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## **Welcome and Introductions (Claire)**

CP welcomed to steering group and everyone in attendance introduced themselves. Minutes for the meeting have been circulated and CP checked with the group that they are happy to sign them off.

## **Actions from last meeting (Jo)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead** | **Activity** | **Progress** |
| Poseidon | See if it’s possible to get a copy of pre assessment from BIM/Fisherman Frank (only basic FIP) | Done |
| ALL | Finalise names on ToR | Done |
| Poseidon | Add note to AP/PA to acknowledge new MAPs and work on understanding how this would alter the scoring- discuss at next meeting so SG can revisit milestones | Updated pre assessment |
| Poseidon | Reflect lack of industry appetite for FUs and reasons why in PA | Updated pre assessment - PUKFI commissioning separate FU research |
| Mike P | Circulate link to NSAC website report on FU TAC management (MSC to add to dropbox file of evidence) | Done |
| Helen D/MSS | Find out what CEFAS are doing re: action 4 (estimates of stock abundance) and what extra would be needed, as well as costings to undertake extra work on this | Update at meeting |
| MSC | Write to DEFRA as a group to encourage them to have CEFAS participate in SG (MSC to draft) | Ewen Bell has agreed to sit on the group |
| Malcolm M | Follow up with Scottish Creel Fishermen’s Federation re: their project on entanglement and report back to Poseidon | Meeting took place, report to be produced early April- Not a major issue but hotspots to be ID’ed |
| Poseidon | Work with David Donnan to understand where PMFs fit in P2 (habitat vs ETP) | Updated pre assessment |
| Poseidon | Find wording in standard regarding habitats – recovery back to historic levels, or maintaining level when the PA is undertaken | Rod circulated |
| SNH/Poseidon | Update at next meeting on what areas of burrowed mud are included and new management measures to protect them | Updated pre assessment |
| MSC | Speak to Open Seas for update on their GoFish zones |  |
| Helen D/MSS | Connect with CEFAS and AFBI for update at next meeting on feedback and what might need adding to the plan | Update at meeting |
| Kevin | Provide more info on creelers and secondary species- see what is available and report back at next meeting | Update at meeting |
| Harry | Update group with summary of consultation results | Update at meeting |
| MSC | Feedback to group on MSC LO seminar happening in December | Update at meeting- report circulated to group |
| Poseidon | Use updated MAP scoring to update AP along with SG feedback | Updated pre assessment |
| MSC | Clarify whether Open Seas actually want to be members of SG and report back to the group | Done- agenda item |
| MSC | Claire to send final report to OS once all comments from group included and it’s signed off – if they comment then we will discuss at next meeting | Pending sign off of report from steering group |

**Action: MM Get hold of creelers entanglement report to be produced early April**

* Creeler and 2nd species
  + Not much info available
  + crab and lobster are other species caught by creel but crossover is not likely
  + fishing for nephrops that’s what you’ll get

**Action: Jo to circulate MSC Landing Obligation seminar report**

## **Recap of FIP Structure, how it works, and timelines (Claire)**

* PreAssessment represents snapshot in time, describing the fishery at the time it was commissioned and helping the group to identify gaps
* Action Plan contains actions to address the gaps identified by the Pre-Assessment
* Assessed against the MSC standard- 28 PIs across 3 principles
* Over timeline of FIP aim to get all PIs that they might score 80 in a full assessment
* Focusing on Year 1 actions during this meeting
* No funding currently to deliver individual actions – S1 gone to EMFF and various other external funding sources, as well as SG members
* Project is MSC facilitated, it is down to the steering group to undertake and deliver actions
* 3rd Nephrops meeting, 1st in June 2018, Pre-Assessment presented at November SGM and consultation then took place
* Changes to AP/PA will be gone through today so they can be signed off and uploaded onto FisheryProgress and Seafish/MSC websites - hope for sign off today
* Poseidon annual reviews to track progress across timeline using BMT tool
* If down as lead on particular action you are not expected to undertake the work alone, but you will be the point of contact for updates on progress
* Open Seas generic feedback has been considered by Poseidon and circulated to group
* MSC facilitating the FIP, and cannot tell the group what to do to achieve the MSC 80 level
* Consultants (Poseidon) to support work of group- PM brought in around harvest strategy development and options available (Action 2)
* FIP currently ‘In Development’, waiting for group sign off on PA/AP so that it can become an ‘Active’ – start off 5 year timeline

## **Update on Multi-Annual Plan (MAPs) (MP)**

MP provided the group with an update on the two MAPs:

* North Sea introduced in 2018
* North West Waters introduced in Feb 2019 – REG 0074 (2018)
* Both broadly similar
* TAC can be set as total amount of FU
* Sets out targets, safeguards and conservation/tech measures that can be introduced
* Harvest strategy can be set away from management by FU 🡪 range of complexities
* Can create approach to protect fishery from over-exploitation
* Paul Medley has been commissioned to develop a paper on why FU TACs are not being used by the steering group
* MSC not prescriptive on management approaches just as long as end point is reached
* SG members against TACs by FU, but not against implementation of some management measures in specific regions
* Will local fishermen be involved?
  + SG members to gather info from local members
  + Can make sure that everything is fed in
* Farne Deeps stock – UK confirmed that measures would be put in place to protect stock
* Consultation sent out to ask what measures could be put in place
* Measures introduced have helped
* Industry instrumental in building package
* Make sure that if FU TACs are not used that other option is still likely to meet MSC standard
* Purpose of FIP is to identify areas which need work to be improved
* Took 5 years to develop NSAC Long-term Nephrops plan

## **Changes to Pre Assessment and Action Plan (FN)**

FN gave the group a brief overview of the updated made to the pre assessment and action plan as a result of the steering group consultations. The pre assessment is a snapshot in time and will not change now, but the action plan can still be updated before the group launches the FIP.

* Comments recorded in Log
* SG members to be allocated as leads as we go through
  + Leads are person to update to rest of group don’t have to do all the work

## **Principle 1**

* No changes to P1 scores
* Harvest Strategy updated but score still remains below 60
  + Measures included in MAP currently don’t have the confidence that will be responsive to FU stock status
  + FU TACs removed from action plan
  + P16 of PA set out objectives, trigger points etc for NS MAP & Farne Deep example
  + Harvest strategy must be responsive to stocks
* Do technical measures need to be defined in advance for scores to be raised?
  + HS development project commissioned to move forward from NS MAP and define what is most appropriate options
  + Formalise how this is implemented
  + MAPs fairly specific and set out 🡪 everything from low level to complete fishery closure
  + Flow chart/tree to be developed
* Is this too prescriptive?
  + Pre-emptive process to show fishery what would be done if X or Y happens
  + Toolbox developed for all North Sea but specific measures then can be used for specific units
  + Working out which measures are most useful for different types of issue
  + ‘Global Best Practice’ level is being aimed at

**Action 1 Stock Status**

* 1a: ‘*Ensure that harvest rates in FUs 6 and 34 are reduced to below the Fmsy proxy initially by restricting landings to no more than the catches advised by ICES for these two UoCs’*
* Action Lead: SG – HS Dev Project on the way (required resources)
  + toolbox of options will be useful
  + fishery footprint map shows distinct area that fishing activity occurs within
  + Y1 to start as soon as FIP is signed off
  + Technical measures on Devil’s Hole?
    - Not much activity in the area
    - No camera surveys done so info on stock is less robust
    - TAC now set for year
    - Stock status milestones maybe should be moved to kick in Y2 in order to be aligned with ICES advice and TACs being set
    - CM – Farne Deep and Devil’s hole both below FMSY
  + Action Plan can be changed as we go along
  + Is it a requirement for annual surveys?
    - Discussed in A4

**Action 2 Harvest Strategy**

* 2a: ‘*Assess the options and scope of alternative harvest strategies, in accordance with the North Sea Multi-Annual Plan (NSMAP), that will demonstrate that it is highly unlikely that the Fmsy for an individual FU will be exceeded*’
* Action Lead: Steering group through HS Dev Project
  + Different components need to be taken into account
  + No requirement to do this in any particular way
  + Most fisheries don’t involve TACs
  + Stock definition = FUs (each assessed and managed separately)
    - Can therefore have different management regimes for each if needed
    - More flexible and more complex
  + MSC and management not necessarily the same thing
  + MSC need auditable and evidence based – may limit which management systems can be put in place
    - Ideally pre-plan what to do before you do it
    - Consult as if required to know that when stock is below specific reference point everyone knows what is to be done
  + FUs need to be thought of as separate ‘fisheries’
  + 2 parts to strategy
    - under normal conditions – tech controls, mesh size etc to hit harvest rate (Total Catch around science based rate)
      * could be argued that most FUs are in this position
    - plan of what to do if things go wrong
      * difference in MSC between Limit Ref Point and normal Ref Point – if below LFP then fishery is suspended
      * ICES working group to meet and talk about this this year
    - Both need to be run in tandem
    - Need to demonstrate to MSC that measures implemented will achieve necessary rebuilding/maintenance of stock
  + Most fisheries have constant harvest rate to keep species at status quo
  + But a secondary back up plan is required as fail-safe
  + Computer sim models used as evidence that strategy would work (example)
  + NS Haddock fishery example
    - Rules in place so is still MSC certified even though fishery fell below status quo and needed to be built back up
  + HS not maintained at FU level and this is why it is below 60
    - In MAP these are already pretty much laid out
  + Farne Deep example shows that some evidence that stock at FU level can be recovered if these rules are applied
    - Slight calculated risk
  + Is putting these measures in place for each specific FU overkill?
    - MAP is law so of course it will be abided by
    - Legal requirements can conflict with one another
    - No harvest strategy guarantees stock health but if its defined it can then be audited and is provable
  + Is the key point the evidence?
    - If computer modelling was to be done at FU level for HCRs then action would be completed
    - Farne Deep example can be used as evidence
  + MAMP agreed by all member states
    - Why is this not auditable if its set in law
    - Not being done at a FU level
    - Evidence based for the outcome of stock recovery
    - Currently not specific enough for FU level
  + Paper is to look at whether MAP is currently good enough and if it’s not then what can be done on top of it to raise score
  + MAP set out what is to be done and in intent regulation is good
    - Whether or not this is practical and can actually be rolled out in practice
  + Facilitate what is currently in place and if it’s enough and if it’s not what can be done to raise score
  + It is the fishery’s responsibility to demonstrate that it meets the MSC standard

**Action: Paul Medley to reach out to Mike Park, Whitby Seafood, Ned Clarke, Carlos Mesquita, Harry Wick, Alan MaCulla, Ewen Bell re: harvest strategy development project**

* Farne Deep case study as to why FU TACs don’t necessarily work
* All FUs are covered under a MAMP

**Action: If draft report is available before next SG meeting then a webinar to present initial findings**

* Action should be around keeping Spawn Stock biomass around Sustainable Yield – FMSY proxy as a safe harvest level

**Action: Poseidon to update wording of Action Plan: link to biomass to fluctuating around bMSY – should be at Btrig**

* 2b: ‘*Investigate whether there is any discarding of nephrops above the MCRS*‘
* Action Lead: MSS
  + Discards per FU and describe why may not be relevant anymore
  + Needed as a tracking doc to demonstrate it has been considered
  + ICES assumes that 25% of discards survive
    - This is a conservative estimate
    - Survivability at sea level and sea bed may be different
  + Discards survivability project -> Fisheries Innovation Project (Sterling Uni)
  + Total discards 4.4% 🡪 25% survivability rate
  + Important to minimise unwanted mortality and review evidence available and measures to minimise unwanted catch
  + Providing discard information

**Action: CM to provide discard data and explain why MCRS is no longer relevant and that it has already been considered**

**Action: FIS paper with Stirling on Nephrops discards- circulate and send to FN**

**Action: Highlight action with AFBI and CEFAS for their input**

**Action 3 HCR Rules & Tools**

* + - 3a: *Consider options for defining Blim and how exploitation rates should vary dependent on the estimate of stock status in relation to stock abundance reference points. Ensure that catches do not exceed the levels advised by ICES*
    - ICES workshop focused on fishing mortality reference points rather than biomass reference points
      * Cefas made attempts to create BLim values
      * Btrigger in NS are lowest abundance records from surveys
        + Embedded in NS MAP from 2008/9 (?)
      * BLim not yet defined – clarification from ICES on timeline
      * BLim to not be defined until year 3
      * Limit Ref Point are problem for ICES
        + Easy to define in default value and terms
        + Scientific requirement but in theory assessors can suggest working value for assessment purposes and as last resort
        + Would have to have some justification
      * Cefas and MSS to discuss with ICES and contracted out if needed

**Action: Contact Ewen about contracting out this work if necessary**

**Action 4 Information & Monitoring**

* 4a: ‘*Determine timescale for implementing annual TV surveys in all FUs’*
* Action Lead: MSS
  + Hasn’t changed since last meeting
  + In Scottish FUs, aim to survey each one every year
  + FU 34 & 10 are not priorities
    - 34 – 8 of last 10 years
    - 10 – much more exposed and isolated, last surveyed in 2012
      * another 24hrs of ship time may increase likelihood of survey
  + might be better to have a good survey for smaller FUs every 2nd year rather than annually
  + wording to be changed from ‘Annual’ to ‘regular’
  + ICES splits stocks by categories – smaller FUs are ‘Data Limited’ and use passed results from surveys
  + ICES may have just released paper on Data Deficient stocks
  + Seafish IDing Category 4 stocks and what might be done to get more data for them
  + If smaller FUs don’t have Btrig etc would they not fall foul of HCR
    - Should be developed by the time they are needed
    - landings is not a good approximation for overall population
  + Massive fluctuations between abundance surveys
  + Advice determined by latest survey data
  + No protocol of prioritisation but smallest FUs are undertaken last
    - Based on level of catch and region
  + No estimates of Nephrops recruitment
  + For FIP AP there needs to be an eye kept on that regular reviews are being undertaken

**Action: Cefas find ICES paper on data limited fisheries - seafish /cefas? Work on category 4**

**Action 5 Assessment of Stock Status**

* 5a: ‘*Review data requirements for developing harvest ratio reference points for FUs 5, 10 and 34. Use 7.5% harvest ratio as reference point until better estimate is available.’*
* Action Lead: MSS & Cefas
  + ICES looked at all Harvest rates and picked 7.5% as proxy for FUs that have not yet has a Reference Point developed
  + No change of score

## **Principle 2**

* Comments detailed in comments log
* Anything of relevance from S2 Scallop has also been fed in
* Primary outcome scores unchanged
* Primary management reduced to less than 60 due to Whiting TAC set at a level that is expected to hinder recovery
* ICES advice is 0 but a TAC has been set
  + Cod recovery won’t be hindered but it will for whiting 🡪 any whiting catch will harm recovery
  + ICES advice specifically specifies that Nephrops trawl catches majority of whiting
  + Beginning to analyse data specific to FUs
  + Dispute over inter-benchmarking for Cod 🡪 could significantly adjust upwards if changed
  + Whiting TAC has been set to allow Nephrops fishery to continue in area 🡪 fishery has sig impact on whiting
  + Regional work done to assess status of all fin fish species (currently covering Clyde but could be extended out)

**Action: Carlos to ask Helen if there is any benchmarking for Whiting and the timeline**

**Action: Elaine to look into regional work on finfish stocks - St andrews and cifa awaiting info**

* Inclusion of invert ETPs
* Not possible to justify that UoA does not hinder recovery of invert PMFs due to footprint not fully documented and overlap not known
* Pink Sea Fingers, Fan Mussel, Ocean Quahog, Heart Cockle, Northern Feather Star
  + Included within MPAs
* PMFs
  + Seabed habitats; low mobility species; mobile species
  + Protection via MPAs and management for specific features
  + MSC methodology not prescriptive as to whether PMFs count as ETP e.g. Cod should be primary/secondary rather than ETP
  + Looking at accepted approaches within other MSC certified fisheries to inform process
  + All PMF habitats considered as VMEs 🡪 inc beds, sea pens and burrowing megafauna
  + Almost how MSC standard has been written
  + Commercial mobile species in primary/ secondary
  + Low mobility species considered at ETP along with non-commercial mobile species (e.g harbour porpoise)
  + Similar species considered by both S2 FIPs
  + 11 features selected out by SNH as ‘priority’ 🡪 ‘Recover’ conservation objectives
    - burrowed mud considered a PMF
    - so Nephrops trawl takes place within this
    - further work needed on this list
    - PMFs chosen by Scottish Government with consultation from SNH
    - ETP and Habitats sections of PA concern on wording
    - PMF info on website and look to overlap PMFs within fishery
    - 11 MPAs with burrowed mud as priority feature
    - Marine Scotland consulted on status of PMFs outside of MPA network and management measure consultation to come in future
    - Consultation on phase 2 MPA management measures

**Action: Cass to send Jo info on Phase 2 management measures consultation this year when available (and on MPAs consultation)**

**Action: All Industry reps to find out about creel bait species and estimate quantity**

**RL**: Highly relevant that fishery occurs on burrowed mud

V little protected within MPAs as it is considered widespread

Majority is therefore fished

Scot Gov under obligation to protect status of PMFs

Any plan for Nephrops fishery is de facto a plan for conservation status of PMF

Does not come through in doc

* + - Burrowed mud proposed as VME
    - Acceptable level of interaction needs to be defined
    - Scotland far ahead in regards to process, deciding MPAs and implementing management
    - need to understand trigger levels surrounding trawl interactions with burrowed mud
    - most heavily impacted habitat due to long term trawling
    - currently no habitat plan for burrowed mud
      * long consultation looking at what parts of sea met DEFRA requirements and subsequently closed off
      * percentage of how much features should be protected undertaken by Marine Scotland
        + some MPAs exclude bottom trawling
    - CB: MPA network in Scottish waters phase 1 do have fishery management in place and some will be consulted on in phase 2 this year
      * Not looking to protect everything but need representative cover across a spread of sites
      * Cannot protect everything
      * Sustainable fishery should also work for conservation measures and would be in interest of fishery to look after Burrowed Mud PMF
      * Everyone coming together will hopefully get to the same goals in the end
        + Ecosystem scores lowered based on better wider ecosystem impact understanding
  + Will UoA cause serious/irreversible harm 🡪 reversibility and recoverability
  + Damage requiring 5-20 years of recovery considered in this bracket
  + Recovery = 80% grow back
  + VMEs must consider historical extent (if known)
* Move on rule

**Action 6 Primary Species**

* + - 6a: *Collate and analyse catch composition for each FU, to confirm categorisation of main & minor for each FU.*
    - Action Lead: MSS and Poseidon
      * 2 key data sources MMO and EU DCF
      * Nephrops trawl considered by MMO under demersal trawl/seine
      * Different FUs will have significantly different landings 🡪 not total catch
      * MSC standard quite prescriptive as to main/minor species
        + no minor species at SG80 or 60 level
        + strong argument for West of Scot Whiting to be considered a ‘Main’
    - precautionary approach
  + recommended that analysis should be done annually 🡪 to be reflected in AP
  + up to assessors when it comes to full assessment
  + catch and discard estimate sampling in line with stock
  + FU sampling would require a lot of work
  + Sampling not designed for these specific requirements
  + Feasible but difficult
  + Not all Nephrops caught in targeted fishery
    - Client group not yet formed but what gear should be included needs to be discussed
    - Fishery to be taken through SFSAG 🡪 include all vessels
    - Large proportion of Nephrops now caught in subset in TR1
    - 6b: *Establish bait species used within creel fishery and determine outcome status*.
      * yet to get information on this
      * amount of Bait used is important
        + less bait used the better as it could count as a minor species
        + various white fish, herring, mackerel all used as baitfish
        + Action to get fishers to determine what/how much baitfish used in fishery
        + SFSAG would not consider creel within their certification
        + Nephrops mostly use whole fish as bait
        + William Davies feedback: majority of Nephrops creel fleet use Herring/Sprat and a little bit of Mackerel occasionally. This is usually very small cuts of fish NOT whole fish – 40/60g chunks

**Action 7 Secondary species**

* 7a: ‘*Accurately profile catch composition of creel nephrops fishery. For example, review catch data to determine if catch composition specific to nephrops creel can be determined (i.e. separate from crab & lobster creels and whelk pots). Based on this data review categorisation of main & minor for each FU’*
  + crab and lobster considered despite it being likely that they are not caught 🡪 anecdotal but not evidence for this as yet
  + ways to accurately profile this needed
  + Loch Torridon MSC fishery was a creel fishery 🡪 would be good to look at this
  + Logbook data for specifically creel fishers to estimate composition of catch
  + Try to avoid use of observers at extra expense

**Action: All look into Loch Torridan certification data**

**Action 8 ETP Species**

* 8a: ‘*GIS-based risk assessment. Listing of potential ETPs interacting with creel and trawl UoAs, and then mapping of ETP distribution overlap with UoA creel and trawling effort’*
  + VMS for more than 12m vessels created by ICES
  + Comment from OpenSeas led to use of this publicly available data source
  + Speak to ICES about shapefile availability
  + Data on PMFs is quite course currently but would be good to get shapefiles to get better resolution
  + SNH might have distribution data available
    - NMPI data should be downloadable
      * Tall Sea Pens should be included

**Action: Environmental SG members to provide Poseidon with shapefiles so they can be mapped onto VMS data, Richard to feed in (cover all habitats and ETP species)**

* **Would be interesting to know what shapefiles used by SNH**
* **Fiona to be put in contact with SNH GIS team**
* **Spurdog have high risk of interaction so this would be a good species to focus on 🡪 minimise risk of interaction**
  + **Currently being undertaken in Western Islands and looking at it in South West**

**Action: Elaine- find out timeline for ETP research and pass on to Jo**

* + Not much VMS information on Creel
    - Will be solved with inshore VMS introduction

**Action 9 Habitats**

* + - Action Lead: agreed that Poseidon should not be action lead due to conflict of interest. SNH suggested but want to remain as ‘active observers’. Seafish (on basis of trying out tool that has been developed)
      * Partnership agreement to be discussed offline
      * LINK to also feed in as partner
    - 9a: ‘*Review overlap of trawl and creel fisheries (footprint analysis) and vulnerability of commonly encountered habitats and VMEs, including Scottish PMF habitats and MPA and SAC habitat features.’*
      * Shapefiles and agreement over what to include

**Action: SNH look into availability of shape files for Poseidon**

**Action: All eNGO SG members to provide data – what’s available and most important**

* + - 9b: ‘*Review status of management measures development and implementation within MPAs and SACs’*
      * change due to SG member comment
      * more information on SAC and PMF habitat features
    - 9c: ‘*Assessment of nephrops trawl impact on habitats, including analysis via Bangor University habitat assessment tool’*
      * discuss commission and undertaken of this project
      * possibly similar to Lemon Sole
        + habitats inferred from substrate
        + productivity of habitat and depth of gear penetration and type of habitats
        + separate analysis on VMEs
        + Possible project for FIS (?) – wording to highlight innovation
        + Emergent macro-fauna included?

Productivity inferred from how much is taken vs how much is still there

Similar principle to Nephrops camera surveys

* + - * + Find out where pinch points are
        + Speak to Jan Hiddink about Bangor work
        + MK habitat PhD inclusion possible(?)

2 discussed 🡪 one based on the west coast, some controversy

should have impact on both Scallop & Nephrops

Local fishing associations want to be around the table to discuss before signing off

**Action: Look into whether this could be included in MK’s PhD or other ideas for funding? FIS?**

* 9d: ‘*Review VMEs based on knowledge of the historical extent and distribution.’*
  + blurring of ETP and habitat species, ongoing further discussions needed to talk about fine details
  + management plan could be designed to cover both
  + may need some re-alignment of AP to merge these actions together

**Action 10 Ecosystem**

* Lead: SG sub-group TBD and to report back to larger SG.
  + Follows on from previous action
  + Look for external funding
  + Seafish to be AL and advise
* 10a/b: ‘*Review available data / information available on ecosystem interaction, including relevant to Actions 6 to 9. Constitute expert group and conduct SICA analysis of main ecosystems and ecosystem services impacted by nephrops trawling across the UoAs under assessment.’*
  + subgroup needed to be developed
  + SICA analysis already prescribed
    - Quite involved and assessment team don’t have much time to undertake
    - If client group can undertake beforehand then it would be good
    - If no alternative and risk assessment can eliminate gap CG should commission someone to do it and start process before it becomes a condition
    - Can be written as independent report and submitted to assessment team
      * Cefas undertook Channel Scallop SICA

**Action: consider external funding for SICA**

* Habitat information for Creel has meant a lowered score
  + Recommendation to improve catch composition data
  + Increase representation of creel sector on SG
  + Any information on creel footprint?
    - Only info available that is reliable is landings data at ICES rectangle scale
    - VMS data only available for over 15m 🡪 will improve over time as a result of inshore VMS and 12m MMO data
    - MSS may have data available through ScotMap 🡪 for all creeling and not specific

**Action: Continue to update SCFF and see if they are interested in engaging further**

## **Principle 3**

**Action 11 Compliance and Enforcement**

* 11a: ‘*review the risks of non-compliance associated with the nephrops fishery (including in relation to the Landing Obligation)’*
  + implementation of LO has led to change in score
  + aligns with Scallop FIP
  + VMS not accurate determination as to whether vessel is fishing or not
  + 3knot fishing assumption not enough to prove or disprove
  + SFSAG NS Cod fishery example
    - Closure to everyone as it was too difficult to determine gear in gear out
    - 1 warning and then removal from MSC vessel list

**Action: MP to update on SFSAG code audit when relevant and provide info on how they are addressing the LO**

* Where action lead is ‘Steering Group’ how is it closed out?
  + Watching brief actions put as SG
  + Majority have been changed to specific action leads
* 2 weeks from when latest AP is sent around for comment and then it will be closed and put up onto FP etc
  + no major updates to PA
    - SNH comments on same timeframe

## **Next Steps**

Stakeholder engagement

* Anyone IDed to be included in SG?
  + LINK 🡪 environmental interests are under-represented
    - WWF on line and LINK represents 8 bodies
    - 15/18 pages of comments from Richard
    - lack of confidence from environmental groups
    - suggestion of OpenSeas
    - more active involvement, another LINK member onto SG
  + meeting in general focused on Scotland
    - sub-groups might encourage more local interaction from both environmental and industry
      * Possible to move SG meetings around but does not necessarily change environmental representation
      * WWF to attend in person rather than dialling into meeting?
        + Clarus: Definitely consider but almost impossible for them to attend all 8
        + Have to be strategic as to which SG meetings to join
        + FIPs are fairly industry specific, meaning that NGOs not fully focused on fisheries may find it challenging
        + Would agree that it would be useful to have more environmental input
        + Sub-groups are a good suggestion and then decisions brought to overall SG meetings for sign off
      * Creating environmental sub-group may look like segregation and not having as must input
      * Follow up with LINK Northern Ireland, consider future meetings and who else should come
    - More regional fishermen to come along potentially?
    - ‘Industry’ isn’t just large scale fishing attending – range of industry members
    - Aisla - possible need to try and reach out to smaller NGOs and engage with MSC standard and FIP
      * Change in style of engagement after FIP has been signed off and is in process

OpenSeas

* + - Want to become SG member but up to other SG members to make the ecision
    - Scallop idea was to send ToR to them and they must agree that they align themselves with these
    - Go down to vote if not unanimous
    - Helena (Tesco) – OpenSeas should be more engaged
    - William Davies – happy to have OpenSeas
    - Group agree that it makes sense to do it the same way as the scallop group
    - WWF – what happens if they’re not able to join the SG and how can we have their input 🡪 one way or another it is important to get their voice heard
      * Not being on SG doesn’t mean they won’t be involved at all
      * Will still seek out their input

**Action: JP to engage with and feedback to group over sign-off on ToR**

* + Rules of Engagement doc to be developed
    - Provides updates on any developments
    - Can be sent out externally and can be updated on a 6-monthly basis
    - Timeline of what has happened since last update
  + Webpages
    - Seafish website
    - FisheryProgress
    - MSC developing landing page
    - Film

**Action: Jo to circulate MSC Fishery Standard Review**

* + Chair discussion
    - Dan Whittle put forward as co-chair alongside MSC during 1st SG meeting
    - Help during hiring for CP replacement and the FIP moving into its active phase
    - Agreement across SG

## **Close**

CP thanked the group for attending. The next meeting will be arranged by Doodlepoll for June/July.

















