

Project UK Stage One: Channel Scallops (Facilitated by the MSC)

Wednesday 19th February 2020, 10.30 – 15:30
MSC, 1 Snow Hill, London, EC1A 2DH

Attending:

AB: Andrew Brown	Macduff
AD: Ally Dingwall	Sainbury's
AL: Andy Lawler	Cefas
AT: Adam Townley	NESI
BS: Bryce Stewart	York University
FB: Femke de Boer	SWFPA
FN: Fiona Nimmo	Poseidon
GC: Gus Caslake	Seafish
HG: Hubert Gieschen	MMO
JH: Jan Hiddink	Bangor University
JM: Jenny Murray	Defra
JP: Jo Pollett	MSC
KK: Katie Keay	MSC
LP: Lauren Parkhouse	Devon&Severn IFCA
MS: Matt Spencer	MSC
ND: Nathan de Rozarieux	Falfish
SN: Steve Newstead	Bangor University

Dial-in:

CP: Claire Pescod	Macduff
TR: Theresa Redding	Natural England

Apologies:

Chloe Smith	Southern IFCA
Estelle Brennan	Labeyrie
Ewen Bell	Cefas
Iain Spear	Coombe Fisheries
Kathryn Nelson	Sussex IFCA
Jim Portus	SWFPO
Robyn Cloake	Labeyrie

Observers:

Anthony Alvin	MSC
Hirmen Syofyanto	MSC

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss progress on the Stage 1 Action Plan for scallops; to discuss the updates to governance and branding; and to develop a work plan for the year ahead. No feedback was received on the previous meeting minutes from 5 September 2019 so they will be uploaded to Fishery Progress. These minutes are recorded in the order the actions were discussed in the meeting.

KK chaired the meeting and opened it by telling the group that two MSC staff from Indonesia, who work on fishery improvement projects there, were in MSC's London office today. They wished to observe the afternoon session to see how Project UK steering group meetings were run and KK asked if there were any objections to this. There were none so Anthony Alvin and Hirmen Syofyanto joined the group after lunch as observers. KK also noted that FN has replaced Tim Huntington as the Poseidon consultant on the Channel Scallop FIP in order to harmonise work with the Stage 2 Scallop FIP.

Action 1: Stock Status

FN confirmed that the Year 1, 2 and 3 milestones are complete based on the Cefas stock assessment and CCTV studies that defined the stock areas. The Year 4 milestone is for stock areas to be incorporated into management planning. When Poseidon conducts the annual review in April 2020, PI 1.1.1 will likely score SG80 as the stock is highly likely to be at or around MSY, but they will try to break down the score into each of the separate stock units. FB believed that industry funded surveys are expected to continue for the foreseeable future, but she will confirm this at the next SICG meeting.

AL confirmed that the next Cefas stock assessments will be available on 1st April and that Cefas had received no information that disagreed with the stock areas allocations. AL had received some Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) information showing fishing intensity from France but this is sensitive information and is for scientific use only. This data confirmed that stock assessment areas were comprehensive. The group noted that this sort of data is difficult to acquire, and the publicly available

data from the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) had not been updated since 2016. Although other sources of data exist, permission is required to use it.

AL offered to check whether the French data could be anonymised and used by the group confidentially. He also stated that the Eastern Channel is sampled by Ifremer (the French Research Institute for Exploitation of the Sea) and not Cefas. That data is publicly available. AL was uncertain whether the French thought the stock was at MSY, but said that the French were reporting very high catches at the moment and that the stock appears to be doing well. ND noted that this was good news as it may have been an issue trying to rebuild a shared stock.

There is currently a knowledge gap in the stock assessment data around the distribution of scallop larvae and their interactions across dredged and undredged areas. AL read out the draft terms of reference for this work and offered to circulate it to the secretariat. FN said that from an MSC perspective it might not be necessary to conduct this work within the duration of the FIP, but it may need to be addressed as a condition for certification depending on the scoring for SG80 or SG100. The work would be expected to cost £55-60,000 inclusive of VAT and take a few months to complete - it would be entirely desk based but would take a lot of computer processing power. GC noted though that all this work may not drastically alter the scoring; and if that is the case the group might be better saving the money for research in other areas.

AL believed this work could help understand what level of connectivity there is and to further define stock boundaries. FB stated that this work is a priority for industry and has been discussed by the SICG project steering board. Cefas would be interested in tendering for the work and the group discussed who would be able to independently review and judges the tender. FN suggested it would make sense for it to be members of the Steering Group minus those who are tendering. BS said he would be happy to be a part of the process. The FIP would need to work closely with the SICG on this work and include them in the tendering process. There is an SICG meeting next month (March 2020) so it would be useful to have something ready by then.

BS asked whether the group knew if there were plans in place for a strategy on Harvest Control Rules (HCRs), and if so, would it be catch or effort control. Defra is working with industry to develop this strategy and the new Fisheries Bill refers to species specific management plans. This aligns well with the approach the FIP is taking so far. Defra is trying to work out what to deliver in the short and long-term, but priorities have not yet been decided so it would be difficult to give a timescale on the work. Work undertaken by SICG and other industry groups is being considered, along with fishery management plants (FMPs) like the ones being developed by Project UK. Defra is reviewing documents and will speak with the Devolved Administrations (DA) and industry to identify priorities. BS pointed out that scallops are the third most valuable fishery in the UK, and the most valuable to England. JM agreed with this and noted that shellfish are increasingly a priority for Defra.

Actions:

- **FB to check that industry led surveys will continue and inform the Secretariat**
- **AL to check on usage of anonymised French data to share with the steering group**
- **FN to get stock assessment data from Iframer for the Steering Group**
- **Secretariat to develop ToR and a review group for the larval distribution tender**
- **Secretariat to contact SICG to ascertain appetite to fund and/or lead on larval distribution work before next SICG meeting**
- **AL to send Ewen's larval ToR to secretariat**

Action 6: Endangered, threatened and protected (ETP) species

FB updated the group on the feedback from her mitigation strategy. Firstly, the confusion around '4.3%' by weight or by total number came directly from Rhiannon Holden's report, where it states that

bycatch per individual is counted. Secondly, around the use of the term 'rare', the MSC standard defines rare as meaning less than 5% of individuals caught.

FN felt that just using the number of individuals doesn't provide a lot of data. GC thought that this figure represented ETP species being 4.3% of total bycatch, not the total catch (i.e. GC implied this figure is 4.3% of the 5% bycatch) even by weight, if the weight of scallops is included the bycatch weight would be miniscule. JH thought the fishery should demonstrate absolute number of individuals as it matters about how many ETP species you catch, not ETP as a percentage, and questioned whether, for example, a percentage of catch be appropriate for common skate. The MSC requires that the direct effects of the UoA are not likely to hinder recovery of ETP species.

GC questioned the definition of ETP species as some of them have quota, and FN suggested the group should review their ETP list as it was drafted in 2017 and may need updating in light of new legislation. The work by Rhiannon Holden and FB covered ETP but it would be good to utilise other data sources – such as Cefas data – to address primary and secondary species as well. GC mentioned work in the Isle of Man (IoM) where there was an approximate interaction with ETP species of 1.37 animals per tow, however they didn't weigh anything so only have data on number of individuals. The same work could be done in the Channel, where there should already be a record of total catch and ETP species. Weight data could then be inferred from length data, which would provide the length-weight relationship.

GC recommended revisiting Rhiannon Holden's report to ascertain where her information came from before asking for the observer data again. AL agreed to follow up with Cefas for the observer data: he thought the MSC preferred biomass data rather than estimates of biomass from length-based frequencies, but a lot of Cefas sampling is length based. FN thought that other fisheries are likely to have done similar calculations as it is logical and cost effective. FN agreed to review the ETP species list and check for any new species to be added. TR mentioned she thought there were discussions being had over English Priority Marine Features and that she would try and find out more.

JH asked if there was information other than observer data that could be utilized to ensure that all available data sources had been considered. Observer data may be the only source quantifying what is being taken by commercial gear but organisms such as sea fans will likely not be recorded despite the possibility of interactions. It is interesting the ETP list includes species such as thornback ray as there are plenty of them and are commercially exploited. This is probably as a result of it being on the IUCN list. BS stated that in IoM there was an interaction of only six bycatch individuals per tow for eight dredges; which equates to a very low interaction between gear and ETP species. Most of these were cuckoo rays and in the six years of study there has been very little interaction with ETP species.

For fish and elasmobranchs, the group believed the incidence is low but for invertebrates more work needs to be done. AL agreed to look into whether Cefas observer data covered invertebrates as they may not show up on survey data. The Action Plan mentions pilot projects but ETP interaction is so low that there wasn't a need to put actions in place. Claire Szostec did quite a lot of work in the Channel in 2017, which Rhiannon Holden's work had incorporated.

Management of species would need to focus on SACs and protected areas, of which there are many in the in-shore area: about 40% of Devon's waters are closed off to protect marine features and incorporate buffer areas. FN asked if it would be possible to get a list of marine protected area (MPA) and special areas of conservation (SAC) areas along with the qualifying factors, which LP offered to do for Devon and would ask the other IFCA's to do the same for their districts. JNCC may also be able to provide useful information on this.

Industry already have skate and ray ID guides designed in collaboration with the Shark Trust but identifying can be tricky as even the MMO can struggle to distinguish species at times. ND felt that if the fishery meets SG80 already we should focus on other actions rather than spending resources on this to achieve SG100.

AL explained that stock surveys monitor bycatch to a degree, but it varied so as not to compromise the main purpose of being on the vessel. FN stressed the importance of any extra information from TR on protected species in English waters. Having a document stating what management is already present in the area would contribute to the scoring of this PI.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to ascertain where Rhiannon Holden's ETP information came from**
- **AL to provide observer data for bycatch and ETP species; and check whether observer data covers invertebrates**
- **FN to review the ETP list and recirculate with the group**
- **TR to find out more about PMF introduction to English waters**
- **LP to collate a list of protected areas and the qualifying factors in Devon and to ask other IFCA's to do the same**
- **Secretariat to ask JNCC to collate a list of protected areas and qualifying factors for the Channel**
- **FB to work with FN to clarify what the 4.3% figure represents**

Action 5: Primary/Secondary Species Information

GC confirmed that observer data and Data Collection Framework (DCF) data are linked and centrally funded but thought DCF data was in number of individuals and not tonnage. The Cefas database includes both number of individuals as well as length frequencies. JH reiterated the need to be certain as to what type of data is available. FN suggested the observer data could also be used to understand information on the species and weights of any bycatch in this fishery.

GC stated that numbers are probably more important than weight, as the group needs to understand what the primary and species are and whether to treat them as main or minor. FN said that the MSC standard asks for the likelihood of any bycatch species greater than 5% of weight of catch, so weight is the methodology we need to apply. ND mentioned bycatch rules may have changed due to the Landing Obligation (L.O). GC explained that under the L.O you must land all quota species, which takes precedent over the 5% rule, and he then went on to state that scallop fishermen are landing a bit of sole at the moment.

FN suggested that there is an opportunity to use the data already available, with funding to support the conversion of data to weights, rather than conducting a bespoke survey. BS referred to a Cefas paper from 2007 that looked at discarding in the Channel, and all the data is put into weights, indicating that this methodology could be used again. It will be important to include the data from Scottish vessels, and Cefas can request the data from Marine Scotland, who already report their catch by weight.

FN believed there should be enough previous data available for this action, as SG80 stipulates only that *some* quantitative data is available. There is also landings data available and with L.O being in place all quota species should be in the data, except for skates and rays due to their high survivability. Working out the catch profile is something Cefas could do with funding and could then be provided for assessment.

ND mentioned that Jim Portus keeps information for his members so the group could talk to him rather than go through the MMO for data. ND thought Jim would be happy sending it, but the data would need to be anonymised. Depending on the data, the group may need to consider reviewing alternative measures relating to catch of non-target species, and this would align with the work being undertaken by the Project UK Stage 2 Scallop FIP. ND questioned what the alternative measures are for, as the bycatch was not unwanted as species such as sole will be utilised.

BS mentioned that York University have work on organisms other than fish and elasmobranchs as bycatch, and that Bangor University will probably have some too. In the Irish Sea and English Channel, areas that have been dredged for decades have led to sensitive communities being damaged with only the more resilient species able to remain. GC thought that if the group is looking at these species by weight e.g. starfish, then they will not be near the 2% or 5% threshold, but their actual numbers could be huge. BS mentioned that bycatch from scallop dredging can include tiny individuals so where is the line drawn on what to include in the assessment. FN clarified that there was no limit to minor species but the MSC definition just asks for *some* quantitative information. SG100 would be looking for comprehensive quantitative information, so anything less is likely to be listed as *some* quantitative information.

Actions:

- **AL to check what vessels and where Cefas observer data is coming from for scallop fishery in the Channel, including Scottish vessels**
- **AL to share Marine Scotland contact with FN**
- **Secretariat to find data source Rhiannon Holden was using for her work, and then check with AL for any updates to the data**
- **BS to share Claire Szostec and Rachel Brown's work on bycatch in scallop fisheries**
- **AL to investigate what would be involved in converting length data to weight, and how much it would cost to fund**
- **Secretariat to speak to Jim Portus regarding access to member data on discards/bycatch to understand percentage of species in the catch**

Action 7 & 8: Habitats and Ecosystems

SN will complete his Post Doc in March, so he presented his results to the group. The first part of his work involved predicting suitable habitat to support sensitive species by utilising a Maxent Model to provide information on habitat suitability rather than species distribution. To ascertain this information, he used presence data from open data bases as well as environmental variable data. Any results above a score of 0.5 indicated suitable relative benthic habitat with the resolution of the data squares approximately 5km².

The initial results showed that longer-lived species had greater sensitivity to the impacts of scallop dredging with linear declines being seen in some species. SN also showed that there was a community aspect to the results as well; and that if a community is made-up of longer-lived species then it will, in theory, be more sensitive to the effects of dredging.

SN identified 68 sensitive species found in the UoA, with low records for some of them, making it hard to predict distribution. Longevity was also difficult to ascertain for many of the marine invertebrates and, as such, 29 of these species were taken forward for the model. This reflects a good range of species, from the pink sea fan (which has a 50 year life expectancy) to the Arctic quahog (a 500 year life expectancy). SN talked through some of the early model results using Arctic quahog as an example. As it is very long-lived with a lot of fishing in its area of distribution it had a low Relative Benthic Status (RBS) score. This pattern can be seen in many of the examples. RBS scores 1 = all population remaining and 0 = complete depletion.

The RBS scores and habitat map were put together to give 39 different habitats, providing a score per habitat per species. The majority of the scores shown by SN are well into the 90s – good scores with only one that scored below 80 (deep circalittoral fine sediment). SN suggested that from this data it is highly likely that it will pass MSC assessment for PI 2.4.1. In summary, Areas 7d and 7e do not seem to be suffering too much from scallop dredging but there are localised areas at high risk to the impact of scallop dredging, with some species impacted more than others due to potential distribution.

The next step in the research is to work out the recovery rate for each of these habitats to return to an undisturbed baseline, which SN estimated would have to have an RBS score above 0.8. All scores came back above 0.8 except for one. The MSC standard stipulates a recovery rate of 5-20 years for habitat to have recovered, but this would only apply to habitats that score below 0.8 to begin with, which makes recommendations for next steps difficult. Possible recommendations include the use of move-on rules from sensitive areas, although this would be difficult for species with wide-ranging distribution. SN recommended reducing fishing in areas with high Species At Risk (SAR) scores.

SN has deployed cameras on vessels with help from Macduff and Coombe Fisheries but has not yet collected the data from these. If he cannot get to the vessels in person then CP suggested asking the skippers to post the memory cards to him for analysis. Unfortunately, not a lot of fishing has been taking place due to the number of storms this winter, but SD hoped there would be enough data to analyse. There is a comprehensive memorandum of understanding in place that limits review of the footage to SD and his team, and it is too late to use computers to analyse the footage instead. SN did illuminate to the group that Julia Wouters from Aberdeen University had been working on this topic of automated analysis, something AL said he would follow up with.

SN stated that this work only focussed on commonly encountered habitats, but if there was a list MPA due to the presence of vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) then an assessment could be done quickly. However, if the effort is greater than 20% of the area then there could be an issue. BS wondered whether had been done previously by a Bangor University Post-Doc student before on VMEs.

Given the negative media on dredging, a good communications plan will be needed if the Steering Group chooses to publish this report. Locally dredging can be intense but the impacts are offset by the large areas of habitat not being dredged. The secretariat can help with this.

The group discussed the resolution of the Cefas data and the possibility that it implies a greater fishing footprint than the reality due to the time-gap in VMS 'ping' data, which was also an issue when the Cefas Scale Intensity Consequence Analysis (SICA) was undertaken. GC suggested looking at the data further, as it's unlikely that the number of vessels in the Channel have the capacity for the level of intensity depicted in the study. JH felt it looked plausible but SN could review the ICES reports, VMS assumptions and towing times.

The report only includes VMS data from the over 12m fleet, and SN suggested that the VMS report underpinning the study indicated that including the <12m vessels would have little effect on the work. Devon and Severn IFCA had installed iVMS on all vessels >6.99m with a resolution of every 10 minutes, but the resultant data had to be accessed from MMO through a Data protection Act request. The English iVMS process has paused while MMO revisits business and technological requirements with stakeholders, with a proof of concept due for completion in February 2020. It would be good to understand how many scallop dredgers don't have VMS in the Channel, and how this information might alter the results of the Post Doc study.

If the group can pull together a VME map then it should take about a week to add this assessment into the final report as they won't need to run any new models, just incorporate it into their workings. FN said she would look for a VME map for SN. SN plans to deliver the written report for the FIP and then see if the research would qualify for a journal publication, which will need good communications support from Project UK and Bangor University.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to support communicating the message of the report publicly**
- **CP to ask the fishermen to post their SD cards to SN**
- **SN and JH to review VMS assumptions and ICES reports to confirm the number of vessels in the channel and their level of intensity**
- **SN to find out how many <12m vessels are active in the Channel**

- **FN to locate or draft a VME map for SN and JH to incorporate into their habitat work**
- **SN to share the presentation with the group**
- **SN to follow up with Seafish for data on vessels and where they are fishing**

Actions 2 and 3: Harvest Strategy and Harvest Control Rules

This action is currently behind target, but as the Scallop Industry Consultation Group (SICG) has been tackling several of the actions in the timeline in one go, the FIP should still be on target by the end of the project. AB updated the group on the progress the SICG have been making with their management proposals to Defra. Members of the SICG recognised that something needed to be done to ensure scallop stocks are healthy and that restrictions are likely to occur in the fishery. Industry are testing solutions with Defra but not quite at a stage of co-management. Defra had asked the industry a series of specific questions and challenges. These revealed conflict between various segments of the scallop industry but, critically, allowed SICG to reach enough areas of agreement to put forward a coherent approach that covered two potential types of intervention: fleet measures and management measures.

Fleet measures are mechanisms to prevent further growth of effort, where there has already been a large rise in effort for 10-15m vessels. When the price for shellfish is high, vessels move into the scallop sector, as it is an open fishery, and when the price drops they leave the fishery again and target other species. Currently the price of scallops is high and management is insufficient. The fishery needs to be restricted, and regulations need to apply to all vessel sizes (>15m, 10-15m and <10m).

Currently, >15m vessels adhere to the Western Water Regime and must have shellfish permits, 10-15m vessels only need permits and <10m vessels are free to fish when they want. The SICG has proposed a freeze on permits (not a deletion of permits), as well as a cap on effort for all vessel sizes. The advantage of this is that there is minimal disruption for existing fishermen, with no reduction in fishing effort. These fleet measures are essential to be able to implement successful management measures.

Management measures are a mechanism for reducing fishing effort, and may include catch controls, harmonisation of technical measures such as dredge limitations, closed areas and closed seasons. Most successful shellfish fisheries tend to be catch controlled rather than effort controlled. The SICG understands the need to be inclusive of all industry sectors and recognised that smaller vessels have shown concern in moving to a catch-based system. It will be imperative that any management measures address the potential for displacement within the fishery.

SICG put these options to the Devolved Administrations (DA), including Defra, and are awaiting an official a response. AB was pleased to see in the Fisheries Bill to commitment to co-management and FMPs and stated that the SICG model was attractive to other shellfish – crab, whelk and lobster. The SICG would like to see the earliest possible implementation of fleet measures, a wider discussion on management measures, their development and timetable for implementation, and consultation and collaboration between wider UK Fishing Associations (UKFAs).

JM confirmed that Defra had received the proposals from SICG but had been delayed in responding due to the election and Brexit. Defra has conducted an initial review of the proposals and is now going through responding to the various proposals for more detail for clarification. There wasn't anything being proposed that seemed completely unfeasible. The FMP approach outlined in the Fisheries Bill aligns well with what SICG is doing, and the next steps will be for Defra to finish reviewing proposals and set up a meeting with the DAs. Then they will prioritise management measures that could be implemented in the short term.

GC asked whether the SICG had spoken about how their proposals would sit with other nations that fish for scallop. AB explained that there was a parallel process going on with the French but, due to

Brexit, it was hard to say how much progress had been made. As scallops are a shared stock in the Channel, there is an obligation to manage them sustainably along with the French. Much of this action is out of the Steering Group's control, and the concern with Brexit is that the UK may no longer have access to French waters so it is important to get this right. Macduff and SWFPA are still willing to sit on a joint French/UK working group, but it would be good to have Jim Portus and a retailer participate too.

The larval distribution work will be important in relation to this action as it could help understand how the scallop stock in the Bay de Seine might be connected to the Eastern Channel. BS stated he had a paper from France that might be of use to the group. HG thought the French might have a stronger part in UK scallop management than we think, and that the complexities in the Channel may be exacerbated by Brexit. Currently the Western Waters Regime is being continued with 3.3million kilowatt days for the UK fleet until it is replaced by a new management regime.

FN presented the graphs in the Action Plan and explained the use of a replacement MSY in the situation this FIP finds itself in – with poor information. The replacement MSY was referred to as HRMSY by FN. Poseidon produced the graphs based on only three years of data available, but the problem at moment is that there aren't trigger levels defined or the HCRs to implement. AL explained that the latest survey will always have provisional harvest rate estimates which are retrospectively updated when data becomes available 12 months later. This will always be the case due to the type of surveying. MSY estimate is a proxy, based on 35% spawning per recruit. Cefas used a length-based Cohort Model as the fisheries weren't in equilibrium. JH said that in Wales the length-based analysis performs worse than age-based. Cefas is moving to an age-structured approach but do not currently have a series of data for this.

FN asked if the group were happy to use HRMSY going forward as currently there is no Blim, fMSY, Btrig. AL confirmed that when Cefas has more data they will review reference points, but at the moment will continue to use HRMSY.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to ask AD and Jim Portus whether they would like to join the UK/France scallop FIP group**
- **BS to share his French paper on scallop connectivity in the Channel**
- **FN to contact Julian Addison for a review of the P1 actions and progress**

Actions 9 & 10: Consultation/ Fishery specific objectives/ Decision making

CP is currently working on the FMP which will be circulate once more detail has been added, and after the SICG have a response from Defra on their management proposals. Hopefully this can be done before the annual review as the Defra response is expected at the start of March.

Action: CP to circulate draft FMP ahead of the scoring for the annual review

Action 11: Monitoring and Evaluation

This action is complete unless the Steering Group wanted additional external review. The MSC standard would accept an external review from another department within an organisation, a peer organisation or an independent external reviewer. The Poseidon review commissioned by the SICG constitutes an external review. Project UK's Stage 2 scallop Steering Group is looking to get some ICES WG input, so Stage 1 could also be included as there will be a large amount of overlap.

Action: Secretariat to investigate having the ICES WG to review FMP once complete

AOB

KK announced that the ToR had been finalised with input from the group, but concerns around voting arose from a member in the Stage 2 FIP, who emphasised that decisions should be made by consensus only, and never get to the stage of needing a vote. There are now two options for the Stage 1 Steering Groups: to keep the agreement resulting from the consultation which includes voting as a last resort where consensus cannot be made, or align with the Stage 2 request to remove the clause on voting (section 1.4 of the draft ToR) to remain consistent throughout Project UK FIPs.

AB felt that if there are different FIPs, each with differing stakeholders, then a consistent approach may not be sensible or necessary, and therefore it is fine to have slightly different ToR for Stages 1 and 2. JH added it is worth having voting in case you have a difficult stakeholder in a group because it might help the actions progress. KK said that the secretariat is asking all Stage 1 groups this question and would update the group on the outcome in March 2020, after all these meetings has taken place.

KK presented the final Project UK logo to the group and explained there will be guidance for use coming soon. If anyone would like to contribute to the guidance, or wants to use the logo in the meantime, then get in contact and the secretariat will give guidance.

Task	Responsibility
Action 1: Stock Status <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FB to check that industry led surveys will continue and inform the Secretariat• AL to check on usage of anonymised French data to share with the steering group• FN to get stock assessment data from Iframer for the Steering Group• Secretariat to develop ToR and a review group for the larval distribution tender• Secretariat to contact SICG to ascertain appetite to fund and/or lead on larval distribution work before next SICG meeting• AL to send Ewen's larval ToR to secretariat	FB AL FN MSC MSC AL
Actions 2 and 3 Harvest Strategy/ Harvest Control Rules <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Secretariat to ask AD and Jim Portus whether they would like to join the UK/France scallop FIP group• BS to share his French paper on scallop connectivity in the Channel• FN to contact Julian Addison for a review of the P1 actions and progress	MSC BS FN
Action 5 Primary/Secondary Species Information <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AL to check what vessels and where Cefas observer data is coming from for scallop fishery in the Channel, including Scottish vessels• AL to share Marine Scotland contact with FN• Secretariat to find data source Rhiannon Holden was using for her work, and then check with AL for any updates to the data• BS to share Claire Szostec and Rachel Brown's work on bycatch in scallop fisheries• AL to investigate what would be involved in converting length data to weight, and how much it would cost to fund• Secretariat to speak to Jim Portus regarding access to member data on discards/bycatch to understand percentage of species in the catch	AL AL MSC BS AL MSC
Action 6 ETP <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Secretariat to ascertain where Rhiannon Holden's ETP information came from• AL to provide observer data for bycatch and ETP species; and check whether observer data covers invertebrates• FN to review the ETP list and recirculate with the group• TR to find out more about PMF introduction to English waters• LP to collate a list of protected areas and the qualifying factors in Devon and to ask other IFCA's to do the same• Secretariat to ask JNCC to collate a list of protected areas and qualifying factors for the Channel	MSC AL FN TR LP MSC

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FB to work with FN to clarify what the 4.3% figure represents 	FB
<p>Action 7 & 8: Habitats and Ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to support communicating the message of the report publicly • CP to ask the fishermen to post their SD cards to SN • SN and JH to review VMS assumptions and ICES reports to confirm the number of vessels in the channel and their level of intensity • SN to find out how many <12m vessels are active in the Channel • FN to locate or draft a VME map for SN and JH to incorporate into their habitat work • SN to share the presentation with the group • SN to follow up with Seafish for data on vessels and where they are fishing 	<p>MSC CP SN, JH</p> <p>SN FN</p> <p>SN SN</p>
<p>Actions 9 & 10 Consultation/ Fishery specific objectives/ Decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP to circulate draft FMP ahead of the scoring for the annual review 	CP
<p>Action 11 Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat to investigate having the ICES WG to review FMP once complete 	MSC