

Third section

# Fisheries management: institutions, legislation and management policies





## Chapter 7

# Italian fisheries in the Mediterranean regional context

## 7.1 Fisheries in the Mediterranean Sea: the relevant international law provisions

Scovazzi T.

### The nature and extent of maritime zones

Under customary international law and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (Montego Bay, 1982; UNCLOS), marine spaces are divided into different zones, moving from the coast seaward, namely:

- A) The marine internal waters are waters subject to the sovereignty of the coastal State and located on the landward side of the baseline from which the territorial sea is measured. The baseline corresponds, depending on the geographical characteristics of the coastline, to the low-water line or, in particular cases, to one or more straight segments that connect some determined points located on land or islands in the vicinity of the coast<sup>1</sup>.
- B) The territorial sea is a belt of coastal waters, that may not extend beyond 12 nautical miles (n.m.) from the baseline (Art. 3 UNCLOS). It includes also the seabed and its subsoil. It is subject to the sovereignty of the coastal State with the exception of the right of innocent passage for ships flying the flag of third States. The territorial sea does not depend on any express proclamation by the coastal States concerned, but is granted to them as a mere consequence of the sovereignty on land (*ipso iure*).
- C) The contiguous zone is a belt of water adjacent to the territorial sea, the outer limits of which do not exceed 24 n.m. from the baseline of the territorial sea. It is established on the basis of an express proclamation by the coastal State concerned, which may exercise the control necessary to prevent infringements of customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary laws and regulations applicable within its territory or territorial sea and to punish such infringements (Art. 33 UNCLOS).
- D) The exclusive economic zone is a maritime area adjacent to the territorial sea that may not extend beyond 200 n.m. from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is

<sup>1</sup> Under the UNCLOS, straight baselines can be drawn in the cases of deeply indented coastlines or fringes of islands (Art. 7), mouths of rivers (Art. 9), bays (Art. 10) or archipelagic States (Art. 47).

measured (Art. 57 UNCLOS). The exclusive economic zone is established on the basis of an express proclamation by the coastal State concerned, which enjoys “sovereign rights” for the purpose of exploitation of the natural resources, whether living or non-living, and production of energy from the water, currents and winds, as well as “jurisdiction” with regard to artificial islands, installations and structures, marine scientific research and protection and preservation of the marine environment<sup>2</sup>. The other States enjoy the freedoms of navigation, overflight and laying of submarine cables and pipelines, and of other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to these freedoms.

- E) The continental shelf is defined as “the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond its territorial sea throughout the natural prolongation of its land territory to the outer edge of the continental margin, or to a distance of 200 n.m from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured where the outer edge of the continental margin does not extend up to that distance” (Art. 76, para. 1, UNCLOS). In the continental shelf, the coastal State exercises sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources (Art. 77, para. 1, UNCLOS), both mineral and living<sup>3</sup>. The continental shelf exists *ipso iure* and does not depend on any express proclamation by the coastal State concerned (Art. 77, para. 3). The rights of the coastal State over the continental shelf do not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters (Art. 78, para. 1), that can be subject to the regime of either the exclusive economic zone or of the high seas.
- F) The marine areas located beyond the zones subject to national jurisdiction constitute the high seas, also defined as “all parts of the sea that are not included in the exclusive economic zone, in the territorial sea or in the internal waters of a State, or in the archipelagic waters of an archipelagic State” (Art. 86 UNCLOS). On the high seas jurisdiction over ships is exercised by the State that has granted its flag to them. The high seas is subject to a regime of freedom that encompasses different activities:
- “1. The high seas are open to all States, whether coastal or land-locked. Freedom of the high seas is exercised under the conditions laid down by this Convention and by other rules of international law. It comprises, inter alia, both for coastal and land-locked States:
    - a) freedom of navigation;
    - b) freedom of overflight;
    - c) freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines, subject to Part VI [= Continental Shelf];
    - d) freedom to construct artificial islands and other installations permitted under international law, subject to Part VI;
    - e) freedom of fishing, subject to the conditions laid down in section 2 [= Conservation and Management of the Living Resources of the High Seas];
    - f) freedom of scientific research, subject to Parts VI and XIII [= Marine Scientific Research].
  2. These freedoms shall be exercised by all States with due regard for the interests of other States in their exercise of the freedom of the high seas (...)” (Art. 87 UNCLOS).
- G) The seabed located beyond the limits of the continental shelf is called the Area and is subject to the special regime of the common heritage of mankind (Part XI UNCLOS). For geographical reasons, no seabed falling under the Area regime exists in the Mediterranean. In fact, in this semi-enclosed sea no point is located at a distance of more than 200 n.m. from the nearest land or island.

<sup>2</sup> For more details see Art. 56 UNCLOS. Nobody knows the difference between “sovereign rights” and “jurisdiction”.

<sup>3</sup> The living resources of the continental shelf are the so-called sedentary species. See *infra*, para. C of “The UNCLOS”

## Peculiarities of maritime zones in the Mediterranean Sea

The general rules of international law on the regime and extent of maritime zones within and beyond national jurisdiction apply also in semi-enclosed seas (such as the Mediterranean Sea<sup>4</sup>, despite a certain number of unsettled maritime boundaries). There is no doubt that States bordering enclosed or semi-enclosed seas are entitled to establish exclusive economic zones whenever they wish to do so, even though for geographical reasons they cannot claim a full size 200-mile zone<sup>5</sup>. International law does not prevent States bordering seas of limited dimensions from establishing their own exclusive economic zones, provided that maritime boundaries are not unilaterally imposed by one State on its adjacent or opposite neighboring States<sup>6</sup>.

However, in the case of the maritime zones established in Mediterranean Sea, which is surrounded by twenty-two bordering States<sup>7</sup>, a number of peculiarities that make the present picture particularly complex must be taken into account.

Not all the Mediterranean coastal States have so far decided to establish an exclusive economic zone. However, some coastal States have proclaimed beyond the territorial sea *sui generis* zones, namely a fishing zone or an ecological protection zone. While neither of them is mentioned in the UNCLOS, they are not prohibited either. They encompass only some of the rights that can be exercised within the exclusive economic zone. Such a fragmentation of rights seems compatible with international law, also on the basis of the general principle that the right to do less is implied in the right to do more (*in maiore stat minus*).

The current picture of national coastal zones is summarized hereunder.

- A) As regards internal waters, several Mediterranean States (Albania, Algeria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Italy, Libya, Malta, Morocco, Montenegro, Spain, Tunisia and Turkey) apply legislation measuring the breadth of the territorial sea from straight baselines joining specific points located on the mainland or islands. Historical bays are claimed by Italy (Gulf of Taranto) and Libya (Gulf of Sidra).
- B) Most Mediterranean States established a 12-mile territorial sea. The exceptions are the United Kingdom (3 n.m. for Gibraltar<sup>8</sup>) and the Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia on the island of Cyprus), Greece (6 n.m.) and Turkey (6 n.m. in the Aegean Sea, but 12 n.m. elsewhere).

<sup>4</sup> The Mediterranean is a semi-enclosed sea according to the definition provided by Art. 122 UNCLOS: "For the purposes of this Convention, 'enclosed or semi-enclosed sea' means a gulf, basin or sea surrounded by two or more States and connected to another sea or the ocean by a narrow outlet or consisting entirely or primarily of the territorial seas and exclusive economic zones of two or more coastal States". The UNCLOS calls on States bordering semi-enclosed seas to cooperate, directly or through appropriate regional organizations, in different fields, including the management, conservation, exploration and exploitation of the living resources of the sea (Art. 123).

<sup>5</sup> In fact, exclusive economic zones have been established in semi-enclosed seas, such as the Black, the Baltic and the Caribbean Seas.

<sup>6</sup> As remarked by the International Court of Justice in the judgment of 18 December 1951 on the *Fisheries* case, "the delimitation of sea areas has always an international aspect; it cannot be dependent merely upon the will of the coastal State as expressed in its municipal law. Although it is true that the act of delimitation is necessarily a unilateral act, because only the coastal State is competent to undertake it, the validity of the delimitation with regard to other States depends upon international law" (International Court of Justice, *Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders*, 1951, p. 20).

<sup>7</sup> Spain, the United Kingdom (as far as Gibraltar and the sovereign base areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia on the island of Cyprus are concerned), France, Monaco, Italy, Malta, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, Greece, Cyprus, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco.

<sup>8</sup> A longstanding dispute is pending between Spain and the United Kingdom as to whether Gibraltar is entitled to a territorial sea.

C) Five States have declared a fishing zone beyond the limit of the territorial sea.

Tunisia has established along its southern coastline (from Ras Kapoudia to the frontier with Libya) a fishing zone delimited according to the criterion of the 50-meter isobath<sup>9</sup>, based on legislation dating back to 1951 (Decree of the Bey of 26 July 1951) which was subsequently confirmed (Laws No. 63-49 of 30 December 1963 and No. 73-49 of 2 August 1973).

Malta established a 25-mile exclusive fishing zone (Territorial Waters and Contiguous Zone Amendment Act of 18 July 1978). Under Legislative Act No. X of 26 July 2005, fishing waters may be designated beyond the limits laid down in the 1978 Act and jurisdiction in these waters may also be extended to artificial islands, marine scientific research and the protection and preservation of the marine environment.

Algeria created a fishing zone with an extent of 32 n.m. from the maritime frontier with Morocco to Ras Ténès and 52 n.m. from Ras Ténès to the maritime frontier with Tunisia (Legislative Decree No. 94-13 of 28 May 1994).

Spain established a fishing protection zone in the Mediterranean (Royal Decree 1315/1997 of 1st August 1997, modified by Royal Decree 431/2000 of 31 March 2000). The zone is delimited according to the line which is equidistant between Spain and the opposite or adjacent coasts of Algeria, Italy and France<sup>10</sup>.

Libya in 2005 established a fisheries protection zone the limits of which extend seaward for a distance of 62 n.m. from the external limit of the territorial sea (General People's Committee Decision No. 37 of 24 February 2005), according to the geographical co-ordinates set forth in General People's Committee Decision No. 105 of 21 June 2005.

D) Two States apply legislation for the establishment of an ecological protection zone.

In 2003, France adopted Law No. 2003-346 of 15 April 2003 which provides that an ecological protection zone may be created off the national coasts where there is no exclusive economic zone. In this zone France exercises only some of the powers granted to the coastal State under the exclusive economic zone regime, namely the powers relating to the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and the establishment and use of artificial islands, installations and structures. A zone of this kind was established along the French Mediterranean coast by Decree No. 2004-33 of 8 January 2004 which specifies the co-ordinates to define the external limit of the zone. However, the French ecological protection zone is today superseded by the establishment of an exclusive economic zone in the Mediterranean (decree 2012-1148 of 12 October 2012). In 2005, Slovenia provided for the establishment of an ecological protection zone (Law of 4 October 2005)<sup>11</sup>.

In 2006, Italy adopted a framework legislation for ecological protection zones (Law No. 61 of 8 February 2006) to be established by decrees. Within the ecological zones, Italy will exercise powers which are not limited to the prevention and control of pollution, but extend also to the protection of marine mammals, biodiversity and the underwater archaeological and historical heritage. The first of the implementing enactments is the Decree of the President of the Republic of 27 October 2011, No. 209, which establishes an ecological protection zone in the Ligurian and Tyrrhennian Seas.

<sup>9</sup> The area where the Tunisian fishing zone is located is considered by Italy as a high seas zone of biological protection where fishing by Italian vessels or nationals is prohibited (Decree of 25 September 1979).

<sup>10</sup> No fishing zone was established as regards the Spanish Mediterranean coast facing Morocco.

<sup>11</sup> Croatia objected to the right of Slovenia to establish national coastal zones beyond the territorial sea. A dispute is pending between the two States and will be decided by an arbitration.



E) One Mediterranean State established a maritime zone for both fishing and ecological purposes: On 3 October 2003, the Croatian Parliament adopted a “decision on the extension of the jurisdiction of the Republic of Croatia in the Adriatic Sea” and proclaimed “the content of the exclusive economic zone related to the sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the living resources beyond the outer limits of the territorial sea, as well as the jurisdiction with regard to marine scientific research and the protection and preservation of the marine environment, whereby the ecological and fisheries protection zone of the Republic of Croatia is established as of today” (Art. 1). However, on 3 June 2004, the Parliament amended the 2003 decision in order to postpone implementation of the ecological and fishing zone with regard to Member States of the European Union.

F) A number of States established, or officially announced the establishment of, an exclusive economic zone.

In 1981, Morocco created a 200-mile exclusive economic zone (Dahir No. 1-81-179 of 8 April 1981), without making any distinction between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean coasts.

Upon ratifying the UNCLOS on 26 August 1983, Egypt declared that it “will exercise as from this day the rights attributed to it by the provisions of parts V and VI of the (...) Convention (...) in the exclusive economic zone situated beyond and adjacent to its territorial sea in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Red Sea”.

By Law No. 28 of 19 November 2003 Syria provided for the establishment of an exclusive economic zone.

Cyprus proclaimed an exclusive economic zone under a law adopted on 2 April 2004.

Tunisia established an exclusive economic zone under Law No. 2005-60 of 27 June 2005. The modalities for the implementation of the law will be determined by decree.

Under a declaration of 27 May 2009 and a decision of 31 May 2009, No. 260, Libya proclaimed an exclusive economic zone. The external limit of the zone will be determined by agreements with the neighbouring States concerned.

By a framework Law adopted on 19 September 2011, Lebanon established its exclusive economic zone. Three annexes define the limits of the zone between Lebanon and, respectively, Syria, Cyprus and Palestine<sup>12</sup>.

On 12 July 2011 Israel deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations the list of the geographical coordinates of the Northern limit of its territorial sea and exclusive economic zone<sup>13</sup>.

France recently established an exclusive economic zone also in the Mediterranean (decree 2012-1148 of 12 October 2012). The French exclusive economic zone partially overlaps with the Spanish fishing zone. In conclusion, the Mediterranean Sea may be considered today a sea in transition towards a generalized exclusive economic zone regime. However, some high seas areas still exist within this semi-enclosed sea. The present multiform situation has an influence also on the regime of fisheries.

<sup>12</sup> Lebanon does not recognize Israel.

<sup>13</sup> The exclusive economic zones claimed by Israel and Lebanon partially overlap.

# The international regime of fisheries

Several international instruments, having either a world or a regional scope, apply to fisheries.

## The UNCLOS

A) In the maritime internal waters and in the territorial sea, fisheries are subject to the sovereignty of the coastal State. Vessels flying the flag of third States may be allowed to engage in fishing activities if a treaty to such purpose is concluded between the coastal State and the States concerned.

B) Within the exclusive economic zone, the UNCLOS fisheries management scheme is based on the determination by the coastal State of the allowable catch of the living resources (Art. 61, para. 1) and the subsequent determination of its own capacity to harvest (Art. 62, para. 2). Where the coastal State does not have the capacity to harvest the entire allowable catch, it shall, through agreements and pursuant to the terms and conditions established in its legislation, give other States access to the surplus (Art. 62, para. 2). The other States must comply with the terms and conditions established by the coastal State and relating to a number of matters listed by Art. 62, para. 4, such as, *inter alia*, licensing, payment of fees and other forms of remuneration, joint-ventures and other cooperative arrangements, technical measures for the conservation of living resources (quotas of catch, seasons and areas of fishing, sizes and amount of gear, number of fishing vessels, etc.). Under Art. 62, para. 3, in giving other States access to its exclusive economic zone, the coastal State shall “take into account all relevant factors”, including, *inter alia*, the significance of the living resources of the area to its economy and other national interests, the rights of land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States<sup>14</sup> of the same subregion or region, the requirements of developing States of the subregion or region in harvesting part of the surplus and the need to minimize economic dislocation in States the nationals of which have habitually fished in the zone or which made substantial efforts in research and stock identification.

Specific provisions are included in the UNCLOS for those species that, due to their natural characteristics, do not respect the artificial boundaries that are drawn by men on maps, namely the straddling stocks (Art. 63)<sup>15</sup>, highly migratory species (Art. 64)<sup>16</sup>, anadromous stocks (Art. 66)<sup>17</sup>, or catadromous species (Art. 67)<sup>18</sup>.

As regards disputes that may arise over fisheries in the exclusive economic zone, the UNCLOS provides that the coastal State is not obliged to accept the submission to compulsory settlement procedures of any disputes relating to its sovereign rights with respect to living resources, including its discretionary powers for determining the allowable catch, its harvesting capacity, the allocation of surpluses to other States, and the terms and conditions established in its conservation and management legislation (Art. 297, para. 3 a).

<sup>14</sup> Art. 70, para. 2, defines the term “geographically disadvantaged States” as meaning “coastal States, including States bordering enclosed or semi-enclosed seas, whose geographical situation makes them dependent upon the exploitation of the living resources of the exclusive economic zones of other States in the subregion or region for adequate supplies of fish for the nutritional purposes of their populations or parts thereof, and coastal States which can claim no exclusive economic zones of their own”.

<sup>15</sup> That is stocks occurring within the exclusive economic zones of two or more coastal States or both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area of the high seas beyond and adjacent to it.

<sup>16</sup> Annex I to the UNCLOS provides the list of highly migratory species, which includes several species of high commercial value, such as tunas and swordfish.

<sup>17</sup> Anadromous species, such as salmon, originate in rivers, migrate to sea and return to rivers.

<sup>18</sup> Catadromous species, such as eels, originate in the sea, migrate to rivers or brackish waters and return to sea.



Yet the UNCLOS management scheme is not always feasible. Developing coastal States do not always have an adequate knowledge of the biological characteristics of living resources located in their 200-mile exclusive economic zone and do not always count on sufficient financial and technological means to determine the allowable catch and to exercise a full control on the amount of foreign catches. In these cases, access to fisheries is often granted by the coastal State in the form of a number of licenses to foreign fishing vessels and in exchange for the payment of adequate fees. With time, the license system could be combined with more advanced arrangements, such as joint venture agreements with foreign fishing corporations where the coastal State directly participates in the benefits and risks of the venture. This could contribute to the achievement of the final aim, consisting of the building by the coastal State of a national capacity to fully exploit living resources.

In the special case of the Mediterranean Sea, the determination of total allowable catches and quotas is not considered as a viable option for the current regional fisheries management due to multi-species nature of Mediterranean fisheries. The exception is bluefin tuna<sup>19</sup>.

C) Under Art. 68 UNCLOS, the regime of the exclusive economic zone does not apply to sedentary species of the continental shelf. They are defined by Art. 77, para. 1, as the living organism of the seabed and subsoil “which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil” (Art. 77, para. 2, UNCLOS). Sedentary species are subject to the sovereign rights of the coastal State, as are the mineral resources of the continental shelf.

D) In the case of the high seas, the UNCLOS fisheries regime is based on an obligation to cooperate for the conservation and management of living resources. Arts. 117 and 118 provide that all States have the duty to take, or to cooperate with other States in taking, measures of conservation. Art. 119 specifies several factors that must be taken into consideration in determining the total allowable catch and establishing other conservation measures, namely, relevant environmental and economic factors, special requirements of developing States, fishing patterns, interdependence of stocks, effects on species associated with, or dependent upon, harvested species, and generally recommended minimum standards. The establishment of subregional or regional fisheries organizations is called for by Art. 118.

An obligation to cooperate is not devoid of legal meaning. It implies a duty to act in good faith in pursuing a common objective and in taking into account the requirements of the other interested States. In principle, this kind of behaviour is likely to lead to the conclusion of agreements, as remarked by the International Court of Justice in the judgments of 20 February 1969 on the *North Sea Continental Shelf* cases<sup>20</sup> and of 25 July 1974 on the two *Fisheries Jurisdiction* cases. In the latter the Court stated that

“it is one of the advances in maritime international law, resulting from the intensification of fishing, that the former *laissez-faire* treatment of the living resources of the sea in the high seas has been replaced by a recognition of a duty to have due regard to the rights of other States and the need of conservation for the benefit of all.

<sup>19</sup> See *infra*, para. “The International Commission”.

<sup>20</sup> International Court of Justice, *Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions, Orders*, 1969, para. 85 of the judgment.

Consequently, both Parties have the obligation to keep under review the fishery resources in the disputed waters and to examine together, in the light of scientific and other available information, the measures required for the conservation and development, and equitable exploitation, of those resources”<sup>21</sup>.

However, a number of crucial questions may be asked as regards some problems that persistently affect high seas fisheries, such as unregulated fishing, vessel reflagging to escape control, insufficiently selective gear, unreliable databases, excessive fleet size and lack of sufficient cooperation between States. To be meaningful, an obligation to co-operate should be complied with by all the States interested in the exploitation of a specific fishery. According to customary international law and to Art. 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, “a treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third State without its consent”. How is it possible to apply to fishing vessels flying the flag of non-party States (for example, a flag of convenience) a conservation scheme agreed upon by the parties to a multilateral treaty? What are the means for preventing the conservation measures accepted by most interested States from being frustrated by a few countries which enjoy the benefits of such measures without burdening themselves with the corresponding duties? It is well known that where the fishing effort exceeds the rate of natural reproduction of the resources, the yield of the fishery decreases. Conservation measures (such as closed areas, closed seasons, quotas, minimum size of nets, etc.) need often to be adopted to achieve the objective of reaching an intensity of fishing which approaches as closely as possible the optimum sustainable yield from a determined fishery. It cannot be taken for granted that, on the high seas, these kinds of technical measures of restraint are agreed upon by all the interested States.

## Other instruments

The post-UNCLOS trend in high seas fisheries is based on the adoption of new instruments for the strengthening of cooperation among all the States which are interested in the exploitation of marine living resources, in particular as regards fishing activities carried out at regional level.

A) Among the many instruments of soft law, consideration should be given to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, unanimously adopted on 31 October 1995 by the FAO Conference. It aims at providing “a necessary framework for national and international efforts to ensure sustainable exploitation of aquatic living resources in harmony with the environment”<sup>22</sup>. The Code has a voluntary character, but, in some cases, it reflects rules that already belong to customary international law or are given binding effect through specific treaties. The Code also contains ideas which may orientate the progressive development of international law of the sea. This is the case of the general principle of responsible fisheries, which is a way to integrate the idea of sustainable development into the field of fisheries:

“States and users of living aquatic resources should conserve aquatic ecosystems. The right to fish carries with it the obligation to do so in a responsible manner so as to ensure effective conservation and management of the living aquatic resources” (Art. 6, para. 1).

B) Another important soft law instrument is 2001 FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (so-called IUU fishing). It provides, inter alia, the following definitions:

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, 1974, para. 72 of the judgment between the United Kingdom and Iceland and para. 64 of the judgment between the Federal Republic of Germany and Iceland.

<sup>22</sup> FAO, *Preface to Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*, Rome, 1995, p. vi.

“3.1. Illegal fishing refers to activities:

3.1.1. conducted by national or foreign vessels in waters under the jurisdiction of a State, without the permission of that State, or in contravention of its laws and regulations;

3.1.2. conducted by vessels flying the flag of States that are parties to a relevant regional fisheries management organization but operate in contravention of the conservation and management measures adopted by that organization and by which the States are bound, or relevant provisions of the applicable international law; or

3.1.3. in violation of national laws or international obligations, including those undertaken by cooperating States to a relevant regional fisheries management organization.

3.2. Unreported fishing refers to fishing activities:

3.2.1. which have not been reported, or have been misreported, to the relevant national authority, in contravention of national laws and regulations; or

3.2.2. undertaken in the area of competence of a relevant regional fisheries management organization which have not been reported or have been misreported, in contravention of the reporting procedures of that organization.

3.3. Unregulated fishing refers to fishing activities:

3.3.1. in the area of application of a relevant regional fisheries management organization that are conducted by vessels without nationality, or by those flying the flag of a State not party to that organization, or by a fishing entity, in a manner that is not consistent with or contravenes the conservation and management measures of that organization; or

3.3.2. in areas or for fish stocks in relation to which there are no applicable conservation or management measures and where such fishing activities are conducted in a manner inconsistent with State responsibilities for the conservation of living marine resources under international law”.

C) As regards multilateral treaty law, the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas was adopted on 24 November 1993 by the FAO Conference. The preamble of the Agreement recalls that “the failure of flag States to fulfil their responsibility with respect to fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag”, as well as “the practice of flagging or reflagging vessels as a means of avoiding compliance with international conservation and management measures for living marine resources”, “are among the factors that seriously undermine the effectiveness of such measures”. The parties to the Agreement are under the basic obligation to comply with the principle of flag State responsibility: “Each Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to ensure that fishing vessels entitled to fly its flag do not engage in any activity that undermines the effectiveness of international conservation and management measures” (Art. III, para. 1 a).

The other main obligations set forth in the Agreement relate to the exercise of flag State responsibility. For example, parties must not authorize any fishing vessel previously registered in the territory of another party that has undermined the effectiveness of conservation and management measures to be used for fishing on the high seas (Art. III, para. 5). Parties are under an obligation to apply such sanctions of sufficient gravity as to be effective in securing compliance with the requirements of the Agreement (Art. III, para. 8)<sup>23</sup>. Other provisions deal with compulsory authorizations for fishing vessels, records of fishing vessels, transmission of information to the FAO for subsequent circulation to all parties.

<sup>23</sup> The importance of this provision lies in the fact that parties are obliged to establish and apply sanctions also relating to activities which take place on the high seas and not in their own jurisdictional waters.

The Agreement is a sign of a new way to understand the regime of fisheries on the high seas. All States retain their traditional right to sail ships flying their flag on the high seas and to give their flag to vessels fishing on the high seas. But this right is linked to the obligation to exercise flag State responsibility. To allow vessels flying the national flag to undermine the effectiveness of international conservation and management measures is to be considered a breach of an international obligation. This important corollary to the right to fish on the high seas is a welcome addition to the body of international law of the sea.

D) Another instance of the trend towards strengthening multilateral cooperation in the field of fisheries is the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, opened for signature in New York on 4 December 1995 (so-called UN Fish Stocks Agreement).

To confirm the new way to understand fishing activities on the high seas, the Fish Stocks Agreement includes a detailed provision on the precautionary approach as applied to fisheries. In particular:

“States shall be more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate. The absence of adequate scientific information shall not be used as a reason for postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures” (Art. 6, para. 2)<sup>24</sup>.

Today the precautionary approach, which is one of the main elements of the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development<sup>25</sup>, has been included in many legal instruments relating to the protection of the environment or the management of natural resources<sup>26</sup>. It involves, *inter alia*, a reversal of the burden of proof in the case of lack of full scientific certainty. Several provisions of the Fish Stocks Agreement stress the important role that is played by subregional or regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements. The Fish Stocks Agreement confirms the general principle that coastal States and States fishing on the high seas are under a duty to cooperate to conserve and manage straddling and highly migratory fish stocks (Art. 5). It also contains provisions that derogate from the traditional principle of freedom of fishing on the high seas. On the one hand, all States having a real interest in the fisheries concerned have the right to become members of a subregional or regional fisheries management organization or participants in such an arrangement (Art. 8, para. 3). On the other, only those States which are members of such an organization or participants in such an arrangement, or which agree to apply the conservation and management measures established by such an organization or arrangement, have access to the fishery resources to which those measures apply (Art. 8, para. 4).

A party may authorize a vessel to use its flag for fishing on the high seas “only where it is able to exercise effectively its responsibilities in respect of such vessel” under the UNCLOS and the

<sup>24</sup> The 1995 UN Fish Stocks Agreement makes the precautionary approach concrete. The basic concept, developed in Art. 6, para. 3, and further elaborated in Annex II, is that stock-specific reference points must be determined and not exceeded (para. 4). A precautionary reference point is defined in para. 1 of Annex II.

<sup>25</sup> “In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation” (principle 15 of the Rio Declaration).

<sup>26</sup> In fisheries, the view that States should “act with prudence and caution to ensure that effective conservation measures are taken to prevent serious harm to the stock” (in the specific case, a species of tuna of high commercial value) was expressed by the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in the order of 27 August 1999 in the *Southern Bluefin Tuna* cases (para. 77 of the order), although the concept of precautionary approach was not explicitly mentioned in it.

Fish Stocks Agreement. Besides the flag State, enforcement jurisdiction is attributed also to port States and other parties to the Agreement or regional fisheries organizations, which can stop, board and inspect vessels on the high seas. The obligation to ensure enforcement of the measures is primarily vested in the flag State (Art. 19). However, powers are also given to the other parties. In any high seas area covered by a subregional or regional fisheries management organization or arrangement, any State party member of the organization or arrangement may board and inspect vessels flying the flag of another State party for the purpose of ensuring compliance with conservation and management measures (Art. 21, para. 1). On notification by the inspecting State that there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has engaged in any activity contrary to the conservation and management measures, the flag State shall either fulfil its obligation to take enforcement action or authorize the inspecting State to take such enforcement action, as the flag State may specify (Art. 21, para. 7). When, following boarding and inspection, there are clear grounds for believing that a vessel has committed a serious violation and the flag State has either failed to respond, or has failed to take the required action, “the inspectors may remain on board and secure evidence and may require the master to assist in further investigation including, where appropriate, by bringing the vessel without delay to the nearest appropriate port” (Art. 21, para. 8).

- E) More recent (and not yet in force) is the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, adopted on 22 November 2009 within the FAO framework.

In the preamble the parties declare themselves “deeply concerned about the continuation of illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and its detrimental effect upon fish stocks, marine ecosystems and the livelihoods of legitimate fishers, and the increasing need for food security on a global basis”. They recognize that “measures to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing should build on the primary responsibility of flag States and use all available jurisdiction in accordance with international law, including port State measures, coastal State measures, market related measures and measures to ensure that nationals do not support or engage in illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing”. The objective of the Agreement is “to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing through the implementation of effective port State measures, and thereby to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of living marine resources and marine ecosystems” (Art. 2).

According to the Agreement, each party shall require that fishing vessels entering in its ports provide sufficiently in advance the information specified in Annex A. After receiving the relevant information, as well as such other information as it may require to determine whether the vessel requesting entry into its port has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of this kind of fishing, the party decides whether to authorize or deny the entry of the vessel into its ports<sup>27</sup>. A party is bound to deny entrance in its ports if it has sufficient proof that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, in particular if the vessel is already included on a list of vessels having engaged in such fishing or related activities adopted by a regional fisheries management organization in accordance with the rules and procedures of such organization and in conformity with international law.

In certain cases listed in Art. 11, a party is bound to deny, pursuant to its laws and regulations

<sup>27</sup> Denials of entry are communicated not only to the vessel, but also to its flag State and, as appropriate and to the extent possible, the relevant coastal States, regional fisheries management organizations and other international organizations.

and consistent with international law, a vessel that has entered one of its ports the use of the port for landing, transshipping, packaging and processing of fish that have not been previously landed and for other port services, including refuelling and resupplying, maintenance and drydocking.

Parties are under an obligation to inspect the number of vessels in their ports required to reach an annual level of inspections sufficient to achieve the objective of the Agreement, according to the minimum standards of inspection specified in Annex B. Where, following port State inspection, a flag State Party receives an inspection report indicating that there are clear grounds to believe that a vessel entitled to fly its flag has engaged in IUU fishing or fishing related activities in support of such fishing, it shall immediately and fully investigate the matter and shall, upon sufficient evidence, take enforcement action without delay in accordance with its laws and regulations (Art. 20, para. 4).

Special provisions apply to meet the requirements of developing States (Part 6 of the Agreement). Parties are bound to take fair, non-discriminatory and transparent measures consistent with the Agreement and other applicable international law to deter the activities of non-Parties which undermine the effective implementation of the Agreement (Art. 23, para. 2).

## The regional cooperation for the Mediterranean Sea

Several legal instruments adopted at the Mediterranean level confirm the trend towards regional co-operation among the States bordering this semi-enclosed sea.

As regards the protection of the marine environment the main treaties are the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean (Barcelona, 1976; amended in 1995), with its seven protocols<sup>28</sup>, and the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area (Monaco, 1996; ACCOBAMS).

As regards marine scientific research, the Agreement establishing the Mediterranean Science Commission (Madrid, 1919; today the International Commission for the Scientific Exploration of the Mediterranean Sea, CIESM) may be quoted.

In fisheries, two forms of cooperation deserve particular consideration.

### The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean

The General Fisheries Commission (formerly Council) for the Mediterranean (GFCM) was established by an Agreement (Rome 1949; subsequently amended in 1963, 1976 and 1997), as an institution under the auspices of the FAO to co-ordinate activities related to fishery management, regulation and research in the Mediterranean and Black Seas and connecting waters. It now has twenty-four members, including one non-regional State (Japan) and the European Union.

<sup>28</sup> Protocol for the Prevention and Elimination of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft or Incineration at Sea (Barcelona, 1976; amended in 1995), Protocol Concerning Cooperation in Preventing Pollution from Ships and, in Cases of Emergency, Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea (Valletta, 2002; replacing a previous protocol of 1976); Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (Athens, 1980; amended in 1996), Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean (Barcelona, 1995; replacing a previous protocol of 1982), Protocol Concerning Pollution Resulting from Exploration and Exploitation of the Continental Shelf, the Seabed and its Subsoil (Madrid, 1994), Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Izmir, 1996), Protocol on Integrated Coastal Zone Management in the Mediterranean (Madrid, 2008).



The area covered by the GFCM Agreement includes both the high seas and marine areas under national sovereignty or jurisdiction.

The GFCM has the purpose of promoting the development, conservation, rational management and best utilization of all marine living resources, as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture in the area falling under its competence. Its specific functions and responsibilities (Article III, para. 1) include the formulation and recommendation of measures for the conservation and management of living marine resources. The GFCM is required to apply the precautionary approach, when formulating and recommending conservation and management measures, and to take into account the best scientific evidence available and the need to promote the development and proper utilization of marine living resources (Art. III, para. 2).

By a two-thirds majority the GFCM can adopt recommendations on conservation and rational management of the resources, as well as measures for their implementation. Such recommendations have a binding character for Parties who are under an obligation to put them into effect, unless they object within 120 days from the date of notification in accordance with the GFCM Agreement.

Several GFCM recommendations regard the development and establishment by parties of the appropriate legal framework defining access to the fisheries resources and fishing grounds, as well as the implementation of management measures and the activities on monitoring, control and surveillance. They relate, *inter alia*, to driftnets, closed seasons, mesh size, management of demersal fisheries, plans of actions, red coral, incidental by-catch of seabirds or turtles, conservation of monk seal, records of vessels, port State control, lists of IUU vessels, logbooks, vessel monitoring systems. Particularly notable are the GFCM measures on the establishment of fisheries restricted areas in order to protect deep sea sensitive habitats (namely Recommendation 30/2006/3, which prohibits fishing with towed dredges and bottom trawl nets within “Lophelia reef off Capo Santa Maria di Leuca”, “The Nile delta area cold hydrocarbon seeps” and “The Eratosthenes Seamount”, as well as recommendation 33/2009/1, on the fisheries restricted area in the Gulf of Lions. Recommendation 2005/1 on the management of certain fisheries exploiting demersal and deepwater species which prohibits the use of towed dredges and trawl nets fisheries at depths beyond 1,000 m.

The GFCM also exercises scientific and consultative functions, in order to keep the state of the resources and the state of the fisheries under review. It is entitled to encourage, recommend, co-ordinate and, as appropriate, undertake research and development activities, including co-operative projects in the area of fisheries and the protection of living marine resources; to assemble, publish or disseminate information regarding exploitable living marine resources and fisheries based on these resources and to promote programmes for marine and brackish water aquaculture and coastal fisheries enhancement. Within the GFCM, a number of committees have been established, such as the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), advised by various sub-committees, the Committee on Aquaculture (CAC) and the Compliance Committee (COC)<sup>29</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> Priority issues facing fisheries in the GFCM region, have been identified and discussed, also to promote convergence and consistency within the fisheries laws and regulations adopted by the parties (see the *Report of the Expert Meeting on Fisheries Legislation in the Mediterranean and Black Sea*, held in Beirut, Lebanon, on 26-28 October 2011).

## The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas

The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) was established under a Convention adopted in Rio de Janeiro in 1966. ICCAT is competent for fisheries of tuna and tuna-like fishes in the Convention Area, which includes the whole of the Atlantic, as well as the Mediterranean as a connected sea. Its mandate is to manage stocks of tuna and other associated species in these waters. It has the power to adopt resolutions that are binding on its parties.

In the last years ICCAT has established a total allowable catch regime and national quotas for bluefin tuna fisheries in the East Atlantic and Mediterranean waters, within the framework of a multiannual recovery plan.

As regards fishing carried out by non-parties, in 1996 ICCAT, under Recommendation 96-11, asked parties to take appropriate measures to the effect that the import of Atlantic bluefin tuna and its products in any form from two non-Party States (Belize and Honduras) be prohibited. It also adopted a general instrument concerning trade measures (Recommendation 06-13), noting that “trade restrictive measures should be implemented only as a last resort, where other measures have proven unsuccessful to prevent, deter and eliminate any act or omission that diminishes the effectiveness of ICCAT conservation and management measures”.

An informal *modus vivendi* has taken place between GFCM and ICCAT. GFCM “adopts” the ICCAT decisions relating to tuna and tuna quotas. In this way there are no contradictions between the GFCM and the ICCAT action.

## The European Union fishery regime

A particular role for fisheries in the Mediterranean Sea is played by the European Union (EU; previously the European Community), a regional economic integration organization of which twenty-seven European States are Members. The EU exercises, *inter alia*, an exclusive competence for fisheries management and conservation within the waters falling under the jurisdiction of its Member States and, beyond such waters, as far as Member States’ vessels and nationals are concerned. Treaties relating to fisheries applying to Member States are negotiated and concluded by the EU (the scope of its external competence has been defined by the European Union in a declaration made on 1st April 1998 at the moment of depositing its instrument of formal confirmation of the UNCLOS). The EU also exercises a shared competence with its Member States in the field of environmental protection, including the marine environment<sup>30</sup>.

EU legal provisions are the foundation on which the seven Mediterranean Sea coastal countries that are EU Member States (Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Slovenia and Spain) develop and implement many fishing and environmental measures. EU Member States are required to implement legal instruments adopted by the EU institutions to secure uniform or harmonised application of agreed policies throughout the EU. While regulations are directly applicable in Member States, directives must be transposed into their national legal systems within a defined period of time.

The EU has a policy for fisheries (Common Fisheries Policy) which has been amended and updated several times since its establishment in 1971. The current regime is provided by Council Regulation (EC) No. 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002. It clearly sets forth the objectives of the common fisheries policy, which aims at providing for coherent measures concerning a broad

<sup>30</sup> See, in particular, Directive 2008/56/EC of 17 June 2008, establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive).

range of subject matters, such as conservation, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources, limitation of the environmental impact of fisheries, conditions of access to waters and resources, structural policy and the management of the fleet capacity, control and enforcement, aquaculture, common organisation of the markets and international relations<sup>31</sup>.

EU action against IUU fishing has been strengthened by the adoption of Regulation (EC) No. 1005/2008 of 29 September 2008, establishing a Community system to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and Regulation (EC) No. 1224/2009 of 20 November 2009, establishing a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy.

Specific provisions for fishing in the Mediterranean Sea are found in Council Regulation (EC) No. 1967/2006 of 21 December 2006 concerning management measures for sustainable exploitation of fishery resources in the Mediterranean Sea<sup>32</sup>.

## Conclusive remarks

The present unclear situation of Mediterranean maritime zones may prevent the development of a coherent fishery policy in the region. It is to be hoped that the likely future institution of exclusive economic zones by the coastal States which have not yet done so takes place together with the strengthening of cooperation within the GFCM, the international organization that was established for the management of fisheries in this regional sea. The European Union should be an active component of the Mediterranean fisheries regime. The European Union fishery policy, which already includes many appropriate measures, could in future devote more attention to the peculiarities and interests of the communities in the coastal regions from where traditional fishing activities are being carried out in certain Mediterranean areas<sup>33</sup>.

## References

- Beer-Gabel J. & Lestang V. (2003) - *Les Commissions de pêche et leur droit*, Bruxelles: 298 p.
- Burke W.T. (1994) - *The new international law of fisheries*. Clarendon press, Oxford.
- Cataldi G. (ed) (2002) - *La Méditerranée et le droit de la mer à l'aube du 21e siècle*. Bruylant, Bruxelles: 534 p.
- Churchill R. (1987) - *EEC Fisheries Law*. Nijhoff, Dordrecht: 299 p.
- Del Vecchio A. (ed) (2006) - *La gestión de los recursos marinos y la cooperación internacional*. ILLA, Luiss, Roma: 202 p.
- Fazio V. & Ricciardi A. (ed) (2008) - *Il distretto della pesca di Mazara del Vallo*. Franco Angeli, Milano: 176 p.
- Fioravanti C. (2007) - *Il diritto comunitario della pesca*. CEDAM, Padova: 343
- Leanza U. & Sico L. (ed) (1989) - *Zona economica esclusiva e Mare Mediterraneo*, Napoli: 325 p.
- Leanza U. (1992) - *Le régime juridique international de la Mer Méditerranée*, in *Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de Droit International*
- Leanza U. (ed) (1993) - *La pesca e la conservazione delle risorse biologiche nel Mare Mediterraneo*. Editoriale Scientifica, Napoli: 295 p.
- Lebullenger J. & Le Morvan D. (1990) - *La Communauté Européenne et la mer*. Economica, Paris: 830 p.
- Meltzer E. (2009) - *The Quest for Sustainable International Fisheries: Regional Efforts to Implement the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement*, Ottawa: 500 p.
- Meseguer Sánchez J.L. (2011) - *Derecho internacional de los ecosistemas marinos*. Reus, Madrid: 224 p.

<sup>31</sup> For a possible future regime see *Green Paper – Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy*, doc. COM(2009) 163 final of 22 April 2009, and the proposal made by the European Commission for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the common fisheries policy, doc. COM(2011) 425 final of 13 July 2011.

<sup>32</sup> A proposal made by the European Commission for a Council Regulation on certain provision for fishing in the GFCM Agreement area, doc. COM(2009) 477 final of 16 September 2009, aims at establishing a permanent legal instrument for the transposition of GFCM recommendations into European Union law.

<sup>33</sup> For a notable instance see the forms of cooperation established by the Fisheries District of Mazara del Vallo, Italy, with the authorities of some North African countries.

- Miccichè L. & Moscato S. (ed) (2005) - *Promozione e commercializzazione della pesca nel bacino del Mediterraneo*. Centro siciliano per gli studi di diritto marittimo ed aereo. Centro siciliano per gli studi di diritto marittimo e aereo, Palermo: 302 p.
- Palma M., Tsamenyi M. & Edeson W. (2010) - *Promoting Sustainable Fisheries*, Nijhoff, The Hague: 367 p.
- Ronzitti N. (1999) - *Le zone di pesca nel Mediterraneo e la tutela degli interessi italiani*. Rivista marittima, Roma: 96 p.
- Scovazzi T. (1979-1984) - *La pesca nell'evoluzione del diritto del mare*. 2 vol., Milano.
- Scovazzi T. (2001) - *The evolution of international law of the sea: new issues, new challenges, in recueil des cours de l'Académie de Droit International*. Vol. 286: 39-244.
- Scovazzi T. (2004) - *Il diritto internazionale del mare nel Mediterraneo, con particolare riguardo alla pesca, in Istituto di Servizi per il Mercato Agricolo Alimentare, Dalla conflittualità al partenariato: il ruolo della pesca nel bacino del Mediterraneo*. Roma: 113 p.
- Sobrino Heredia J.M., López Veiga E.C. & A. Rey Aneiros (2010) - *La integración del enfoque ecosistémico en la política pesquera común*. Valencia: 286 p.
- Spera G. (2010) - *Il regime della pesca nel diritto internazionale e nel diritto dell'Unione Europea*, Torino: 342 p.
- Treves (1995) - *Il diritto del mare e l'Italia*. Giuffrè, Milano: 154 p.
- Treves T. & Pineschi L. (eds) (1997) - *The law of the sea: the european union and its member states*. Nijhoff, The Hague: 590 p.
- Tufano M.L. (ed.) (2009) - *Le zone di pesca: regime, strutture, funzione*, Napoli: 264 p.
- Vignes D., Casado Raigón R. & G. Cataldi (2000) - *Le droit international de la pêche maritime*. Bruylant, Bruxelles: 616 p.
- Vukas B. (ed) (1988) - *The legal regime of enclosed or semi-enclosed seas: the particular case of the mediterranean*. Birotehnika, Zagreb: 515 p.

## 7.2 The General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM): objectives, structure and functions

*Srouf A., Massa F.*

The Agreement for the establishment of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), concluded within the framework of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, was approved by the FAO Conference in September 1949 and entered into force on 20 February 1952. Since then the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea countries have built a fruitful cooperation which has been ongoing for 60 years<sup>34</sup>.

The GFCM currently has 24 Members including the European Union (EU), Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Libya, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey.

The GFCM's objectives are to promote the development, conservation, rational management and best utilization of living marine resources, as well as the sustainable development of aquaculture in the Mediterranean, Black Sea and connecting waters<sup>35</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> The 1949 Agreement for the establishment of the GFCM over the years has undergone a series of changes and revisions, undoubtedly the most important being the amendment of 1997, the year in which the General Fisheries Council Mediterranean became a Commission. This organization is known and still operates as the "General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean" (GFCM). In addition, since 29 April 2004 it has become mandatory for the Members contribute to the functioning of the GFCM through an autonomous budget to provide the Commission with a financial instrument consistent with its objectives and priorities. See [www.gfcm.org](http://www.gfcm.org).

<sup>35</sup> See Article III of the Agreement for the establishment of the GFCM, available at: [ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/DOCUMENT/CGPM/web/CGPM\\_Agreement.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/FI/DOCUMENT/CGPM/web/CGPM_Agreement.pdf)

Like other Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs)<sup>36</sup>, the GFCM is instrumental in coordinating efforts by governments to effectively manage fisheries at regional level consistent with the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (Rome, 1995) and with the UN Fish Stocks Agreement (New York, 1995). In accordance with the provisions in these instruments relating to RFMOs, the GFCM has the authority to adopt binding recommendations for fisheries conservation and management in its competence area.

## GFCM's objectives and functions

In particular, the GFCM has the following responsibilities:

- to monitor the state of the Mediterranean and Black Sea living resources;
- to recommend appropriate measures: (i) for the conservation and rational management of living marine resources; and (ii) for the implementation of these recommendations;
- to monitor the economic and social aspects of the fishing;
- to coordinate and undertake training in all aspects of fisheries;
- to coordinate and undertake research and development activities including cooperative projects in the areas of fisheries and the protection of living marine resources;
- to disseminate information regarding exploitable living marine and fisheries resources;
- to promote programmes for marine and brackish water aquaculture, coastal fisheries enhancement, and for implementing any other activity in order to achieve the Commission's objectives as defined above.

## GFCM's organization and subsidiary bodies

The Commission seeks to promote the conservation and rational management of living marine resources through, *inter alia*, the adoption of binding decisions for the Members related to the regulation of fishing methods, fishing gear and minimum landing sizes, the establishment of open and closed fishing seasons, and identification and establishment of marine protected areas. The Commission can also implement a fishing effort control regime by Operational Units through the regulation of catch and fishing effort and their allocation among Members. Measures generally apply to both capture fisheries and aquaculture.

The GFCM holds its regular session on an annual basis attended by national delegates. The GFCM implements its policy and activities through the Secretariat, based at its headquarters in Rome. The technical and political supervision of the work undertaken by the Secretariat is entrusted to the GFCM Executive Secretary<sup>37</sup> under the general orientation of the GFCM Bureau which is represented by the Chairperson<sup>38</sup>.

The Secretariat and the Bureau manage jointly the preparatory phases for the annual session, mainly through the GFCM subsidiary bodies which have their own specific mandate. These Bodies are the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), the Committee on Aquaculture (CAQ), the Compliance Committee (CoC), the Committee of Administration and Finance (CAF) and their respective subsidiaries.

<sup>36</sup> FAO *Fisheries and Aquaculture Department*. Rome. Updated 20 October 2008. [Cited 7 December 2010]. <http://www.fao.org/fishery/rfb/en>.

<sup>37</sup> At the 35th ordinary session of the GFCM (Rome May 9-14, 2011) Abdellah Srour was elected Executive Secretary.

<sup>38</sup> At the 35th ordinary session of the GFCM (Rome May 9-14, 2011) Stefano Cataudella was elected Chairperson of the GFCM.

## GFCM's recommendations and resolutions

Based on the results of scientific and technical activities of its subsidiary bodies, the GFCM, during the annual ordinary session, adopts binding decisions relating to the management of fisheries and the protection of living marine resources and marine ecosystems and environments upon which these resources depend.

The GFCM decisions are varied in nature and can be classified as follows: Recommendations on Conservation and Management ("REC.CM-GFCM"), Recommendations on Monitoring, Control and Surveillance ("REC.MCS"), and Recommendations on Data and Information Reporting ("REC.DIR").

There are also ICCAT recommendations which are endorsed by the GFCM. All recommendations are binding in nature. Other measures can be adopted as Resolutions which, on the other hand, are not binding for Members but provide only general guidance.

Recent decisions related to the Conservation and Management (REC.CM-GFCM) include the following: the regulation of the red coral exploitation; the implementation of fisheries management measures that strongly mitigate or eliminate the risk of incidental taking of sea turtles and Mediterranean monk seals during fishing operations; the reduction of bottom-trawling fishing effort; the establishment of a Fisheries Restricted Area (FRA) in the Gulf of Lions to protect spawning aggregations and deep sea sensitive habitats; the adoption of a 40 mm square mesh as a minimum size for the codend of demersal trawlers; the adoption of a multi-annual recovery plan for Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean (endorsement of ICCAT Recommendations); the protection of some deep-sea sensitive habitats where fishing with towed dredges and bottom trawl nets is prohibited; the prohibition of towed dredges and trawl nets fisheries at depths below 1,000 meters.

The GFCM has focused, over the last few years, on developing and strengthening the Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) frameworks, including for deep-sea fisheries in international waters. In particular, the GFCM Resolution on Control and Enforcement Scheme (RES-GFCM/29/2005/2) provides guidelines on Flag State duties, obligations of Contracting Parties and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties, compliance and enforcement (e.g. High Seas inspections and observer programmes). Since the adoption of this Resolution, the GFCM has adopted a series of Recommendations related to the procedures and criteria for the acceptance of entities as Cooperating non-Contracting Parties, and a Regional Scheme on Port State measures to combat Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. In terms of fishing capacity, the levels of the overall fishing capacity in the GFCM area are to be determined based on a Regional Plan of Action considering the national and regional fishing capacity management plans and scientific advice (REC.MCS-GFCM/34/2010/2). Through the CoC, the GFCM requests the Members and/or Cooperating non-Members to take remedial actions to address the acts or omissions identified so as not to diminish the effectiveness of GFCM management measures.

### GFCM and the cooperation

The sustainability of aquaculture and capture fisheries has always been a priority on the GFCM agenda. Consequently, a series of priorities related to the sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture have been identified by the GFCM and its subsidiary bodies and presented to the Members. This should not come as a surprise since the GFCM is among the RFMOs that have responded positively to the recommendations of the FAO Code of Conduct: already in



1999, thanks to the support of the Italian government, a consultation between the Mediterranean countries was held in Rome to discuss the applications of the principles under art. 9 of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries in the countries of the Mediterranean and Black Sea. Recently, the regional cooperation for research and management activities in the fisheries and aquaculture sectors has experienced a significant increase in the regional context of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea basin where the FAO regional projects are operational. At present, thanks to the support of several donors, the GFCM currently enjoys the support of a series of FAO regional projects which enhance, in particular, scientific cooperation; they include, among the others: AdriaMed<sup>39</sup>; ArtFiMed<sup>40</sup>; CopeMed<sup>41</sup>, EastMed<sup>42</sup>, MedFis<sup>43</sup>; and MedSudMed<sup>44</sup>. In addition, the activities implemented by SAC and CAQ are supported through a series of projects which include MedAquaMarket<sup>45</sup>, InDAM<sup>46</sup>, ShoCMed<sup>47</sup>, and LaMed<sup>48</sup>. Furthermore, the Commission cooperates closely with other international organizations in matters of mutual interest including, *inter alia*, partners and observers. The GFCM website is available at: <http://www.gfcm.org/gfcm/en>. The website offers a variety of services to users, members, stakeholders and all those who are interested in the activities of the GFCM.

## References

- Cacaud P. (2005) - Fisheries laws and regulations in the Mediterranean; a comparative study. *Studies and reviews. General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean*, 75, FAO, Rome: 40 p.
- Cataudella S. (2002) - A few deliberations on the role of the General Fisheries Commission of the Mediterranean. Communication to the International Conference on Mediterranean Fisheries. International Conference on Mediterranean Fisheries, Naples (Italy), 21-22 June 2002: 391-395.
- FAO/General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean/ Commission générale des pêches pour la Méditerranée (2004) - Report of the Extraordinary Session. St Jullans, Malta, 19-23 July 2004. FAO Fisheries Report /FAO Rap.ort sur les pêches, 755, Rome: 58 p.
- Ferri N. (2008) - Decision-Making Procedures in Fisheries Governance The Role of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), 59-64. In: Cassese S., Carotti B., Casini L., Macchia M., MacDonald E., Savino M. (eds), *Global Administrative Law: Cases, Materials, Issues* (2nd edition), New York University, available on line at <http://www.ijl.org/GAUGALCasebook.asp>.
- Leanza U. (2008) - *Il regime giuridico internazionale del Mare Mediterraneo*. Editoriale Scientifica: 372 p.
- Mannini P., Caminas J.A., Robles R., Massa F. (2008) - *Regional cooperation in the Mediterranean fisheries*. Options Méditerranéennes Series B, 62: 139 p.

<sup>39</sup> Scientific cooperation to support responsible fisheries in the Adriatic Sea (funded by Italy and EU).

<sup>40</sup> Sustainable development of Mediterranean artisanal fisheries (funded by Spain).

<sup>41</sup> Coordination to support fisheries management in the Western and Central Mediterranean (funded by Spain and EU).

<sup>42</sup> Scientific and institutional cooperation to support responsible fisheries in the Eastern Mediterranean (funded by Greece, Italy and EU).

<sup>43</sup> Mediterranean fishery statistics and information system (funded by EU).

<sup>44</sup> Assessment and monitoring of the fishery resources and the ecosystems in the straits of Sicily (funded by Italy).

<sup>45</sup> Development of a strategy for marketing and promotion of Mediterranean aquaculture and funded by Spain.

<sup>46</sup> Indicators for sustainable development of aquaculture and guidelines for their use in the Mediterranean, funded by EU.

<sup>47</sup> Developing site selection and carrying capacity guidelines for the Mediterranean aquaculture within aquaculture appropriate areas (funded by EU).

<sup>48</sup> Mediterranean coastal lagoons management: interactions between aquaculture and capture fisheries (funded by Italy).

## 7.3 The AdriaMed and MedSudMed sub-regional projects

*Ameri E., Milone N., Ceriola L.*

### General historical overview

On the basis of a partnership plan between countries sharing the same fishery resource exploitation area, the Ministry for Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies (MiPAAF) financed two sub-regional projects set up by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), namely AdriaMed (from 1999) and MedSudMed (from 2001), which are still ongoing. These projects promote responsible management of resources via a shared scientific research approach and multidisciplinary analyses of management-related issues, thereby supporting the work of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM). The objectives of both projects were identified and were in full keeping with the FAO Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries and the 2001 Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries.

The operating area for AdriaMed is the Adriatic Sea (Albania, Croatia, Montenegro, Slovenia and Italy), whereas for MedSudMed it is the central-southern Mediterranean, in particular the Sicilian Strait (Libya, Tunisia, Malta and Italy). Italy is currently participating in both projects at a public and private scientific research institute level. The priority issues were jointly identified at the beginning, then, following on within this framework, and on an annual basis, specific activities are reviewed, discussed and proposed by the Project Coordination Committee. The latter comprises representatives from the donors, member countries, the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use and Conservation Division (FIR) and the GFCM. The scheduled activities are then carried out via the scientific institution cooperation system developed in the Adriatic Sea and the Sicilian Strait. This flexible structure allowed the projects to steer through the important geopolitical changes that have occurred in the two regions, rapidly reorganising their activities.

### AdriaMed: Scientific cooperation to support responsible fisheries in the Adriatic Sea<sup>49</sup>

The AdriaMed project aims to support and promote cooperation at an institutional level in relation to resource management and exploitation policy, by strengthening technical collaboration between the research units and national governments of the Adriatic countries. The project is financed by the MiPAAF, and as from 2007, an additional grant is provided by the European Commission (Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, DG MARE).

The main activity topic areas are described below:

1. Reinforcing communication tools between the institutions involved in fisheries in order to promote coordination and cooperation

The project developed an information system for spreading information and scientific data in the area: databases available on-line, specific data management tools to support national institutions such as ATrIS (AdriaMed Trawl Surveys Information System software for bottom trawling survey data), the small pelagic fish database, the socioeconomic database, an unified bathymetric map

<sup>49</sup> [www.faoadriamed.org](http://www.faoadriamed.org)

of the Adriatic Sea. A description of the work carried out as well as the results obtained are available on the project web site. AdriaMed is an international partner of the international database ASFA (Aquatic Sciences and Fishery Abstracts) and it produced a series of technical documents (AdriaMed Technical Documents, AdriaMed Occasional Papers) which can be downloaded from the website.

#### 2. Supporting the implementation of a fishery resources monitoring system based on standardised methodologies

The AdriaMed operating strategy was initially based on identifying priority issues for the Adriatic region fishing sector. These topics were identified via the active participation and cooperation of experts in the field who set up thematic working groups (shared stocks and fisheries socioeconomics). The process of scientific method standardisation was advanced via study groups aimed at intercalibrating tools and methodologies and at jointly analysing data. The project also supported specific monitoring activities by gathering data on commercial fishing and extending joint scientific surveys to all the Adriatic Sea in order to supply the most up-to-date estimates as to the level of exploitation of shared Adriatic stocks. These computations are needed to meet national and international management needs, such as, for example, those of the GFCM Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC).

#### 3. Identifying the specific fisheries management plans to be applied experimentally in some areas to reinforce Adriatic Regional collaboration in managing resources

The project ensured that the existing Management Units in the Adriatic Sea were catalogued and described according to the criteria indicated by the GFCM. It also helped identify the possible options for managing key areas for fisheries (e.g. the Central Adriatic Pomo Depression (Fossa di Pomo/Jabuka Pit).

#### 4. Promoting harmonised fishing legislation to help decisions making on the management of shared fishery resources

AdriaMed promoted a collection of baseline information regarding the legislative framework for fisheries in the Adriatic countries (available for consultation on the web site) and carried out studies on non-professional fishing.

#### 5. Support for developing responsible mariculture

The project initiated the debate in the Mediterranean as regards identifying interactions between fishing and aquaculture, in order to facilitate an integrated management of these activities. Pilot measures for providing technical support were implemented in accordance with Recommendation GFCM/2009/33/4 on the need to gather statistical data on aquaculture production.

## MedSudMed: Evaluation and monitoring of the fishing resources and ecosystems in the Sicilian Strait<sup>50</sup>

The project was created to promote scientific cooperation in the Central and Southern Mediterranean, in order to monitor fishery resources and the ecosystem, and to obtain a common knowledge base for supporting the international management of fisheries. The results obtained are presented to the GFCM - SAC, and made available on the project web site. They are also published, periodically, in a series of technical documents ((MedSudMed Technical Documents). The project has been operating since 2001 with financing from the Italian MiPAAF. It was co-financed in 2011-2012 by the Sicilian Regional Assessorate of Agriculture and Food Resources.

<sup>50</sup> [www.faomedsudmed.org](http://www.faomedsudmed.org)

The national scientific fishery institutions of Italy, Malta, Libya and Tunisia are partners in the MedSudMED project.

The main activities are described below:

1. Promoting standardisation of fishery resource monitoring and study methodologies

Monitoring activities can be standardised via inter-calibration of the direct resource survey activity (scientific bottom trawling fishing surveys for demersal resources, acoustic and ichthyoplankton surveys for pelagic resources), and through carrying out joint studies. The coordinated analysis of the regional data led firstly to fishery resource abundance distribution maps being produced for this region, showing spawning and nursery areas, and secondly to manuals and technical reviews being issued.

2. Increasing the scientific knowledge about the fishery resources in the area

The project organised numerous oceanographic surveys, acoustic ones for small pelagic fish and collections for ichthyoplankton, throughout the Sicilian Strait; in particular it organised the first monitoring campaigns for small pelagic fish in Libyan waters. Furthermore, MedSudMed contributed towards improving knowledge about commercially important stocks in the area (such as the common octopus, *Octopus vulgaris*) and about the distribution of fishing activities (such as the pilot study for the distribution of resources and fishing activities carried out in waters near Malta).

3. Reinforcing the capability of single scientific institutions in the area to analyse data and results and to produce management type indications

The project used both training activities during survey and data processing work, and exchange of research scientists involved in marine research surveys. Furthermore, MedSudMed set up specific working groups for demersal and pelagic resources of the Sicilian Strait, in which research scientists from all the participating countries produced a series of assessments about the state of several shared stocks in the area, such as the pink shrimp (*Parapenaeus longirostris*), hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) and common dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*). The results of these shared evaluations were presented to the GFCM – SAC.

4. Reinforcing scientific and technical cooperation at a Mediterranean level

Regional cooperation is reinforced via interaction and coordination with other FAO sub-regional projects, above all via support for the GFCM and its SAC.

## A glance at the future

These two projects have profitably proceeded along parallel lines for many years and are now in two completely different geopolitical situations. In the Adriatic Sea, there is an ongoing progressive assimilation of the coastal countries within the EU. This, over the medium term, could require revising of both the project mandate and its operating procedures, which should continue to guarantee the presence of a common debating table for discussing fishery management problems.

For the Central Mediterranean and the Sicilian Strait, it could be necessary to extend the current prevalently scientific approach to considerations and activities more closely connected with shared fishery management. MedSudMed, with its ten years worth of experience, would represent the ideal platform for making progress in this direction.

## References

- Camilleri M., Dimech M., Drago A., Fiorentino F., Fortibuoni T., Garofalo G., Gristina M., Schembri P.J., Massa F., Coppola S., Bahri T., Giacalone V. (2008) - *Pilot Study: Spatial distribution of demersal fishery resources, environmental factors and fishing activities in GSA 15 (Malta Island)*. FAO-MiPAAF, Assessment and Monitoring of the Fishery Resources and Ecosystems in the Straits of Sicily. GCP/RER/010/ITA/MSM,13: 97 p.
- Cataudella S., Massa F., Crosetti D. (eds) (2005) - *Interactions between aquaculture and capture fisheries: a methodological perspective*. Studies and Reviews. General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean, 78, FAO, Roma: 229 p.
- Massa F. & Mannini P. (eds) (2000) - *Report of the First Meeting of the AdriaMed Coordination Committee*. FAO-MiPAF, Scientific Cooperation to Support Responsible Fisheries in the Adriatic Sea. GCP/RER/010/ITA/TD-01: 64 p.
- MedSudMed (2003) - *Report of the First Meeting of the MedSudMed Coordination Committee*. FAO-MiPAF, Assessment and Monitoring of the Fishery Resources and Ecosystems in the Straits of Sicily. GCP/RER/010/ITA/MSM-01: 57 p.
- Vrgoč N., Arneri E., Jukić-Peladić S., Krstulović-Šifner S., Mannini P., Marčeta B., Osmani K., Piccinetti C., Ungaro N. (2004) - *Review of current knowledge on shared demersal stocks of the Adriatic Sea*. GCP/RER/010/ITA/TD-12: 91 p.

