What is under the table of fishery assessment?

Davi Rodrigues
Presenting author
Introduction

Uncertainty - Artisanal fishery activity in Brazil is very informal. Assessments conducted under L&P/O&G process lacks of methodological uniformity, showing unexpected different results.

Credibility - Artisanal fishermen have been arguing that fishery assessment are not representative of the reality of their fishery activity. They are “losing hope” that the L&P/O&G is capable of addressing the impacts of such activity.

Liability – AECOM share the responsibility with the industry and society related with the improvement of the L&P/O&G in Brazil. We consider we must contribute with the development of a better world.
Fishery assessment is an important part of the L&P/O&G process in Brazil;

It identifies the fishery activity potentially impacted by the O&G industry;

A Federal Agency – IBAMA – is responsible for the L&P process, and they define the minimal scope of the assessment

A fishery community can be impacted if:

1- their fishing ground is overlapped by the O&G sites;
2- if the fishing ground is damaged by an oil spill

The definition of the fishing area for each fishing community is critical for the impact assessment
What is this about?

IAIA 15 - 35th Annual Conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment
Where is our investigation?

[Map showing locations in Brazil, including Rio das Ostras and Campos Basin]
To whom do this work concern?

Wooden boats
Moderate use of tech
Informality

Seismic Drilling Production

IAIA 15 - 35th Annual Conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment
To whom do this work may concern?
How we developed our research?

Analysis of the obligations – Term of Reference

Analysis of nine practices, looking after:

- Divergences between the geographical amplitude of the fishing areas (fishery assessment)
- Implication of the different fishery assessment results within the definition of the impacted areas
How we developed our research?

- Implication of the different fishery assessment results within the definition of the impacted areas

Project 1: Fishing Area 1 - Not impacted

Project 2: Fishing Area 2 - Impacted

Any change is observed

The fishery community would not be considered part of the impacted area
How we developed our research?

- Implication of the different fishery assessment results within the definition of the impacted areas

Project 1

- Fishing Area 1: Not impacted
- Fishing Area 2: Not impacted

Any change is observed in the impacted area

Project 2

- Fishing Area 1: Not impacted
- Fishing Area 2: Impacted

The fishery community would not be considered part of the impacted area

Fishing ground

O&G Site Area

Rio das Ostras
What have we found?

Analysis of the obligations – Term of Reference

There isn’t any methodology established and there is a non-standardized use of qualitative methods.
What have we found?

Analysis of the obligations – Term of Reference

Two simple and objective criteria to define who is impacted

- Temporary or permanent site closure for fishing
- Temporary or permanent increase of the risk of accidents including boat and fishing gear collisions with the O&G facilities

Not well defined evaluation concepts:

- “Expressive presence in the project area”;
- “Significant dependence on the natural resources”
What have we found?

Spatial geographic divergence

Seven different fishing areas

Three different consulting firms

Four different oil companies
What have we found?

Impacted Area divergences – Rio das Ostras Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishing Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What have we found?

Impacted Area divergences – Rio das Ostras Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering the actual diagnostics prepared under each licensing</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the majority resulted from the cross analysis</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How large and how much impacted is the Rio das Ostras fishery Communities?
We are still far from conclusions

…but very interested to start a broader discussion about:

• Addressing uncertainties of the fishery assessment under the L&P/O&G process;

• Increase community participation at the L&P process;

• Improve the Term of Reference to better reflect the need of impact assessment and fishery assessment;

• Consulting self-regulation to improve the IA practices;

• Development of regional studies and establishment of a monitoring process
Thank you!

Davi.Rodrigues@aecom.com