

**Summary of the First Sustainable Fisheries Interim Coordination Mechanism Meeting
Barbados, Thursday, 3 September, 2015**

Participants

Name	Abbreviation	Designation	Organization
Mr. Raymond Van Anrooy	RV	Executive Secretary	WECAFC-FAO
Mr. Milton Haughton	MH	Executive Director	CRFM
Mr. Mario Gonzalez	SM	Executive Director	OSPESCA
Mr. Lionel Reynal de Saint Michel	LR	Director	IFREMER
Mr. Stefan Asmundsson	SA	Executive Secretary	NEAFC
Mr. Johan H. Williams	JW	Director, Fisheries & Aquaculture	Norwegian Ministry of Trade, Industry
Mrs. Laverne Walker	LW	Senior Project Officer	CLME+ PCU

Agenda

1. MOU for establishment IFCM
2. Proposed work plan
3. Future steps

Meeting Development

LW: welcomed participants from the three Regional Fisheries Bodies of CRFM, OSPESCA and WECAFC-FAO. Special acknowledgment was extended to RV co-financing this meeting and for putting together the draft of the MOU which would be discussed.

1. MOU for establishment IFCM

- LW: gave a brief introduction to the CLME+ SAP and CLME+ Project Document, and provided an update of process of its endorsement (SAP) by 22 Caribbean countries. She also indicated that the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) is preparing a Concept Note for submission to the GEF, in the search for additional resources to implement some actions outlined in the CLME+ SAP. Under the CLME+ SAP Strategy 2, countries called for the establishment of an interim arrangement for sustainable fisheries coordinated by FAO-WECAFC and including CRFM, OSPESCA and OECS. However, considering that the OECS Commission is not an established RFB, the interim mechanism will be limited to the three RFBs.
- LW: A proposal for the interim coordination mechanism objectives was then presented, and the group decided they will be adjusted to allow for coordination outside the CLME+ SAP. In this sense, the IFCM is expected to facilitate, support and strengthen coordination amongst the 3 RFBs. In order to formalize the operation of the IFCM, MH expresses hope for an agreement among the RFB and finalize the approval and signature of the MOU. MG indicated that the MOU need to be reviewed by OSPESCA countries before he can sign it. The revision process may take 15 days.
- JW: stated that countries may see this interim coordination mechanism as a step towards a more formal arrangement. MH responded that he envisages indeed this mechanism help the region to move towards a formal arrangement, becoming as a model for more coordinated work.
- RV: highlighted the importance of signing of the MOU by the Secretariats of the 3 RFBs. SA indicated that word interim is often interpreted as the transition from A to B, so participants

agreed to keep this word, and reiterated in the future it could be used to support the establishment of an RFMO. MG recommended to focus instead on the term coordination. Through the MOU, the 3 RFBs are seeking to determine how to strengthen coordination efforts to execute activities under the CLME+ Project as well as contribute to the establishment of an RFMO.

- MG: indicated that OSPESCA comments on the draft MOU will be shared upon completion of the revision process, and mentioned it looks like the document could be simplified. The inclusion of too many details implies the risk of leaving out some aspects.
- MH: indicated that in the past the Latin American and English speaking Caribbean countries utilize different MOU formats, and so suggested to pick one format for this MOU, and supported the MG comments in regard to its content.
- Regarding the time required to get the MOU signed, the 3 RFBs agreed that efforts will be made to expedite the signing of the MOU. As such, the agreement would be between the Secretariats of the 3 RFBs. Once OSPESCA complete its consultative process, both CRFM and WECAFC-FAO can easily proceed with the signing of the MOU. Participants believe MOU may be signed by the last week of October.

2. Proposed Work Plan

- MG: indicated that OSPESCA had four priority areas that they would like to be considered: a) climate change, b) expansion of the management plan for spiny lobster, c) flexibility of OSPESCA regulations to include other countries, and d) establishment of a country-basis binding traceability system for spiny lobster.
- MH: supported the proposal of MG, as many of these priorities were taken from the Joint CRFM-OSPESCA work plan, thus asked if these would also be considered priorities for WECAFC-FAO as well. He pointed out that the RFBs could work towards streamlining many of their working groups, and indicated that need of resources to operate, plan, review and develop their detailed work plan, therefore more than one meeting a year might be required. LW recalled that clear work plan with an associated budget is needed.
- RV: also expresses his support to the proposals of MG and MH, and recommended that sub-projects on shrimp and groundfish, spiny lobster and flyingfish be included in the work plan of the interim mechanism. He indicated WECAFC support to work on lobster regulations for the region, and the development of a regional plan for the spiny lobster. In this sense, indicated that queen conch should also be added as a priority area, as the region had made a number of moves through the development of a queen conch management plan. He stated that for IUU and fisheries statistics, also considered priorities, the decision as to whether to include them in the work plan would be dependent on what funding was available. The TORs for all the Working Groups should be available in both English and Spanish as a minimum and the CLME+ PCU may wish to keep a database of the latest version of the WG TORs on their website.
- MH: indicated that since the development of the SAP a number of initiatives had been approved, such as REBEYC II and C 4 and as such there is a need to ensure that the most recent developments are factored in, as to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts. Regarding the lobster sub-project, it is understood that OSPESCA will take a lead on the implementation of the activities, however there is a need to discuss the mechanism for involving the CRFM countries participating in this sub-project. He suggested that this could be one of the tasks of the interim arrangement. He also stated that CRFM is also looking for some support in translating the lobster declaration

articles into simple language that could be understood by all, in order to raise awareness and ensure that the fishers are sensitized to what is expected. He wanted to know if this sort of activity could be supported by the CLME+ Project.

- Participants discussed if the topic of climate change need to be included as a priority issue or it should be treated as a separate issue. In the end it was agreed that where necessary the issues of climate change and variability would be mainstreamed into many of the agreed upon activities. MG indicated that within OSPESCA membership climate change had been highlighted as a priority issue, and so indicated that his office had recently started putting out a weekly bulletin dedicated to climate and its potential impact on fisheries and aquaculture.
- In conclusion, the following areas were agreed as priority areas for inclusion in the work plan for the first year of the interim arrangement: queen conch; spiny lobster; flyingfish, IUU fishing, with climate change and disaster risk reduction being mainstreamed into other activities where necessary.
- A work plan and budget would be developed for the first year of the interim arrangement. The CLME+ PCU would put together a template which would be filled out by the RFBs immediately and re-submitted for allocation of budget (~USD \$30k). There may be necessary to identify additional resources through the support of donors or other partners.
- MG: shared with participants the need for country buy-in was a lesson learnt from the first CLME project. OSPESCA would like to see a mechanism which would allow greater participation of the countries, thus they take ownership of the project and its activities allowing for greater sustainability of the outputs. LW responded that are providing very clear TORs to the countries for the National Focal Points. MG asked the PCU constantly share these TOR, so they are reminded of the functions and responsibility of a NFP.

3. Future steps

- The revised MOU would be shared with the meeting immediately.
- WECAFC-FAO would take the responsibility of having the revisions reflected in the Spanish version.
- The CLME+ PCU would develop and share a template with the RFBs so that they could define activities for year one of the work plan with an associated budget.
- The RFBs would work towards having the MOU signed by the PEG meeting to take place 26-27 October.
- The RFBs would meet during the Miami meetings to better define the work plan of the interim arrangement.
- CLME+ PCU would put together the notes of the meeting and share with the meeting.

LW: thanked all participants for their contributions and especially thanked WECAFC-FAO again for their contribution to the meeting. She also thanked the simultaneous translators for their support during the meeting.