

## Minutes of Channel scallop FIP Steering Group meeting

Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2017, 14.00 – 17.00  
MSC Office, 1 Snow Hill, London, EC1A 2DH

### Attendees:

Bill Badger (BB)	Defra
Chloe North (CN)	MSC
Christopher Page (CP)	Heriot-Watt University
Claire Pescod (CP)	MSC
Helen Hunter (HH)	Defra
Iain Spear (IS)	Coombe
Jim Portus (JP)	SWFPO
John Macalister (JM)	SWFPA
Nathan de Rozarieaux (NdR)	Falfish
Rhiannon Holden (RHol)	Imperial University
Ruth Hoban (RHob)	New England
Tim Huntington (TH)	Poseidon

### Attendee via phone/web:

Andy Lawler (AL)	Cefas
Michel Kaiser (MK)	Seafish SAG
Sarah Clark (SC)	Devon & Severn IFCA

### Apologies:

Adam Green	Lyons
Ally Dingwall	Sainsburys
Andrea O'Shaunessy	MMO
Bryce Stewart	Seafish SAG
Colin Trundle	Cornwall IFCA
Gus Caslake	Seafish
Juliette Hatchman	Macduff
Margaux Favret	MSC France
Mark Webber	Oceanfish
Paul Trebilcock	CFPO

#### 1. Minutes & Action Points

There were no comments on the minutes of the last meeting, so they were signed off. We went through the action points from the minutes and the people responsible explained how they had addressed it or if not, their plan for addressing it.

HH has and will continue to share updates on the project within Defra.

Number	Lead	Action	Status
1	CN	To amend ToR & send round group	Complete
2	All	To send track changes of ToR to CN	Complete
3	JH/JP	To discuss the actions with the UK scallop project and see if they are willing oversee that these actions are happening	Ongoing
4	HH	To share the project outputs including Action Plan with government	Complete
5	CN	To get information from MP and summarise for the group for the next meeting	Ongoing
6	CN	To liaise with MMO to see if this data is available	Complete
7	JH	To investigate the overlap between the two projects, if there are any gaps.	Ongoing
8	CN	To discuss further with Cefas to cost the necessary review of information	Complete
9	HH	to provide CN with a contact at JNCC to investigate this	Complete
10	CN/TH	To investigate with standards if other fisheries have used this argument successfully.	Complete

## 2. Terms of Reference

There was a suggestion at the last meeting to have the Terms of Reference signed in person as well as virtually. Therefore, the Terms of Reference was passed round and signed. Defra are there as an observer and therefore don't sign the Terms of Reference.

## 3. Project Update

CP gave an update on the year 1 outputs from all the FIPs. All outputs of the project should be transparent; therefore, we are uploading them all onto the PUKFI webpage on the Seafish website: [www.seafish.org/pukfi](http://www.seafish.org/pukfi)

CN is writing a year-1 funder's update and will circulate.

*Minutes action 1: CN to circulate the year1 funders update when ready*

CP gave an update on Seafish's involvement in the project. Tom Pickerell was responsible for the other strand of Project UK (PUK), which was looking to carry out a large-scale pre-assessment and identify other FIPs around the UK. MSC is meeting with Seafish soon to discuss their involvement now that Tom has left, Helen Duggan is discussing this internally. Gus Caslake is representing Seafish in the FIPs in the Southwest.

*Minutes action 2: CP to update group after meeting with Seafish.*

MSC is being asked about other species that people want to be included so they are thinking of starting another round of FIPs. MSC are aware of a lot of interest from the industry and supply chain for Scottish scallops, North Sea monkfish and nephrops.

CP asked the group what their thoughts on more FIPs would be and if they would support it financially and if there are any other priority species that haven't yet been highlighted with Tom. The group felt that we need to limit this priority list and narrow it down.

Some people were concerned that more FIPs would divert attention from the current FIPs and slow the progress. We could also use the lessons learnt from these FIPs if we do the next lot of FIPs after. CP assured the group that if we are going to add more FIPs, extra resource will be brought on board to deal with the workload.

There are also other FIP projects in the UK and Ireland now as well, with the Welsh Fisherman's Association carrying out pre-assessments and initiating FIPs in Wales, and a FIP project in Ireland too. The MSC FIP tools are relatively new but PUKFI is demonstrating their use and showing a replicable project model.

The actions in the action plans are being carried out through a number of means, through steering group members themselves, through consultants, through a postdoctoral researcher and through masters students. The two masters students were present at the meeting, they are researching effects of certain fisheries on Endangered, Threatened & Protected (ETP) species. Rhiannon is working on scallops and Chris on monkfish. Rhiannon is due to present her early findings later in the agenda.

#### 4. Scallop Action Plan updates, Principle 1

##### **Action 1 & 2 (stock status & harvest strategy)**

These actions are covered by the scallop stock assessment project. Ewen attended the ICES Scallop Working Group (WG) last October, he asked for a Terms of Reference for how the WG will look at the stock assessment work. There is a requirement for the project steering board to report to the WG. The stock assessment project is applying for funding for the next 2 years.

Participants in the scallop stock assessment project updated the group that they think they have enough data for all 3 stock areas in English waters. The WG have already discussed the stock units proposed and are agreed it looks like 3 stock units.

MK - Bangor did some genetics and connectivity research a year ago. This could help inform the process. The Bay de Seine looks like a separate unit from English side of the channel, but it may be similar to the North Cornwall population. The subpopulations are not as straightforward as east and west.

AL - Cefas are always open to more data to inform them better.

MK – we should be getting industry vessels more involved with the surveys and research dredge efficiency to use as CPUE data, this will help us have a more scientific and sustainable campaign.

*Minutes action 3: MK to circulate an advance draft of genetics paper.*

*Minutes action 4: CN to clarify the word 'consultation' in the action plan. Who are we consulting?*

*Minutes action 5: CN to map out Venn diagram of who needs to be consulted that is not in either project group. Where is the value chain vertically? Seafish have done something similar.*

##### **Action 3 is on Harvest Control Rules (HCRs)**

JP & Juliette Hatchman have discussed and have concluded that the aims and objectives of the scallop stock assessment project are addressing the aims and objectives of this project

*Minutes action 6: CN to follow up with Juliette and JP about project overlap exercise and circulating update on the scallop stock assessment project*

*Minutes action 7: CN to pull MSC requirements out for the stock assessment Performance Indicators (PIs) to assist Cefas in making sure its covered and set up a meeting with Ewen and Andy.*

#### **Action 4 is on information and monitoring**

Cefas – we need to know stock structure and stock productivity but there are no information gaps in the current stock assessment plan. There will be an industry bio-sampling scheme, a dredge survey and an underwater TV survey. However, if the funding isn't there in the future they will not be able to carry it on.

TH – There needs to be a review of the next 5 years of where any gaps might unfold.

#### 5. Scallop Action Plan updates, Principle 2

##### **Overview of preliminary Endangered, Threatened & Protected (ETP) species research**

Rhiannon Holden was introduced as the masters student selected to carry out the ETP research project. This project will look at the impact the scallop fishery may or may not be having on ETP species by assessing the risk the fishery is posing on the recovery of ETP populations. She will look at the fishery footprint in relation to ETP species distributions and catchability of the species in dredges. RHol has just started her research but she showed a few slides of the list of ETP species that she has identified could be in the same area as the fishery. Prioritisation of those 150 species is going to be key.

JP – It will be good for Rhiannon to meet the fishing industry because there is a lot of species on the list that will never come into contact with a scallop dredge and she needs to get industry input on that.

MK suggested she should refine the list before talking to fishermen so she doesn't get an adverse reaction from the beginning. She should go with a hypothesis of which species she thinks could be vulnerable. Indirect effects of the fishery should also be taken into account. He suggested to look at the Marine ecosystems program, the idea of program is to model different activities in sea and ecosystem consequences, it could feed into evidence base.

*Minutes action 8: CN to write in the link between ETP action and ecosystem action in the action plan.*

*Minutes action 9: MK to send a paper about the inshore fishery to Rhol*

SC – Most IFCA's will have idea on effort distribution in their districts.

MMO may have done some work on inshore effort or there may be something published in the ICES journal of marine science. Colin Warwick did some work for crown estate bringing fisherman's info on GIS database.

## Habitats

There is an application submitted to EMFF for a 2-year postdoctoral researcher to research into habitat impacts and habitat recoverability for this fishery.

MK gave an overview of what the postdoc will be doing - There is existing information on habitat types and together with VMS data, they can apply the tool that Bangor are developing for the MSC and with information on the distribution of species with different traits. This will enable them to do an analysis on to what extent the fishing has depleted the benthos, and the recoverability. They should be able to be more quantitative on estimating the condition of the seabed. One question is how do we take account of other seabed interacting gears?

TH – have they identified any VMEs that fall outside of ETP side, like pink seafans and fan mussels? It is worth considering those as a distinct stream in this work.

The question was asked, how much of total community biomass is removed by dredging? It was proposed to prioritise the most sensitive species.

JP asked whether the prioritisation and risk takes into account the density of the sensitive feature, and pointed out that it should be a factor. What is the appropriate unit for a population assessment? For example, in Lyme Bay the majority of the population is protected. By mapping you may find that you don't need to do this complicated analysis, you should analyse the fishing footprint first.

The questions were asked, will it be looked at seasonally and how long a time period should we look at the fishery footprint over? TH & CN explained that it is normally done quarterly and in the MSC guidance it recommends to look at the fishing activity over the last 5 years.

*Minutes action 10: CN to circulate MK's papers round group.*

## 6. Scallop Action Plan updates, Principle 3

One of the gaps highlighted in the pre-assessment was that there need to be a regular review of the management, both internal and occasionally external. The group asked Defra if this exists within Defra. HH explained that there is an informal internal review within Defra, it happens at various points within year. There is the generic high level reviews for example, when there's a new government. Then there's also more specific reviews such as if there's consultation with industry about new measures. The development of management measures for this project would be this sort of informal reviews.

JP – It would be better to have a specific timeline for review for specific fisheries. E.g. dover sole had a review period which was useful in order to refine recovery plan. JP feels better to have a formal review period.

TH – This could be written into the management plan that will be developed as part of Action 2.

JP – We have to be aware of Brexit and that the Western Waters effort regime may change.

CP – The Brexit process is review of current management as well but it must be recurrent thereafter.

TH – It also must be complete review rather than just what you are working on in the FIP. It doesn't have to be every year, it could be 5-yearly. With regards to minutes action 10 from the last meeting,

these FIP meetings are a review but will not continue after the FIP unless there is a specific effort to do so.

CP – It could be something that could be amalgamated into the Scallop Industry Consultation Group

*Minutes Action 11: MSC & TH to review the milestones in the action plan for M&E and then send round the group*

MK gave some thoughts about Principle 3 – This is the most difficult principle. You need to think about the management you want to apply fairly early on in the project. What are the trigger points and what is the spatial scale for management? Then you can design the work that Cefas are going to do. Scallops are sedentary so an area by area approach works well. Scientists need to know that in advance to inform the information you get. For example, if they are looking at scallop in the Isle of Man, they are moving to a smaller management scale.

AL - The survey is just on the stock assessment areas at the moment but they can be adaptive.

Mk – If considering quotas for scallops, you need to take into consideration an environmental disturbance threshold on an area by area basis when allocating the scallop quota, because a total scallop quota could have disproportionately bad Principle 2 scores.

TH – We should do a risk assessment of different management regimes and look at what the potential impacts could be. Output vs input limited. We should build this into work we are doing.

*Minutes action 12: CN to capture a risk assessment of different management regimes in year 2 in Action 2.*

MK – Scallops have a life history that requires structure on the seabed so good logic would be to build this into management process.

The Steering Group members were surprised that Scotland doesn't need an impact assessment when they change policy. This is something to consider if we start any FIP work in Scotland.

#### 7. AOB and date of next meeting

RHob – New England Seafood continue to strongly support the work of the FIP and think the progress is encouraging, and that there is good collaboration with the scallop stock assessment project. It would be good to have a flow chart to show progress against the timeline.

JP – SICG meeting in December 6<sup>th</sup> and the stock assessment project steering board is Jan 10<sup>th</sup>.

ICES WG – 10<sup>th</sup> 11<sup>th</sup> 12 October. It would be good to have the meeting this so we know the outcomes in terms of the stock assessment.

**W/C October 16<sup>th</sup> for a call.**

## 8. Summary of minutes actions

Number	Lead	Action	Status
1	CN	circulate the year1 funders update when ready	Ongoing
2	CP	update group after meeting with Seafish	Do now?
3	MK	circulate an advance draft of genetics paper	Complete
4	CN	clarify the word 'consultation' in the action plan. Who are we consulting?	Complete
5	CN	map out Venn diagram of who needs to be consulted that is not in either project group. Where is the value chain vertically? Seafish have done something similar.	Complete
6	CN/JH/JP	follow up with Juliette and JP about project overlap exercise and circulating update on the scallop stock assessment project	Complete
7	CN	pull MSC requirements out for the stock assessment Performance Indicators (PIs) to assist Cefas in making sure its covered and set up a meeting with Ewen and Andy	Have set it up
8	CN	write in the link between ETP action and ecosystem action in the action plan	ongoing
9	MK	send a paper about the inshore fishery to Rhol	Complete
10	CN	to circulate MK's papers round group	Complete
11	MSC & TH	review the milestones in the action plan for M&E and then send round the group	Ongoing
12	CN	capture a risk assessment of different management regimes in year 2 in Action 2	Ongoing