BACKGROUND

GAP is funded under the EU Funding Period 7 "Science in Society programme". Its stated aim in European fishing is to connect science, stakeholders and policy. Details of the whole project can be found at www.gap2.eu

AGENDA AND REPORT

This well attended workshop had the specific purpose (stated in full above) of identifying what scientific support is required for successful regionalisation under the new CFP. The event was well organised and professionally facilitated around four key questions:

- What are the knowledge **needs** for the implementation of discard plans and multi-annual plans?
- Who will **develop** the knowledge base and how can its credibility and reliability be ensured?
- What funding and support is needed for the research infrastructure to **deliver** the knowledge for regional decision-making?
- How could the knowledge be **accessed and deployed** in a regional context?

The day was structured in three sessions: context-setting presentations for all, followed by splitting into four groups to address each of the above four questions in turn, finishing with wash-up to discuss the output on each question, look for areas of consensus.

Martin Pastoors of GAP2 gave a presentation on the context of changes in the new CFP. He described the landing obligations as a fundamental change in philosophy, and regionalisation as the "new hope". He displayed a diagram of the messy and complicated interconnections between the EU institutions (Council, Parliament and Commission), the scientific bodies (ICES, STECF, and the JRF), and the stakeholders (the RACs – now the *AC*s), in order to inform the workshop's thinking on provision of science to the emerging regionalisation.

The Dutch Member State policy officer Henk Offringa gave the second context presentation, on the North Sea version of regionalisation. It is the most advanced area in terms of work, and he based his presentation on the Memorandum of Understanding of the North Sea MS Group.

While the focus of the day was specifically on provision of science, it was clear from discussion after the presentations that actual structures and process to make regionalisation a reality simply did not yet exist anywhere. To summarise the debate, the present lack of regional cooperation between stakeholders and Member State policymakers was what delegates saw as the principal problem to be addressed.

For the second session, informal groups were created and each addressed all four key questions in turn. As is usual for workshops such as this it is hard to report on all the output – a great number of suggested conclusions were recorded on each of the questions and they will of course be made available by the GAP2 project when collated.

At the final session in plenary each group reported its own points of consensus, which were then briefly discussed. Delegates returned to the point on structure and the single point of agreement across all groups was the need for some structure to be created for each area of regionalisation. Concern was expressed that regionalisation might simply mean Member States at Director level taking decisions without proper interaction with stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS

This was a worthwhile exercise, if only to make clear the work yet to be done on the actual structure of regionalisation. That means making sure that, as the structures are developed, both industry and other stakeholders have an appropriate voice. The ACs will be the means of access to this; all the ACs in which we are active are already working on it.