

Impact assessment:

plaice and sole
long-term management plan

- Best practice in process for socio-econ impact assessment
- Review of process in flat fish impact assessment
- Strengths and scope for improvement in the process
- Outcomes of the process

- Steps according to Taylor, Bryan and Goodrick 1995
- **Scoping** – nature & boundaries of the IA
- **Profiling current impacts** of activity in question, to establish baseline level & rate of change
- **Formulating alternatives**, in which alternative ‘impact’ scenarios are developed
- **Projecting and estimating effects** of different impact scenarios
- **Monitoring** actual impacts
- **Mitigation and management** of impacts
- **Evaluation** of the impact assessment process

Flat Fish IA process



Jan 06	Long Term Management Plan adopted by commission
June 06	NSRAC & Member States requested impact assessment. DG Fish agreed DG Fish Econ Unit drafted ToR (with input from NSRAC & MS) DG Fish Econ Unit appointed STECF Working Group chair person
Aug 06	<i>Working Group chair person got married and went on honeymoon....</i> Preparatory meeting with DG Fish, chair & some experts Commission price flexibility study to use with economic model
Sep 06	DG Fish Econ unit evaluated economic model: EIAA STECF Working Group held, with observers (contributing)
Nov 06	Working group report completed & presented to STECF plenary Working group report not accepted by STECF plenary DG Fish conservation unit proposed alternative recovery plan
Dec 06	Council agreed principles of recovery plan & management plan
Jan – Mar 07	6 principles evolved into plan similar to original via negotiations
June 07	Council adopted regulation for 2 phase plan: 1. recovery 2. management

- Industry observers made positive contribution
- People with flexible approach and “can-do” attitude
- Brought scientists of three disciplines together
- Access to pre-approved biological models and a pre-approved economic model
- Use of two different economic models forced questions and explanations - deepened understanding in the end
- Continuation of work outside of STECF working group – allowed more reflection and drafting time

But, could do better...



We did not have....

- ... experts used to working together between disciplines
- ... integrated and agreed data sets between sub-groups
- ... integrated bio-economic model with feedback between economic part and biological part
- ... chance or budget to appoint and bring sub-group chairs together before the meeting
- ... enough time to prepare or carry out the work
- ... budget mechanism (institutes supported staff time)
- ... several options to compare against each other prior to adoption of “best” option – just “take it or leave it”
- ... an experienced chairperson (!)
- ... suitable adjacent meeting rooms for sub-groups

- Quantitative data was very limited
- Qualitative social research varied and case specific
- Quantitative impact assessment was impossible
- Appendix – social assessment framework for fisheries
(Hatchard, J., Delaney, A., Holmyard, N. & van Hoof, L.)
- 4 sequential steps
 - Take account of bio and econ simulations of proposals
 - Assess direct impacts on social factors affecting industry structures (quantified where possible)
 - Qualitatively assess indirect consequences for community structures and associated social factors
 - Assess capacity of public & private social institutions to manage & respond to social changes resulting

- **Scoping** – nature & boundaries of the IA – **not bad**
- **Profiling current impacts** of activity in question, to establish baseline level & rate of change – **ok**
- **Formulating alternatives**, in which alternative ‘impact’ scenarios are developed – **was not done**
- **Projecting and estimating effects** of different impact scenarios – **did our best with models we had**
- **Monitoring** actual impacts – **not at that stage yet**
- **Mitigation and management** of impacts
- **Evaluation** of the impact assessment process

- STECF plenary in Nov 06 had questions and concerns and did not adopt the working group report
- Further STECF working group convened to address questions – lead to improved understanding
- Concluded it would be possible to adapt IMARES model and EIAA to have dynamic feedback loop
- Process can be refined for other cases in EU
- Proposals to allow observers to STECF plenary
- Some biologists learned some basic economics...
- Chairperson learned considerably more about stock modelling and recruitment relationships than she ever expected to....

Despite less-than-perfect outcome first time round...

...well worth doing and lots of good learning to use next time!

Follow up working group – March 07

SEAFISH

