



FISCIL

Discussion Paper

<i>Preamble</i>	3
<i>Introduction</i>	4
<i>The Global Fishing Industry</i>	4
<i>The Five Regions</i>	5
<i>The Licenses</i>	5
<i>Competition</i>	6
<i>The Five Corporations</i>	6
<i>Existing Fishing Corporations</i>	8
<i>FISCIL Corporations' Income</i>	8
<i>Ownership Distribution</i>	9
<i>Initial Infrastructure (including Aquaculture)</i>	11
<i>Government Involvement</i>	11
<i>More Money for the Industry</i>	12
<i>Obvious Implementation Issues</i>	13
<i>Conclusion</i>	13
<i>Addendum – Stewardship Process</i>	15

Preamble

We cannot solve any of our biggest problems unless we have the enthusiastic participation of those with 99% of the power in this world (or is it only 98% or 95%). It is the politicians and the corporations who have this power. In global scale actions **they get to decide whether we do a thing or not**, so if you are not making them happy then all you're going to get is a fight and/or empty promises, such as what we've had over the last fifty years of the environmental debate (forget about what they deserve or we'll never fix anything). This approach is roughly the opposite of what you're used to; not merely addressing or mitigating, actually solving the problem by making money rather than the problem costing money to fix (not a single penny and we create massive economic surpluses right at the beginning). Shouldn't this be the gold standard for what we've been trying to accomplish for the last fifty years; a genuine solution that those in power will want to do even more than greenies. Just because this solution gives those with 99% of the power in the issue what amounts to everything they want doesn't mean I'm actually on their side. I'm firmly entrenched on the side of what's good for the majority; I'm on the side of fixing the problem and this WILL do that. There are no holes in these discussion papers and these reforms will all work "as advertised" (Green, *liberté, égalité, fraternité*), but they are discussion papers, NOT White Papers. There are no holes in these reforms; just ask.

Introduction

FISCIL (Fishing Industry Segmentation Creating International Licenses) is the name of the reform that has been created to address the issue of overfishing.

FISCIL segments the world's oceans into five regions, North and South Atlantic, North and South Pacific, and the Indian Ocean. East and West is another alternative for the split, and it is probably the better of the two.

We then issue exclusive licenses to fish those waters to five newly created public multinational corporations that will be owned by the existing commercial fishermen, even those who fish to support small villages. These licences are not sold to these corporations, they are simply issued to them.

By doing this we create huge assets (the licenses) that can be leveraged to greatly increase the value of these corporations.

With over a hundred billion dollars being made available through leveraging these new assets, we will be able to undertake initiatives that will dramatically increase the volume of fish in the ocean.

The principal way to increase the value of these licenses, and subsequently the value of FISCIL corporations, is to increase the volume of fish in their region of the ocean. There is reforms infrastructure and technology designed to do this, and what we're talking about here is a direct and unambiguous connection between improving environmental conditions and the making of hundreds of billions of dollars. The health of the oceans is dramatically improved if we push the volume of fish in the oceans back up to what it was a hundred years ago.

This discussion paper is about FISCIL as a complete solution for overfishing, and even though FISCIL is also a major plank in the H3 approach to Climate Change, those details are not covered in here. You can get what you need on that in the FISCIL section of the CC discussion paper and also in the "a bit of silliness" section of that document.

The Global Fishing Industry

The state of the Global Fishing Industry has become a truism. It doesn't need to be covered here, except to say that a reform of the industry that creates a lot more jobs (as in another twenty, thirty or forty percent), makes everybody in the industry richer, creates more bureaucracy (so we get them

onside as well), creates a fully funded hundred billion dollars in infrastructure projects, and puts politicians at centre stage in solving one of the world's biggest problems, with a solution that obviously does (solve it); such a thing is going to be adopted. Not to even mention that the greenies will love it too.

For every single major problem in the world, everybody really can win; we just need to think harder. The days of the zero sum, in everything, are over.

The Five Regions

As mentioned in the introduction we segment the world into five regions, and the five regions are fairly intuitive, with the only real room for debate on the regions being whether to split the Pacific and the Atlantic into North and South or East and West. So, East Pacific, West Pacific, East Atlantic, West Atlantic, and the Indian Ocean. These are the five regions. Bureaucracy will have such fun getting together and drawing the lines will they not?

An arbitration committee should be set up inside the UN to help negotiate many things to do with FISCIL, and specific borders for the five regions would be one of these things. It would be best if a new UN agency were created to oversee all things FISCIL on an ongoing basis and this would of course be the home of the arbitration committee.

Just like everything else inside the FISCIL reform, responsibility for oversight should not be given to an existing agency; a fresh start is needed right across the board. There's nothing wrong with the FAO (the UN agency this would fall under), but no existing agency should be charged with this job because existing agencies carry too much baggage and are set in their ways; an existing agency will insist that FISCIL does things its way, and that's the old way we're trying to get away from.

The headquarters for the five different regional multinationals are almost pre-determined by the regions: China, India, United States, Brazil and the European Union.

The Licenses

The licenses need to be issued under the authority of an international agreement, preferably out of the United Nations, and preferably out of the UN agency that should be created for the FISCIL process.

The licenses cannot be for sale by governments. The corporations will be created and part of their creation is the license to fish a specific region of the ocean exclusively.

The regional multinationals need to leverage these licenses to provide the lion's share of the funding for the massive amount of infrastructure that is an integral part of the FISCIL reform. If we hobble them at the outset by forcing them into debt just to pay for the licenses what would be the point. If the five regional multinationals do not have a massive war chest, they will struggle and make bad, panicky decisions, just like every other corporation in the world does when it's under pressure.

To try and get money for these licenses would turn the companies (and the reform) into junk, and if we were to do this then it might even be a non-starter. This time, let the first thing we do, be the smart thing to do; pretty please, with sugar on top??????

The FISCIL reform is going to make hundreds of billions of dollars if we let it, so let's, let it.

Competition

We add even more value to these corporations by removing competition from the primary production side of the industry; these five corporations will not be permitted to compete with each other for markets. In industries where money is the only imperative, such as in the case of banks or selling cars for instance, competition is necessary for many reasons, but when there are substantial environmental imperatives, removing competition and reducing the number of players in an industry (to five in this case) is critical; competition makes people do stupid, reckless, careless things, with no regard to the environment, and even if it were not banned there's nothing to be gained except shaving margins to the bone; and the initiator could well find themselves ganged up on; it's an obvious thing to do and it's what I'd do. It's a moot point because competition will be removed from the equation. There will be no competition for markets, but there are many species that are not available in all regions of the ocean and of course that sort of purchasing will not be restricted.

The Five Corporations

The five corporations set up under the FISCIL reform of the Global Fishing Industry will be fairly standard public

companies with a wrinkle or two. The corporations will be owned by all the existing commercial fishing entities under a ten or fifteen year accrual contract, but it is certainly possible that the timeframe will be considerably less than this.

The structure of the five multinationals will be that of a public corporation with a board of directors operating under a public trust deed that will limit their possible actions, but within some very wide parameters. As we've seen all around the world since we first started down the corporate path, a memo and articles (a standard corporate constitution) is hardly sufficient to ensure good behaviour. And we'll double down on ensuring this good behaviour by opening up every little part of FISCIL corporations for public scrutiny. Public access to information, just like in government, except that there are no confidential documents and there are to be no redacted sections in documents provided. FISCIL removes competition from the primary production end of the Global Fishing Industry, and so there are no trade secrets to protect. If someone in FISCIL East Atlantic comes up with a good idea to improve efficiency, increase yields, make more money or anything else, then everybody gets access to that good idea. It serves no purpose to withhold in the environment created by FISCIL. There is no competitive advantage to be gained because they don't compete with each other.

These companies need to be run conservatively and debt and equity levels need to be kept under control. The level of debt and IPO equity will be predetermined, and this is one of a dozen major elements that will be worked through when we get to the business end of FISCIL's pre-adoption. There is no optimum level that can be defined right now, because there are too many conditional factors that will impact what these optimum levels are.

Now the relationship between the regional multinationals and all of the existing fishing corporations would lend itself to a system where we use management contracts (smaller companies being contracted to manage the FISCIL corporations). We must positively exclude this as an option in the public trust deeds for FISCIL corporations that govern what they can and cannot do.

The whole point of the FISCIL exercise is to encourage long term planning and thinking, and this does not happen inside a management contract environment. A board of directors and an executive that are solely focused on how to create value for their corporation and their shareholders,

most of whom also happen to be the fishermen, is what the FISCIL environment relies upon.

The easiest and unquestionably best way to increase the value of FISCIL corporations will be to increase the volume of fish in the ocean. And we're talking about more than just the comfort of shareholders leading to a higher PE ratio. The value of the fishing license that each fishing corporation will own will be directly linked to the volume of fish in their region of the oceans, and the volume of fish will be an audited calculation that is the baseline asset valuing statistic of a FISCIL corporation. Again, the direct link between improving environmental conditions and making hundreds of billions of dollars.

Existing Fishing Corporations

All existing fishing corporations get to retain roughly the same level of ownership autonomy they have now. Regulation in the Fishing Industry throughout the world right now is such that in a FISCIL environment, fishing companies are going to have more autonomy in their freedom of movement than they enjoy at the moment. They will not have the freedom to do absolutely anything otherwise there would be no point doing any of this, but the situation will be better for them than it is now and they will all make more money; and of course they will be richer through their partial ownership of the larger entities as well.

The relationship between the regional multinationals and the existing fishing corporations in a FISCIL environment will be like smaller business units of a large corporation. In this case the smaller business units have their own budgetary controls and make their own decisions, but they must operate within the ideology, ethics and morals of the parent company (stewardship in this case). They never get a visit from the "parent company" except as a how do you do or if they're cooking the books. It will be a better environment for them, and a freer one than what they have at the moment.

FISCIL Corporations' Income

This has not been decided yet because there are a few options, including one that wouldn't make much sense in the current system but is probably the one to use. There can be licensing and through-flow markets, or there can be set prices for each country that the market purchases and on-sells, or there can

be a single price out of source market purchase system, or as I said above, some other way. The stewardship system we'll put in place will change the dynamics of pricing fish and how fishing is actually done, so some of the current dynamics are going to change in the process. Also to bear in mind is the fact that the vast majority of fishermen who trade through the market will own part of the FISCIL corporation they are trading with, so if we have a trading system that cuts their personal income by ten percent but doubles the price of their shares they may be inclined to go for that if the shares are worth enough. I'm not saying that's the way it'll work, merely saying that we'll have latitude to decide which way it is done.

Ownership Distribution

Everybody who fishes commercially and "commercially" is to share in the ownership of the regional FISCIL multinational for their region of the globe. This includes the five or ten people who go out and fish to feed their village.

Those who fish to feed small villages "commercially" or otherwise will be treated differently under the rules of FISCIL in that there will be no requirement for them to sell their product through the FISCIL market system, nor will they be bound by certain fishing restrictions that are put in place as part of the global stewardship. Call it compensation for the decades of being fished out they've had to endure. It's hard to know how long it will take before their local fishery will return, but the stewardship plan for the entire global fishery will see fish stocks return in big numbers all over the world within five years; some of the areas that need remediation work will need more than others, so we could be talking five or six years for some areas. There will be specific definitions for subsistence fishermen (who sell their product in their own small village) and commercial fisherman, and there will be "no" limits or fees placed on recreational fishing. Just bear in mind that FISCIL corporations will have exclusive licences to fish these oceans commercially, they won't own the territory and they're not policemen.

Distributing ownership of the five regional multinationals is a massive logistics exercise: We calculate the volume of fish caught in each of the regions over a selected twelve month period that we select from the two years preceding the announcement of the FISCIL reform. The percentage of the total volume of fish caught in that year by an entity will

determine their share of the regional multinational in their part of the world. For the purposes of the calculation, the word “announcement” should mean as soon as it is put onto the global agenda, and obviously a single specific date range will be used to ensure there is no ambiguity. The end date in the range should be no later than six months prior to the “announcement” date, and not only will it be the date used for calculating volume and shares, it is also the cut off date. Any company coming into the industry less than a year before that date will not get a share in FISCIL corporations. Mustn’t have the inside info types diluting the pool for everybody else. The full share ownership threshold is five years with a sliding scale down to twelve months. “Full share ownership” means that if you’ve been in the industry for five years or longer then you get a full share according to what was mentioned immediately above; if only four years then you get eighty percent of a full share, three years gets a sixty percent share or some other percentage as defined in the pre-adoption stage and so on down to twelve months. A specific date that is a full six months or more before we know FISCIL is going to be adopted ensures there will be no carpetbaggers. There may be some who are unlucky enough to have started a business eleven months before the cut off date, and that’s just the luck of the draw. Having said that though there will be exceptions and provisions for long standing participants in the industry. For example, someone who has been in the industry for twenty years but only started a new business two years prior to the FISCIL start date would still get a full share, or other such consideration for their long participation in the industry (50% extra, 80% extra over their proportional share). An arbitration committee, with strong guidelines but some latitude, will be formed to adjudicate any grey area claims; perhaps the same arbitration committee alluded to in an earlier section.

For the purposes of this calculation a coastal fishing village in “Tanzania” is to be considered a single entity that will be compensated accordingly; compensated with the relevant percentage of their regional multinational, and obviously a full share. And incidentally, a share that is closer to their historical catches and not their current “fished out by larger interests” piddling catch they get today. To not allow for something like that would be obscene. Some will also get a shiny new boat so that they can assist with maintenance of the stewardship plan in their area. After fishing becomes less

of a hard slog for them than it has been of late, they'll have a little more time on their hands and may be interested in the extra work.

Initial Infrastructure (including Aquaculture)

The obvious infrastructure for FISCIL is the creation of headquarters for each of the five regional multinationals and an expansion of port facilities for some cities. This will be sizable, but it will be small in comparison to the infrastructure FISCIL corporations will create to increase the volume of sea life in their region.

There will also be an upgrade of the existing fishing fleet on the agenda for those who want the new boats and the refits, and it will be an ongoing process so people will not need to rush from fear they'll miss out. It'll be a global upgrade.

This section had previously included mention of technology called D-SAT, which up until October 2020 had been the primary plank in the stewardship plan for the FISCIL Reform. It has now been superseded with a better and more comprehensive plan that will contribute even more in the fight against Climate Change than the D-SATs would have. I have included details of this new stewardship plan as an addendum at the end of this document.

Government Involvement

Clearly governments need to be hip deep in this one with negotiation of the international agreements and the various legislative instruments required to facilitate the creation of the FISCIL environment.

Beyond that is up for discussion. If governments decide they want to provide additional funds or tax breaks to assist in the ongoing development of the FISCIL process then this is a good thing. Many politicians will choose to remain hip deep in these big and flashy actions that actually and truly solve one of the world's biggest problems. Reminding everybody in their country that it is they who helped solve one of the world's biggest problems is something to dine out on for many years, and deservedly so if they help it along.

Many governments will choose to set up a new bureaucratic department to oversee FISCIL in their country, and at the very least will insert a new group within their appropriate departments; fisheries, agriculture what have you.

There is as much or as little post set up involvement as governments will wish.

More Money for the Industry

Additional money comes into the industry by getting rid of any middle men and by altering the power dynamic between the industry and the large wholesale/retail end-sellers. In the world we live in today it is considered a cardinal sin to increase prices on the consumer, so the harvesters and processors won't do that. Let the larger end-sellers worry about pricing for the consumer. When one of the main issues is balancing up the power dynamic, it really can work like that. I'm leaving that hang rather than explain it; figure it out. Of course seafood pricing is quite volatile already so more money can be brought into the industry using that as well.

Additional money for many players in the industry also comes in via the work involved in the global stewardship plan. The fishermen will be well suited to do much of this work. Again, these details have been included as an addendum at the end of this document.

Less than five years after FISCIL is adopted, the industry will be producing a lot more fish for sale to the various markets, and this is the other place where the industry gets more money. With more being available to harvest and the higher profile of the industry because of the FISCIL reform, the market will grow automatically.

Almost everything in this document so far is straightforward and easy to see, so how about one small leap of faith: In addition to what I've already mentioned in this section, H3 is pushing forward many other global reforms that are worth a lot more money to the global economy than the FISCIL reform. When these reforms start impacting Africa, all of the FISCIL corporations will be "required" to sell to Africa in massive quantities, not just East Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, and NOT at cut prices either. H3 reforms are designed to increase the size of the global economy by over \$50 trillion and "bring **everybody** up with the rest of us"; raising everybody's standard of living is going to be the new best way to make money in this world, and all of it pure commerce; there is no charity in H3 reforms (even though some small parts of it may look that way). Consumption of a wide variety of healthy nutrition all over the world is going to increase because of this. What is better or will be better placed than

seafood to fill this demand? Africa is not the only place that will be impacted in this way.

Obvious Implementation Issues

1. FISCIL does not impact recreational fishing. This is all about increasing the volume of fish in the world's oceans so recreational fishing spots are not going to be fished out; quite the opposite.
2. A considerable number of unsophisticated individuals will be issued ownership in the five regional multinationals and they will be protected against predatory practices.
3. In a FISCIL environment the number of illegal fishing operations will be whittled down because such operations will be invited to fish legally. They don't get a slice of the regional multinationals when they are created, but we're going to need almost twice the number of fishing boats within about five years. Most should come on board.
4. Fish migrate and will pass from one region to another all the time; what is lost on the roundabout is picked up on the merry go round. Corporations will not be permitted to put up walls or nets at the boundaries, nor anything else that may restrict fish migration. It's not going to be an issue.
5. Carpetbaggers coming in and using people who have been in the industry for years as a front to gain shares in the ownership distribution won't work. A person can only get a share that is commensurate with their economic status as an owner. So in other words, an "old salty" deckhand cannot be used to grab a full or partial share under the exceptions. All H3 reforms will operate under "spirit of" (the law) rather than "letter of", and any grey area claims will be dealt with by the arbitration committee mentioned earlier.

Conclusion

So we have a reform of the Global Fishing Industry that will create over a million new jobs around the globe (re-create would be a better term to use for a very large proportion of these jobs). It will make everybody in the industry richer and it will allow them to bring in consistently bigger hauls. The FISCIL reform of the Global Fishing Industry will give the Fishing Industry a promising future to replace the doom and gloom of the last two or three decades.

It is big and flashy actions that solve one of the world's biggest problems (obviously so) and it requires politicians to be hip deep in it, so they will love it. It requires additional bureaucracy in governments around the world and at the UN also so bureaucracy will love it too. It requires a whole range of infrastructure and manufacturing projects that will add to industry generally, so they will love it too. It is plain, straightforward action that obviously solves overfishing completely so the greenies will love it too. I think you will be very hard pushed to find someone who is not going to: Love it too.

The main thing that everybody needs to understand here is that this is just a discussion paper. The document that will be produced after this gets onto the global agenda deals with so much more: The different regulations in the various jurisdictions, implementation problems in places like Somalia (yes it will be implemented in such places), Africa generally, issues in the region from the Bay of Bengal to the Philippine and Arafura Seas, and all the other close quarters regions. It deals with what we do in the event of massive environmental or manmade catastrophes, and it deals with a dozen other major issues that have not been dealt with in this discussion paper.

To those who've been looking into H3, including the books and the other discussion papers, or even if this is your first stop, are we having fun yet???????

Addendum – Stewardship Process

The whole point of the FISCIL exercise is to place a permanent direct link between making hundreds of billions of dollars and an improving environment; the more we clean the oceans and fill it back up with fish, the more money the five newly created FISCIL corporations will make. It is genuinely that simple. The stewardship process for the entire global saltwater fishery is part of the financial model for the Global Fishing Industry moving forward, and without it all we would be creating is five corporations that would tread water as it slowly crept up their neck and then over their heads as the oceans were decimated. As I think I say in one of my books, “this time, let the first thing we do be the smart thing to do”.

Now remember that this is a whole of planet solution, so when you see some of these details don't “freak out” at what you perceive the cost or scale will be. The FISCIL process will add over \$400 billion in value to the Global Fishing Industry and will make it self-sustaining heading into the future from here (you CANNOT say the self-sustaining thing about it at the moment). The three year upfront cost to deliver this (**that fishing corporations don't need to pay for**) is less than \$80 billion, and the annual cost to sustain it after that will be less than \$20 billion per year and probably somewhere in the vicinity of \$5 billion to \$10 billion per year; and all of it is part of the financial model that will deliver this massive financial windfall to the Global Fishing Industry.

The bottom line on this stewardship process is that we'll have intensive use of somewhere between 1.5% and 2% of the world's oceans (about five million square kilometres+-), that also happens to be mostly positive for the regions we'll use, AND for the oceans at large; and we'll leave the other 98% to do whatever it's going to do with a rather massive boost to help it along the way (an addition that will dramatically increase carbon absorption in the oceans). With the exception of cetaceans and pinnipeds, and probably sharks too, the oceans will absolutely recover to what they were two hundred years ago within twenty years; BELIEVE IT. It'll take pinnipeds about one hundred and cetaceans about two hundred or three hundred years to recover to that extent. I don't think anybody can make a guess of any worth about sharks. Oh yes, a final comment to make before we get into it is that the intensive use areas are open ocean environments, with only about one-one-hundredth of the area used being

coastal waters. You already have the short version of this in the Climate Change discussion paper, so let's go with something a little more detailed in here. There are four parts to it and then an explanation of where they fit in the process:

PART ONE

is the seeding of massive free floating kelp forests in highly specific deep ocean regions. We're not talking about *Sargassum* or *Ogo* here, we're talking about (possibly hybridised) *Macrocystis* and *Nereocystis*. We may look to cross them with some free floating species, or other unexpectedly useful species if needs be so that it may take more easily to its open ocean role. It may not be necessary as they do not receive their nutrients from being anchored to the ocean floor. We have more options than these.

The way we'd create these forests is to place about one hundred spores (probably already formed seeds) spread across a platform (mat/"roll-up"/veggie sheet) that will provide them with the initial nutrients to get them going, and these platforms will always be placed in areas where there is significant upwelling of cool water and nutrients so they can grow. The platforms will have buoyancy sufficient to keep them floating near or just below the surface until their pneumatocysts have developed, the platforms will be made of natural elements that are edible, and they'll completely breakdown into microscopic bits inside one month.

The more of these forests we create the more sources we will have to collect spores, so it will be a self-sustaining process (self-sustaining in terms of available resources), and we'll take care to store the spores/seeds properly so as to not kill them. We'll need to have a process in place to collect as many of the spores from as many of the forests as is practical. I have a clever idea or two about how we can manage this process, but it's hardly something I'll need to worry about as we'll have good people on the job who will understand the extent of the resources at their disposal; they will come up with plenty of good ideas without me.

After we've done the initial testing and we identify the hundreds of locations for these forests, we'll eeny-meeny-miny-mo a location in each of the five regions and take about four or five massive container shiploads of these one square metre platforms out to each location (four or five ships all at once and probably five fleets), and because the seeds will be imbedded into the platforms, we can just fling them out the

back one by one and leave them to do their work. They'll be sent out one at a time (not just dumped in a big clump), but about one hundred or more will be ejected out the back every few seconds, probably using an array of conveyors. We'll have the container ship set up to do some of this mechanically because each ship will do about twenty of these jobs every year (+-), and there will be at least three fleets, maybe even five as stated above. We're not going to go overboard on the mechanisation, and the more people we have involved in a process like this, the more people we have out there moving forward who have that sense of satisfaction and character or psychological development from having directly contributed to fixing one of our biggest problems; an oft underrated part of any large beneficial process.

Obviously we'll end up dialling it back after a couple of years if it works better than expected, and if it is working less well then we keep going at the current rate and look for ways to improve it. The 'veggie sheet' would probably be the best option, but we may need to do it a more natural way, and if we do then we'll just roll with the punches and do it.

Now it is entirely possible that we'll have some time on our hands with these ships leading up to the first forest-seedings, so it's probably not the worst idea to rig these ships in such a way so that they can do a couple of garbage runs; if this can be done simply then we'll do it.

Now I say container ships because that is a closer approximation of their function, but we'll probably be converting oil tankers for this purpose, and we'll be choosing ships that will be most easily converted over to new technology as it becomes available (technology mentioned in the Eden book; these ships will not run on fossil fuels).

PART TWO

is to identify the best practice examples of aquaculture (environmentally speaking), develop the model further, and allocate licences to many existing fishing operations around the world to replace some of their wild catch operations with aquaculture operations; again, only the absolute best practice operations will be duplicated WITH improvements.

Because the FISCIL process is essentially grabbing a hold of the entire global saltwater fishery with the vast majority of seafood being pushed through the FISCIL markets, they will have some latitude to "suggest" guidelines for environmental best practice, and because the companies impacted will not

be impacted financially and will own part of one or more of the FISCIL corporations, we're not talking about tyrants imposing their will on the plebs; it'll be a massive multinational corporate co-operative, if you can manage to get your head around such a term. We're going to introduce new technology that will do the flushing part of aquaculture operations more efficiently, we'll be using many recent developments, and we'll be pushing up specific lines of research inside a massive new marine research operation called ORCA, which will grow inside the H3 operation over the next few years. We WILL have best practice, with ongoing improvements.

PART THREE:

About a dozen massive (suitable) oceanic areas are to be "cordoned-off" and "cultivated" to their limit in order to provide the bulk of the global seafood supply. I'm talking about ramping up fish habitats in the region to their maximum, constant seeding with nutrients, adding significantly to the oxygenation of the waters, adding masses of different fish species' fry and fingerlings to the "cordoned-off" areas as if they were fish farms (almost certainly raised in the coastal areas in these regions), and even all the way to artificial current creation where it is required. We will even engage financially (in one way or another) with all relevant stakeholders of input rivers to allow quasi-management of waters running into our "cordoned off" areas.

The "cordoned off" part of it is something that has inverted commas for a reason in that they won't actually be cordoned off as we understand the term, so they won't be enclosures. It will be an array or system of elements that will come together to keep the vast majority of fish we raise in each area inside or within a certain range of the designated areas. It starts with those things mentioned in the previous paragraph, which will include the addition of kelp forests in these areas as well, the fish habitats are also likely to include technology called D-SAT that you can find in the Eden book (it was originally the main element in this stewardship process until it was replaced with these four elements in October 2020), and we're going to second into service all of these soon-to-be redundant offshore drilling platforms; there's quite a few of them out there. Those of you who are aware of the bigger H3 Climate Change picture would know that we're about to wean ourselves off fossil fuels, and these offshore platforms will be amongst the first

infrastructure to be retired (the owners will be keen for it to be so); we're going to put them to work. We'll investigate some very high tech options for this cordoning off process, but we won't go overboard on this part of it in the early stages. I wouldn't go as far as to say that this cordoning off process will be an easy process, but we already know how to do it and we just need to put it all together.

What we lose "out the sides" of these cordoned off areas will move on to contribute to returning the oceans to their former selves, which of course will help the bigger picture in the financial model for the FISCIL corporations.

Now we can't just plonk these cordoned off areas in the middle of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans, and fortunately there are some obvious choices. The final list may look a little different, but this should be pretty close to the money:

1. We start with the biggest and most obvious one: Essentially all of Southeast Asia; starting in the South Andaman Sea and incorporating the Gulf of Thailand, Java Sea, Banda Sea, Celebes Sea, Sulu Sea, and probably including the South China Sea as well.
2. Gulf of Carpentaria and Arafura Sea, Australia and Papua New Guinea.
3. Bass Strait, Australia.
4. Mozambique Channel, Mozambique and Madagascar.
5. The Mediterranean from Gibraltar to landfall in the east.
6. The Black Sea is essentially lifeless below the photic layer so oxygenating this big body of water will have an interesting impact.
7. The Baltic Sea.
8. The North Sea.
9. The Caribbean Sea enclosed by Yucatan and Cuba and the chain of islands in the east.
10. The Gulf of Mexico. With the end of fossil fuels this comes in as an option.
11. Gulf of California, Mexico.
12. Sea of Okhotsk, Russia.
13. Northern Sea of Japan from the southern tip of Sakhalin Island up to the Strait of Tartary.
14. Argentina, approximately 100,000-150,000 sq km between Argentina and the Falklands.

Now obviously, those who are in the know on such things will look at some of these choices and say something to the effect

of, “have you any idea just how much cleanup is required for half of these options”. So obviously I’ve just answered that question/statement; it’ll all be part of the process. Some of them will require additional intervention, and that’s where other parts of the H3 Agenda come in.

There are a few obvious additional options such as the various bodies of water surrounding the Arabian Peninsula, but these seem a little more problematic than the options listed above.

PART FOUR

is to leave the other 98% of the world’s oceans to recover with the assistance they will be getting from part one, the kelp forests. This is not about letting it recover so that we can just use it as we have over the last century again. THIS global stewardship plan is what we do from this time onwards, and 98% of the world’s oceans will be viewed by FISCIL corporations as a place to go to fill in any supply gap caused by any number of problems that could occur; so something to use sparingly, a “break glass in case of emergency” only resource.

THE INITIAL PROCEDURE

Those are the four elements, and the basic idea of how they fit together in the global stewardship plan is this:

1. We implement parts one, two and three all at roughly the same time as we continue to source seafood according to how we’ve been doing it for the last decade.
2. Part three (cordoned off areas) is established and left to grow for three or four years. This is obviously not practical for a few of the areas, especially Southeast Asia, so we’ll need a management plan for those four years in those areas.
3. As more of part two comes online (new best practice+ aquaculture) we start to source a little less from the oceans.
4. About three or four years after we have established part three we switch all of our wild catch sourcing from the oceans to these “cordoned off” regions, which will have grown large enough to be self-sustaining, and we leave the other 98% of the world’s oceans to recover with the assistance of the kelp forests.
5. About three or four years after this is done we could reduce the amount of fish we take out of the cordoned off

areas by about twenty percent and open the rest of the oceans back up for limited catches to make up the total. It is of course possible, and probably even likely, that we'll have such a well oiled machine running that the fishing companies will want to just keep sourcing from the "cordoned off" regions as much as possible, and the 98% will be largely left alone.

6. The cordoned off areas will be able to supply quite a bit more than what is required at this point, and with the ongoing march of increasing population for the time being, that's just as well.
7. If we need to source more food because the lifestyle of two billion poor is noticeably raised over the next ten years, then we have the ability to fill part of this need from out of FISCIL corporations. Raising lifestyle of the poor is one of THE key planks to controlling population growth, WITHOUT ever needing to tell people that they can't have children, so it's probably something we should move to fairly soon, don't you think????

That's how we do it, and with a little reminder of some of the additional upside for the fishing companies mentioned in an earlier section. I think it's easy to see that there is a lot of additional work involved in this process, and that it is work the fishermen will be best placed to undertake; so in other words employment in the industry, which has been on a downtrend for decades, is going to go the other way for a little while.

This will return the oceans back to what they were centuries ago AND carbon absorption by the oceans will go through the roof. Let's get to it.

Well that section was fun wasn't it???? I do enjoy giving out some of the finer details of the H3 operation.

Sean Gallacher
Brisbane, Australia
0424 529 885
abc@h3hq.org
www.h3hq.org