# **UK Fisheries Improvements**

# **SW Crab & Lobster FIP Steering Group**

Wednesday 7th February 2018, 10.30 – 15.30

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

Welcome Introductions & Apologies

Attendees:

**AH:** Andy Hickman Tesco

**BB:** Bill Badger (conf call) DEFRA

**BP:** Beshlie Poole South Devon and Channel Shellfish Association

**CN**: Chloe North MSC

**CP:** Claire Pescod MSC

**DH:** Doug Hoult Isles of Scilly IFCA

**DM**: David Markham BlueSeafood

**ER:** Emma Rowse The Real Cornish Crab Company and Rowse Fishing

**EB:** Ewan Bell Cefas

**JH**: Juliette Hatchman Macduff

**LZ:** Laky Zervudachi Direct Seafoods

**MB**: Mark Bell Interfish

**MR:** Mark Rowse The Real Cornish Crab Company and Rowse Fishing

MV: Mathew volla Plymouth University student

**NR**: Nathan de Roz Falfish

**NP**: Neval Pitman (conf call)

**PB**: Pia Bateman

**RLH:** Rhiannon L Holden MSC

**SC**: Sarah Clark Devon and Severn IFCA

**TH**: Tim Huntington Poseidon

**WH:** William Harvey (conf call) W Harvey and Sons

**VG:** Vicky Gravestock (conf call) Southern IFCA

Apologies:

**MW**: Mark Webber OceanFish

**GC**: Gus Caslake Seafish

**EB**: Estelle Brennan Lyons

**MW:** Mark Webber

**RM**: Robin Masefield Cefas

**TB**: Trevor Bartlett BlueSeafood

**SP**: Simon Pengelly Southern IFCA

Minutes & Action Points

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number | Lead | Action  | Status |
| 1 | RM | get the official quote from Cefas for the Principle 1 Harvest Control Rule modelling work. | Completed- see action 1 |
| 2 | CN | write tender and get quotes from other consultancies, then look into funding. | Completed- see action 1 |
| 3 | AG | seek verification from the relevant people within Lyons, as to whether they could receive and administer the funding on behalf of the Steering Group. | Completed- unable to take funding, need to talk about that. |
| 4 | BB | consider consultations and this project, and provide some information to the group about how best to proceed. | Completed Bill sent document now on dropbox, talk about this in principle 3 |
| 5 | TH | send Gus a GGI best practice to build in to the review. | Completed: Tim has done that, thank you |
| 6 | CN | explore possibility of MSC involvement in the Masters student via the Science | Completed: and masters student is in the room and catch composition data available |
| 7 | CN & SC | progress the masters project proposal to send to Plymouth | Completed |
| 8 | SC | to seek permission to use the IPA and IoM catch composition data | Completed |

CP: Any comments on the minutes? Will put these up on the seafish website under PUKFI. Credible Fip= full transparency.

CN: Everyone has completed their meeting actions so thank you.

Update on Project

CP: PUKFI S2- replicate model SW Irish coast nephrops, scallops. Stage 2 is up and running, doing outreach and gaining steering group membership. Edinburgh for the Brexit and Scotland’s economy, let us know if there is anyone to get in contact with? New funders Scottish White Fish, seafood Ecosse, Scottish seafood association. Drive improvements and maybe get to certification stage.

CP: PUKFI Timeline= set deadline over 5 years and bench marking and tracking tool and Tim will being doing the annual review. Tim may be asking them for more information, report. April.

CP: Fisheries progress, agreed information to be uploaded to the platform, pre-assessments, action plan and membership of the group. Uploaded for this FIP. Portal, cross-checked okay-ed and live. We will circulate this around.

CP: Tim is here to provide advice independently on each of the actions

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 1

CN: this action, wanting to analyse. We wanted to figure out whether these work together to achieve MSY, crab and lobster stock good. If it were to decrease are these regulations enough, are these in conflict. For analysis, we would need to hire a consultant. Earlier this year, Bleshie and I wrote a funding application, which was unsuccessful. We have been trying to get quotes,

EB: With the specification put out for the tender, both an evaluation of various management measures, also requiring suggestions for management- conflict of interest with the government. Our job is to evaluate proposals rather than come up with external. Unable to tender for work, as it is currently written. Revaluate how work is brigaded and split up more formally.

CP: Arm that evaluates DEFRA, even as consultancy still has a conflict of interest. Another quote from another company. Hopefully south west panel could fund this, they need a list of tenders and pick up from Gus.

CN: with the funding do they need a number of quotes

Bleshie: project suggestions, gus comes back to us, then we score on an importance level, more quotes the better 3+.

CN; is there money still left in pot

Bleshie: A bit of removability and rolls

CP: Sub 60, automatic fail. Move to 60-80 through starting work

CN: critical score, only 2 sub 60. We need to work on this, both related to stock management

TH: Harvest strategy, effort control. First strategic overview. Vision: there have been lots of approaches to management. Shetland etc. Different approaches, pros and cons of each management method, any gaps not considered. Could look outside UK. More about strategy

JH: Nautilus report? Evaluating all management FSCs. Uk and irish brown crab fisheries. Very comprehensive

TH: Good starting point

CP: Action 2, year 2 milestones, proposing holistic management strategies. Next step put these quotes to gus. If you would like to submit Ewan then do send that through, if you could do specific sections

EB: Try and do numerical analysis, rather than descriptive. MLS inside and outside, how do we do this. Merge, problematic. We can’t tell IFCAS optimum minimum landing size, still conflicts of interests.

CN: Different management needs to come up first then suggest management?

EB: Look at stock assessment as it currently stands, relative contribution of different measures, where would you go in the future?

CP: Put in tenders in next few weeks ACTION 1. Submit quote?

EB: When would delivery expect to do?

CN: Try to get funding secured by end of financial year and work done in the next 6 months

CP: May june, draft perhaps with final version after that.

TH: Management options, different IFCAS, series of options- discussion where we want to go? Decide, escape gaps etc. go down certain route and model various options

EB: need to discuss with defra, fisheries management best go forward, voluntary measures, legislation, defras role would need to be evaluated.

CN: Bringing in too early?

EB: quite possibly

CP: Non-government linked quote

EB: safest to go with that one. In terms of harvest strategy and developing harvest control rules- level of dynamism to receive accreditation. How often would you need to update fisheries management policy.

CN: Not prescriptive ie. Every year, needs to be done to protect stock.

EB: Timely enough to the biology of the species

CN: Other quote, does include analysis- but less modelling and proposals for ranges of different things. Holistic harvest strategy. Could we go ahead and commission? Industry?

ER: Yes

CN: Write up into proposal, run past bleshlie and put to the panel.

CP: We have the tender, we will put that past gus. It may be useful to set up sub-group, options for management? Building on action, project reports presented to group? Take forward and look at options? Originally looking at outputs in action 1. Useful to have inshore focus and vivier focus as well?

CN: Good idea to compartmentalise, move forward a bit quicker? Discuss that in between the meetings? Do people think that is good idea?

BP: yap

TH: Important to get IFCAS involved, in the past have not been involved

Steering group: Yes

JH: Sooner the better DEFRA involved

BB: Become more and more relevant.

CP: Slightly more regularly, be more specific and focussed. Action 2 to set up sub-group email, speak to Sarah and other IFCAS who would like to be involved.

ER: Are there any POs? Member of CFPO

CN: Paul is involved, but hasn’t been coming to groups

ER: Keep up to date may put pressure

BB: Consultations with stakeholders who aren’t part of the group

CN: Keep small?

CP: Yes, not sure of yet what we will be discussing and basing initial discussions on what we know

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 2

CP: Linked to action 1

CN: HCRs- harvest strategy overall effort control to maintain stock at MSY, harvest control rules- how we will control effort. Integral. Paper we will be commissioning will lead into both. Hasn’t started yet, will start in year 2. Ideally would have had this for this meeting, hopefully we will get this in the first 6 months and last 6 months developing proposals. Claw it back as we are slightly behind. Use time today to think about what HCRs we need

CP: Let the action 1 report first, change action lead on 1 and 2. Update that GGFF, small scale fishery fund to put to panel. Management sub-group and elaborate on members of that.

TH: We will need a lead

CN: Bleshlie, are you still okay for being the lead- joint lead.

Bleshlie: Could do with some help

CP: Supported by Chloe.

CN: One industry and one supply chain?

CP: Andy?

AH: Time commitment, time between the meetings?

JH: Management group- IFCA?

AH: Will I add enough value, wondering if someone with more technical abilities would be more appropriate

CP: Supply chain partner could remind group to show that this is happening. Maybe be more useful to have an IFCA

DH: Could talk to chief to see whether would be most appropriate. ACTION 3- doug to talk to other IFCAs and coordinate IFCA lead for management sub-group

CP: Anything on action 2? Changing the lead? Reporting?

CN: Action lead the same as for action 1 and 2. Hopefully be successful with seafish funding , and pay directly to consultant. Explore whether that is an option.

CP: Cannot take direct funding at the MSC, maybe seafish could hold. Submit those to SEAFISH.

BP: Not much funding goes towards crab and lobster, so it would be great to direct some

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 3

CP: Revisit chair? On the agenda.

CN: Gus leading on this action from seafish. Action was to conduct review on potential gear, management measures that could be adopted in the fishery and reduce any unwanted bycatch in the fishery

CN: Gus has sent a first draft, so I will run through the options. Has mentioned gear measures- escape gaps

TH: Part of new FCR, review of alternative measures to reduce bycatch, every 2-3 years best practice that could be applied to this

ER: what are the bycatch mortality figures. Mortality

TH: Mortality low, just needs to be done in future reference. Very low- catch and landings, returned alive no consequence to populations. There does need to be an initial review, and done on the risk basis.

JH: Need the evidence, MSC.

TH: Prove this is the case

CP: Some fisheries around the world, almost proven activity

CN: Continuously reviewing gear improvements, that are happening? Good for their fishery to reduce the bycatch?

TH: Opportunity for fisheries

CP: Proactive FIP, measures in place already. Showing these. Have a review that everything is being done?

CN: Gus has mentioned, things that would effect bycatch

DH: Mandatory escape gaps in Devon and Severn IFCA

CN: Explore this for other IFCA

SEE word document

ER: Plastic bottoms, use on pots

CP: Need to be more area specific, GUS. Particular areas IFCAs. Present at june meeting

MR: With the steel bottoms, rays get into the- just bars, allow.

EB: Bars to plastic transition, legs get caught- any discards, lower survival rate- extensive limb damage.

CP: Need to be explored and reflected pros and cons, gus get in touch with CEFAS Action 4

TH: Voluntary basis, code of conduct, adopted through UOA

CN: Escape gaps, why were they mandatory? Peoples feelings, reduce juveniles?

BP: Argument against, clear pots quicker, juvenile lobster do escape? Come with problems. Restrictions on other gear, any stock assessment data won’t be full enough. They would have been released anyway. Not perfect scenario. Based on US model, 50/50 whether they are particularly useful

JH: Didn’t include in future regulations? Clearing of pots, lost green crab fishery, Industry would like them to remain

EB: smaller lobsters and crabs may be predated on, something larger may have a picnic. Enhanced survivability. When something large comes in, escape gaps positive. Section of stock you’re not seeing in the assessments

TH: Main bycatch species? Only lobster over 5% of catch, cod/seabass less than 1./2%

CP: Review is done

BB: Interesting discussion. Pre-assessment says no significant bycatch measures? Aren’t required? Still a process?

TH: Review whether mechanisms are available and are they necessary.? Low bycatch models Common sense

CP: Review, checked up on every 5 years?

BB: Sounds sensible

EB: Do cuttles go in traps?

MR: Will not travel over soft netted entrances, lobsters more predatory in US

ER: Lay eggs in the pots

CP: Good start from GUS, will be in touch with various people- on the ground data. Add mike mottgommery as potential person to input? Share in june. Finalised draft to feed into annual review, mid march aim.

CN: In year 2 if necessary on the end. May not need to mainstream management measures, adjust on action plan

CP: Good opportunity for Tim, to talk about global ghost gear initiative

TH: Best practice, commission us to prepare document, for handling fishing gear released 2/3 months ago. Consultation- oceans, changes made. Stakeholder by stakeholder. Discarded, abandoned. Marking traceability of gear, fishers reduce gear loss. Speak to control agencies, recycling of gear. Practical resource. Fisherman association cross check? GGGI on the website.

CN: In terms of this project, how should we take ghost gear into account? Bleshlies code of conduct, send information? What people do,

ER: try and get it back, as it costs a lot of money.

CP: Pin to alternative measure, ACTION 4. Talk to industry what they do with retrieving gear and add to the report

TH: Pots, rebate, nets collapse, pots stay structurally sound, rot- re-baiting, 5-10 years. Entanglement issue? Cetaceans tangled

CN: protocols which people do when they loose pots, get Gus to gather information and put in the back of his review of alternative measures. Help him with information to ensure that is considered

EB: Survey of fishers, how often people lose gear?

TH: 2004, not quantified since then, RFS might be do it?

ER: no

BP: They get reported to the IFCA, lost gear? Records, extrapolated could be useful data

TH: GGGI registries of lost gear

CN: Try to ensure there is a voluntary code of reporting how often they lose gear

ER: Weather or conflict of gear usually lose

AH: Good thing to support? GGGI. Driving change on ground?

BP: Don’t want to engage, not willing to discuss?

TH: I’m surprised, poor outreach.

CP: Next steps? Guidelines adopt?

TH: No money left, push that out there

CP: Add to dropbox guidelines ACTION 5

CN: Industry review measures from the GGGI,

CP: Gus will be adding this to the review, do a comparison, are there any organisations they do more or less. Add to action?

TH: Part 2. Prevention mitigation and cure? GGGI split, avoid high risk areas. Risk of gear loss, training

AD: Really useful in non-uk fisheries, scale for international fisheries

BP: Completely agree

TH: SEE DOCUMENT. Strong North American focus GGGI.

CP: CBT manual can provide examples from other fisheries to achieve the standard, accessible.

CP: Revisit chair basis? Happy to have a discussion? Facilitate process, come to a conclusion

ER: Happy for Claire

JH: Vote you, independent- prompting us

TH: Good job Claire.

CP: happy to take on role, we will revisit this in 12 months. Always open to constructive feedback. Good practice to remind on actions in the meeting actions,

TH: Chloe chases people in advance

Action updates, Principle 1, Action 4

CN: This action is about the information available, landings data- catch data- pockets of research, data currently being gathered. Quantify information, compare different areas? Interpolate between areas of collection. Year 1 carry out risk assessment, sarah clark- reported on this. Bleshlie highlighted isle of man data on catch composition, compare isle of man data, and inshore potting agreement data and data from rowses and have masters student carrying out data, where are the gaps and risks from bycatch

Did progress this, sent proposal and have Mathew on board.

Mv: Following on from pre-assessment, gaps from IFCA, phd from lyme bay, isle of man, data gathered. And compared for similarities and see whether there is a way to fill gaps, and build. Statistical analysis, and linked to fishing practices used in certain areas

TH: Timing

MV: starting now and finishing in September

CN: include data gathering with North Devon potters,

MV: join fishing industry along different sights along the coasts and north Cornwall

TH: Understand why there is a difference, different gear types, locations, different bate used

MV: topography, major scope for different areas to look at. Any patterns

EB: Collecting information pot by pot?

MV: Guess it is pot by pot, assuming. Primary and secondary

ER: One industry lobster and crab

EB: primary species if there is a management plan, crab fishery catching lobsters-secondary

TH: HCRs primary

EB: Observer data, numbers of individuals, length weight conversion factor not available.

MV: measurements to biomass? Lyme bay conversion,

EB: All depends on species by species basis. Not available to us. Fishbase?

MV: Measure bycatch species and come up with size weight ratio, extrapolate up?

EB: Back and weigh it.

MV: very early days. Sarah Clark managing this

CP: May have MV in London. Present some of the draft information in may/june? Put you in touch with certain people.

MV: In contact with Tim and Chloe, may need to speak to cefas,

TH: historical bycatch data sampling processes extract

CN: observers in cefas on crab and lobster

EB: Not a priority

CN: MILESTONES: reflect the project, year 2 address- further data collection, rowses currently collecting data. 1 and 2 covered. More data that needs gathering. Altering milestones to reflect what’s happening. Scope of the work. Falmouth marine college

ER: Book keeper, Falmouth marine college. Getting involved- spring take them out. Pass MV data collected, in same way. Craig on the line. Collecting bycatch data

MR: set way for data collection from cefas

EB: Need to find out from observer team, set protocols, how people are collecting. ACTION 6, look to see whether there is a written one.

CP: Steve mackintyreson. Fishing into the future

EB: Good protocol. See whether there is

CN: Send ACTION 7- around the group from steve macinson. Fisher collected data. Circulate, and adjust milestone

JH: Fisher platform, used.

ER: As long as it is being collected in correct way, never been used. Standardised

TH: trends and changes

MV: standardised at beginning

JH: Risk assessment

CN: Sarah was supposed to pull together information- so great opportunity for masters student. So we will be reflecting that in milestones

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 5

CP: ETP risk assessment. Done by CEFAS emff bid, to help deliver actions and post-doc with bangor university and up and running. Is anyone is interested in wider piece of work. Press release, channelling funding into industry and working on improvements. Large part to cefas and delivering across 6 FIPS.

EB: We’ve identified a range of species that are classified as ETP, that could potentially interact. any observer data any records. Interactions mainly consist of organisms on the seabed, review literature on potting impacts, know from other studies and IBPMA. All of the work looking at benthic impact will come into play. Low potential impact. Marls, sunset corals? University Newcastle, what happens to each pass- remarkably little impact. We have a list of potential species.

Useful to get hold of the video footage- lyme bay- sarah Hall, see if there’s additional evidence of biota

DH: IFCA HRAs MCZs, impact assessments be useful, impact on seafans, published on each district on website.

CN: Crab fishery pot, southern right whales entangled- in France. List?

EB: Occasional records, anecdotal

MR: Gus would know, linked to the RFS. Phone them and report entanglement, still alive? List of all

BP: British……

CP: **Take action 8 f**or ER, to explore who holds entanglement data

CP: UK Shetland fishery, minkes caught- over a long period. Cetacean work, look into him the man pingers

TH: Sea reptiles? Sea turtles,

ER: leatherbacks caught, alive and released.

CP: Yes there are released and alive, need to show that

TH: De-hookers long-line

EB: Seahorses?

JH: Put it back,

CP: Wildlife trust,

CP: draft due 7th march, sent to tim EB.

TH: Population status, of high risk animal, trends and impact on those populations,

CP: Minke whales, not having negative impact. Reduce interaction.

CN: Some of the species overlap, send thesis to EB.

TH: 2.3.1, 2.3.2 2.3.3, how action is reduced, is there interaction or mortality if it does occur. Criticised, no known limits on how often they interact. Is this significant.

CP: Present that for may june, needs addressing.

CN: Action lead? Are there other people? Industry/supply chain? Leave this one with gus? Reflect that,

CP: Work carried out by cefas,

ER: Seafish have the information, responsible fishing scheme, had access to that information

CN: See whether anything needs to be done, looking at milestones on track. Only score within one section

CP: Make sure draft, is sent to MV and make sure ETP data collected.

CP: Peer review, cefas, payment? Help us review the projects.

EB: Journal articles, approach people at cefas.

CP: Should we look to get that published? Put in as paper, peer reviewed? Pay someone to do it?

EB: Find the funding.

TH: Joint author? Shorter.

TH: Decision with ETP, non-etp? Broad habitat types, commonly encountered, support habitat sides. Would be included. Several sensitive habitat, most vmes ETP? Would be of use to assessor.

CP: NESI, gear type matrix, vs habitat.

Action updates, Principle 2, Action 6

CN: This action is in principle 3, management- gap that was highlighted, discussion of management leads- inshore and offshore. Other countries fishing on this stock. Bit less clear of milestones. Leader of irish FIP, keen to share information and work collaboratively with this. Management objectives, aim to do the same sort of thing. French are even further behind, but are talking to French MSC colleagues. Using English French rivalry, kicking them into the action. No action lead, define action lead and define milestones.

TH: Evidence that people are discussing, SMAC?

CN: Will Harvey sent CN proposal from North western waters advisory council to look into fully documented fisheries, with other fisheries

CP: implement pilot study for brown crab assessment. In real time, cpue, see document. Shows there are discussions being made across different countries and mentions FIPS. ACTION 9- take action to circulate report and maybe Will could give more information

EB: supposed to focus in science, don’t remember this being discussed

TH: Formal level, how do discussions occur

EB: Talk about science gaps, no formal stock assessment in the channel. ICES group biology group- desire amongst labs to coordinate, it will possibly require a joint push from UK , Irish French administrations to push Ices assessments. A need recognised on a science level, political. No recognition of national management. Complex situation

TH: final assessment:? Regular meetings through the AC, only formal.

EB: Only place as which discussions are being had,

CP: Could be something we discuss.

EB: brown crab focussed sub group at the AC, scientists invited, policy but mainly industry. Almost entirely uk, French.

ER: first time heard of it

DH: NGOs?

EB: Trevor bartlet, Nora park?

ER: Transnational acronate project.

EB: Spanish involved in that also, talk of keeping something going? Finished now

BP: Then became FIP. Not worth spending money on with Brexit, -irish FIP

CP: Jay percy/

TH: invite over other FIPS?

JH: when they have something to present? Link up

TH: link up frank

CP: Come and give update.

CN: In terms of what we need to do, for 80 level, carry on with transboundary ifca and defra management sub-group, now with other countries.

EB: Don’t think there is much time in spending, due to Brexit? 5 years of timeline. See what happens next. Revisiting for milestone. Formal review. ADD in timescale, revisit, bring up at annual timelines. ACTION

TH: p3, looks good in general.

CP: Tim does he has any questions? Ask questions after lunch, annual review and BMT leaflets.

CN: Clarify, that with the milestone will revisit that annually, group will discuss. We will monitor the situation with respect to brexri add ACTION/ chat to frank, anything to update us on. Standing agenda item, what difference is?

CP: How can we benefit?

Summary of Meeting Actions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Lead** | **Meeting Action** | **Principle/Action** | **Timeline** | **Status** |
| 1 | CN  | Write the Principle 1 analysis into a research proposal to go to the Seafish Southwest panel for potential funding, and send to Gus with the quotes | P1/ A1 |  | Complete |
| 2 | CN | Set up a management subgroup | P1/A2 |  |  |
| 3 | DH | Talk to other IFCAS and coordinate lead for management sub-group | P1/A2 |  |  |
| 4 | Gus | Refine word document on alternative measures to be more area specific and involve the IFCAS and talk to industry on how they retrieve gear | P1/A3 | Present at June meeting |  |
| 5 | EB | Look into whether there is a standardised way to collect bycatch data for Matthew (Masters student) | P1/A4 |  |  |
| 6 | CN | Send Steve Mackinson’s fisher collected data document from fishing into the future on good protocol with collecting data around group  | P1/A4 |  | Complete |
| 7 | CN | Adjust Action 4 milestone on action plan to include Masters student research | P1/A4 |  |  |
| 8 | ER | To explore who holds entanglement data and feed back to Ewen at Cefas for the ETP research | P2/A5 | asap |  |
| 9 | EB | Finish draft of ETP analysis and send to Tim and present at next steering group meeting research | P2/A5 | March  |  |
| 10 | CN | Circulate the project proposal that Will Harvey’s sent on FDF, round group | P2/A6 |  | Complete |
| 11 | WH | Present update or give a bit more information about the FDF project at next steering group meeting | P2/A6 |  |  |
| 12 | CN | Link up other FIPs again for the next meeting, Frank from Ireland could come to address cross boundary management and learn from each other or give and update | P2/A6 |  |  |
| 13 | CN  | Adjust milestone for action 6, to bring up in annual meetings- standing agenda item | P2/A6 |  |  |

Bench Marking and Tracking tool

CP: Tim is doing the annual reviews, 3 of the 6 FIPS. CN will be running through BMT, send document around.

CP: Do we still need seafish and fisheries progress. Decide on involvement in the project, still able to host webpages on website.

CN: run through

CP: ACTION for all fips, is there anything that will not be included on the fisheries progress compared with seafish. Actual year 1- pre-assessment. Action plan agreed by everyone, how it will look in terms of the scores.

JH: Promote through improvements, facebook more consumer and twitter more industry.

CP: PUKFI, promote msc certified.

JH: Provide any text, send around

EB: Figures and charts, posted onto FIP page, global platform

MR: White crab and brown crab? Soft shell?

EB: ACRONAT-quality of project, how much give across the claw

CP: Issue?

MR: Comes down to processor

JH: Nautilus

TH: harvest strategy

CN: Gap not addressed?

CP: Boats landed

ER: Issue in particular in Ireland

TH: Total mortality of crab is above, nothing to do with stock status

MV: what happens to white crab

CN: land, but not gathered in data?

JH: not sure they want it

ER: processor doesn’t usually take it

MR; goes to wild bate

CN: and mortality not captured

TH: Same species

EB: does the standard talk about product quality

CP: Different FIPS look at indicators in a different way, some of the PIs will need actions. Looking to develop new set ups logging information, and incorporating this into the FIP.

JH: Over and above?

CP: No reference to white crab comes under

TH: Unwanted catch of target stock, 1.1.2.1. Suggest, study that might be done with contractor add to terms of reference of tender, include, any data?

CN: ACTION add to gus review of alternative measures to avoid white crab mortality?

JH: No statutory measures

TH: Gus’s review not on primary

ER: If processor does not accept it then we do not land it

CP: ADD to consultant contract ACTION

CP: Maybe Irish FIP, take action to ask what is going on? Annual update on what PIs are scoring?

CP: Monkfish product, Ally Dingwall. Closely watching annual reports. And M and S, premium product as it is the FIP. Andy Hickman, potentially sourcing from FIP for brown crab.

CP: circulate link for fisheries progress, seafish simple process. Corporate action plan still able to commit time to UK seafish.

CP: Tim looks at progress across. Shortish report from first week of April. Review of all FIPS.

AOB & date of next meeting

CN: Structure of meetings? Travel commitments, is it better to have more regular meetings on the line or shorter? Happy with it the way it is>

CP: If everyone if on the line or in the room.

JH: provide updates, initially good. Then dial in is fine.

CP: Next one fully remote, may-june, doodle poll?

CN: Management sub-group before report delivery?