

# CALAMAR

## Expert Paper

### *EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation Working Group*

23 May 2011



This project is funded by the European Union.



## Authors

Serge Beslier (Co-Chair), Andrew Rosenberg (Co-Chair); Luis Cuervo-Spottorno, Rebecca Lent, Charlotte Mogensen, Diane Regas, François Simard, Niko Weinholst

*The presented recommendations were not arrived at by consensus and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of all authors or their organizations.*

## Calamar Project Team Support

Katriona McGlade, Mallorie Bruns, Sandra Cavalieri

## About CALAMAR

The Cooperation Across the Atlantic for Marine Governance Integration (CALAMAR) project aimed to strengthen networks among key maritime stakeholders in the EU and US, and contribute policy recommendations to improve integration of maritime policies and promote transatlantic cooperation. The project convened a dialogue of more than 40 experts from both sides of the Atlantic. The CALAMAR project began in January 2010 and culminated in a final conference in Lisbon, Portugal on April 11-12, 2011 where the Working Groups' conclusions were presented. Two reports were developed to complement the dialogue by providing background information and assessments that: 1) compare EU and US maritime policy, and 2) identify opportunities and challenges for integrated maritime governance. A third report lays out policy recommendations for improved transatlantic cooperation in maritime governance based on the recommendations selected by the working groups throughout their discussions over the course of the CALAMAR project. The following report presents the conclusions of the CALAMAR EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation Working Group. All project reports are available on the project website at the following link: <http://www.calamar-dialogue.org/>.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Opportunities for Cooperation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Harness scientific capacity for coordinated policy action and integrated assessment .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Coordinate funding and focus in transatlantic maritime research.....	5
3.2	Conduct integrated assessment for the North Atlantic.....	6
3.3	Coordinate seabed mapping efforts.....	6
3.4	Develop communication and transparency between US and EU institutions and agencies involved in maritime governance.....	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Environmentally sustainable maritime technology and practices for greener outcomes in shipping, fishing and energy .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Exchange best practices in environmentally sustainable approaches to maritime governance in shipping, fisheries, energy development, sea-bed exploration and exploitation and combating pollution and marine debris.....	8
<b>5</b>	<b>Monitoring, control and surveillance .....</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	Improve information sharing, especially to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing .....	11
5.2	Strengthen MCS standards within the International Maritime Organization (IMO) .....	12
<b>6</b>	<b>International Influence.....</b>	<b>12</b>
6.1	Increase coordination at international fora .....	13
6.2	Build capacity within development agencies.....	13
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## I Introduction

The United States (US) and European Union (EU) have a long history of formal and informal bilateral cooperation on a range of issues. Recent EU and US policy developments have highlighted new opportunities to increase and improve upon collaborative action in the field of maritime governance. In July 2010, US President Barack Obama signed an Executive Order establishing the National Policy for the Stewardship of the Ocean, Coasts, and Great Lakes with objectives that closely mirror the EU's Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the EU Integrated Maritime Policy and, in particular, its international dimension. The Executive Order is also in line with other EU sectoral policies bearing an effect on maritime issues, such as the EU Cohesion Policy, climate change policy on coastal communities, Maritime Spatial Planning, marine knowledge, marine Research and Development (R&D), maritime safety and security, maritime clustering or maritime transport.

Through sharing best practices and ideas on policy implementation measures the EU and US can identify areas where joint approaches could improve sectoral and cross-sectoral environmental standards and guidelines for i.a., fisheries, shipping and energy development. Such collaboration has the potential to extend and strengthen EU and US leadership at multilateral and international fora to guide maritime governance and to improve the use and effectiveness of integrated approaches to ocean management in the Atlantic.

This document presents an overview of four key areas that, in the view of the working group, stand to gain most from EU/US transatlantic cooperation. An overview is provided for each area, followed by policy recommendations, proposed timeline and suggested audience for the recommendations. The paper ends by summarizing the conclusions of the working group and highlighting cross-cutting areas with other working groups in the CALAMAR dialogue.

## 2 Opportunities for Cooperation

The EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation working group has identified four key areas in which enhanced cooperation between the US and EU is likely to yield immediate results for the conservation and management of the Atlantic Ocean, as well as provide interesting opportunities for maritime policy development:

- 1) Science: improve upon existing scientific capacity through increased coordination and funding of research and knowledge exchange programs. Joint scientific action should include an integrated assessment of the Atlantic. Increase transparency of current scientific initiatives and policy efforts to enhance mutual understanding.
- 2) Exchange of best practice: share information on the development of environmentally sustainable maritime approaches in key sectors, such as shipping and fisheries, which can provide win-win situations where environmental impacts are reduced whilst enabling continued economic development.
- 3) Monitoring, control and surveillance: improving monitoring, control and surveillance of ocean activities, in particular, with regards to Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing and to safety and security at sea. Ensure that information collected for ocean management, and the results of management actions, are fully monitored and adequate control mechanisms are put in place.

- 4) International influence: enhance the international role and influence of the US and the EU through cooperative work, notably at multinational environmental, fishing, shipping, and maritime management fora. Both the EU and the US should ensure that the high level of support they provide to less-developed nations is targeted at programs, which take an environmentally responsible approach to managing coastal and marine areas.

### 3 Harness scientific capacity for coordinated policy action and integrated assessment

The EU and the US have some of the strongest scientific capacity in the world. However in order to capitalize on this, there must be a concerted effort to facilitate scientific collaboration and the translation of science into policy. Particular attention should be paid to the development of joint mechanisms and activities as well as creating the conditions for maritime clusters to be developed where appropriate. Of specific interest are activities that can provide added-value through i.a., improving upon existing marine knowledge; expanding research and development capacities; and through the creation of economies-of-scale in maritime areas where inefficient duplication of effort may take place. Timing and focus for these activities should be coordinated wherever possible and included in e.g., the EUs Eighth Framework Programme for Research.

Until now, most analysis of the ocean environment, and the impacts of human activities on that environment, has been carried out in relation to sectoral activities such as fishing and shipping. However, a fully integrated assessment of coastal and ocean areas, taking into account the current status, trends and expected impacts of different human activities in the Atlantic, could form the basis for a much more effective integrated policy. Mapping activities that are already underway can be coordinated to supplement this knowledge and strengthen the collaborative process. Carrying out an integrated assessment would be in line with EU Member State obligations under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and in particular, with the upcoming EU Integrated Maritime Policy Strategy for the Atlantic region as well as with the US Ocean Policy; this would allow for collaborative policies to be developed based on this coordinated scientific analysis. In order to ensure the success of joint initiatives such as integrated assessments, efforts are necessary from both the EU and the US to make their current policy activities clear and accessible to the other party.

#### 3.1 Coordinate funding and focus in transatlantic maritime research

The EU's Eighth Framework Programme for Research, a fully developed European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODnet), the US Comparative Analysis of Marine Ecosystem Organisation (CAMEO) Program and the US National Oceanographic Partnership Program should coordinate funding and thematic focus for transatlantic cooperation in science and policy research. DG Research is also in the process of developing an EU Strategy for Marine and Maritime Research in response to the requirements of the EUs IMP. This strategy seeks to enhance integration of knowledge and research; to strengthen research capacities; and bring about new forms of governance in research that will seek consensus among scientific and industrial stakeholders. The

development of such a strategy within the EU may provide interesting learning points to be taken forward within future transatlantic scientific initiatives.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) is well positioned to take on the work of integrated assessment if the EU and US can make funding available. Many ocean scientists are already working with ICES, which has an excellent track record of providing scientific advice and is set up to do so, and although it is European-based, there is full participation from the US. ICES also provides an added advantage, as it is able to bring together scientists from a number of other countries to participate in the work. Since an integrated assessment needs to synthesize the research across a broad range of disciplines, it is unlikely that it will be compatible with existing research funding mechanisms. More suitable therefore, would be the development of a stand-alone program through collaborative science funding from the EU and US, based on experience acquired, for example, through EU Research and Innovation (RTD) marine project funding under the 7th Framework Programme for research.

### 3.2 Conduct integrated assessment for the North Atlantic

An integrated assessment of the North Atlantic that covers coasts, oceans and seas should be developed in a collaborative way, building on the significant body of collaborative work already in progress under the ICES framework. An integrated assessment should additionally seek to draw on the scientific work of US and EU institutions more broadly, such as the integrated marine ecosystem assessment being carried out at National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries' Northeast Science Center (Woods Hole) for the Northwest Atlantic, the actions to be undertaken by EU Member States in the context of the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, the developments taking place within the EU EMODnet network and the extensive scientific analyses of the OSPAR Commission.

The assessment should take both biophysical and socio-economic components into account and aim to provide a basis for i.a., maritime spatial planning for coastal as well as marine activities and the development of sustainable growth in Atlantic maritime sectors and areas. With regard to the latter, collaborative international efforts will be needed from both the EU and US, and in collaboration with relevant RFMOs such as NEAFC and NAFO. This would ensure, in particular, the appropriate management of offshore activities. A cost assessment will be necessary before carrying out an integrated assessment for the North Atlantic and should be conducted through ICES with support from the EU (European Commission and relevant EU Agencies) and the National Ocean Council (NOC).

### 3.3 Coordinate seabed mapping efforts

Integrated assessment of the marine environment can greatly benefit from the development of high resolution mapping of the ocean floor, particularly in highly productive or sensitive areas. Both the EU and the US are engaged in developing high resolution maps in selected areas but this work is not yet coordinated within a coherent program covering the North Atlantic. The benefits of coordination are to leverage ship-borne and land-based data management and analysis resources to make this information more readily available to scientists working on integrated assessment and to share technology, lessons learned and expertise across projects. Seabed mapping such as, DG MAREs Atlas of the Seas, the US

Center for Coastal & Ocean Mapping, the Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping (CCOM)/ Joint Hydrographic Center (JHC) and the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) maritime can form the basis for a broader collaborative effort to map the North Atlantic as comprehensively as possible. The expertise on marine knowledge gathered through the EMODnet could also be useful in this context.

### 3.4 Develop communication and transparency between US and EU institutions and agencies involved in maritime governance

There is a need to enhance communication and transparency to increase awareness of maritime policy activities taking place, specifically with regards to integrated assessment work being carried out under the EUs Integrated Maritime Policy, its Common Fisheries Policy, its Environmental Policy and its shipping policy, as well as by the NOC in the US. A website with a centralized information data-base under the control of the focal institutions (European Commission, Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) and NOC) could be established for this purpose where relevant information could be made available to interested parties. The EU Maritime Forum could serve as a starting point from which to develop such a website.

#### Audience for these recommendations

All research related activities should be coordinated through the DG for Research and Innovation (DG Research) and the US National Science Foundation. The immediate audiences for an integrated assessment are the European Commission and its agencies, e.g., DG Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE), European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA), the Community Fisheries Control Agency (CFCA), the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders (FRONTEX), NOC and US federal agencies. However, more broadly, an integrated assessment can also provide important information for international organizations such as the regional fishery management organizations, OSPAR, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and others as they continue to strive to improve the effectiveness of their management efforts.

#### Process and timeline for these recommendations

With regards to research, the current EU Framework Programme (7<sup>th</sup>) will run until 2013. However, consultation for the next Framework Programme is currently underway and coordination with US counterparts should take place immediately to ensure that transatlantic research interests are represented in the next funding period (8<sup>th</sup> EU Framework Programme). The scientific work for an integrated assessment can begin as soon as a mandate for such work is given by the EU and NOC, in principle, if sufficient financial and human resources can be made available. A logical time step is a five year assessment that is updated at this same interval. The linkage of this scientific work to policy measures will be a consequence of the deliberations and progress of the EU under its Integrated Maritime Policy (and in particular under its Integrated Maritime Policy Strategy for the Atlantic area), of progress made in the implementation of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and in the US under the National Ocean policy. With regards to seabed mapping, work is already underway, meaning that coordination can proceed almost immediately (resources permitting).

## 4 Environmentally sustainable maritime technology and practices for greener outcomes in shipping, fishing and energy

On both sides of the Atlantic, the development and application of technology that uses less energy, results in less pollution, consumes fewer resources and has generally less negative impacts on ecosystems, is an important area of research, as well as product development, application, and investment. This initiative is of course driven by a concern for the environment, but also, to a large extent, by economic concerns and competition for a growing market in “green technology.” The maritime sector should not be left out of this equation. Progress is already being made with regards to increases in offshore renewable energy development and the shipping and fishing industries are developing new standards and taking important steps towards developing fishing gear with a lower carbon footprint.

However, these efforts are not emerging in a coordinated fashion and there is an immediate need for the private sector to work with government to encourage and facilitate the application of green technology across maritime enterprise. The development of new maritime technology requires heavy investments in research and development, innovation, and is critically dependent on market forces. To facilitate this growth, the EU and the US could work together to create huge economies of scale by having complementary development programs for green maritime technology. Rules and regulations as well as incentive programs that complement each other on both sides of the Atlantic will have the effect of spurring on development and acceptance of new maritime technology – particularly in the areas of marine bio-technology and renewable marine energy – thereby benefiting both EU and US industrial and environmental interests.

### 4.1 Exchange best practices in environmentally sustainable approaches to maritime governance in shipping, fisheries, energy development, sea-bed exploration and exploitation and combating pollution and marine debris

There is an immediate need to exchange best practices on employing sustainable maritime technologies to provide greener outcomes in order to create win-win situations in terms of the environmental, socio-economic and technological benefits. The following are areas where the sharing of best practice is particularly recommended:

#### a) Shipping

In the shipping industry, there is general agreement that both the EU and the US stand to gain if they leverage policy-making to implement a more coordinated and strategic approach rather than carrying out piecemeal activities. There are some interesting examples of win-win initiatives taking place within the shipping industry with relation to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Environmental Shipping Index (ESI) provides a new international standard for emission levels and rewards vessels, which perform better than the legal norm. As a voluntary system that encourages the marine sector to reduce emissions without distorting the market, more ports should consider implementing ESI and the initiative should be promoted outside Europe to create a global mechanism that encourages green shipping. The principles enshrined in the EU Third Maritime safety package, and the corresponding legislation, should also encourage the development of co-operative best practices between the EU and the US on shipping.



Equally, the World Port Climate Initiative is a collective of 55 prominent ports working under the International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH) to actively reduce air pollution. The index shows ships' environmental performance in terms of emissions, allowing ports and other nautical service providers to use the index to reward ships, and thus, encourage sustainable behavior in the shipping industry. Additionally, a number of technical measures such as speed reduction, the extension of land-based electricity use at ports and harbors, and engine monitoring can also create a net benefit (negative cost) when implemented, which may furthermore result in a reduction of around 400 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year by 2030.

There are evidently quick wins and the shipping, shipbuilding, and marine equipment sectors are already investing heavily in these potentially cost-saving technical measures. Technologies to enhance the efficiency of vessels, such as drag reduction techniques and drive propulsion systems, are just some examples of developments in this rapidly growing industry which could benefit from EU-US exchange and cooperation.

b) Fisheries

In relation to fisheries, best practice could be shared in line with the principles enshrined in the 2012 reform of the EU Common Fisheries Policy. These would include management measures that favor low-energy and selective gear types, the use of rights-based management in order to reduce overcapacity, setting siting standards for offshore aquaculture, reducing emissions and increasing effectiveness through the use of Vessel Monitoring Systems to monitor fishing boats rather than the use of time- and resource-intensive at-sea patrols. Best practice and common approaches should be shared in anticipation of meetings at International Fisheries Organizations, to which the EU and US are parties to, in order to enhance leadership.

c) Energy development

Research projects on renewable marine energies and more efficient energy use have produced a number of promising developments on both sides of the Atlantic. The EU is supporting the development of marine renewable energies and their connection to main energy grids. Fluid co-operation between EU and US research and development institutions and technology development firms in this area would be particularly welcome, in view of the high degree of specialization and costs involved in the development of cutting-edge maritime technologies. Meanwhile, offshore oil-exploration will continue to take place, at least for the near future. Therefore, improvements to safety and safety standards for offshore activities are still of key importance and should form the basis of extensive cooperation as should mitigation plans and contingency mechanisms such as new techniques for more effective oil skimming.

d) Sea-bed exploration and exploitation

Both the EU and the US share much in common in terms of their drive for the sustainable management of marine resources and their use or extraction. EU/US cooperation would provide particular benefits in relation to emerging and highly technical areas such as deep sea-bed exploration and exploitation. It is clear that such activities present a number of opportunities for both the EU and the US. However, these activities are both costly and require high levels of technological development. For this reason, support should be given to EU/US cooperation and sharing of best-practise and expertise. This would ultimately lead to improved efficiency and cost-effectiveness as well as agreement on sustainable and

environmentally sound approaches. Based on EU and US experiences of best practice, a series of joint guidelines could also be developed through which the EU and US could set a benchmark for future agreements on other maritime issues as well as establishing themselves as leaders in this emerging industry.

e) Pollution and marine debris

Contamination is a major problem in both the EU and the US and it is of vital importance that best practices should be exchanged in relation to risk assessment and management approaches to reduce contamination through i.a., persistent organic pollutants or illegal dumping and to prevent these from entering the aquatic food chain. Marine debris is also an area of high concern for the EU and US. Policy frameworks such as the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) should be mobilized to tackle this issue. Additionally, examples of best practice could be shared in relation to the tracking and retrieval of marine debris (especially plastics, lost containers and fishing gear), as well as participating in regional fora such as OSPAR, which has developed guidelines for monitoring marine debris. Joint initiatives to reduce pollution and marine debris should furthermore provide advantages and support to industry for developing monitoring, tracking and retrieval technologies as well as improvements to fishing gear, in line with US and EU fisheries and environmental policies.

#### Audience for these recommendations

In view of developments taking place in their regulatory framework and in their maritime industries, the EC (European Commission) and US NOC will likely have the lead in developing an action plan for supporting the development of maritime green technology in the Atlantic. However industry must clearly take a lead role and work with the administrations to ensure that incentive structures are effective, so that technological progress flows into the market place and fuels economic growth and job creation. Efforts to improve tracking of marine debris and pollution require leadership from the EC and US NOC, but will also need to be coordinated with relevant agencies such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and EMSA (European Maritime Safety Agency).

#### Process and timeline for these recommendations

A useful starting point would be a maritime green technology conference between the US (NOC) and the EU (coordinated by the European Commission, DG MARE) within the next one to two years to generate suggestions and recommendations for key focus areas, which could include i.a., shipping, marine renewable energy, fishing and coastal management. The annual International Marine Debris conference organized by NOAA and UNEP also provides a platform for regular transatlantic cooperation and information exchange.

## 5 Monitoring, control and surveillance

Increasing attention is being focused on monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) on the high seas to combat Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing. There is evidence to suggest that IUU fishing has strong links to organized crime and thus, the fight against illegal maritime activities could benefit considerably through shared access to data collected by agencies such as INTERPOL, FRONTEX or the new Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE) developed by the EU (Coordinators: DG MARE, European

Commission). Vice versa, maritime control agencies could provide data to assist INTERPOL's new maritime piracy task force. Although relatively new, it is intended that the CFCA will play an increased role in the fight against IUU fishing. Indeed it has already acted in cooperation with other EU agencies and came to an agreement with EMSA and FRONTEX in 2009 regarding the exchange of information and expertise on maritime surveillance.

The EU and the US both contribute to the International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network (IMCS Network), a voluntary global network of fishery enforcement agencies, where the exchange of information is fundamental to addressing global IUU fishing. With regards to transatlantic cooperation, a framework for mutual assistance between the EU and the US regarding IUU fishing is now in existence; however, cooperation will need to be strengthened on a practical level to operationalize this framework through regular information exchange between EU and US authorities, as well as other actions.

Both the EU and the US are investing in new technologies, which make the surveillance of previously inaccessible areas possible. A coordinated approach will reduce costs and duplication of effort as well as increasing overall Marine Domain Awareness (MDA) in the north Atlantic and beyond. Of key interest is the strengthening of import monitoring programs with respect to IUU products. There is a great potential benefit to be gained from taking a joint approach across the US, EU, and other major import markets for fish and fish products (particularly in Japan). The US and the EU have very different systems for ensuring that IUU products are not imported into their markets, and in a number of cases, the decisions on whether or not to import from a specific country has been incompatible with the decision made by their transatlantic counterpart. These different systems have yielded varying results in the initial years of implementation, and there are clearly lessons to be learned on both sides. While the systems in place in each of these markets need not be identical, there would be strong synergies in sharing data and other information, as much on the process as on the substance.

### 5.1 Improve information sharing, especially to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing

The struggle against IUU fishing would benefit tremendously from regular information exchange between the authorities in the EU and in the United States, particularly in their respective IUU import monitoring programs to ensure a coordinated, effective global effort. This would not only reduce costs and duplication of effort, but would also take advantage of the developing technical expertise on both sides of the Atlantic. There is a need to share information on compliance and identify infringers to help close markets from IUU fishing. Other issues that would also benefit from information-sharing include the navigation of "flag of convenience" vessels, illegal trafficking of persons and goods at sea. Furthermore, opportunities for regular sharing of data between the EU and US from both private sector and government sources should be identified. These data-sharing opportunities should be used to establish a basis for regular cooperation perhaps through a *vademecum* or handbook reference, which clearly sets out the different levels and areas of responsibility on either side of the Atlantic.

## 5.2 Strengthen MCS standards within the International Maritime Organization (IMO)

Further cooperation between the US and EU is needed to strengthen standards within the IMO to improve international MCS. Although the EU is not a member of the IMO, it can influence decisions through its individual Member States. Key areas for improvement are on standards for Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs); guidelines/new standards for offshore ports; joint actions for underwater and seabed exploration and exploitation; setting up, and connectivity of, offshore marine renewable energy facilities and other offshore installations. Crucially however, the current exemption of fishing vessels under 24m in length from IMO reporting, not only limits effective surveillance and control, but may also pose additional threats to overall maritime security. Establishing clear standards and tighter controls should provide for greater MCS across sectors. This should be done making full use of new technology to maximize efficiency and keep costs down.

### Audience for these recommendations

With regards to MCS, the US and EU could coordinate efforts through the IMCS Network, the CFCA and other relevant agencies, including US Homeland Security, EMSA, and FRONTEX. At European Commission level, DG MARE (lead service on the development of the Common Information Security Environment), together with the Maritime Transport division within the Directorate General for Transport and Mobility (DG MOVE), could promote and supervise EU Member States' coordination efforts on EU/US transatlantic cooperation on these issues. Standards at the IMO should be strengthened through requests from EU Member States and the US. DG Mare and the US NOAA and Coast Guard should be the immediate audience for these recommendations.

### Process and timeline for these recommendations

A joint action plan is suggested. This should be agreed upon by the EU and US and be implemented over the next three years.

## 6 International Influence

The US and EU are generally in agreement with regards to issues of maritime governance, but enhanced co-operation could strengthen their ability to exert influence on outcomes at international and multilateral fora. The EU and the US working together present a powerful force in international settings such as at Regional Fisheries Management Organization (RFMO) meetings (e.g., the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)), as well as IMO, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), International Whaling Commission (IWC) and other international fora. Scientific species protection plans (e.g., bird and shark protection plans) could be used as a starting point for identifying further agreement and joint approaches to management. Clearly the North Atlantic should be a model for maritime governance utilizing the best practices between the US and EU along with other North Atlantic states. This model should then serve as a basis for positions in broader international settings.

Another area of potential cooperation is through the support that the EU and US provide to less-developed countries. Both parties invest heavily in development aid and it is essential that in coastal areas, these funds be used to support environmentally responsible

approaches to maritime management, particularly with regards to coastal adaptation to climate change. Information-sharing on these programs will help to avoid duplication of effort as well as ensuring that new technologies e.g., selective fishing gear are made available to those participating in maritime development programs.

### 6.1 Increase coordination at international fora

The EU and US are strong players at multinational environmental, fishing, shipping and maritime management fora. However, their influence could be leveraged through greater bilateral coordination on key issues before engaging with other parties at multilateral or international fora. This will both increase their leadership potential and enhance the possibility of attaining outcomes that are mutually desirable. This should take place by strengthening efforts already in existence under the US-EU High Level Fisheries Consultation. Other joint activities such as information exchange on MCS, energy development or tackling marine debris would provide additional support.

### 6.2 Build capacity within development agencies

The EU and the US should agree to compile and share standard data and information on capacity-building efforts to help avoid duplicate effort, ensure complementary work and in some cases, allow for collaboration, particularly where one party has comparative advantage for historical, cultural or linguistic reasons.

Work is also needed to ensure that agencies in other parts of the US and EU administrations, providing international development assistance, are aware of the potential impacts of funding in coastal areas. To prevent inadvertent harm caused by inappropriate programming, cooperation is needed for capacity building regarding, for example, the provision of selective fishing gear, development of port facilities and monitoring control and surveillance. However, the EU and US must also lead by example and improve MCS of their own fishing fleets to avoid over-exploitation of stocks in the EEZs of less-developed countries. Further capacity-building could also be carried out in relation to marine professional development, the development and exploitation of offshore renewable energies, marine energy and IT connectivity networks and seabed exploration.

#### Audience for these recommendations

Leadership should come from NOC and DG MARE who could cooperate with and support agencies, EU Member States and Commission services carrying out capacity building on marine issues, particularly in Atlantic areas. Relevant agencies would include (but would not be limited to) the US Agency for International Development (USAID), EuropeAid, EMSA, CFCA or within the context of the development of the EU Common Information Sharing Environment (CISE).

#### Process and timeline for these recommendations

A three-year Action Plan is proposed, including potential joint workshops between EU/US organizations, development agencies and other relevant stakeholders.

## 7 Conclusion

The areas discussed and recommendations made by this working group show that there are a number of areas in which the EU and the US are already working towards similar aims in maritime governance. The EU Integrated Maritime Policy and, in particular, the development of a future EU Integrated Maritime Policy Strategy for the Atlantic, provide a key basis for cooperation. These policies present the EUs work towards integrated maritime governance structures and mirror the US National Ocean Policy's focus on integrated ocean management on both its coasts. The working group's analysis suggests that there is also great potential for transatlantic cooperation on several areas that are of strategic interest to both the US and the EU such as marine debris, IUU fishing and energy development. However, there is still room for enhancing coordination in order to ensure that efforts in the north Atlantic run in synergy, rather than in parallel, to one another. Straightforward strategies to increase communication, transparency and understanding of the respective responsibilities and governance systems on maritime affairs in the US and the EU are likely to provide an important starting point for enhancing this coordination.

Both the EU and the US have strong scientific bases, which are currently not reaching their full potential. Opening up scientific dialogue and exchange of data may lead to the development of joint approaches to integrated assessments, seabed mapping efforts and the development of new and emerging maritime technologies. Enhancing EU/US transatlantic cooperation therefore not only provides an opportunity for mutual learning processes but also for economic gains, and the development of competitive marine technological advantage. Furthermore, increasing this comparative advantage and communication will enable the EU and US to exercise greater leverage and leadership at international fora, such as the IMO and International Fisheries Organizations, ensuring that new developments and transatlantic interest in integrated ocean management are duly reflected at those international organisations and taken into consideration by their member states. Considering the advantages to be gained, it is essential that joint programmes are able to rely upon regular funding and operational backing from both the EU and the US government.

Major challenges, therefore, include obtaining financial support not only for scientific and policy-based dialogue, but also to further R&D programs such as a comprehensive integrated assessment of the north Atlantic. Although the policy landscape is ripe for integrated maritime governance approaches, strong political will is needed to ensure that these approaches are coordinated all the way across the Atlantic, from its western to its eastern coasts. Prioritization of the move beyond traditional communication channels is key to increasing dialogue and consequently to improved understanding of one another's governance structures, policies and scientific initiatives.

### Cross-cutting issues

Many issues identified here by the EU/US Transatlantic Cooperation Working Group also have relevance to the other three CALAMAR working groups, especially with respect to the need for improving the link between science and policy and for increasing exchange of best practices for maritime governance. Specific synergies with other working groups include:

- Integrated Marine Policies and Tools Working Group – integrated assessment(s); sharing best practices for marine spatial planning.

- Oceans and Climate Change Working Group – developing green technology and practices within maritime sectors; international development aid to support coastal adaptation to climate change.
- High Seas Working Group – improving monitoring, control and surveillance in PSSAs and the high seas.

## 8 References

Center for Coastal & Ocean Mapping, the Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping (CCOM)/ Joint Hydrographic Center (JHC) <http://www.ccom-jhc.unh.edu/>

Commission Regulation (EU) No 86/2010 of 29 January 2010 amending Annex I to Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 as regards the definition of fishery products and amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1010/2009 as regards exchange of information on inspections of third country vessels and administrative arrangements on catch certificates <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32010R0086:EN:NOT>

Community Fisheries Control Agency (CFCA) <http://cfca.europa.eu/>

Comparative Analysis of Marine Ecosystem Organisation (CAMEO) <http://cameo.noaa.gov/>

European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) <http://www.emsa.europa.eu>

Environmental Ship Index (ESI) <http://www.environmentalshipindex.org/Public/Home/>

European Union Directorate General for Enterprise (DG ENTR) [http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/index\\_en.htm/](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/index_en.htm/)

European Union Directorate General for Environment (DG ENV) [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/index\\_en.htm/](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/index_en.htm/)

European Union Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (DG MARE) : [http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/index_en.html)

EU Maritime Forum (DG MARE): <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/>

European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODNET) [http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/emodnet\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/emodnet_en.html)

European Union Directorate General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries Non-Paper: The EU and the Atlantic Ocean [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/partners/consultations/atlantic\\_ocean/non\\_paper\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/partners/consultations/atlantic_ocean/non_paper_en.pdf)

European Union Directorate General for Mobility and Transport (DG MOVE) [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/index\\_en.htm/](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/index_en.htm/)

European Union EuropeAid Development and Cooperation [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/index_en.htm)

European Union External Border Agency (FRONTEX) <http://www.frontex.europa.eu/>

European Union Research and Innovation (RTD) <http://ec.europa.eu/research/index.cfm/>

European Union Third Maritime Safety

Package [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/safety/third\\_maritime\\_safety\\_package\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/safety/third_maritime_safety_package_en.htm)

Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS)

<http://www.earthobservations.org/geoss.shtml>

International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH) <http://www.iaphworldports.org/>

International Maritime Organization (IMO) <http://www.imo.org/>

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) <http://www.nafo.int/>

Northeast Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC) <http://www.neafc.org/>

OSPAR Commission. <http://www.ospar.org/>

UN Division for Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea <http://www.un.org/Depts/los>