

# Expert Meeting

## Synthesis Report

Prepared by:

Sandra Cavalieri, Ecologic Institute

15 November 2010



This project is funded by the European Union.



*The following report summarizes the key observations and policy insights that emerged at the Cooperation Across the Atlantic for Marine Governance Integration (CALAMAR) Expert Meeting of the Multi-Stakeholder Working Groups held in Paris, France on 11-12 October 2010. The Workshop was produced with the assistance of the European Union within the framework of the Pilot Project on Transatlantic Methods for Handling Global Challenges. More than 40 experts in ocean and coastal management from the US and EU participated in the Expert Meeting. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the official positions of any institutions or governments with which the participants are affiliated. The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Ecologic Institute (Germany) and our partners, Meridian Institute (US), Duke University (US), Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations - IDDRI (France) and University of Delaware (US), and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.*

*This report was written based on minutes from the working group discussions prepared by Jeffrey Allenby, Miriam Balgos, Marie Bourrel, Mallorie Bruns, Laura Cantral, Gwenaelle Hamon, Jesse Hastings, Kirsten Howard, Elizabeth Lee, Katriona McGlade, Ralph Piotrowski, Franziska Stuke, and Elena von Sperber.*

## I Introduction

The *Cooperation Across the Atlantic for Marine Governance Integration* (CALAMAR) project convened an Expert Meeting of the Multi-Stakeholder Working Groups on 11-12 October 2010 in Paris, France. The meeting brought together more than 40 experts from industry, government, NGOs, and academia to discuss best practices and policy options to enhance transatlantic cooperation within four cross-sectoral working groups:

- Integrated Marine Policies and Tools Working Group
- EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation in the North Atlantic Working Group
- High Seas Working Group
- Oceans and Climate Change Working Group

Key objectives of the Expert Meeting were to:

- Provide an opportunity for dialogue and relationship-building among ocean policy stakeholders in the EU and US;
- Facilitate the exchange of experience, information and lessons learned regarding integrated ocean governance approaches and how to advance in both the EU and the US;
- Identify initial recommendations for decision makers in the EU and US that will be further developed and refined over the course of the CALAMAR project.

The CALAMAR project began in January 2010 and culminates in a final conference in Lisbon, Portugal in April 2011 where the Working Group's conclusions will be presented. Three reports compliment the dialogue and expert working group papers with assessments of 1) EU and US maritime policy, 2) opportunities and challenges for integrated maritime governance and 3) policy options for improved transatlantic cooperation in maritime governance. Full reports with accompanying policy briefs will be disseminated on both sides of the Atlantic. This synthesis report summarizes the key observations and policy insights from the second CALAMAR Expert Meeting of the Multi-Stakeholder Working Groups held on 11-12 October 2010 in Paris, France.

The CALAMAR project is funded by the European Commission, Directorate General for External Relations and is being carried out by five partner organizations: Ecologic Institute (Germany), Meridian Institute (US), Duke University (US), IDDRI (France) and University of Delaware (US).

## 2 General observations

**The world's oceans are at risk due to impacts of climate change and global demand for marine resources.** The EU and US have a common interest in conserving marine resources, while at the same time, developing an environmentally sustainable maritime economy. Transatlantic cooperation could enhance opportunities for integrated maritime governance to improve management of a wide range of activities in the coastal, exclusive economic zones (EEZs) and high seas.

**There is a need for better understanding of socio-economic impacts of climate change, especially on coastal areas and the maritime sector.** Coastal areas are of considerable, but frequently underestimated, economic importance for both the EU and US. Guidelines provided by the European Commission<sup>1</sup> and the US Final Recommendations of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force<sup>2</sup> address economic issues related to climate change.

**Bridging the gap between science and management of ocean resources should be encouraged to better address the issues related to maritime issues.** Each working group highlighted the need to build mechanisms for better communication, data sharing and integrated assessments.

### 3 Transatlantic strategies

**Recent developments in EU and US policy highlight the importance of international cooperation.** US President Obama signed Executive Order 13547 in July 2010 establishing a National Policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes, which recognizes the importance of “cooperating and exercising leadership at the international level”.<sup>3</sup> The European Commission recently prepared a Non-Paper on ‘The EU and the Atlantic Ocean’ in preparation for a potential Communication, which recognizes a ‘strong overseas dimension’ in addressing issues in the Atlantic region.<sup>4</sup> One opportunity for bilateral cooperation exists in working together to identify and designate potential Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in the North Atlantic high seas, e.g. the Sargasso Sea.

**The US and the EU could share significant information and experience regarding maritime issues in the North Atlantic.** There are many specific challenges and cross-cutting issues in national and shared waters, so the potential for collaboration exists, especially in mitigating and adapting to climate change and governing the high seas. The North Atlantic could serve as a starting point for a number of initiatives that could be applied more broadly. For example, joint measures could be taken to protect the North Atlantic and its species such as eels, sharks and tuna. Possible opportunities for enhanced knowledge sharing and cooperation between the US and OSPAR should be explored.

**There is a need to improve and develop communication strategies and exchange of information** between the EU and US. The following six potential actions were identified among the working groups that could help the EU and US move closer to this goal:

---

<sup>1</sup> The economics of climate change adaptation in EU coastal areas. Available at: [ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/climate\\_change/report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/climate_change/report_en.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Final recommendations of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force (2010). Available at: [http://www.whitehouse.gov/files/documents/OPTF\\_FinalRecs.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/files/documents/OPTF_FinalRecs.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> US Executive Order 13547 (2010). Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts, and the Great Lakes <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/2010-18169.htm>

<sup>4</sup> European Commission (2010). Non-paper: The EU and the Atlantic Ocean. Available online at: [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/partners/consultations/atlantic\\_ocean/non\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/partners/consultations/atlantic_ocean/non_paper_en.pdf)

- 1) **Identify fora for international cooperation and environmental data-sharing**, focusing on compliance with existing agreements, tools, networks and sources of information. For example, the EU and US could cooperate on strengthening standards within the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and develop protective measures through Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) to restrict increased fishing that is predicted for the next 15 years. A general recommendation is to find complementarity in plans of action and seek agreement on main position points to present in international fora (e.g. IMO, RFMOs, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), International Whaling Commission (IWC)). In addition, work carried out through the OSPAR Convention could be extended or replicated in other regions of the North Atlantic, and the US could work more closely with OSPAR within the North-East Atlantic region.
- 2) **Exchange case studies and best practices** on local and regional scenarios of climate change impacts and related efforts, especially how to achieve ecosystem resilience under different conditions. Explore both private sector and government databases for opportunities to share data (e.g. illegal shipping, alternative/renewable energy). The development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration-Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC), the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the European Commission (EC) could potentially lead to a transatlantic oceans electronic portal to provide a platform for sharing experiences, tools and best practices.
- 3) **Support transatlantic policy dialogues** between the two continents on coastal adaptation to climate change, high seas and related issues with a focus on sharing information and developing possible joint approaches to management. Results of the collaborative processes should be disseminated to the broader public. For example, a transatlantic meeting could be convened including scientists with relevant expertise and policy makers with the aim of accelerating progress in identifying possible EBSAs and VMEs using the criteria established by the CBD and FAO and promoting protection of these areas.
- 4) **Develop a common understanding, mapping and valuation of ecosystem services** and focus on linking efforts to build resilience. Establish a principle to share information as quickly as possible, especially related to offshore activities.
- 5) **Establish data-sharing mechanisms on natural systems**, especially scientific data, methods and techniques (e.g. through Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS)), to accelerate progress in the identification of Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs) in the high seas.
- 6) **Enhance surveillance and monitoring capabilities in the high seas**. Development of technology will advance remote sensing capabilities. Available technology should be used to implement innovative and effective surveillance and monitoring schemes in the high seas, and in particular, in high seas MPAs.

Resulting information should be shared appropriately to support governance and management objectives, enhance interoperability of transatlantic systems and provide regularized, compatible channels for information-sharing on issues such as seabed data, compliance (i.e. vessels carrying out Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU) fishing), IUU products (i.e. on countries that have been closed off from trade with EU or US).

## 4 Tools and approaches

**An Integrated Assessment of the North Atlantic would provide information critical to future maritime use.** The assessment should build on existing efforts, especially through OSPAR, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and the European Commission's 'European Atlas of the Seas' to cover coasts, ocean and seas of the North Atlantic. Support could be provided through existing programmes, such as the EU Framework Programme 8, the CAMEO programme – a joint programme of NOAA and the NSF – or the National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

**A common framework for implementing Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) would strengthen decision making, especially in the high seas.** Prior assessment of human activities in the ocean is a fundamental and well-established process required by the EU and the US for most activities within their EEZs, including on the extended continental shelf. There are no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements for existing high seas pelagic fisheries, but UN General Assembly Resolution 64/72 does emphasize the need to assess existing bottom fisheries and prohibits fisheries where there could be negative impacts. Human activities on the high seas that have the potential for adverse effects should be subject to prior assessment to ensure sound scientific decision making. Current gaps in this regard include, among others, offshore energy projects, sargassum harvest, fisheries other than those covered by UN resolutions 61/105 and 64/72, as well as implementation of those resolutions by NEAFC and NAFO for existing bottom fisheries.

**Marine Spatial Planning (MSP)<sup>5</sup> is an important process for the integrated management of human uses of marine areas.** Experiences and lessons learned from applications in the US and EU will result in recommendations for both planners and policy makers. Key considerations include the authority and financing mechanisms available at the outset, identification of relevant stakeholders, clearly defined goals and shared future vision, transparent and iterative processes in implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and appropriate use of data.

**Establishment and management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) is a high priority.** A potential opportunity for bilateral cooperation exists in working together to identify potential Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs) and designate Marine Protected Areas

---

<sup>5</sup> An overview of Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) is available at:  
[http://www.baltseaplan.eu/downloads/WWF\\_Cartoon\\_MSP.pdf](http://www.baltseaplan.eu/downloads/WWF_Cartoon_MSP.pdf).

(MPAs) in the North Atlantic high seas, e.g. in the Sargasso Sea, to help countries meet global goals adopted under the Convention on Biological Diversity at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. In these areas, appropriate protective measures from the competent international and regional organizations should be secured, recognizing that it is essential habitat not only for endangered species, but also for important commercial and recreational species.

**Strengthen green maritime technology for shipping, fishing and energy.** The working groups recognize the strength in complementarity between rules and regulations for similar activities. Mandating the same policy may not be necessary on both sides of the Atlantic, but efforts on one side of the Atlantic should not be undermined by inaction by the other. Examples of areas where exchange of best practices and development of complementary efforts include offshore aquaculture, shipping (e.g. double hulls), oil drilling, deep sea mining, fisheries (e.g. type/size of gear and offshore resources), spatial planning (especially for energy developments), decommissioning of extraction systems (e.g. oil platforms), and handling marine debris (e.g. plastics, lost containers and fishing gear).

## 5 Stakeholder participation

**The involvement and interaction among various stakeholders affected by the impacts of climate change should be facilitated.** In particular, interactions among ports on both sides of the Atlantic should be developed, such as through the development and exchange of case studies and development of MOU, since ports are an important portal between shipping and the economic development of the coastal area. There is also a need to understand the concerns of the global insurance industry regarding climate change, and to invite their involvement in the dialogue, which also presents an opportunity for the industry to share their scenarios about sea level rise.

## 6 Governance objectives

**The EU and US should cooperate on carbon emission and rate reduction.** In this regard, the promotion of local energy sources is encouraged. There is a need to have an improved regulatory regime for new and emerging technology and to develop appropriate regulatory and monitoring mechanisms. Technology is accelerating at a rapid pace and there is a need for more powerful regulations. In this area, EU practice is considered to be ahead of developments in the United States.

**There are massive gaps in governance, implementation and enforcement of regulations of the high seas, which lag far behind management of coastal waters.** The vast majority of the North Atlantic Ocean consists of high seas beyond the jurisdiction of particular nations, which provides opportunities for transatlantic and international

cooperation. Management and governance practices of this area lag far behind those in place for domestic waters of the US and the EU, and is not adequate to address the growing spectrum of human activities that are taking place on the high seas. Modernizing and strengthening high seas management can accrue major economic benefits for both sides of the Atlantic. Important gaps in high seas governance include the absence of mechanisms to implement ecosystem based management (EBM)<sup>6</sup>, the lack of mandatory prior assessment, and the absence of coordinated, systematic processes for identifying and protecting high seas areas of ecological or biological significance.

## 7 Next steps

The results of the Expert Meeting in Paris will be further developed through continued dialogue among the four cross-sectoral working groups, and will be incorporated into the final CALAMAR report. The policy options based on the extensive expert contributions will be presented at the CALAMAR Conference, to be held in Lisbon, Portugal in April 2011.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ecosystem based management (EBM) is “an integrated approach to management that considers the entire ecosystem, including humans. The goal of EBM is to maintain an ecosystem in a healthy, productive and resilient condition so that it can provide the goods and services humans want and need. EBM differs from current approaches that usually focus on a single species, sector activity or concern; it considers the cumulative impacts of different sectors” Ehler and Douvère, *Marine Spatial Planning*, p 24.