

## UK Fisheries Improvements Channel Scallop FIP Steering Group

Wednesday 23rd November, 10:00- 15:30  
MSC offices, 1-3 Snow Hill, London EC1A 2DH

### Attendees

Adam Townley (AT)	New England Seafood
Ally Dingwall (AD)	Sainsburys
Bryce Stewart (BS)	York
Christina Mangana (CM)	Bangor
Claire Pescod (CP)	MSC (Chair)
Erin Priddle (EP)	MSC
Ewen Bell (EB)	CEFAS
Gus Caslake (GC)	Seafish
Femke de Boer (FdB)	SWFPA
Ian Spear (IS)	Coombe Fisheries
Jim Portus JiP	SWFPO
Jo Pollett (JoP)	MSC
Juliette Hatchman (JH)	MacDuff
Margaux Favert (MF)	MSC
Mike Kaiser (MK)	MSC
Paul Trebilcock (PT)	CFPO
Rhiannon Holden (RH)	MSC (Minutes)
Theresa Redding (TR)	Natural England
Tim Huntington (TH)	Poseidon

### Dial-in

Hubert Gieschen	MMO
Bill Badger	Defra

### French reps @ 2.15:

Manuel Eurard  
Arnuald Mannor  
Manon Joguet

### Welcome & introductions

CP welcomed the group and mentioned that French representatives will be attending the meeting later in the agenda to speak about potential collaboration. CP mentioned that RH had checked in advance with the fishing industry. The action points were run through:

<u>Number</u>	Lead	Action	Linked to action plan	Progress
1	TH	Create a critical pathway analysis and/or gantt chart	N/A	Done

2	JH	Develop a management plan sub-group & liaise with CN about what has been done in other FIPS	Actions 2, 3, 9 & 10	Formed
3	HG	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	Action 1	Nothing found
4	EB	Write up the figures on the mismatch between area reported for landings, and VMS plots; and take this information to the SICG.	Action 1	Mismatch of figures- ongoing
5	BB	Speak to HH and start the process to try to get Scottish vessels included on the list of observer vessels	Action 5	BB email to get Scottish vessels included, no answer yet and is moving and keep on pushing, JH follow up-contact with cefas and didn't see reason why it couldn't happen  Ewen> MSS, wants to be involved, hope to get that resolved, sets a precedent and who is sampling where  JH- no MSS scallop observer programme. lack of data  ACTION to see progress for next meeting
6	FdB	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.	Action 6	Done
7	RH	Send ETP thesis peer review around group with comments	Action 6	Pending review
8	CN	Change wording of the habitats milestones	Action 7	Done

9	CP	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	Done
10	All & CM	Promote this work through comms channels and for CM to share leaflet with group	Action 7	Done
11	TH	Send the SICA scoring template to RM	Action 8	Done
12	Group	Revisit the SICA with new information following habitat research completion	Action 8	
13	CP	Update Marine Scotland on the project, discussing UK-wide management plan		Ongoing

There were no questions on the action points.

## Action 1

CP introduced the action, saying that this consisted of stock status. EB gave update: preliminary stock assessment published in March covering various areas as first step, and most of the fished areas had an assessment. Scallops outside these areas which need to be considered, data collection has been progressing and will be increasing this year so they hope to publish something in the new year. All going well.

EB talked on the methodology: Dredge survey and monitoring landings, with more survey work in the last few weeks on the southern side of 7d and expanding. Industry are very much involved in this process, providing vessels and partnership work and shellfish team were nominated for data award.

JH said that this is an industry part funded project, more than usual- paid levy, paid for dredge vessels and continued to next year.

- **Action for EB to send link when report is live on Gov website, and to inform the group is something additional is needed after this assessment round is complete**

BBS spoke about the ICES scallop working group meeting- report not publicly available yet and will be published soon, presentation on stock assessment work for fisheries around Europe. Common trends can be seen: it suggests there are climatic effects and that globally fisheries are dealing with same challenges; technology use, improved stock assessments and monitoring.

- **Action for BBS to send ICES scallop working group paper to the Steering Group**

CP asked if there is anything here which flagged up a need to identify potential information gaps? TH gave examples and asked whether there are potential gaps which the French could feed in on. TH said we can speak about this later under Action 4.

JH said that there is a gap in knowledge through larval dispersal and ask whether this group can help research and fund this? TH mentioned the Y2 milestone: proposals for stock units put out to consultation.

EB said that it is divided into assessment areas and drawn across ICES rectangle lines, finest resolution which stocks are drawn, nothing definitive no internal agreement. Should be a question to ICES working group. TH agreed that for management purposes this could be put out for consultation. JH asked what else needs to be done in terms of agreeing stock units, we are pretty much there? EB said that in terms of the resolution of data, not huge amount we can do.

TH said this may have an implication for management, understand roughly the stock size and HCRs and shared stock management area, i.e. where the stock is, where they manage, how they manage, and what we can influence. BBS said he presented this to ICES working group, and they all agreed with what was presented to us and based on information we had it was a logical explanation.

JIP said we need to ensure there is consistency in the terminology, management? Stock units? Stock status?

- **Action for TH to update wording around stocks and remove consultation action from Y2 in Action 1**

TH said that in year 2, do we need to have CEFAS feedback, if it's gone to ICES working group now? AD clarified we need to have biologically defined stock units. BBS asked about larval mixing.

EB said the FIP needs to be pragmatic for separate stocks, complexity of stocks and separate management rules- how can we realistically capture dynamics on patch and separation. Number of studies looking at larval distribution and whether they are sufficiently robust to come to a decision.

CP asked what more we can do? Can we get better information, funding to get research on that? TH asked if it undermines HCR rules and scallop stocks? CP said we should wait for publications.

JH said initially larval connectivity in dredged and undredged beds did show data deficiency. EB is in support of broad decisions and not too much mixing between these areas and assessment areas- 7d North and South not huge mixing and boundary seems reasonable. Strong growth differences and restricted mixing across eastern channel and western channel. However there hasn't been a holistic assessment below 50 degree line in French and gap between 49 degree and 50- need to work with French equivalents and on doing assessment there.

JP asked whether the FIP covers the whole EEZ or just fisheries in UK EEZ unless we bring in French. It was answered by the group that it includes the boats in this room and vessels of members- FIP is for UK vessels and stock assessment goes beyond. EB said that we can't do a stock assessment which stops at boundary line

TH clarified that the fishery location says 7e and 7d UoA. CP said this will be in discussion if the group want to enter full assessment. TH said it is worth thinking about and defining.

## Action 2 & 3

JH gave an update on SICG: Currently the management sub-group have commissioned Poseidon to review scallop management and SICG sub group has been set up to produce a UK scallop management plan with primary aim to work on high level framework and regional components including HCR for differentiated UK fisheries. JH confirmed that there are currently 26 industry members on SICG group, who split down into smaller working groups. JH said data is not currently public and is held by Poseidon, however this may be made available to selective experts.

JH said they wanted to base next steps on the Poseidon report. Such as the Crab and Lobster FIP- considering consultants to address the effectiveness of management measures. JH said the SICG group is currently just industry, and they hope to have others and the support role of MSC. SICG are working on a UK scallop management conference in February to expose scallop industry to different approaches globally. Claire will be presenting on Project UK. BBS said that the UK scallop management conference will invite fisheries champions and industry to share ideas.

CP gave example of the management group developed for the crab and lobster FIP, who have additional support by Poseidon to take specific topics offline. JH said that a terms of reference will be developed and the SICG has own objectives.

There was then a discussion by the steering group on stage 2 scallops, about areas of inclusion and who sits on the groups, in addition to how these species were identified: Irish sea, North sea and Scotland. JH said it's great that we are trying to avoid regional management.

TH clarified that a UK wide harvest strategy may end up with different underlying strategies but its useful to look at MSC structure as a starting point with common long term/short term objectives to put into fishery management plan. BB said that this is a vehicle for delivering things but it all depends on national legislative change. This has changed a lot recently and we should help each other to focus on it working on day one when we leave the EU, and then look at scenarios that still work after Brexit. Effort regime? Or other regimes used? What the western waters regime could look like the future?

JH asked if there were opportunities to consider other models and management moving forward, amendments or alternative to western waters? BB clarified that this is the same. JH said in terms of timelines this has not been discussed yet and she will report to SICG and take some guidance from the industry. EP talked about the western waters and alternative management strategy, Defra and MMO open it up to SICG working plan and MSS and fisheries administration.

TH said that April 2020 HCR annual review. Discussion around start date of the FIPs.

## Action 9 & 10

This action is led by the management sub-group, and dependent on SICG.

TH said this is UK wide and must be local elements for the FIP and harvest strategy. JH said stock elements and fleet need to be taken into account. JIP said he is aware of PUKFI 2 and SICG are responsible for queen, a lot of overlap.

- **Action for JiP and JH to feed back at the next meeting and give update on SICG management plan.**

GC mentioned HCRs, look at stock area as unit of assessment and pull out connections to other fishery conditions eg sardine HCR and other fisheries. TH said it is probably worth a harmonisation of stock assessment models, and unit of certification in order to understand what they are and the risk?

JiP clarified that we are aware of French colleagues and aware of what has happened in Bay de Seine- the issue is for Cefas to find out how linked they are biologically and understand differential harvest control rules and joint management. CP said this relates to the session later as an opportunity to work out how FIP could benefit from French input. They are undergoing a pre-assessment and not yet in FIP but there could be benefit for both and working out what could be done together.

#### Action 4

CP introduced the action consisting of stock structure and productivity and how we would go about collecting data. EB said that stock assessment data bulk covered by joint project between SICG and industry, with exception of scallops living in non-dredged areas- this will be looked at with TV underwater. Biggest gap is understanding undredged scallops interacting with those in dredged areas. Larval dispersal coarse resolution, within patches needs to work on more modelling. Hydrographic modelling and spawning times and how they vary each year- a bit of research and may need to find funding to do that.

CP asked whether this could be looked at through a postdoc or research position? EB said that in terms of studentships, a PhD impacts how quickly the research can be complete: 2-3 years. Cefas has potential to do it, or other organisations that can do that sort of thing. Propose to Defra as R&D project and quicker turn around than to put out to universities.

CP said that currently the action is at a conditional pass 60-80 so we should think about how much it would cost as a masters project? BBS said a summer placement York could work full time, and he can help to find someone. TH commented that in terms of the scoring, we know where gaps are, and are almost there but work does have implications on spatial management and harvest strategy.

BBS says that this is critical, unexploited scallops in biomass, huge influence and exploitation rates.

- **Action for EB to produce a proposal (2 pager) for research either conducted by studentship or cefas. EB will provide estimate of costs and timescale of project. To look at larval distribution.**

#### Action 5

This action is being discussed with DEFRA. TH said that proposals have been put forward around what can be done and who was going to do it. Current observer programme focuses on 7d - 12 trips a year. EB said that there are only certain number of trips on English boats, and sampling on observer trips and that occurs. Could we do a one off exercise which is not part of assessment programme. Targets in relation to bycatch and monitoring. Targets for gear type to cover metiers

and small target for observer and bycatch. JP asked whether there was potential to recommend additional data collection?

There was a discussion about Scottish vessels to include more coverage on a sampling list, EB said that would be a separate project and more of a short observer project spanning a year and seeing whether they are represented and do not revamp. GC asked whether this would be a fisher led sampling programme? BBS cameras involved? EB said this would only work measuring commercial species, and MSC requiring biomass estimate and only doing individuals.

➤ **Action EB to send paper to group from CEFAS**

TH said that year 2 should be full data collection, EB said that the group needs to be in agreement with the French to draft proposals and formulate a plan. CP asked whether this data is representative and if the group would be broadly happy with the approach?

➤ **Action for EB to draft plan for sampling and look to get that resourced covering the Y2 milestone- draft out years worth of data collection scope – look at getting it up and running and resourced**

## Action 6

CP introduced the action on ETP management: the SFSAG cod work in addition to input from the industry could help to inform outputs from Rhiannon's masters. FdB gave short summary of the work which she has done between meetings; combining the work from the cod SFSAG certification and Rhiannon's thesis, then discussed with JiP and JH to ground truth management measures (see document for further info.\*)

JH made the point that we need to follow the MSC process and consider holistically if management measures are deemed necessary. We need to establish whether there is an issue with ETP interaction. CP said this is part of the action: to work out the feasibility/effectiveness of proposed management measures, for ray species especially. GC commented that the interaction is so low and 3 species exempt under survivability.

JiP said that the landing obligation changed rules for scallop dredging as the 5% bycatch does not include any TAC species so reworded to remove TAC species as they are now part of the 95% law, and bivalve molluscs and with solitary exemption for skates and rays can continued to be discarded.

➤ **Action for JiP to put together text for Femke to include discard changes in the law for TAC, elasmobranch species and add into FdB report.**

TH hypothetically gave the example of the auditor: precautionary management approach to prevent ETP within fisheries management plan strategy- look at relevant measures, high survival and code of conduct could be largely beneficial to the group. Confidence that strategy will work, follow-up work, prove discard survival and evidence that it is implemented successfully, and fisheries management plan progressed.

GC mentioned trigger points and there was a discussion of trips. Prove the negative that it is not an issue. TH said that it's good to stay precautionary and incorporate this into strategy. Should look at proportionate analysis. JiP remarked that of the skates and UK vessels, amount in low percentage and TAC/quota for species. TH asked if there is a TAC and mortality of these species.

- **Action for FdB, JiP, JH to update FdBs report, determine if there is an issue and whether this could fit into the management plan. JiP to send information to Femke and add tracked changes**
- **Action for FdB to have consultation and add in 5%/95% TAC new species discard laws and understand where they are relevant**
- **Action: next meeting Adam- update on Ruth's work re: ETPs (also feeds into the management plan)**

## Action 7

Mike Kaiser joined discussions and spoke about current P2 tools being developed by the MSC which could assist some of the work which the FIP is doing.

CM then gave habitats presentation (see document\*), forming an integrated spatial approach. She has created a poster with IFCA supported and a simplified message, and IFCA communicated with the industry. Data collection from search data and layer of habitat and monitoring of bird bycatch and interview with fisherman to look at gaps.

1. Vulnerable marine ecosystem- scoping for terminology and search and collect list 32 species and presence absence data later downloaded and grouped and biological traits and grouped
  - a. Completed- mosaics and
  - b. OSPAR/local plan and management of species and NATUR England 2000
2. Local knowledge & interview
  - a. Fisherman interview and initial
  - b. Claire Szostek
  - c. Increase resolution of inshore VMS
  - d. Face to face interviews and phone and 37 people
  - e. Feed into fishery footprint and validate model
  - f. Inshore closures Cm found were pushing vessels offshore
3. Video camera
  - a. Ready to deploy
  - b. Support activity please- macduff

JH said she would you be happy with people filling it in the forms/interviews and sending back

- **Action for CM to send questionnaire to JH for Macduff boats to fill out and respond**
- **Action for CM to send group/TH summary of what work has been done to date in the form of a report. TH to evaluate work. Send data collected and presentation to JP to add to FIP dropbox (with update of presentation for accuracy)**

MK said that having the charts filled in is critical for quality assurance of data. Bangor university developed hydrographic larval modelling, re-coil effect around Lyme bay, and matches and engaging properly. CM added that larval distributions, gyre, climate change and seasonality in spider crab have been looked at. CP mentioned that SEAFISH are often interested in data deficiency work.

TH said that in terms of progress, develop management approaches as it progresses and management recommendations at end of modelling exercise at the end of Y2. Post-doc- Christina is leaving so recruitment is starting now. They hope to have someone in place ASAP. Project



developing evidence and management approaches not part of work, and presented to group to look at possibilities for management options.

JH said that the work done for Bangor university stock assessment project, with skipper and pen to draw on charts can be shared.

- **Action for JH (stuart from SICG) to send CM/Bangor maps data collected for the stock assessment project, defining where they fish**
- **Action for MK to send particle tracking model**
- **Action for TH will update timeline on the action plan, with versions updated.**

## Action 8

Gwladys and Roi presented on the SICA workshop report that included industry reps and MSC helped facilitate. Follows on from the April SICA workshop and analysis to look at Scale/Intensity /Consequence. Gave presentation (see document\*):

Objective:

- Impact on ecosystem as a whole
- Consequence score
- Spatial extent, 1-6... if less than 1

### 1.Characterise habitat

- Classified as coarse sediment... gravel-sands
- VMS & logbook data and defined fishing activity and select what trip targets, landing of scallops, more detail in report and definition on the

Conclusions:

- Most habitat suitable for scallops, activity widespread through area, consistent. No incentive for exploratory tows, estimate 28% would score a 4 in light of missing information/ VMS data 3.
- Intensity scored 3/6
- No sessile organisms taken into account
- Identify sub-components effected
- First impact is the highest impact
- Low resolution on VMS data

Recommendations

- Fishery could score >80
- Further investigation into the activity of non-VMS equipped vessels and investigation
- Finer resolution on habitat data and associated species
- Hard to define which of the subcomponents is most vulnerable
- Continuous research in gear technology improvement could be beneficial
- Management- scientific understanding

CP confirmed that this piece of work has moved on a huge amount following SICA analysis and will be opened up to group. Need to look at analysis of dredging and if there are management issues.

MK remarked that the key issue here is VMS data & improve robustness of scoring and have better quality data. Bangor looked at GPS data vs VMS data isle of man, complicated patterns of fishing and smaller estimate, VMS (2-ping) overall estimate, something to think about. Femke and Jim could implement vessels and tracked plots to analyse and portray fleet activity, swept ratio. Footprint would reduce? Fishery going forward, effort up or down? Inshore vs offshore. MK said year on year, change of footprint could significantly change scoring, so annual audits from CAB throws up problem, but this can be within our control.

GC remarked that in the SICA scoring the resolution to come up with 28% in 3-5km boxes is unrealistic representation of actual footprint. Roi said they could gauge more precise fishing activity in grid cell. Overlap many tracks within the grid cell and VMS data > representing distribution of footprint.

MK suggested that the industry could input to have more accurate representation, higher data levels would be benefit to the industry. BBS said he agreed with MK, better data means better info as we are looking to define fishery into particular areas. What is the impact of the fishery, as they have been dredged for decades, scallop fisheries do have an impact, what is acceptable? Not within VMEs. Fishing areas as opposed to closed areas. Inshore data: biological interactions tend to be here, so we need to understand whether this is really important. 5-year mesh data from Devon and Severn data. IVMS on all vessels. Devon and Severn pilot study and access to data.

TR remarked that there is uncertainty with data, which needs to be accommodated within the scoring.

➤ **ACTION for TR to get data from Devon and Severn IFCA on IVMS, and east of England trials**

MK remarked that VMS data is state of art, regarded as good quality data, however, one can go further in CAB scoring and view of the uncertainty of precautionary of scoring. Does not prevent fishery client going above and beyond eg 1 minute and analyse. Use to inform and footprint and state of the sea.

JiP mentioned the Gear in Gear out initiative, which does not require you to increase polling rate, more intelligent and choice on analysis and speed range. Have info on VMS plot, multiply certainty. JiP said this is essential for towed gear technology.

MK said that the intent of P3 is to have a coherent management plan and strategy to mitigate against ecological impact, and it has to be credible. Define robust mechanism for what is being looked at and decision-making mechanism. BBS gave example of the off Yorkshire coast, scallop fishing and no other gear there, trials by IFCA. Not going to suit everywhere and potential and flexibility is key. And being reactive.

JiP mentioned conflict resolution and stock conservation. CP asked to show/reflect what they are about, and no miss interpretation. Take away and look at details and comments- sign off task, 60-80/80 and second part from Mike and can we use this and narrow down these areas. Provide feedback to JoP.

AD commented that exploratory tow contradicts data produced by CM at Bangor.

TH said in terms of general comments, in our interviews fishermen tow familiar grounds unless they move out. Uniform yield does not vary that much and explore that much. Moving up, SICA analysis

moved on lots, worth commenting on. Well represented across different group and well documented and robust in RBF approach. If there is a disagreement of scoring then the more precautionary choice must be made.

PI2.1 more precautionary than RBF and look at most vulnerable ecosystem components as FIP stands. In full assessment, take RBF or not scallop fishery will look at habitats as most. Ramifications in 3 years' time red pre-assessment/ full assessment then do they use RBF? Last for 1 certification cycle, will have to go down full route. Under 80 conditions on RBF outcomes, what condition might be?

- **Action for CEFAS to circulate most recent draft and for group to provide comments on the report.**

MK mentioned the habitat impact tool, linked to scoring 60-80 and VMS layer and comes out with scoring and will be delivered in 12 months' time and useful tool for and investing in industry. What difference would it make to the outcome, worth investment, substantially different, do for a selection of vessels.

## Action 11 & 12

See above

## AOB

Fishery progress up on-line

Date of next meeting March/April

Progress- external parties, and send out doodle poll

## French Industry Update

French delegates joined the room. CP gave overview on where PUKFI is and how it was developed i.e. the prioritisation exercise and project inshore, celebrity chefs, smaller scale species- are those species sustainable. Large scale understanding of data deficiency stocks and drive improvements. Action plan template, BMT, develop a number FIPs, and work towards full assessment. Stage 2 PUKFI whole area, prospective FIP. 18 months into S2. Action plan circulated.

It was noted by the steering group that collaboration is really important and if they decide to do a French FIP it would be beneficial. This is the first meeting to see what could be done and hopefully the start of process and more regular meetings.

Arnauld gave presentation (see document\*), running through the various subject matters as listed below:

From Nord and OPN and NFM engaged,

- Driving force- French market,
- Acoura assessment body, completed March 2018
- Most results similar to UK MSC pre-assessment
- 4 preconditions
- 13 conditions
- Principle 1:
  - 3 pre-conditions/1 condition

- No capture strategy nor HCR
- Structure of stock not defined
- No defined points of reference
- Principle 2
  - See presentation

### **Perspectives and 2 questions for the FIP**

- Reduce assessment to an easier area- bay of seine, better rating
- Engage a French FIP- only if we can work together

### Two questions?

It was said by the group that no scallop FIP will succeed without common work in Eastern Channel.

JiP said Welcome, conversations yesterday at high level group, discussing French proposal for Bay de Seine. NWW high level government considered proposal more than a year ago- all about collaboration and joint management, very welcome and good news on both sides and good prospect for collaboration. Anglo-French FIP working on it. AD commented that certification cannot succeed without collaboration.

CP summarised that all but two PIs are the same for the French pre-assessment, so with an overlapping of scoring, broader management makes sense.

BBS has a question for MSC people, would this be two separate certifications? CP responded that it would be multiple certificates on stocks, and likely that we will keep to separate client groups, whereby French and UK certified. Look at harmonisation, same CABs? Economies of scale and work closely.

MF mentioned the Sardine stock, two certificates, what can be done using MSC fisheries and jersey and lobster fishery and up to the group and clients.

JH asked whether the FIP would score better on P1/P3, if we collaborate? TH explained the trend of certified fisheries with shared stock and combined stocks, start off separately and unit of assessment and stock the same and harmonise.

CP also commented that the French PA is just for the eastern channel. JiP asked whether this could be envisaged that 1 part of the channel moves forward more quickly due to collaboration, in western channel there will never be collaboration with the Bay de Seine area.

Manon clarified this is a different PO, and said that we do have scallopers in the western channel. GC asked how liaison between French and English fisheries would work? Requirement on how we do this? CP said we need to inform and FIP not picked up for western channel. For western side to understand whether there is collaboration and eastern side for the moment. French UK Working group.

JH asked what would happen 18 months down the line, if the French were to set up FIP- 5 year FIP? CP said that we are in consultation with the CAB and other work could be 5 years or FIP start ahead of time. JH expressed concerns that pressure from retailers and if they have to wait additional 18 months that would be a problem. TH said we should continue on current path, collaboration required and at least have observers at both meetings and likewise. Observer system could feed into work.

JH said that working group sounds good and beginning to discuss joint management systems. Manon said we are here to see if collaboration is possible, it's the other way, and start working group together and move to FIP working group. Manuel said same gaps to fill, work together, collaboration is mainly on Principle 1/3.

CP said that we are happy to establish working group and confirm with you after this meeting. Someone from this FIP comes to sit and provide information. MF noted that the exchange knowledge and good practices is critical. Manon said that research projects, pulled all together and results, and collaboration with stock assessment.

There was a then a conversation in the group about difference in gear and European regulations.

➤ **Action for MF/CP/JoP to set up working group with French Reps and decide frequencies**

JiP underlined that there is an established anglo- French channel working group, developed in December in Brussels, specific to scallops. Could this group meet after one of UK FIP meetings and how best to take that forward.

Manon asked how do you foresee working group, who will be involved, science point of view and other sectors and industry. Also need to be more focussed? MF said this would revolve around an agenda and bring extra people. CP commented that a ToR will be developed on the regularity and purpose and key elements. And anything we might have forgotten about. Manon said that 2 people, primary people to speak with.

CP mentioned MSC Facilitation. Manon asked could MSC provide information on what a shared point of view and criteria, examples of MSC certified level and help with and TH can provide info on that. JH asked whether the pre-assessments have both been done by acoura.

➤ **Action for JiP to circulate who is funding the established WG project and sitting in the FIP**

Manuel asked about the purpose of certification. For the retailers, market- UK market, funders and Uk retailers, morrisons and tesco, NESI and coombe fisheries M&S.