



North Western Waters Advisory Committee

Working Group 3 (Channel)

Thursday 9th July 2015
09:00 - 11:00

Conference Room 01, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh.

Chairman: Daniel Lefèvre
Rapporteur: Jim Portus

1. Welcome

The Chairman welcomed members, observers and invited guests to Edinburgh for the NWWAC Working Group 3. The full list of participants is appended (Annex I).

- Apologies received from John Hermse: Noted.
- Welcome Ciaran Whelan for Irish South & East FPO and Manu Kelbéline (replacing R P Chever) for CDPMEM Finistère.
- Adoption of Agenda: The Agenda was adopted. R Brouzes requested to provide additional reporting of Ray in ICES Area 7d. Agreed.
- Adoption of Report from last meeting (Bilbao Thursday 23rd April 2015): the meeting report had been circulated beforehand among all WG3 members. It was agreed that 2 amendments should be made. Regarding Point 1: Rachel Lagiere represents PO COBRENORD, not Bluefish. Regarding Point 5 the French translation should be Ray *brunette* not *undulates*.

2. Implementation of new CFP landing obligation in the Channel fisheries:

- Introducing this subject, the Chairman invited the Commission (Laurent Markovic, LM) to explain their position and objectives for NWW, also with regard to the MS Joint recommendations for the discard plan. The EC keeps asking for data for the calculation of a quota top-up, why is that?

LM: for example sole in VIII, the landing obligation applies to trawlers (if in 2013-2014 > 5% sole) and the EC needs to know which/how many vessels this applies to and what their discards were.

RB: whiting question: the ICES advice is positive, will the new TAC include discards or not? If the TAC is not topped up, then unwanted catch should not be deducted from the quota.

LM: If this species is not in the Joint MS recommendations then the TAC will not be topped up.

RB: is it possible to sell unwanted catch for options other than human consumption? Undersized species are not allowed for human consumption, but can they be used for medicine, fish meal etc, for 'indirect human consumption'?

L: – not sure what 'direct or indirect for human consumption' means but perhaps it is add this to the letter to the EC for explanation?

- Conclusion: *Pose questions for the ExCom letter to the Commission.*

3. Sea Bass Management:

- Report from the InterAC meeting in Paris [Jacques Pichon]; Many meetings have discussed seabass. Now, without consensus the EC has seen fit to set up emergency measures this year in the face of poor ICES advice for 2016.



The day before the InterAC meeting the EC issued a proposal for the 2nd phase of the emergency measures – including a new minimum size (42 cm). The meeting had to concentrate on the short term instead of the long term agenda. Thus no Long-term plan has yet been drafted. All professionals recognised and accepted that measures could be taken, and that adaptations should be made to the EC proposal to make it bearable. Limits have been imposed. Flexibility between months should be possible. It had been decided to draft AC advice to MS on this. To conclude the work, all stakeholders need to compromise. This has proved difficult. There was a lack of good will. There is now concern about the functioning of the AC to be able to respond adequately and to produce timely good advice.

The Chairman opined that there is no comfort from the fact the new measures will be temporary and will be reviewed at December council.

JP: He felt that the meeting in Paris had too many people from too many different backgrounds. It would be good to better prepare for meeting with participants indicating beforehand their objectives and intentions.

Barry Deas: Opined that the InterAC has not done well with advice – it is a complex organisation with a wide variety of interests. InterAC advice has not influenced the bag limits, monthly catch limits and the new MCRS. A plan must be developed – part of Multi Species Plans or standalone – the InterAC needs to focus on this plan as urgent business. What might work to produce good advice is a focus group with scientists/managers. It is important to have flexible measures to help avoid unintended consequences (e.g. application of the LO, pelagic or demersal).

LM: confirmed that the EC was not comfortable setting short-term measures. What they needed was advice leading to a long-term plan.

Manu Kelbéline opined that although the ICES advice is very strong, MSY in 2016 would be socially unbearable. The new CFP allows for socio-economic reasons to deliver MSY by no later than 2020.

JP: agreed with BD – long term plan needed. CFP looks for quick implementation of plans, but a separate plan might not be most efficient. Perhaps seek modest approach for 2016 with MSY by 2020.

LM Measures will have to be taken before 2020.

Stephan Baucher – a great deal of work has been done already by eNGOs on seabass, they submitted a text – what happened to that text? This will have to be put back on the table.

Bertie Armstrong– the process for bass has been very difficult. We are looking for compromise in a small focus group. This would be the best way forward. Please put it to the Ex-Comm.

- Conclusion: *small drafting/focus group to be proposed to the ExCom.*

4. Eastern Channel 7d Sole:

- NWWAC established a small Focus Group to provide advice for sole 7d in the Eastern Channel [Emiel Brouckaert].

EB: Last year pressure from France & Belgium ensured the ICES single-species Fmsy advice was not translated into the TAC, but still 28% reduction was implemented. The Commission accepted commitments from the MS involved in the fishery towards a management strategy to avoid further sharp reductions. The NWWAC established a focus group to draft advice in a tight deadline of the middle of June. A report of the focus group meeting in Dublin is available in draft.

Analysis of a range of options for the stock prepared by Ifremer helped greatly. Draft advice has been provided that was submitted to ExCom in time for evaluation by STECF. A note from CEFAS was received that concurred with Ifremer.

The new management strategy would reduce the TAC in 2016 to 3000 t then keep it constant until 2020. According to Ifremer, this should ensure the stock reaches Fmsy by then. Technical measures were included as options for STECF to evaluate for their contribution to stock recovery. These included TCMs, a biomass safeguard and rigorous data collection. Flexibility is important – the plan should be able to adapt to new information to avoid static plans that hampered developments as experienced in the past.

LM – the EC welcomed the advice and hoped STECF evaluation will be positive. He asked will this mean that the French measures will be continued? Will nursery areas be off-limits to netters?



Delphine – the measures will stand in 2015, but perhaps will be adapted over time. The Nursery area closures will be imposed.

RB: problem with the stock is low Recruitment, few juveniles managed to grow. Opined that measures to protect juveniles on the UK side would be very useful.

MK: the need to reduce the TAC and Technical measures, viewed positively by NGOs. The HCR (harvest control rules) need to be very precise.

LM: there is a controversy between EP and EC on the requirements of the Lisbon Treaty vis a vis use of HCRs. This will be resolved in court, hopefully by the end of the year.

BD: commended Emiel as chair, hopes the advice will be taken up even if it is not legislated. UK was happy with management by TAC. UK are ready to look into use of nursery areas and appropriate measures of protection, but noted that UK fisheries differ and what suits one metier may not suit another.

- Conclusion: *Sole in ICES Division VIII submitted advice note commended.*

5. Acrunet presentation

This item was removed from the agenda for another suitable date due to absence of the presenter.

6. Ray management: Undulate ray -- Intentions of the Commission concerning the fisheries.

Landings of this species are no longer banned since 2014 thanks to the hard work by stakeholders co-operating with scientists. It is, however, a very low TAC. In FR scientific research is considered the way to make best use of limited catches.

More elasmobranch species are being considered. For example, the CEFAS spurdog project.

RB: we have a TAC for a combination of Rays – advice is given on a PA basis (Cat 3), but the approach for TAC setting is not very clear. To protect weaker species this is OK, but *Raya clavata* is 70% in some areas. Could a TAC be set for this species and a group TAC for the other species?

LM: for 2015 any in-year changes need to be requested by MS. Congratulates fishermen on the program that was set up by fisheries organisations. To begin with STECF was not in favour because data were not clear, they had to give PA advice because of that. It would be good if all MS set up a scientific protocol to improve data and enable planning of the catches to avoid early choke of fisheries.

ICES advice will come in October. Since 2014 ICES has given advice per species. If we want different TACs for different species a distribution key for relative stability is needed. Cautioned that taking certain species of rays out of the 'pool' may create more choke species?

There was discussion on the difference between the FR industry proposal and the plan that STECF received for evaluation (and rejected). A project is set up in FR – RAIMEST. Report should be finalised by September and results available by the end of the year and this could be used as the basis for AC advice. More vessel nationalities are invited to join,

Barry: French initiative is good, it should achieve a more targeted management than current measures and more data. The **AC could take up a coordinating role and make coherent advice**. Could serve as a model – how to move to less rigid management system while having the data to support scientific background for rules.

- Conclusion:
 - AC to coordinate (set up Focus Group?) to prepare a coherent advice
 - Support establishment of projects in other MS similar to RAIMOUEST on Skates and Rays
- **Spurdog** Intentions of the UK concerning management.

Chair: Are there any comments on the project, which is now only undertaken by the UK?

Paul Trebilcock: the project tries to get real time data and management adaptation. WG2 felt the AC should support other MS to get involved.

Johnny Woodlock: This will be discussed in ExCom, notes that he could not support reopening of the fisheries, because the species can be very quickly fished down and is currently recovering.



Chair: Important to get scientific input to improve the avoidance and management of this species. Calls for the **group to support this**.

- Conclusion: *Support WG2 initiative on Spurdogs.*

7. GAP2 Report: Report on a meeting of a working group on scallops in VIId,e at Port en Bessin, Normandy [Erin Priddle]. See PPT on NWWAC website.

The project provided a good platform for suggested improvements to management for scallops in the Channel. Project is now finished, reports have been distributed. Objective is to bring people together – stakeholders, science, managers. Good governance framework is important, data collection needs improvement in coordination,

- Designing research protocols
- Harmonisation without homogenization
- Set up a management WG
- Convene a scallop focus group (within or separate from the AC)
- UK industry selectivity trials of FR gears.

Ad-hoc meeting in Edinburgh – will be reported on. Focus group needed?

InterReg funding? – Retailers – private – finances to be explored.

Follow up: **focus group on Scallops with AC needed** could also be done by Webex to prepare a meeting in October.

- Conclusion: *Support investigation of funding streams to carry forward the work of Gap2 in association with NWWAC*

8. Summary of actions and proposals for the Executive Committee

- *ACTION: Implementation of Landing Obligation: Pose questions for the ExComm letter to the Commission.*
- *ACTION: SEABASS: Support establishment urgently of InterAC Focus Group*
- *ACTION: Sole in ICES Division VIId submitted advice note commended.*
- *ACTION: Support establishment of projects in other MS similar to RAIMOUEST on Skates and Rays*
- *ACTION: Support WG2 initiative on Spurdogs.*
- *ACTION: Support investigation of funding streams to carry forward the work of Gap2 in association with NWWAC*

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 1105.



ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Members WG3		
Daniel	Lefèvre	CRPMEM Basse Normandie
Jim	Portus	South West FPO
Bertie	Armstrong	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Anne-Margaret	Anderson	The Scottish White Fish Producers Association
Emiel	Brouckaert	Rederscentrale
Richard	Brouzes	OPBN
Kevin	Charlot	CNPMEM
Sylvie	Roux	CDPMEM des Côtes d'Armor
John	Crudden	European Anglers Alliance
Dave	Cuthbert	New Under Ten Fishermen's Association
Barrie	Deas	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
Emanuel	Kelbérine	CDPMEM du Finistère
Rachel	Lagiere	OP COBRENORD
John	Lynch	Irish Fishermen's Organisation
Helen	McLachlan	World Wildlife Fund
Geert	Meun	Dutch Fisheries Organisation (2)
Jacques	Pichon	Pêcheurs de la Manche et d'Atlantique
Delphine	Roncin	CRPMEM Nord/Pas de Calais/Picardie
Dominique	Thomas	Coopératives Maritimes Etaploises & Armement Cooperatif Artisanal du Nord
Paul	Trebilcock	Cornish Fish Producers Organisation
Ciaran	Whelan	Irish South & East FPO
Stephan	Beaucher	Fundacion ENT
Observers		
Andrew	Clayton	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Gonzague	De Moncuit	Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable et de l'énergie
Iain	Glasgow	DEFRA
Mindaugas	Kisieliauskas	European Commission
Laurent	Markovic	European Commission
Erin	Priddle	GAP 2 Project
Glenn	Quelch	European Fisheries Control Agency
Johnny	Woodlock	Irish Seal Sanctuary
Ross	Dougal	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Marc	Ghiglia	UAPF
Eduardo	Miguez	EAFPA
Despina	Symons	EBCD
NWWAC Secretariat		
Conor	Nolan	Executive Secretary
Barbara	Schoute	Deputy Executive Secretary
Joanna	McGrath	Executive Assistant - Finance and Administration