local management and they could be given a wider role beyond fisheries policy in future. The ideal solution would be a system with an overarching strategic framework with sufficient local flexibility.

### **Question 1**

*Is there adequate stakeholder awareness of and engagement with European policies? If not, how could this be improved?*

Participants agreed that there was insufficient awareness of and therefore engagement with European policies. Many stakeholders either see EU policies as a low priority issue or have insufficient capacity to adequately engage with them. This varies dependent on a number of factors, such as geography, history, sector, scale, issues, communities etc. It is important to establish who is not being represented and to investigate why to ensure a holistic approach to governance.

What defines a 'community' or 'stakeholder' is also unclear. For instance, the advocated ecosystem approach requires clarification, given its biological and socio-economic aspects. Other challenges include the fact that existing administrative boundaries do not always reflect maritime areas, particularly at the local level. There needs to be Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) to effectively co-ordinate policies for land, inshore coast and seas. Multi-level governance is key to achieving effective management of Europe's maritime space.

*How can stakeholders become involved in a formal Maritime Spatial Planning framework?*

Following on from the last question's discussions, the land-sea interface was explored, with a study carried out in Belgium on ICZM mooted as an example of best practice. A wide range of co-operation means were discussed (e.g. cross-border co-operation through INTERREG programmes, UN conventions etc.). Generally, it was felt that policy-makers follow the path of least resistance and aim to minimise conflict during policy development. This leaves stakeholder fora such as the RACs to manage conflict. It would be more effective if these fora were better engaged during policy development, rather than consulted retrospectively. The democratic legitimacy and accountability of these groupings was highlighted, as was their local knowledge and data gathering expertise. There is a need for wider knowledge both at the local level and across large, strategic areas. It was also acknowledged that not all stakeholder groups are as active as the fisheries sector, hence a flexible approach to engagement is required.

Whatever the tool chosen, it is important that it facilitates as inclusive policies as possible.

*What role can local and regional governments play in implementing a European Maritime Policy?*

As mentioned previously, existing boundaries do not necessarily parallel ecosystems, hence the role which local and regional governments can play depends on the geographical area in question. New structures/ways of working may be required (e.g. lead authorities for specific areas). Centralisation is not necessarily the answer as partnerships of local and regional authorities (e.g. North Sea Commission) offer an alternative, strategic model. However, many policies are still centrally-led - it was noted that the UK marine bills were led by central government. A system of pre-decision, consultation, decision, post-decision and stakeholder management was suggested as the best way forward.



## 6.0 Capitalising on Maritime Assets

The aim of this workshop was to investigate means of growing and developing Europe's maritime industries. A particular focus of the workshop were the opportunities presented by the European Maritime Policy for maritime enterprises.

Some of the issues which the workshop focused on included:

- How to balance the needs of traditional and emerging maritime sectors
- How to explore synergies across different maritime sectors (e.g. through clustering and research)
- How to ensure that the fiscal and legislative regime for delivery of the Maritime Policy reduces the administrative burden for business

The workshop was chaired by Iain Gabriel who was supported by Stuart Bews, both of Aberdeenshire Council.

### Summary of session output

*How can the economic potential of Europe's oceans and seas be accessed in a way which is sensitive to the marine environment and existing users?*

Firstly it is important to identify what is the economic potential of the sea and the ways in which this can be developed. Examples included carbon sequestration; there is potential for an Interreg project.

Improved transnational co-operation between the key stakeholders will lead to the development of projects which will develop the identified economic potential. For example; transnational co-operation on port diversification could look to identify further innovative, economic opportunities for ports.

*Are there ways in which different maritime industries could work together to enhance their competitiveness?*

Transnational co-operation allows industry to work together and improve competitiveness. One particular issue is a shortage of IT skills in maritime industry, this requires training and again co-operation is key. There are also complementarities of oil and gas skills with renewable energy skills which could be better exploited.

Industry offers such varied incentives and salaries that some will be less desirable. Traditional industries, or rather established industries, still have to innovate and develop.

*How could Maritime Spatial Planning help to balance the needs of different users of the seas?*

This requires co-operation of stakeholders interests – this should be included in an MSP strategy. In addition timelines are required to ensure progress is made quickly and continues to develop. Demo projects should go ahead now and develop the MSP and be pro-active. We need to identify maritime assets and look at ways to develop these sustainably. Different Member State's positions may conflict in their views of MSP, hence there is a need for early co-operation.

*Are legislative and administration burdens currently inhibiting coastal and offshore economic development?*

Yes, for instance, certain areas of UK changed to connect renewable energy to the grid, others paid to input – clearly an issue to those areas charged to input.

A level playing field would be supported. MSP has the potential to reduce the administrative / legislative burden and is more than just spatial planning offshore.

MSP can support the capitalisation of maritime assets if correctly developed.



## 7.0 Conference Summary and Key Themes

### 7.1 Conference Summary – Lorna Duguid, Rapporteur

The Conference rapporteur summarised the messages from the conference speakers and the output from the workshops.

#### *Session 1*

There were many common themes emerging from the speakers. The importance of long term forward planning and a maritime policy that embraces all natural assets for future generations was presented. Many of the speakers highlighted the impact of climate change.

A common factor was the importance of regional co-operation and innovation in driving solutions and competitiveness. Compatibility between the environment and industrial competitiveness could be found.

It was noted that there are different overlapping strategies but by developing an integrated management and co-operative approach each could be addressed. In moving forward we would have to take account of diversity and treat it as a strength, not a barrier.

#### *Session 2*

The importance of the marine sector to Scotland and the introduction of the Marine Bill, was presented. There had been wide consultation of stakeholders in the development of the Bill and this will contribute towards managing the competing demands of being productive and competitive whilst protecting for the future.

The efforts being implemented by fishermen to protect stocks and promote sustainability were outlined and it was explained that fishermen now have a very different attitude to stocks and how they are protected. Other sectors noted their input to marine planning; the ports highlighted the role they could have in data collection and the energy sector outlined the consultative process required to progress with a marine energy project.

#### *Session 3*

It was outlined that the way forward for Marine Spatial Planning will be where all sectors are working together in a common interest, all stakeholders need to be involved. Interested parties would only continue to be involved if they could be fully involved in the planning framework and they could see ongoing benefits through strengthened competitiveness.

## Key Themes from the Workshop Sessions were:

### *Spatial Planning*

We cannot transfer terrestrial planning directly to marine planning. There is a need to identify and gather data, actions have to be prioritised and monitoring and evaluation of the plan and process have to be set in place. There is a need for co-operation, everyone needs to sit around the table on an equal basis.

### *Governance and Democracy*

There is more demand for direct, bottom up engagement of stakeholders and communities, they have different local interests and values. There is a need to choose the most appropriate level of governance, an overarching framework with local flexibility. It was noted that managing sector conflicts would be a challenge for local empowerment.

### *Capitalising on Maritime Assets*

We need to identify what the economic potential is for transnational co-operation and projects this would lead to improved competitiveness. Maritime Spatial Planning can support capitalisation of maritime assets if correctly used.

## 7.2 Conference Conclusions – Anders Fasth, North Sea Commission

Anders Fasth summarised the conference themes:

- Importance of sustainability, a sustainable sea for all
- Co-operation and understanding at all levels
- Need for robust data to inform future developments
- Need to push forward on key projects, actions and results
- Importance of action and planning at regional level
- Having a 'we can' attitude

He noted that stakeholder engagement is democracy. Before implementing decisions must listen and talk. After a decision there should be another discussion with stakeholders regarding how it will be managed.

He saw a process emerging:

Pre decision discussion



Decision



Post decision discussion



Create rules

Development and progress are due to peoples' engagement not due to political decisions, which do not create development. Stakeholders want to be engaged, they want more responsibility. There is a need to develop a regional approach and a concrete pilot project for the North Sea.

People create progress not rules.

## **8.0 Conclusions and Next Steps**

Following the conference, the organisers and supporters have identified the following the next steps to continue to develop the thoughts, suggestions and comments offered during the course of the conference and resulting from the workshops.

### **8.1 Developing a North Sea Strategy**

Working closely with the North Sea RAC a strategy will be developed for implementing Marine Spatial Planning that will be applicable for the whole of the North Sea. The project will be conducted trans-nationally and will identify the process that will be undertaken when developing and implementing a Marine Spatial Plan.

The project will identify how best to establish Marine Spatial Planning at regional level. Consideration will be given to identifying which organisations need to be represented and at what level, can existing groups such as the RAC's take forward the planning process or should new think tanks be developed to agree the plans?

Consideration will also be given to defining the needs of groups, identifying what data needs to be collected, what is available and what needs to be measured. Economic and social benefits will have to be identified in order to show to stakeholders the merits of being involved in the process and to attract all parties to the table on an equal footing. Consideration will also be given on how to manage conflicting interests.

The outcome of the project will be to identify best practice in implementing local and regional Marine Spatial Plans and to develop a toolkit which can be used in their implementation.

### **8.2 Deliver a Local Practical Delivery Project**

A local practical delivery project will be piloted. The area it will cover has yet to be defined but will involve partner countries from the North Sea. The project will identify best practice in Marine Spatial Planning and apply the methods to achieve maximum sustainable yield in an identified species.

Measurement will be the key to the success of the project; monitoring requirements will be set in place at the beginning to ensure that impacts and outcomes can be accurately measured. The role of all stakeholders will be monitored throughout the project including the impact of innovation in traditional industries.

### **8.3 Highlight Good Practice and New Initiatives**

A leaflet and on line resource to identify new and innovative ideas leading to sustainability in the fishing industry will be developed. Information will be gathered from all stakeholders in the North Sea, which will highlight the efforts they are applying to protect species and allow stocks to grow and maximise yield on an ongoing basis.

## 9.0 List of Conference Attendees

Name	Organisation
David Anderson	Aberdeen Fish Producers
Hugo Andersson	NSRAC
Elsbeth Attwooll	MEP
Ann Bell	NSRAC
Niall Benson	Durham Heritage Coast Partnership
Stuart Bews	Aberdeenshire Council
Barry Bleichner	University of Aberdeen
Elizabeth Bourke	NFFO
Martin Brebner	Aberdeenshire Council
Christian Byrith	North Sea Region Programme
Pamela Cruickshank	Aberdeenshire Council
Kate Dean	Aberdeen City Council
Auke De Vlas	University of Aberdeen
Ingrid Dobson	Scotland Europa
Lorna Duguid	Rapporteur, Elle Dee Projects Ltd
Rhona Fairgrieve	Scottish Coastal Forum
Anders Fasth	North Sea Commission
Iain Gabriel	Aberdeenshire Council
Allan Garvie	Nave Nortrail
David Green	University of Aberdeen
Rolf Gydemo	Baltic Sea Commission

Emily Hastings	East Grampian Coastal Partnership[
Lars Haukvik	North Sea Commission
Ian Hay	East Grampian Coastal Partnership
Tom Hemingway	Peterhead Port Authority
Ian Hudghton	European Parliament
Peter Inglis	University of Aberdeen
Gordon Ingram	Lunar Fishing Co. Ltd
Jesper Jönsson	North Sea Region Programme
Paul Johnston	Aberdeenshire Council
Jon Jordan	European Policy Solutions
Maja Kirchner	European Commission
Wendy Kenyon	Scottish Parliament - Researcher
James Knowles	Aberdeenshire Council
Gerd Koehler	University of Aberdeen
Hideo Kojimoto	Hirosaki University
Sylvia Korn	Marine Scotland
Phil Leeks	SEPA
Kathryn Logan	The Moray Firth Partnership
Bo Löfgren	Baltic Sea Commission
Erik Lindboe	North Sea Commission
Richard Lochhead	Scottish Government
Colin Mackenzie	Aberdeenshire Council
Lieselot Marinus	European Commission DG MARE

Francesca Marubini	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Roddy Matheson	Aberdeenshire Council
Liam McArthur	Scottish Parliament
Peter McGrath	Scottish Parliament
Philip McKay	Aberdeenshire Council
Ron McKail	Aberdeenshire Council
Brian Miller	SEPA
Neil Mitchison	European Commission
Alasdair Morgan	Scottish Parliament
Malcolm Morrison	Aberdeenshire Council
Eleanor Munro	Aberdeenshire Council
Elaine Murray	Scottish Parliament
Mike Park	Scottish White Fish Producers Association
Stephen Paterson	Peterhead Port Authority
Peter Peacock	Scottish Parliament
Tom Piper	KIMO
Yasa Ratnayeke	Aberdeen City Council
Anne Robertson	Aberdeenshire Council
Jonathan Robertson	East of Scotland European Consortium
Mark Salmond	Angus Council
Veronica Smith	Marine Scotland
Robert Stevenson	NESFO Ltd
Patrick Stewart	Scottish Fisherman's Federation

Joanna Strathdee	Aberdeenshire Council
Mike Sullivan	Aberdeenshire Council
Erik Tichelaar	University of Aberdeen
Iain Todd	AREG
Shona Turnbull	Highland Council
Sebastian Unger	OSPAR
Coen Verboom	University of Aberdeen
Pim Visser	European Association of Fishing Ports and Auctions
Joyce Walker	NSRAC
John Wallace	Peterhead Port Authority
Maureen Watt	Scottish Parliament
David Whitehead	ESPO
Bill Wilson	Scottish Parliament
Colin Wishart	Highland Council

## 10.0 Conference Presentations

Conference presentations can be accessed at:

[www.northseacommission.org](http://www.northseacommission.org)