



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

MINUTES

WORKING GROUP 1 (West of Scotland and Western Approaches)

**CNPMEM, Paris
Wednesday 3rd of February 2016
09:00 –10:30**

Chairman: Bertie Armstrong (standing in for John Anderson)
Rapporteur: Debbie Crockard

1. Welcome

The acting WG1 Chairman, Bertie Armstrong, welcomed the members and the attendees to the meeting. The full list of participants is included as an annex to these minutes. Apologies for absence were received from John Anderson.

The agenda¹ was adopted as drafted. The following action points from the last meeting in Edinburgh (8th July 2015) had been completed:

- To contact relevant member states to ask them to make available national data on skates and rays;
- To compile a list of detailed questions on the implementation of the Landing obligation for Commission response ;
- To write a letter to the Commission on quota uplift issues;
- To organise a Focus group on Multi-annual Plans.

The following action remained in progress:

- To organise MAP scoping meetings with managers, scientists and AC to discuss the MAPs and the consultation response.

2. Election of new chair

¹ All relevant documents to the meeting can be found at the NWWAC website: [link](#)



John Anderson was unable to continue to act as chair due to an increased work load. The acting chair opened the floor to nominations for a new chair for WG1. Kevin Mc Donnell informed the group that the Scottish industry had discussed the nomination and would like to nominate Ross Dougal for chair. Mr Armstrong put it to the floor for consensus, no competition to the nomination was offered.

Mr Armstrong confirmed that Ross Dougal was accepted as the new chair to take up post from the next meeting.

3. MAREFRAME project (Alan Baudron, Aberdeen University, UK, Kåre Nolde Nielsen, Arctic University, Norway)

Alan Baudron congratulated the new chair and thanked the AC for the invitation. Mr Baudron explained that *MAREFRAME* is an EC funded project, which has been funded to develop the application of an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management in order to develop alternative management strategies in cooperation with stakeholders for several case studies across Europe (see <http://mareframefp7.org/>).

The meeting was provided with an outline of the tools and processes that would be used to facilitate this approach (presentation and introduction can be found [here](#)), considering:

- The use of Multi Annual Plans (MAPs);
- The incorporation of wider areas, more species and consideration of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and
- The use of the Baltic template for regionalisation.

It was highlighted that the NWWAC felt that the consultation on MAPs had been insufficient.

Members were informed that an Ecosystem model simulated alternatives and provide decision support for draft management proposals. The differences between the *MAREFRAME* and *DAMARA* approaches were outlined as follows:

- *DAMARA* – User defined, high level of detail for mixed fisheries.
- *MAREFRAME* – Collective alternatives, definition and evaluation, A food web model, which provides a broader picture of the ecosystem.

A case study on the recovery of cod and whiting stocks was presented, which included, the impact of seal predation and multispecies Maximum Economic Yield (MEY).



On the basis of this case study, the strengths and weaknesses of the model were explained:

Strengths:

- End-to-end model = whole ecosystem;
- Food web model = trophic interaction;
- Ability to model a large number of species;
- Encapsulation of complex processes;
- Includes the impact of the environment.

Weaknesses:

- Not (initially) designed to simulate fisheries;
- Careful when simulating mixed fishery;
- Catches = discards not modelled (landing obligation not considered);
- Modelling decades into the future may not be accurate.

Further details on the study can be found on the *MAREFRAME* website (<http://mareframe-fp7.org/>) detailing the different predicted results following different management measures for cod, whiting, Nephrops and the culling of seal.

An explanation was provided on how the model could serve as a decision support tool, using multi-criteria analysis. The model had the potential to resolve conflicts of interest, working with an online page, which allowed users to explore alternative options in detail. This was described as a work in progress, however, and the decision tree was not yet operational.

For the time being a different model was used to help with the multi-criteria analysis (MCA), which provides a summary with the most likely outcomes, including both ecological and economic aspects. A brief explanation of how this works was outlined:

- To use this tool the user defines the relative importance of each criterion. This defines how a change in a single variable affects the importance of a change;
- Users can define the shape and type of the relationships;
- The user is asked to weight the different criteria e.g. time, ecological, economic, fleets, food web;
- The purpose of this construction is to allow user to run their own evaluation.

Using this analysis in their case study, the *MAREFRAME* experts found that a mixed, Maximum Economic Yield (MEY) and gadoid recovery approach would perform better than the current path. The speakers invited NWWAC members to use the MCA tool for their own purposes, to



help decide on the best management approach and improve alternatives in the context of producing draft recommendations. Further details will be made available on NWWAC website.

Mr Armstrong thanked the speakers and agreed that the limitations of the model appear to be realistic, considering for example the difficulties recovering both cod and haddock stocks in a mixed fishery. Finding a model that could show the results of management actions, would be of significant assistance in the decision making process.

Kevin Mc Donnell commented that it was an interesting presentation and agreed that the AC should follow up on this project in order to be able to make informed choices. The model would be of assistance in future deliberations on the Landing Obligation (LO), especially concerning the phasing of species into the LO.

Daniel Lefèvre stated that it would be interesting to know if the system could be used in other sub-regional areas as well, and could be made available in other languages.

Mr Baudron advised Mr Lefèvre to contact him in French, and although the software was not available in French he would see what he could do.

Barrie Deas said that he really wanted to believe that this was a powerful analytical tool that could be used, but, as with any model, it depended on assumptions and data. If the model could travel back 20 years, what would it be saying about where we are now? This type of exercise would be useful to provide an indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the model and to provide confidence in the model.

Mr Baudron replied that the model had only just been released and so far the output made sense. He agreed that Mr Deas's suggestion had merit but unfortunately this analysis would be difficult because the model was parameterised with data beginning in 1985 and that the dataset would not be sufficiently long to produce quality output when starting the analysis in 1996 as suggested. Mr Baudron therefore proposed that it might be possible to conduct such an analysis going back only 5 or 10 years.

Mr Armstrong agreed that such an analysis would help build confidence in the model output and suggested that members who were interested should test the tool in order to check the value of the predictive power of the model.

Mr Baudron agreed that those within the *MAREFRAME* project would cooperate fully and extended an invitation for members to contact him, if necessary. Mr Nielsen asked if stakeholders felt there was a need to modify the alternative scenarios that have been proposed so far?



Mr Armstrong proposed that since the AC had introduced the use of Webex that this could be used to discuss this issue. He pointed out that the project might have some difficulty with the opinion of civil society regarding seals. It was suggested that a short Webex could be held to put some further direction on the excellent work done so far.

Johnny Woodlock pointed out that the public reaction to the culling of seals as a management option would render such an alternative unfeasible.

ACTION: *MAREFRAME* to arrange additional Webex meetings to develop alternative scenarios for testing;

AC members to test the MCA model to explore how it can be used contribute to the decision making process.

4. West of Scotland Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Mr Armstrong introduced Michael McLeod from the Scottish Government (Marine Scotland). Mr McLeod outlined his presentation (to be found [here](#)), which focused on management measures for Scottish Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in North Western Waters and also included some designated, offshore MPAs. Members were informed that the management of MPAs should be discussed between all Member States with direct management interests in the area through the process laid down in the CFP ([EC 1380/2013](#)) Article 11.

A summary of offshore MPAs in Scottish waters was provided, which consisted of 13 sites in NWW constituting 5 National MPAs and 8 Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). One specific area proposed was for the management of the Stanton banks, which was considered by the AC in 2013. It was noted that three stakeholder workshops had been held in Scotland to discuss MPAs and that the intention of this process was to be able to present specific proposals in March or April, 2016.

The meeting was advised that although there might be delays in the process, the Scottish Government will seek ICES opinion on the proposals and that they would be sent to the EC by the end of the year.

New opinion on the regulation of deep-sea fishing by depth (Clarke et al 2015 ([link](#), in English only) was brought to the attention of members. This paper analysed catches of target and by-catch species and compared the economic return against the ecological consequences. A principal conclusion drawn was that below 800m the ecological impact is considerably higher than at shallower depths, and as such trawling below 800m, appears to be unsustainable. The results suggest that between 600 and 800 m the commercial benefits derived from fishing start



to be outweighed by potentially negative ecological consequences. These findings were used as a basis for some of the decisions on the management in the different MPAs:

- **Anton Dohrn seamount**

The proposal was to prohibit the use of mobile demersal gear, compared to the modest amount of demersal trawling that took place between 2009 and 2013.

- **East Rockall bank**

The management boundary for this area has been drawn closer to the feature based on discussions on how close a boat can go without doing damage. Indents to the boundaries were proposed to allow the small number of boats that fish there to continue.

- **Solan bank reef**

As the relief of the reef is currently relatively low, the restoration of the reef was the main conservation objective for this area. The main problem was to allow some fisheries to continue while allowing the recovery of the reef. The designated contours should cover enough of the area to still meet conservation criteria.

- **Wyville Thomson ridge**

The map that was presented was slightly out of date. The red-hatched areas were considered a realistic area for high conservation concern. This area presented a clear conflict between fishing activity and areas to be protected (i.e. iceberg plough marks), which means that the proposal if accepted will move some fisheries from this area.

- **West Shetland shelf**

This area is important for static gear fishing for brown crab. No measures were proposed on top of the current measures for demersal trawls but the proposal does entail a tightening up of measures to prevent dredging in future.

- **Rosemary bank seamount**

This highly sensitive area (sponges, soft corals) was considered to be sensitive to all demersal fisheries and the proposal is to ban fisheries in this area, including static gear activity, which was considered not compatible with protection.



- **Gelkie slide and Hebridean slope**

This area was divided into three sections with associated demersal gear restrictions. The depth limitation for fisheries was overlooked in this case in order to provide for the 2 corridor approach that stakeholders were comfortable with.

- **Barra Fan and Hebrides terrace seamount**

To protecting the seamount community in this area, demersal fisheries would not be allowed on the seamount summit. The area was recognised as a busy fishing site and therefore the proposal left the heaviest fished area open to trawling.

Mr Armstrong thanked Mr McLeod for the presentation and pointed out that the Article 11 procedure is predicated by the term “provided”, in Article 2 of the CFP. He asked for further explanation behind the decision that trawling below 800m is unsustainable.

Mr McLeod responded that the decision was made on the basis of the scientific paper by Clarke *et al.*, and considered the level of impact on other species, like elasmobranchs, which were believed to be too high a cost to the ecosystem to accommodate.

Mr Armstrong reiterated that feedback had been asked for and that a timetable had been laid out, which was very helpful. He also stressed that early consultation was very useful in order to allow input from an early stage.

Mr Armstrong asked about the process and the involvement of the regional groups of Member States, as the decision makers. Mr McLeod indicated that the regional Member State group would ultimately draft the Joint Recommendation for area management. Before the proposals are ready for discussion by regional Member States, the UK welcomed stakeholder input to the drafting process. Input from (members of) the AC will be relevant at all steps in the process.

Mr Armstrong confirmed that the AC would have to look at the relevance of input by the AC, or by members of the AC in different stages of the process and that the implementation of the consultation process engaging the ACs as provided for in Articles 11 and 18 of the CFP, will be closely monitored by the AC.

Philip Taylor highlighted that workshops discussing inshore MPAs had been very productive and supported the use of early informal consultations. He asked if it would be possible to present the areas of importance defined by the NGOs and Fishermen (i.e. the lines that were drawn) during the workshop to show the AC how the discussions had progressed. Mr McLeod agreed that this could be done in order to show the evolution of the decision process since the workshops.



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

Mr Armstrong stressed that all stakeholders depend on this process being evidence-based and the basis for decision making should be transparent. Colm OSuilleabhain (Irish Government) stated that the NWW Member States high level group recently agreed a Terms of Reference for an Article 11 subgroup that will be used to draft Joint Recommendations on MPAs. He pointed out that initiating Member States (the UK in this case) should provide this group with an initial proposal along with scientific substantiation in order for the drafting process to start. The AC will be consulted on the drafting process, in a manner similar to that employed for the implementation of the Landing Obligation.

ACTION: The AC Secretariat to forward invitations to members for MPA workshops organised by the Scottish Government to ensure stakeholder participation.

ACTION: Mr McLeod to provide the areas of importance defined by the NGOs and Fishermen (i.e. the lines that were drawn) during the last workshop, to show the AC how discussions have progressed.

5. Summary of actions agreed and decisions adopted by the Chair

ACTION 1: *MAREFRAME* to arrange additional Webex meetings to develop alternative scenarios for testing;
AC members to test the MCA model to explore how it can be used contribute to the decision making process.

ACTION 2: The AC Secretariat to forward invitations to members for MPA workshops organised by the Scottish Government to ensure stakeholder participation.

ACTION 3: Mr McLeod to provide the areas of importance defined by the NGOs and Fishermen (i.e. the lines that were drawn) during the last workshop, to show the AC how discussions have progressed.



Annex 1 – List of Participants

NWWAC members		
Bertie	Armstrong	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Frank	Stride	Scottish Fishermen's Organisation
Anne-Margaret	Anderson	The Scottish White Fish Producers Association
Tom	Bryan-Brown	Mallaig and North West Fishermen's Association
Andrew	Clayton	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Juan Carlos	Corrás Arrias	Pescagalicia Arpega
John	Crudden	European Anglers Alliance
Barrie	Deas	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
Ross	Dougal	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Paul	Duane	Sea-Fisheries Protection Authority
Caroline	Gamblin	CNPMEM
Irene	Kingma	Dutch Elasmobranch Society
Marina	Le Gurun	Blue Fish
John	Lynch	Irish Fishermen's Organisation
Luis Francisco	Marín	Organización de Productores de Pesca de Ondarroa
Alan	McCulla	Anglo-North Irish FPO
Kevin	McDonnell	West of Scotland Fish Producers Organisation
Francis	O'Donnell	Irish Fish Producers Organisation
Eibhlin	O'Sullivan	Irish South & West FPO
José Luis	Otero	Lonja de la Coruña
Philip	Taylor	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Declan	Tobin	JNCC
Olivier	Le Nezet	CRPMEM Bretagne
Observers		
Severino	Ares Lago	Fundación Rendemento Económico Mínimo sostible e Social
Emily	Baxter	Cumbria Wildlife
Alan	Baudron	University of Aberdeen
David	Beard	Manx Fish Producers Organisation
Stéphan	Beaucher	Consultant
Hugo	Boyle	Irish South & East FPO
Lydia	Chaparro	Fundació ENT
Vera	Coelho	The Pew Charitable Trusts
Debbie	Crockard	Seas at Risk
Dave	Cuthbert	New Under Ten Fishermen's Association
Paul	Françoise	Comité Départemental des Pêches et des Élevages Marine CDPMEM 14
Robert	Griffin	European Commission
Heather	Hamilton	ClientEarth
Romain	Le Bleis	CDPMEM: 29
Daniel	Lefèvre	CRPMEM de Basse Normandie
Kåre Nolde	Nielsen	Norwegian College of Fisheries
Colm	Osuilleabhain	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine,



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

**NORTH WESTERN
WATERS**
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

Juana	Poza Poza	Mº DE AGRICULTURA, ALIMENTACION Y MEDIO AMBIENTE DGDE RECURSOS PESQUEROS Y ACUICULTURA
Glenn	Quelch	European Fisheries Control Agency
Declan	Tobin	JNCC
Loes	Vandecasteele	ILVO
Johnny	Woodlock	Irish Seal Sanctuary
Alan	Addison	SWFPA, Skipper Venture II Bf 326
Patrick	Murphy	Irish South & West FPO
Jim	Portus	SWFPO
Michael	M ^c Leod	Scottish Government
Paul	Trebilcock	CFPO
NWWAC Secretariat		
Conor	Nolan	Executive Secretary
Barbara	Schoute	Deputy Executive Secretary
Sara	Vandamme	Project Development and Communications Manager