

UK Fisheries Improvements Channel Scallop FIP Steering Group

Tuesday 19th June 2018, 14:00- 17:00
Conference call (Marine Stewardship Council offices)

Welcome Introductions & Apologies

Attendees:

Bryce Stewart (BS)	York University
Cristina Mangano (CM)	Bangor University/York University
Nathan de Rozarieux (NdR)	Falfish
Gus Caslake (GC)	Seafish
Femke de Boer (FdB)	SWFPA
Juliette Hatchman (JH)	Macduff
Ewen Bell (EB)	Cefas
Colin Trundle (CT)	Cornwall IFCA
Adam Green (AG)	Lyons
Ruth Hoban (RHob)	New England Seafood
Claire Pescod (CP)	MSC
Chloe North (CN)	MSC
Rhiannon Holden (RHol)	MSC
Adam Townley (AT)	New England Seafood
Roi Martinez (RM)	Cefas
Hubert Gieschen (HG)	MMO

Apologies:

Jim Portus	SWFPO
Kathryn Nelson	Sussex IFCA
Sarah Pilgrim- Morrison	Macduff
Helen Hunter & Bill Badger	Defra
Estelle Brennan	Lyons
Hannah Macintyre	M&S
Cassie Leisk	New England Seafood
Ally Dingwall	Sainsburys
Mike Kaiser	Bangor
Sarah Clark	Devon & Severn IFCA
Mark Webber	Oceanfish
Jessica Inkster	Falfish
Joe Prosho	Morrisons

Introduction

CN welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the meeting will present the results from the annual progress review and BMT which TH has conducted, this meeting marks the first year of implementation of the action plans. The actions plans have become working documents which have been adapted and changed every meeting. The meeting will refresh the issues, what has been done and next steps for Y2 of the FIP, as well as indicating whether the action plans are behind/ahead or on-target. The channel scallop FIP looks at 11 actions, which are broadly on track and making improvements. The communication of the reviews will be discussed at the end, such as how the group might want to show the delivery of key actions to demonstrate the work being done with PUKFI.

TH gave a short overview of the presentation, saying that the FIP is mid-way through Y2, looking at a single unit of assessment and the fishery is broadly on track. One Performance Indicator (PI) was expected to change status (PI 2.4.1 – habitat status), however this hasn't changed- otherwise everything else is on track, but there is more pressure on year 2 as 8 PIs are expected to change within the next 6 months. By year 4 all PIs should go green.

BS voiced the opinion that expecting PI 2.4.1 to change to above 80 after year 1 was unrealistic, as it is hard to increase the PI for habitat while the stock boundaries are still being decided in Principle 1. The habitats PI is partly dependent on stock extent. Limits- distribution, one of the reasons stock status is low is poor information and this is the same with habitats. TH said it was premature to expect that it would change considerably.

CN said that yes, the PI has started behind schedule- but should be back on track and milestones should be adapted to better reflect what will happen in action 7.

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 1 – stock assessment

An introduction to the PI was given by TH saying that the SICG have been working with Cefas on the stock assessment, and have been giving updates to this group sharing of work planning of studies of exportation rates and exploitable biomass. The PI is therefore on target. CN said that the workstream has been acting in parallel.

EB gave an update presentation on the delivery of the stock assessment. He exclaimed that the work is currently being finalised and agreed with partners, with the final publication awaiting DEFRA's consent, this should be published soon. EB then went into detail about the study, saying that this has been collaborative across the board with involvement by DEFRA, CEFAS and industry, who have been extremely proactive in the activity.

EB said that the steering board will help to guide areas, whereby the channel has been split into 5 areas with 4 covered there is no coverage in 27.7d SOUTH where this is covered by French sampling and this stock boundary area will hopefully get better clarification on the ICES working group. The VMS data has been acquired to define the main bed which requires sampling through a random stratified sampling approach. Catch rates are converted to fisher-able biomass through a gear efficiency co-efficient. Videos on commercial boats will show any other conflict with other fisheries.

The final assessment process was indicated by EB saying that the absolute biomass from abundance in the dredge survey multiplied by the total area in the beds. Harvest rate= ratio of landings/biomass. Biological samples- length, age samples, age profile will be looked at against MSY to see if the fishery is acting at that rate to understand the stock and fishery status. Determine the number of areas, that require better management. The hydrodynamics with the larval contributions from the Bay de seine, look at holistically and work with French counterparts to achieve full stock assessment. Engagement-work is being conducted and scientific consultation with the steering board, SICG, with the process constantly evolving. This will also span to ICES and north-west waters ACC, sub-group, science and administrators in order to move things forward.

EB said that the work will be assessing the units separately, with distinct differences in biology and how the fishery will decide management. There are some different management measures across the various areas, so it is up to policy and industry to determine how we best go-forward. The work is sensitive to differences in biology with the sharing of larvae, so more data is required to understand how much exchange is going on.

TH then outlined that the Y2 in the action plan involves the development of stock units and for the work to go out to consultation. EB anticipated that the results will be displayed on DEFRA website this year in 2018. CP asked EB whether the work conducted by C. Szostek has fed into the stock assessment, this involved looking at the connectivity of sub-stocks studying genetic differences across the channel. EB said that there is not much explicit genetic difference across the channel but the timescale for genetic change is large so this may underpin how you manage the fishery. EB indicated that there is also another large-scale French study currently being undertaken.

TH said that the PI is at a sub-60 level but on target, there was a question about whether the FIP could feed into the this stock assessment work and CP asked TH whether there are any gaps in terms of the MSC PIs? TH also explained that this work will also be relevant to action 2 & 3.

JH said that it would be useful to have a critical pathway analysis for the action plans and FIPs to understand which actions feed into each other, **Action for TH to create a critical pathway analysis and/or gantt chart** to provide clarity to steering group on the dependencies of different actions. TH said that in year 2 to be on-track there needs to be proposals for stock management.

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 2 & 3 – Harvest Strategy and Harvest Control Rules

TH gave an outline of the principles falling into the actions and annual reviews. It was indicated that a strategy development of formal harvest control rules will have to be proactive and responsive to stock. An example was provided by TH saying that if the stock drops to certain level, then a quota should be introduced. These actions are dependent on the stock assessment work in action 1 in order to look holistically at stock units and areas. TH then went on to indicate what the actions require; firstly, an approach to a management plan and consideration of appropriate harvest strategies with by the end of this year it needs to be agreed for the unit of assessment. It was discussed whether action 3 should be delayed to year 3 and agree then.

JH said that according to the timelines of the SICG work to be realistic the action plan milestone should be adjusted to reflect action 3- should address this. TH answered that at least some proposal for harvest

strategy should be agreed in Y2. JH indicated that the UK scallop review is currently underway with regional components and the stock assessment is expanded to cover the Celtic sea and Irish sea.

JH mentioned that PUKFI Stage 2 Scallop project- which will provide an action plan for remaining UK fisheries and lead to a better knowledge in English waters. Combined with the expected outputs SICG, span UK scallop group. Marine Scotland has conducted something similar whereby the SICG needs the fishery to be considered at UK level different administrations giving Poseidon 14-16 weeks.

JH said that the commonality between the two projects will provide the industry with management future arrangements, with 8 core areas 1 areas fisheries management regimes asking industry what works, the regional differences in administration and post Brexit management, as well as the Technical measures under the EU effort regime and the ways this can be improved after the EU. JH outlined what will the consultation phase will consist of and anticipated that the final sign off will be in September, from then it will be decided whether the current focus is sufficient or whether additional focus is required to achieve MSC certification and what could meet the MSC standard.

JH then went on to say that September/Autumn the SICG will have the review to provide better information of the stocks, produce action plan and look at what is required to improve remaining fisheries, as well as what the harvest strategy could look like. There will be a regional dimension but want to consider on a UK basis.

TH said that the actions are on-target in review. CN asked the Steering group about representation and the development of a management sub-group. JH exclaimed that it would be relevant to have someone with technical expertise, some industry and would like to invite BS, MK whereby the industry would like to come up with a proposal and then consult with DEFRA and CEFAS to potentially tap into their technical expertise. CN said whether a regional channel sub-group might be more useful. JH indicated that all the same players, just one sub-group for UK. JH said that it would be good to have discussion off-line about how other FIPS have managed this. SICG, administrations – do sit on the group, sub-group will report back to wider group. **Action JH to develop a management plan sub-group & liaise with CN about what has been done in other FIPS**

TH indicated the balance in discussion whereby proposals need to be balanced and rational to understand views of regulators and viable options, first level.

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 4 - Information for stock assessment

TH indicated that these actions are the last of Principle 1 looking at the status of stock, whereby there is a need for gathering additional stock information to understand whether there was any gaps. CEFAS held discussions at the beginning of the year, which requires further discussion at meeting.

EB said that the landings data was well covered by standard report published by the MMO with effort data-however it would be useful to have the measure of the area of swept by data speed and time of fishing, although the days fished is used as a proxy for the effort gap in effort matrix. The review looked at the VMS data and the link with catch records, some 25% of landings cannot be matched with VMS day. This could potentially be due to the mislabelling or identification of the wrong rectangle where was

fished. EB suggested that some education for the fishing industry may be required to ensure that log books are filled in effectively.

Sampling landings on size and age, surveying activities going well- how is surveying going, biological information more. By in large- no major gaps in data we need, no time-series data, hard to regenerate that. JH proposed whether larval connectivity would be relevant and is the group making the assumption that un-dredged areas are spilling over? EB exclaimed that more work on that area would be required to better define stock management units. TH said that there are minor gaps in the terms of understanding effort, misreporting of catch, inshore fishing. Asking the group if there is anything which FIP can do to address these?

EB answered that when looking at the logbook data against VMS, that it might have possibly been filled in incorrectly i.e. wrong rectangle. An educational workshop could fit in here- whether this is to come from the FIP or MMO is the question? This was opened up to the group. HG commented that he would have to come back to this therefore an **Action was taken for the MMO to look into whether there is any current work on address the problem people mistakenly filling the wrong rectangle in their logbooks, and therefore the landings data mis-matching with the VMS data.**

EB replied saying that if this comes from the MMO then it may look like an enforcement issue, is was then stipulated about the best way for the industry to take this on-board. If 25% of landings from vessels which had VMS could not be matched then accurate spatial management cannot be developed, therefore improving the collection of this information is vital. TH laboured that the fact that there is a 25% error sends up a red flag, he said that if this could be reduced and why this is happening needs to be explored- if workshops could provide a vehicle for this, electronic logbooks were then suggested. EB made the point that fishers still filling this in by hand and then updated, paper logbooks are 24hr -day by day, link to VMS. EB said that this gap will be presented to SICG and discussed there, and can be revisited on an annual basis. **Action for EB to write up figures and take to SICG, this information will be fed back to the next FIP meeting.**

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 5 – Primary & Secondary species information

TH outlined what is required under this PI and action, this involves the capture of non-target species whereby primary has sub management & secondary species is unmanaged. There is a requirement to look at information. In year 1 it was described that CEFAS conducted an analysis and it was found that 7d had some gaps whereby it was suggested that a more intensive bycatch recording programme would be recommended. TH highlighted that since CEFAS recommended this, there has been no designing or resourcing of an observer programme. Therefore, it is behind in terms of action plans but on target for BMT, TH indicated that there is a need to take CEFAS recommendations forward.

CN confirmed that the group will start to contract the work required and questioned how could the group fill the data gap in 7d, run-down of data issue and the options that might be worth considering?

EB answered that the current way fisheries are targeted is through an observer programme. It was stressed that 3 samples are collected from English vessels per quarter, could be area 4 and channel and

into the Irish sea. Most of the English boat scallop fishery are from 7e that's where samples come from. It was indicated that there is no current agreement between Scottish boats and observer coverage. Therefore, the group would need marine Scotland agreement. EB then indicated that CEFAS- do not have finances to go beyond 12 trips per year, need to double resourcing available. Most occur in 7e, that where English boats are.

CN asked whether this a target for just 7d or whether its 12 trips across both areas? EB said that to look at statistics in 7e, track by year there is a need to have this data. Obvious differences in bycatch and data, too noisy beyond. At least initial 3 per quarter. JH informed the group about the 3-month closure and 7d, whereby the fishery opens in October. Therefore, the group said that the observer coverage could leave the 3rd quarter. JH asked ideally how many trips are required and Has this been included in report?

EB answered that more than is done currently, the cefas observer programme is running at less than 0.5% of trips sampled, would want to be more than that. Variance is huge, absolute minimum to get useful data. CN specified that in terms of MSC standard it is recommended that fisheries achieve a 5% observer coverage ideally- but this varies on the fishery and size. TH agreed that in order to bring the score up, perhaps the group could aim to get it at 1%. He asked how practical is this? Or would 0.75 be more feasible and get variance down to a reasonable degree of consistency.

CN confirmed that an EMFF application may be required to cover these costs and there would need to be more focus on increasing the pool to include Scottish vessels. JH said that the group needs to address the political issue with marine Scotland. BS highlighted that CM's project is aiming to increase the amount of bycatch data, with cameras, above the sampling of 0.5% of fleet and a little more bycatch data. These cameras have been used previously on pot boats but not on scallops, so there is a hope to increase the data available.

BB explained that he will speak to Helen (Defra) tomorrow who is meeting with Marine Scotland and will ask her if she is happy to bring it up with them whether it is possible for Scottish vessels to participate in draw list-agreement, to gather more data from vessels in 7d. This was explained by EB that this would naturally pull up frequency of sampling at the expense of the sampling rate in 7e. Therefore, in order to maintain the current sampling rate in 7e, we would require additional resources for these two separate parts. **This was taken as an Action for BB to speak to HH and start the process to try to get Scottish vessels included on the list of observer vessels.** And It was also agreed by the steering group to change the year 2 milestone.

JH informed the group that there has been resistance in the past, she said that she would speak to people in group and part of initiative like this and put on list some vessels which refuse to be on list. CP asked for clarification on that, whether the inclusion of whether people take observers on board, still achieving 12 trips, sampling other vessels. Means that small pool, more likely go somewhere else. JH explained that there is a single target for all scalloping. UK, information on other fisheries, North Sea- 2 samples for whole time series. CP said then this work would have a benefit on all areas to enhance.

EB indicated that Marine Scotland's agreement to put Scottish vessels on the list may be down to observers, would they be interested in carrying observers. Boats are only included on the draw list which will take observers. Good leads through SICGs and this group approach vessel units. JH said that

the Stage 2 project will have many commonalities and benefit both projects. CN clarified that the action lead will be taken by CEFAS, whereby BB will talk to Helen and feed back to group.

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 6 – Endangered, Threatened & Protected species

TH gave introduction to the action whereby it is looking at status, management and information. Take Holden's management recommendations and industry should ground proof these with practical management approaches to address issues. Therefore, the next step requires a review by industry, in the form for example awareness building or enforcement measures in place? CN presented RH slides on the top priority ETP species of 5 rays and displayed the bycatch data by the side, and management suggestions for discussion.

The group discussed the potential of what has been done as part of the SFSAG cod ETP strategy and whether information could be drawn from this document and adapted for scallops. FdB was identified as the action lead to look at analysis, how this could be combined with best practice guidelines to deliver a basis that someone from the SWFPA could look at. FdB agreed that she would be happy to check with colleagues to see what has been done before and understand what Jen moet is doing with the scallop fleet. **Therefore, Action has been taken for FdB to look at the SFSAG ETP strategy that they developed for cod, and adapt it for the scallop fishery and liaise with other industry members to produce recommendations for how the fishery can increase it's scores on all three ETP PIs.**

CP discussed the potential of gaining input from the Sharks Trust in terms of fisher-led research. We could ask whether they have any recommendations for avoidance and handling.

CP also informed the group that RH's work is currently being peer reviewed by Mike Bell (Heriot-Watt University) with the review expected at the end of this week. **Action RH to send peer review around group with comments.**

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 7 – habitats

TH introduced Action 7, P2.4 consisting of intensity impact analysis on habitats, this was started at beginning of year and commissioned by Bangor, which will include the development of management approaches where necessary. Currently TH indicated that the PI would achieve a conditional pass, however the milestone might need to be revised as it was a bit ambitious. Revision was discussed by the steering group to align with the 2-year doctoral study and question whether to start to produce actionable management considerations within this year or year 3?

BS & CM gave a recap on what they are doing and how it corresponds to the first milestone in the action plan, whereby the study will be collecting data to fill gaps and habitats are present in action. They will be looking to deploy cameras onboard. Jan Higgin will be working on project with CM and will be looking at list of sensitive species and conduct a modelling exercise, prepare actions. Advise, database- list of sensitive species, their occurrence and impact. And some OSPAR and vulnerable marine species, deploy camera with fisherman support. Jim and Simon Pengally from the southern IFCA have been involved, CM in the process of building the last 4 with 6 to be deployed. CM will be starting with interviews- have in mind some modelling exercise and year 2 milestone and check whether there any specific milestone.

BS explained that in terms of the milestones, till the end of the project. Y2 information gathering exercise and next year in terms of project they will be modelling of various management approaches which requires more information of habitats and how to best mitigate at the end of the project.

CP asked TH whether scores were planned to go up and if the PIs are on-track? TH indicated that the steering group would need to move the milestone, moved to the end of year 3- March 2020. With the work due to be finished at the end of year 3, alongside with EMFF funding and those milestones due to change. BS commented that he felt that would be more reasonable.

CN took an Action to change wording of the milestones: Y1-2 habitat mapping second year of FIP, this was identified as being behind target, not a reflection of CMs work, just EMFF funding change that. Year 2 -3 management, Year 3: implementation of pilot projects. TH said that the group would need to consider update action plan, update review- and two documentations. CP commented that it might be better to revise milestones on an annual basis considering adapting fisheries progress is in the same timelines, feedback group. TH recommended that he did not want the FIPs to slide, it is robust as long as the timescale is respected, it needs to show- that it is within that. CP reaffirmed that the FIP needs to set manageable targets.

CP asked CM whether there is anything the MSC can help with in terms of give outs on PUKFI or a set of talking points or a quick webinar how we talk about fisheries progress. CM answered that some communication content would be really useful to have more information about the project. **CP took an Action to send CM some information on the project for when she is introducing PUKFI to fishermen, and organise a meeting with CM to share PUKFI talking points.**

BS mentioned that they have brochures about the cameras available and all camera about work. The brochures also give advice about which weather conditions, colour- it will be with the camera when they deploy. Social media! There was **an Action taken for all to promote this work through comms channels and for CM to share leaflet with group.**

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 8 – Ecosystem

TH outlined this action about conducting a SICA analysis which uses an expert group to go through a series of steps and identify ecosystems which might be impacted. The SICA workshop took place last April and results for that were confirmed. CN indicated that the action lead needs to be defied at the end of year. The next year milestone for Y2 is to conduct SICA analysis expected- so this PI is ahead of schedule. At the moment, CEFAS will be analysing these outputs and finalising results- with further recommend management provided. CN commented that the group should decide on action lead following that and explained that the SICA is a risk based framework and considers industry and Scientific expertise.

RM then gave a presentation indicating that the study aimed to score impact for the scallop fishery on the ecosystem, this involved compiling a score scale intensity and assess temporal and intensity of fishery- brought together literature and associated benthic and demersal communities., as well as Industry input to inform scoring input. RM indicated that the level of impact is determined by SICA result scoring. Main habitat coarse sediment distribution and Temporal intensity analysis. RM agreed that days at sea corresponds to real log-book data with effort displayed by quarter of the year. Area ratio-fishing

effort aggregated in grid- swept area- determine the frequency. Considering exclusivity. Smaller vessels, 28% swept by footprint. RM went on to explain the sediment type overlap- with distribution of sediments and that the UOA- will cross quite a few ecosystems, deeper- eastern part below 50m depth, seabed with not be affected by stress- in the west more stratified mixing and coarser-final distributions reflect. Include oceanographic parameters- slope not significant in the channel. RM indicated that the end score will be put into the report, the SICA outputs combine both a spatial/temporal value to reach score of 80- UoA, have to be agreed and calculated.

TH explained that the MSC has a scoring template for the SICA, and questioned RM whether the most vulnerable sub-components and trophic size structure have been taken into account. RM indicated that the consequence analysis part has been done by Gladys. It was discussed at the SICA workshop and reflect in the report making a summary Table. **Action for TH to send scoring template to RM.** CP outlined the draft report and the year 2 action. BS described the overlap with CM's work, which will inform the consequence analysis, BS commented that benthic communities are lacking, where the vulnerable marine species and what communities are in various area, BS indicated that this will inform the SICA in due course. CN made a **standing Action to revisit the SICA with new information following habitat research completion.** TH agreed, and explained that CEFAS' approach of ecosystems gone down habitat approach dependent on how do you define ecosystem? Broad vs narrow and varying Substrate types. TH commented that in parallel with BS and CM work the SICA, most vulnerable ecosystems & trophic levels would benefit from CM's research and RM review SICA in due course. CN clarified that results on that should be in the correct format and have longer discussions on that in final milestones.

Action updates, Principle 3, Action 9 & 10 & 11

Action 9

TH talked of management jurisdictions allocated and agreed and indicated that this will be looked at when action 1 has been completed and stock boundaries are out to consultation. It requires a consultation with regards to year 2 & different UK administrations, Brexit and France, inshore and offshore. TH clarified that the group needs to have stock boundaries agreed to start thinking about allocations. JH asked whether this milestone should be amended to reflect this in Year 2/3, therefore an **Action** was to change the action plan.

CP asked the group whether we are doing everything to achieve 9/10/11, under action 3, in terms of responsibilities, Defra sent document.

TH indicated that the SICG by September needs someone to start thinking about this and taking it on. Already in planning, enough to revisit in sept. / October- stock limits and suggestions fine. This should be added to the agenda. We have arrived at point and pre-cursor, topic of conversation. Action for CN to change leads to DEFRA, CEFAS and SICG.

Action 10: fishery specific management plan

TH indicated that this action is a useful framework for a fishery from an auditor's perspective, tick off so many P3. Surveillance plan of who the stakeholders are? Short term and long-term, new information evolves. Action plan developed over year 3, but initiated in Year 2. TH looked at SICG considering at a UK level, makes a lot of sense, for level UK, but management plan has regional components. Not necessarily linked which might be developing at different rates, and channel may be more advanced?

TH talked about the action from last time and distribute a management plan – get one contents prepared, bring together results from actions ETP strategies and all sorts. CN talked about whether we need to have a lead on behalf of the FIP. Stipulating whether a management plan should be adopted by the fishery at UK level, ongoing plan beyond the FIP.

JH asked for clarifications about whether this would involve effectively bringing all relevant information together, is there an argument for fisheries administrations part of this and whether they can lead? TH responded that the work required would be exactly that, and gave an example from Canada that they produced reoccurring plan created by fisheries administration. A plan should recognise the UK leave, promoted towards ICES and forward thinking for EU.

CN and CP spoke about that all actions, need Y2/Y3, proceed with this unless they have resources, which would benefit them, take the lead on that. UK wide plan could involve regional components further down line and provide a good Model. **Action for CP to update Marine Scotland on the project, discussing UK-wide management plan.**

CP deliberated whether to have a group of people to talk to Bill, Juliette, Tim what would he need from us And DEFRA take that on board.

Action 11:

The steering group decided that it could be discuss later, doesn't start till Year 3.

Summary of Meeting Actions

CN will send a table of the actions. There were no comments on the minutes so they were signed off.

AOB & date of next meeting

CN talked about discussing the Steering groups recommended action about Labour issues, 12- put this action plan, not published doesn't need to be agreed today- how do we capture labour issues- MSC agreements, requirements? Highlighted- in scope requirements, not scored but if you are out of scope. CN talked about MSC guidance that ' Client group should not include prosecuted entity, withdrawn from client group- conviction, whole fishery' CN passed it to the group whether the recommendation: note to review or remind? More about labour in standard, ensure unit of assessment remains within scope of MSC.

CN clarified that this was put in the action plan after a request of industry, monteray bay picked up by times, and scallop fleet back at last meeting. Small minority tainting industry. Wanted to show that this wasn't an issue. Included the MSC wording, could be changed from recommendation to review. Anyone prosecuted should be removed from FIP?

BS agreed that this should absolutely be in the action plan and to review this annually, it's great that its in there, more as a note. CN noted to keep wording the same for now and talk about more in next

meeting. Not picked up as specific PI, circulate to Juliette and Jim. Of what will be included. Only FIP which has added anything away from PI. TH concluded that a UK management plan should incorporate this and is included. Work will feed back anything additional.

CP gave summary of the annual review results and noted that it was fantastic to see that all actions are on-track happy as a FIP, purely only an issue over securing EMFF funding. Press release to pull out specific issues, anything which will be particularly useful for those on-line and short summary, include BMT and have these available? And have these on the website, direct people to. NR said that from a funding point of view its better not to overdo expectations and was content as we are. CP commented that at the last FIP steering group meeting it would be useful to circulate lines which people can tweet.

Date of next meeting:

CP said that CN will be moving on from MSC, Pukfi s1 manager- recruiting advert out soon, PUKFI S1- on behalf of group- missed at next meeting, looking at October/November time, best to send out doodle poll- stage 2 meetings. Not to clash with events.

Thanks for all joining.

Summary of meeting actions:

Number	Lead	Action	Linked to action plan	Timescale	Progress
1	TH	to create a critical pathway analysis and/or gantt chart	N/A		
2	JH	to develop a management plan sub-group & liaise with CN about what has been done in other FIPS	Actions 2, 3, 9 & 10		
3	HG	to look into whether there is any current work on address the problem people mistakenly filling the wrong rectangle in their logbooks, and therefore the landings data mismatching with the VMS data.	Action 1		
4	EB	to write up the figures on the mismatch between area reported for landings, and VMS plots; and take this information to the SICG.	Action 1		
5	BB	to speak to HH and start the process to try to get Scottish vessels included on the list of observer vessels.	Action 5 – primary & secondary species information	ASAP	
6	FdB	to look at the SFSAG ETP strategy that they developed for cod, and adapt it for the scallop fishery and liaise with other industry members to produce	Action 6 - ETP	Next meeting	

		recommendations for how the fishery can increase it's scores on all three ETP PIs.			
7	RH	to send ETP thesis peer review around group with comments.	Action 6 - ETP		
8	CN	took an Action to change wording of the habitats milestones	Action 7 - habitats		
9	CP	to send CM some information on the project for when she is introducing PUKFI to fishermen, and organise a meeting with CM to share PUKFI talking points.	Action 7 - habitats		
10	All & CM	to promote this work through comms channels and for CM to share leaflet with group.	Action 7 - habitats		
11	TH	to send the SICA scoring template to RM	Action 8 - ecosystems		
12	Group	to revisit the SICA with new information following habitat research completion			
13	CP	to update Marine Scotland on the project, discussing UK-wide management plan.			