**Project UK Fisheries Improvements**

**Crab and Lobster FIP Steering Group**

**(facilitated by the MSC)**

**Tuesday 27th November 2018, 10.00-16:00**

**Jury’s Inn Exeter, Western Way, Exeter EX1 2DB**

## Welcome, Introductions & Apologies

**Attendance List:**

BB- Bill Badger: DEFRA – Dial in

CP- Claire Pescod: MSC (Chair)

GC- Gus Caslake: Seafish

JP- Jo Pollett: MSC

MV- Matthew Voller: MSc student (Plymouth)

RH- Rhiannon Holden: MSC (minutes)

RC- Rod Cappell: Poseidon (Consultant)

RM- Rosslyn McIntyre: Cefas

TR- Theresa Redding: Natural England

SC- Sarah Clark: Devon & Severn IFCA

WH- William Harvey

**Dial in:**

CS- Chloe Smith: Southern IFCA

HG- Hubert Gieschen: MMO

**Apologies:**

Beshlie Poole: South Devon and Channel Shellfishermen

Chrissie Ingle: Devon Biosphere

David Markham: Devon Crab

Estelle Brennan: Lyons

Laky Zervudachi: Direct Seafoods

Mark Webber: Oceanfish

Juliette Hatchman: Macduff

Rachel Irish: MMO

Simon Dixon: MMO

Trevor Bartlett: Devon Crab

CP welcomed everyone, introduced JP (jo.pollett@msc.org) as the main point of contact for the FIPs and thanked RC for joining the meeting while TH could not be there. CP spoke about the amendments of the action plan, versioning and the addition of the annual reviews at the back, which includes the summary of scoring for the fishery. CP noted that the FIP is now is 18 months through the FIP. A refresher was provided for the BMT and its use as a FIP tracker

## Minutes and Action Points

CP said the action points from the minutes were sent out and these were run through:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action #** | **Action task** | **Lead** |  **Progress** |
| Action 1 | Produce proposals for harvest strategies by the end of March, consider industry representation in the meantime. | Management sub-group |  TBC.. in action 1 |
| Action 2 & Action 3 | Produce matrix of varying harvest control rules across IFCAs. Include matrix in Gus’ paper on a review of alternative measures. | GC  | Gus circulated paper with group |
| Action 3 | GC to circulate review including matrix around group before the next meeting for people to feed in. Present final recommendations & plan at meeting. | GC | Matrix to be completed, TH sent template  |
| Action 3 | MV to collaborate with GC to explore the direct comparison of the effectiveness of escape gaps, why in some IFCAs it is mandatory and benefits to fishery | MV and GC |  Spoken with |
| Action 4 | MV to look at pre-assessment for weight of catch/landings. | MV and CN | complete |
| Action 4 | TH get in touch with Crick for pre-assessment, what is the source of the catch results | TH | complete |
| Action 4 | CN to introduce Craig Baldwin and MV, to ensure the correct protocol for data collection is used | CN, CB, MV | No response from craig |
| Action 4 | Reflect MV in action plan, remove South Devon and Channel Shellfishermen | CN, MV |  To be amended |
| Action 5 | Formation of an industry sub-group to review ETP work conducted by CEFAS, this should reflect all different fleets and use Cefas’ recommendations to inform next steps | Beshlie to coordinate | Beshlie produced summary for ETP, will be in touch with industry |

## Action 1 and 2

CP gave overview of the action and progress to date. The management sub-group is the lead to these actions and BB gave introduction to the sort of questions we need to be focussing on i.e.:

* Harvest strategy
* current management measures
* coherent management measures
* Stock and unit of assessment including IFCA and offshore.
* Any lacking information
* Funding for additional work (SEAFISH/MSC to apply for funding & resource work)

BB went through progress to date; had the 1st meeting in June, the main thing was for someone to pull together all the management measures across the IFCAs byelaws and other regulations. While CN was in post she asked for information from the sub-group whereby Hubert (mmo), and some of the IFCAs provided her with information. The next stage requires review and analysis, to establish whether current strategy needs amending, any gaps or more work to produce a coherent strategy.

BB alluded to the fact that TH was most concerned that it needed to be adaptable, therefore if the stock changes, whether this could address this quickly. This is going to be difficult, work required to look at how this could be done and basis of project proposals for consultants to do piece of work. BB stated that it is not a priority for DEFRA at the moment and therefore would require more consultancy support.

CP stated that the ToR has been developed and was put out to tender in june, this involved:

1. Pulling together information collating measures
2. Produce a strategy and work out where the gaps are
3. Reviewing effectiveness of measures

The quote was expensive. It was speculated that the group could look at the detail of the report and remove/make more specific some details. CP said perhaps a start is to see what is available and go from there.

* **Action: JP to speak to sub-group members and provide everything which has been done, what else could be reviewed for the piece of work. Work with sub-group to narrow down proposal and make more specific. Then MEP could start to work with IFCAs and pull together information.**
* **Action: SC collect IFCA data on management strategies and combine with MM) data**
* **Action: HG send Sarah MMO data on all management measure in place (Sarah and Hubert to connect directly)**
* **Action: SC circulate findings in March for Tim to review, and present at next meeting**

RM said the proposal should be developed, thinned down and then data collection can start in terms of harvest control rules. CP said originally GC was to look at funding from the SEAFISH SW panel. GC said the quote from MEP was too high.

SC concluded that this task can’t be too onerous, as GC has already started this. In terms of timeframes and interviews, this information can be discussed and acquitted from management authorities. All the IFCAs can get management measures together and send through to JP (MAX 30 mins work). [MMO and national legislation]

* **Action: for all IFCAs to send SC, IFCA regulations and pull together. With support for GC. SC to lead this and pull together all existing management measures, and to complete by the next meeting. Circulate before next meeting (March) and RC/TH to look over and see if anything is missing.**

CP concluded that this is a useful piece of work and that interviews with the industry could determine whether the management measures would be effective. If the document could provide a summary of all management measures in place, individual control rules and HCRs. This would ensure everything is together, and only what’s missing/effectiveness would be the cost involved for MEP/consultancy. There was a discussion about whether this could be done in house (i.e. FIP).

HG interjected asking for clarification on detail and what sort of data required from the MMO. GC said that he will take this proposal to board meeting as crab and lobster fishery is a priority fishery. However, this work does not warrant 11,000 pounds. In the alternative measures report, the table has every management measure including all 9 ifcas, but could be missing a few, this data came from Cefas report and might need to be updated. RM stated that the Cefas report is updated every other year so the next will be produced in 2019.

RC detailed that the action is critical as it is at a sub-60 score and few other developments, as it is behind schedule and totally agree that the MEC tender is expensive. Some consideration of effectiveness, as we are going through this action and worth asking whether any industry individuals could give an indication on whether they think this is effective enough. May be worth asking this in terms of MLS. MMO western waters regime have presented an analysis on effort control (scallop) and therefore the MMO might have something equivalent for crab. Which will be good to look at performance of fishery. SC stated that the effectiveness of MLS restrictions can only be measured by compliance/prosecution.

* **Action: HG to liaise with Simon Dixon (stats), about MMO western waters regime report for crab about effort control and circulate to group**

SC talked about HCRs, highlighting concerns and the idea of them being adaptable may prove problematic. Example was given for Devon & Severn IFCA, as the only one to adapt byelaws & measures over 3 months. However, for other IFCAs this may 2 years to 18 months. The size of the UoA also is huge, way beyond the IFCA areas. Therefore, working with the MMO is imperative. From the CEFAS document, it shows that the fishery has very good management and we shouldn’t look to penalise one of the best managed fisheries in the UK. We need to involve, where we can, industry in discussions. The IPA limits effort in certain areas & seasons, whereby management measures have already benefited the stocks.

RC responded saying that it is not necessarily about adding measures, just we need to understand that this is joined up and show there is a broad harvest strategy and managed accordingly. All fleets around the UoA need to be understood across the IFCAs and need to be aware of varying IFCA management. The action is not necessarily alluding to the fact that management is going to change, however the group needs to see whether measures are effective, which could include industry input. The management sub-group has been established under the FIP and can respond on the CEFAS report.

CP suggested that a workshop involving the industry, where each sector could feed in, perhaps would help in understanding what measures are needed.

SC again described difficulties in changing byelaws in a timely fashion, whereby they go through a traditional review. Emergency byelaws can also be created and have the ability to change quickly. RC said that this fits in well with scientific information and effort distribution. There was a discussion had around offshore boats taking more stock, and that this is a MMO issue to deal with changes here rather than IFCAs. GC stated that there is an active management of stock area, in terms of KW days. SC asked how the Western Waters regime will change going forward after Brexit.

BB answered that DEFRA are looking at the Western Waters regime now, whereby it is key to transpose from day one. We are ensuring that this will be workable, whether it needs to be replaced and forms a crucial piece of work. Current consultation on white paper, whether this should be changed? HH met with some of you last week, amending for effort, this is in the early days not sure how this will work, vice versa, any changes and working on same objectives. Changing evidence base and putting in control measures.

* **Action: put Bill Badger on agenda for next meeting to update DEFRA work and SC to find update of WWR and send round group**

On a side note CP said that perhaps at the beginnings of the meetings, it might be useful to add a section into the agenda to discuss future work, Brexit related and upcoming announcements. This would be very useful for DEFRA etc. to talk on priorities and input changes. GC mentioned SAGB effort consultations happening currently.

RC and CP said In terms of this action, this has come a long way, however the Y2 milestone needs to be changed to move to Y3 and fit with Brexit deliberations and uncertainty. This is a measure to not pre-empt work already happening within parliament.

* **Action: Action Plan amend milestone from Y2 > Y3, to fit in with Brexit discussions for action 1&2, and update Action Plan to put Sarah Clark as lead. Update version and circulate to group. Add industry consultation to action plan.**
* **Action: JP ensure Tim/Rod identify anything else that needs doing on this action prior to next meeting**
* **Action: SC update on SAGB at next meeting**

CP reminded the steering group that there are only 6 actions for this FIP compared to others, only the sub-80 PIs are being addressed here, from the pre-assessment those PIs are already achieving global best practice.

## Action 3

CP outlined this action, that it was for Gus to produce alternative measure review for the management of primary and secondary species.

GC said that the brief of the action was to improve the scoring review to further reduce bycatch and minimise UoA mortality of the fishery. Outside of the main species; spider crab below 0.5% (minor species), cray fish also a very low volume. The report has been divided by bycatch by gear and management strategy… GC went into the detail of the report in the room, mentioning the following:

* Escape gaps, mesh size, parlour pots
* Gear design to catch retention. Steel bottom/plastic bottom pros and cons, opportunity to escape
* Effort restrictions and tagging
* Real time reporting and avoidance areas
* Management of fisheries
* Table (cefas report) update as part of action 1, overview of area and pot limitations etc.
* Ghost gear and retrieval (most fisherman want this back- £100 per pot, most vessels have access to retrieving gear and recycling these in ports/ harbours have this facility)
* Recording wise, log books two level recordings. Now there is an app (Cornwall ifca), MMO launched digital submission. May help.
* Secondary species. Volumes so low, majority of secondary species.

TR commented that the bycatch levels looked low referring to the Carlton Paper, whereby there was an the percentage of catch was much higher. GC clarified that the figures for the paper come from the pre-assessment, the spider crab is not really a concern in terms of design and not conducive to catch spider crab on new design parlour pots. Usually 12 inch entrance spider fishery dedicated vs brown crab fishery.

MV commented that from the data he has seen and based on dedicated spider crab fishery, 30% spider crab and 30% swimming grab, need to look at gear used. TH got in contact with Crick and said that the figures were from MMO landings and therefore bycatch is not included on the Pre-assessment. It was discussed that the data is from very different data sources.

SC asked for clarification on bycatch, not separating bycatch that lived and died. Survivability is something important to bear in mind. Fisherman will try and catch whatever species there is. MV said that for MSC standard addresses all catch, when looking at crab all others bycatch. In some circumstances, management in place for spider crab and swimming crab, locally as bycatch species.

SC said that for all species bycatch, there is management in place. Remember the survivability of these species. Escape gap in inkwell pots- species can already escape. Measure to close escape gaps in our IFCA all catch velvet crabs. Netting (spider) and potter (crab), bear in mind netting data. Alternative measures that could reduce bycatch. MMO provided funding for old pots, but how do we know these are discarded. Panel degrades? Positive thing going forward?

HG said that he can’t answer the question, more for Rachel to answer locally. GC commented on the scheme, whereby the MMO has said the old pots are removed, however has heard of no experience of that happening.

SC raised the point that restrictions, i.e. closed mobile gear IPA (level effort) end up reaching a saturation level, areas which they work and have worked for decades and certain amount of pots as a limiting factor- Lyme bay, saturation and gear conflict etc. GC provided examples in North Devon and North Cornwall, whereby gear conflict is enormous and is in constant conflict with the French. SC stated that it would be good to map these different areas of conflict, IFCA areas, not fished and in balance. TR asked whether the conflict could be quantified? SC answered that reporting is encouraged in the IPA (meeting on Thursday), looking to log all conflict. CP could this be added into the GC report on alternative measures.

RC said that for this performance indicator, the scoring measures in alt. measures, MSC standard isn’t looking at reducing bycatch where there is species survival. Scoring issue brought in, focus on bycatch, useful to talk about management measures in terms of spatial measures and bycatch species for the whole catch. Some targeted species that get bycatch. Targeted velvet fishery in SW.

SC gave an example that there is a measure to allow escape gaps to be closed for the velvet fishery. MV mentioned Shetland crab fishery, talking to fisherman, interested in increasing MLS, but maximum landing size might be better for older crab as they reproduce more as hen crabs. Possibility whether this could be brought in for both species.

RC said that in terms of bycatch, MSC standard needs to see everything which is caught. If above 5% and 2%, main species overall- over the UOA broad, crustacean then main. What happens to these species are they discarded live or landed. As long as this is considered somewhere within the assessment, good to get data as accurate as possible. Clearly the data for the PA wasn’t sufficient enough for a full-assessment, therefore data will feed into this. South west brown crab MSC certified keep UOA could be a caveat ‘if necessary’ management species primary species. Primary/secondary managed in terms of reference points.

* **Action: JP to make sure Rachel from the MMO is on steering group list and update her on developments**

RC stated if all measures work and do work within reason and are fit for purpose, not insisting that this is applying these things, more about whether they have been considered. GC’s Paper is a great start in looking at actions and how these measures come into play. Distinct, review for assessment process and can be informed in work to understand the effectiveness and this is appropriate in this area etc.

SC expressed concerns stating it is going to be difficult to harmonise measures across jurisdictions and IFCAs. GC said that shellfish returns, and entitlements give a good indication caught by net/pot by MMO, define from data understand how much is caught in each.

CP noted that one of the things discussed in last FIPs was producing an effectiveness matrix included in the alt. measure report. TH has already sent data/template, useful to link up with industry and IFCA to form this and bring in table measures and scoring, how effective etc. same work for P1.

* **Action: GC to use TH template on effectiveness matrix in the alternative measure report and work with the industry on the group to complete. Add special capacity and gear conflicts to the report.**

RC clarified that the effectiveness matrix should provide additional explanation and to take bycatch into account. CP suggested then industry can be brought into the thinking around that and capture effectiveness. SC gave an example on the code of conduct for lyme bay included and limits on the no. of pots, which she will look at and collaborate with CS (southern IFCA).

GC stated that the bycatch extremely low, uptake of quota & MV confirmed that no rays have been caught from data I’ve acquired. CP said at the next meeting, the group will look at two reports, gear database in seafish – overviewing those of 4/5 different designs, all pots required to catch different species. CS exclaimed that there has been escape gaps research produced by a few university students, distributing data and said that she could send round the group or to Jo. CP said that this would be a useful reference. SC said this could be backed up and communicated with fisherman to gauge on-the-ground effectiveness.

* **Action: CS (southern IFCA) to send student research/ link to paper on the effectiveness of escape gaps to the group- timeline (2 weeks).**
* **Action: SC look at Lyme Bay voluntary measures and send to Gus**
* **Action: GC for next meeting review seafish database for effectiveness of different pots and see what is caught in each type (with / without escape gaps) and present the update**

The group spoke about timelines for the milestones in the action plan, CP stated we were on-track and thanked Gus for his great start so far and to update at the next meeting. Where necessary phrase should be added there, review may say that there are already things being done. GC provided rationale that it is good to have a plan in place, in case, bycatch goes to a certain level to ensure that it is reactionary.

## Action 4

CP introduced the action, whereby Matthew Voller has undertaken research for PUKFI as part of his MRes at Plymouth university. MV then gave presentation and discussed research (see presentation), overview as follows:

* Weight based study is difficult to achieve.
* Based on abundance: two species caught are spider crab and swimming crab
* IPA no species over 5%, Lyme bay spider & swimming
* Seasonal variations- 4 species an issue
* Boat level- increase amount of species
* Management laws in place- both in place and depends how you justify it
* Not under scrutiny of full-assessment

GC asked a question about gear definition and parlour pot/inkwell, requiring more complexity- escape gaps, connotations. Entrance size is imperative. Not comparable across datasets, each of the parlour pots are different. SC said the data Mathew is working on, IPA- creel/parlour/inkwell is a huge amount of data. It might not be clear enough to divide data, but perhaps the PhD research could assist in filling these gaps. GC also stated that the data which has been analysed here is 99% from inshore fisheries, a small part of the unit of assessment and therefore needs to keep this in mind.

CP facilitated discussions asking the group whether this action requires more information if the data sets are not comparable, this forms the first part of the conversation. MV stated that this requires a study that investigates this specifically forming a 4-year PhD of different areas. Historical data, data in terms of weight and ensuring that it fits to the MSC standard. It would be a much longer study and looking specifically at the purpose.

RC gave brief run down where we are; the question has been answered by MV on whether it is possible to extrapolate data, so no, and provides a breakdown of landings to reflect whole UOA (full assessment). GC said that big boats are not included in study and requires inclusion to try to identify that all species are considered, requiring better information. MV said there needs to be clarity on timescale from MSC, seasonal period other species not expecting, reducing species bycatch which are found to be over 5%.

RC stated that the MSC is not prescriptive in this regard, gauge a picture & seasonal peaks- look to smooth over in next year and look at annual catch composition and single potting trip- not representative. Some species occur in big numbers, therefore there is some discretion to look at this as main species. Could kick-start process to look at main species.

SC said if we are to gather more data and more research, this could come back with same results & recommendations, need to be sure that the collection of more data would identify any other bycatch. RM agreed that we need to be confident and confirm details in specific survey, include this into the variability of fishing. SC answered that this could cost a fortune to charter vessels in dedicated fishery. GC said that the fishery is very diverse (more inshore than offshore). Over 12s tend to fish beyond the 6, and if effort is brought into the equation the fleet percentage will go down.

RC emphasised following discussions, that there is a big data gap for large vessels and can’t extrapolate across. Looking at the whole UoA, fill gaps with big boats and some observer activity recording bycatch from big boats. GC said it would be useful to break down species considering the diversity with offshore sector. MV gave the example of Lyme Bay, where the escape gaps are closed, and everything is brought up and recorded. GC said it is worth examining the data in the spring/summer dataset, seasonal data & no winter fishery. MV said the Lyme bay data could just be over 3 seasons. CP clarified that the research showed that there was two main species (spring/summer).

RC said that we need to make sure that we know these species are being caught, information and caveats, some information is inshore, and which is not equivalent on offshore. GC highlighted that we need to be clear of what we are looking at, otherwise we can’t make informed decisions. Small part of year, add in link for full analysis of PhD study. SC confirmed that the PhD study is not on the commercial fleet, informing the benefit of the Lyme bay closure, standardised fleet and gear, not real life. Very different data from IPA, proportion of the catch different study. Controlled study, light effort, no effort, heavy effort so on... Need to add caveat and objectives are divergent.

RC injected that when assessing a fishery, we need to understand the differences in data sets & basis for what we are putting together in catch profile and ensure it is significant. IPA ones most applicable to unit of assessment and include other data sets. Would it be possible for CEFAS to check offshore data?

* **Action: SC to circulate data on the vessels, and get in touch with Mike at Holderness Fishing Group as they have their own research vessel and may have other data**

CP summarised that the group will take to look at potential gaps and look at milestones and effort. CP questioned the group to look at data and whether that would be useful, what the Cefas data comes back with and to look at the data sets. SC asked if there anything around, vivier boats? GC exclaimed there must be cameras on big boats. RM said let’s wait for the CEFAS data, as this is a big gap.

* **Action: RM to send Cefas data to the group - look for historic CEFAS data on larger/offshore boat bycatch, and pull out percentages of species for next meeting**

The action 4 milestones were then looked at by the steering group, saying that perhaps the year 3 milestone needs review. RC said Poseidon will be reporting back in April and the milestone will be left for now, additional data collection following this work and see what is needed after.

## Actions 5

CP introduced the action saying that Beshlie is the lead on this and unfortunately, she could not attend in person, but has provided information on nature and scale of ETP species. JP ran through this briefly (see document), covering the following topics:

* Spoke to catching sector, best practice ETP interaction low risk factor
* Based on catching report, acknowledge- complexity and industry trust
* Careful on not restricting fishing
* MMO representative
* Industry should note the times that they see ETP species but do not interact also
* Biodegradable escape gaps
* Differences in pot construction USA/UK
* Assumption of ghost fishing- significant time into finding gear
* Summary: hard to control - centralised group needs more legislative format
* Evidence of ETP will rely on fisherman’s trust

CP reflected that this is the start of the steering group response and review. SC said she hasn’t seen the paper from Cefas, asking whether there was spatial mapping, interaction and ETP distribution, does it not list all species?

RM commented that the report goes by species group, whether there is spatial data and if that is localised. The report is based on instances of interactions rather than possible interactions. Likelihood of interaction, habitat interaction and behaviour by the area has been noted in addition to the distribution and vulnerability to being caught. CP said we need to provide comments on this report as the steering group.

RM expanded that the total risk, potential risk and presence of ETP in areas has been looked at. There is a table of interaction in the report, with how many incidences and species groups. CP spoke about coverage vs vulnerability and the detail of CEFAS methodology scale 1-5, risk likelihood and severity and whether they come. Mitigated by measures in place and the total. The group then had a discussion around ETP capture and severity. RM said that the comments from CN/TH have been addressed. SC asked about publication?

CP asked the group whether it would be best to do a skype call and run through ETP research again?

* **Action: JP to set up skype webinar for CEFAS/RM to present to the steering group the ETP research**

CP reminded the group that EMFF funding was granted to cover this by cefas (6 tasks), specifically for project. The report is still in the draft format and we hope to publish on Seafish website. Normal risk assessment. The group looked over CEFAS report noting that it requires a more detailed look and decided that it should be further updated version and circulated to group.

* **Action: JP to circulate CEFAS ETP report to the group, for comments, set up meeting following this with steering group for CEFAS to present final report.**

CP stated that this has discussed a few times with input and is worth thinking about the next version. She said it’s worth having a call after amendments and having skype after the next versioning and run through updated report.

RC emphasised that the group needs to make sure the report is specific as possible, data information review is an issue that needs addressing and search for available data, rather than working on general and get data more locally relevant. This may require further discussion and feeding back data

## Action 6

CP gave a quick run through on the action requirements for the management sub-group, on the fishery specific objectives and progress with the action. Noting that the Irish Brown Crab FIP discussion (in other FIPs, steering groups will look at this action after the implications of Brexit are clearer). RC talked of the Celtic sea unit as assessed by Cefas, which extends across to Ireland and whether there is expectation that these are linked, some joint stock assessment. Frank Fleming is currently working on market issues (white crab) and replacement whelk bait, using FIP model as a way of dealing with industry problems. The FIPs need to align if it can with the Irish FIPs, AC could be a good way of exploring.

RM said CEFAS only look at landings into England, not wales, areas were designated by political and biological information and now they are only English stock assessment and information on Larval distribution. CP said the NRW will have the welsh data. CP exclaimed that the stock covers much further than English Waters and to manage the overall stock, we need to be speaking to and aligning with other jurisdictions.

CP said that CN spoke with Frank Fleming, where he said that white crab isn’t an issue. In terms of management, it might be worth getting frank to update on the FIP (basic FIP fishery progress) could be a possible action. Every sub 80 PI to have an action and is up on Fishery Progress= comprehensive, gave run down of FP in more detail. CP said the irish are keen to engage

* **Action: for Frank Fleming through contact by steering group/JP to ask to provide update at the next meetings, perhaps on an annual basis, and Rod to get update from Frank when they speak soon**

RC clarified that white crab issue is more of a market issue, not a good quality product, as far as MSC stock assessment landings accounted for. RC said as it is a shared stock, at least some collaboration on science needs to happen whereby we are joined up on the thinking on stock science at least.

RM, link with Wales and NRW- she said that she has struggled to get samples as landings are so small. GC said this is minimal. CP proposed that perhaps the welsh fisherman association could also provide an update. CP talked about the last Scallop FIP meeting and the development of a working group with the French following the advent of their pre-assessment work.

* **Action: Jim evans or Welsh PO to provide update on Pre-assessment progress in the Celtic sea through contact by GC.**
* **Action: GC update the group on the Welsh Fishermans Association (EMFF held up but should have update  by end of the year)**
* **Action: RM to speak with NRW to acquire data**
* **Action: Nathan de Rozieux to update on report produced in Swansea as proposed by GC**

RC highlighted that it is the time we need to look at whole stock, as UOA extends. France needs to be approached. Start discussions with UK industry and present on results.

## AOB

## Fishery Progress

Fishery progress is still in the pipeline for the next week, hopes to be up in December. This has been uploaded by Rhiannon, thank you. There has been delays in getting this up, reviewing, final edits etc. but should be up soon. CP reflected that this has been an ask by commercial partners for this to be transparent and available online and the FIP is 18 months in. Fishery Progress will be a useful tool in tracking the FIPs on a global platform. RC commented on the set up and how it was started.

The group looked at the Irish Brown Crab FIP on fishery progress. GC commented that the C&L FIP is really struggling to get industry input, which could be addressed in a different way. Perhaps more industry buy-in could be achieved through including market issues in the FIP, whereby SEAFISH could lead on this to improve appetite.

## Comms

Seafish website has been updated, and links are not working we will work on getting that up. There have been discussions internally whether FP and Seafish are both required, pending.

## Date of next meeting – Doodle Poll

April availability, y2 meeting. Look at annual review, action 5, webinar skype – Cefas and circulate minutes and new version. Please make sure SG requests are adding something to the agenda.

## Close

The group then discussed escape gaps and biodegradable panels. Plastic vs tread vs sown into nets vs hemp perhaps this needs to be regulated in a sense due to the plastic issue and marine environment. GC commented on wooden elasticated pins, opening after 2/3 months. SC highlighted that escape gaps are manufactured gear to gear 10-12 years and encourages innovation and long-lasting material- floor of pots, wood, plastic, steel. MV asked whether this binding is biodegradable and if there is a seafish innovation fund for this. Could be an additional action.