



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF
RÉGIONAL POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
REGIONAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO
REGIONAL PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES



NSRAC

Joint Working Group on Long Term Management Plans 13th September, 2006, Schiphol, the Netherlands

Record of Meeting Rapporteur: A D Hawkins First Draft

1. Welcome & Introductory Presentations

- 1.1 The Chair Barrie Deas welcomed participants to the meeting, which was being held jointly by the North Sea and North West Waters Regional Advisory Councils to discuss arrangements for long term management plans. The agenda for the meeting was agreed.
- 1.2 The meeting was breaking new ground. Following the Johannesburg commitment to MSY, and the issue of two papers from the Commission, we were faced with a choice. We could wait for the Commission to come up with proposals or we could develop our own. Both RACs had decided to actively prepare their own objectives for their key fisheries. Our main task now was to decide how to approach this task. It would be important to seek expert advice. It would also be crucial to involve those dependent on the fisheries. However, we were not facing a blank canvas. The Schiphol Focus Group and the Edinburgh Workshop had provided a background for our task.
- 1.3 Tony Hawkins described the outputs from the Schiphol and Edinburgh meetings. At Schiphol in August 2005 a focus group of the NSRAC had met to discuss MSY. It had decided that MSY was not a satisfactory target. The concept had been discredited by Larkin and others. MSY was not stable over time and could not take account of multi-species interactions. It had limited value in the context of the mixed fisheries of the North Sea. The focus group had concluded that:

Lower fishing mortalities (F) would generally bring higher yields. We should therefore be preparing long term management plans for the major fisheries to achieve lower Fs

However, F_{msy} offered too simplistic a target for practical use. A more satisfactory framework would be necessary.

Each fishery should be looked at case by case, focusing on strategic objectives. The aim should be to bring all stocks above safe biological limits, with higher biomasses.

Various alternative strategies should be evaluated with the aid of economic as well as biological modelling.

1.4 The Edinburgh Workshop, funded by DEFRA, and attended by scientists, fishers and fishery managers had accepted the need to operate at higher stock levels and lower fishing mortalities to avoid crisis management. However, it had concluded that rather than concentrate on achieving MSY it would be better to adopt the more general goal of achieving sustainable fisheries. Sustainability was not a unique point on the yield versus effort curve. It involved economic, social and ecological goals, set within an appropriate institutional framework. One of the problems within the CFP was that attention had been focused on biological objectives and management had been top-down – without the opportunity for those dependent on the fisheries to participate. That was now changing.

1.5 The Edinburgh Workshop had proposed a series of general principles for long term management plans:

Management must be adaptable & flexible

Management must take account of all aspects of sustainability

There must be trade-offs between profit, catch, employment & the state of stocks

For the North Sea, management must focus on particular fisheries each with a mix of species

It would be better to set a direction of progress rather than abstract & fixed targets

There would have to be buy-in from the fishing industry

There would have to be incentives for fishers to adopt sustainable practices.

1.6 The Workshop had developed a series of essential features of long term management plans:

Those dependent on the fisheries must be involved in formulating plan objectives and the means for attaining them

The objectives must be clear and achievable

The concept of stewardship, of fishers protecting the resources on which they depend, is important

Each plan must be tailored to a particular fishery and take account of all stocks exploited in that fishery

A wide range of management tools should be utilized

Changes must be gradual, evolutionary & adaptive

The plan must take account of uncertainty, and define the actions to be taken if stocks change.

1.7 The Workshop had ended by concluding that:

Better governance is a pre-condition for the development of long term management plans

The process must be 'bottom-up' not 'top-down'

The RACs should formulate their own plans, with help from the Commission & Member States

First, the key fisheries would need to be defined

Expert advice would then be required to set out the options

It would be especially important for fishers & other stakeholders to choose the options and set the objectives

Above all there would have to be extensive engagement with those who would be affected by the plans.

1.8 Ken Patterson gave the Commission's position. There had been a history behind the Johannesburg commitment to bring stocks to maximum sustainable yield levels by 2015. There had been a similar agreement at Rio in 1992, but little had happened. At Johannesburg, governments had agreed to implement MSY. The Commission is now belatedly following up that commitment. The Commission fully accepts that there are limits to the MSY concept. Experience has shown that MSY is not achievable and in many instances it has been abandoned in favour of minimum biomass (M_{bal} , a value of spawning stock biomass below which the probability of reduced recruitment increases). Recently, the attention of the Commission has been focused on stocks which are at risk. Attention had moved away from achieving safer stock levels. The Commission's Communication on sustainable fisheries has not focused on the biomass giving MSY. Instead it has outlined at the benefits of reducing fishing mortality rates. Those benefits include;

Reductions in costs - Many stocks are fished at higher rates than necessary for optimum yields. Reducing fishing mortality will reduce the costs of fishing without reducing long term yields

Reductions in discarding – At high fishing mortalities fish do not survive to older ages and sizes. A large proportion of the stocks are small fish

which are discarded. Reducing F will result in more large fish, reducing discards and improving the size and value of the fish caught.

Reduction in the impact upon non-target species – Impact on other fish, cetaceans, and sessile organisms will be reduced

The Commission is not following Johannesburg to the letter, but aims to reduce fishing mortality towards levels which will result in maximum sustainable yield. It also accepts that management must be adaptive; it does not want to set a fixed target for all time. Instead it is emphasising that a reduction in fishing mortality has many advantages. As we learn from experience then we can make fisheries more productive by periodically revising the long term targets.

- 1.9 Ken Patterson emphasised that forecasts of the impact of the long term plans would include assessing the impact upon the economics of fishing and on social factors. In September/October, STECF would be looking at these impacts for plaice and sole, and the NSRAC had already been drawn into the formulation of a long term management plan for the flatfish fishery. The Commission was aware of the industry wish for stability. The current biological advice for some stocks did not take account of this, but stability would be an important feature of long term management plans. The Commission was willing at this stage to discuss long term plans with the RACs, producing substantive non-papers to help the RACs develop future options. Only later would the Commission prepare full proposals.
- 1.10 Michel Goujon presented some ideas that were being discussed in France. He was pleased to hear that the Commission would not be as rigid as its documents suggested. Everyone agreed that MSY was not a proper target. It is a mathematical abstraction which relates only to biological inputs, and not to socio-economical parameters. Moreover, the relations between stocks prevented them all being simultaneously at MSY levels. Progression towards stability should be the main aim. MSY was also an unpopular target. Our current level of knowledge only allows us to use, at best, proxies of F_{msy} . The easiest option was often to base it on $F_{0.1}$, an especially precautionary value, very far from F_{pa} . Using this proxy would create hardship for the industry. It was not appropriate to impose ever more stringent targets. It would be better to think in terms of our moving towards a general area which would provide greater stability.
- 1.11 Michel believed that the Commission approach implied the imposition of more and more constraints upon the industry. Things might get better, as the Commission suggested, but who would be left to benefit? There could be no guarantee that the markets would remain after a drastic cut in fishing mortality. As landings declined imports would flood in. Those markets would be difficult to regain. In addition, an MSY approach would only work for long-lived species. New ideas were needed for managing short-lived species, which depended on variable recruitment. To take things forward for the classical species he proposed a three stage process:

The recovery stage

Rebuilding to below F_{pa} , with measures imposed from above, based on scientific advice, balanced by financial support for industry

The consolidation stage

Measures designed to progress towards increasingly stable yields, with measures discussed with fishers and taking account of the economic and social position of those dependent on the fishery

The sustainable stage

Control through conservative measures to keep fishing mortality within a sustainable range, taking into account changes in the environment

RACs would play an important role. The Commission's Communication mentioned the RACs several times, and the obligations placed upon them were quite onerous. Michel wondered whether the RACs would have the time, financial support and technical resources to achieve what was required. There was currently a shortage of scientific input to the RACs. The groups set up to develop management plans would be progressively moving in the direction of becoming fisheries management committees. Their task would be difficult. Finally, Michel concluded that MSY should not be seen as a precise target. Rather, it was an area of light coming from the end of a long, dark tunnel.

2. Discussion

- 2.1 Barrie Deas pointed out that the Communication from the Commission had been influenced by the RACs. There were now a number of shared goals, but one notable divergence of opinion. The Commission was proposing that if we get the biology right then other aspects would fall into place. However, the RACs were echoing the FAO message that you have to get the framework of governance right before you can achieve success in fisheries management.
- 2.2 Danish fishers saw no difficulty with the overall objective of achieving high levels of stock, with low fishing mortalities and lower costs for fishers. It is how we get there which is the problem. The forecast that stocks will increase after a period of deprivation for those dependent on the fishery has not occurred under the current regime. Further effort reductions in fishing mortality and effort of up to 10% would be difficult for fishers to accept. It would also be important to break the link between F reductions and effort. Effort reductions should only be used when risks to the stocks were high. When the position was safe it would be better to make changes to the TAC. Other fishers opined that they had already suffered as a result of the current measure. They were seeking a period of respite after enduring major effort reductions. There was also concern that the Commission's current priorities for fisheries management were based on the biology of cod. The development of long terms management plans was threatened by the current wish to preserve cod at all costs.
- 2.3 Ken Patterson disputed Michel Goujon's assertion that MSY was unpopular. Where fisheries had achieved an MSY target then it was in fact very popular. He

- also pointed out that the reductions in fishing mortality which had been sought in the past had rarely been achieved. Currently, some stocks were declining faster than TAC or fleet reductions. Fishing mortality was therefore rising rather than falling. On governance he was very open to improvements. However, it had been said by an eminent bio-mathematician that 'fisheries management is not compatible with democracy'. The benefits of management are long-term, but democracy only delivers in the short-term. Where management is devolved to stakeholders, priority is given to the preservation of employment. The result was low stocks and poor yields as in the Mediterranean and Japanese fisheries.
- 2.4 Others believed that the Commission had not tried involving stakeholders in management. Yet this had been one of the main planks of the reform of the CFP. An important question was whether the RACs were simply expected to react to Commission proposals or whether they should come forward with proposals of their own, to which the Commission would have to react. The RACs themselves had concluded that they should be pro-active, not reactive. Moreover, for management to be successful there had to be acceptance by the industry. Top-down technocratic solutions would not work. Only the RACs were capable of creating business plans for the future of the fisheries.
- 2.5 In contrast, Ken Patterson thought that the Commission's experience had been that meetings convened with the industry rarely produced initiatives. It had been found more effective for the Commission to put forward concrete proposals for discussion. Then progress could be made. However, he would be happy if the RACs could come forward with their own proposals.
- 2.6 Spanish fishers complimented the two RACs for organizing this meeting. They were also grateful to the Commission for taking part. However, the implications of long term management plans would not be very satisfactory to fishers. MSY was not the key to better management of the multi-species demersal fisheries, although it might be appropriate for pelagic fisheries. Our first aim should be to get all stocks into a satisfactory state. Then we could talk about MSY. Spanish fishers, like others were concerned about the impact of a progressive decrease in landings upon the markets for fish. Looking at the longer term prospects, MSY could perhaps be achieved if the industry was involved, working with member states and scientists. Moderate reductions in fleets might be achievable whereas massive reductions would not be acceptable. Spanish fishers would prefer any measures to be voluntary. They looked forward to hearing from others how we could address the practical issue of achieving MSY.
- 2.7 The Commission's view on markets was that the main competitive threat would come from those fisheries already operating at MSY. Those fleets were operating cost-effectively. We needed to move to a similar position. The alternative to reducing fishing mortality was a continuation of the current decline in Community fleets. Fishers asked which fisheries were operating close to MSY and were given the examples of arctic cod and Alaskan pollack.
- 2.8 The Danish fleet would see benefits from further reductions but wished to avoid a continuing degradation every year in order to reach MSY. Fleets needed time to restructure themselves. They also doubted whether all imported fish were from sustainable stocks. Reducing catching capacity in Europe might also lead to

illegal fishing. Others might take advantage of the reductions suffered by responsible fishers.

- 2.9 There was a plea from fishers for the Commission to be flexible. There had already been a softening of the MSY target. When Ministers had originally accepted the MSY target, in 1992 and 2002, they had done so from poor scientific advice. There are good reasons for moving away from MSY towards targets which are attainable. There is also the over-riding problem of cod. By Christmas all discussions would revolve around cod.
- 2.10 Ken Patterson believed that the Commission had shown flexibility. It was not committed to the B_{msy} concept. It had taken the NSRAC's point about mixed fisheries. It was now thinking mainly in terms of reducing fishing mortality as a way of improving yields and reducing the costs of fishing. It accepted that decisions on long term management plans should be flexible. The way forward was for the RACs to start formulating long term plans that could be adhered to for long periods, with periodic renewal.

3. How do the RACs implement Long term Management Plans?

- 3.1 Barrie Deas summarised the steps taken so far to implement long term management plans. In the North Sea, the NSRAC has decided to set up 5 new development groups. Initially, these are for the following fisheries:

Cod, haddock & whiting - Barrie Deas and Niels Wichman
Nephrops - Mike Park
Plaice & sole - Nathalie Steins and Michael Anderson
Saithe - Patrice Leduc
Monkfish - Jacques Pichon

For North Western Waters, the existing area working groups will take the initiative:

West of Scotland – Bertie Armstrong
Celtic Sea
Irish Sea
Channel

These groups will need to engage with those affected by the management plans. The coordinators will face an onerous task in achieving consensus. There is also the question of scientific expertise. How will the groups engage with scientists? Who will they be and how will they be paid for? Economic and social science expertise will also be required. It will be important that the management objectives which are submitted for endorsement should be based on sound evidence. Who will prepare the options for evaluation? A set of draft proposals has been prepared by Barrie Deas for saithe in the North Sea and West of Scotland:

1. Background Information
2. Major Trends

3. Mixed Fishery Considerations
4. Ecosystem Considerations
5. Uncertainties
6. *Defining Objectives*
7. *Instruments*
8. *Timeframes*
9. Conclusions
10. Review of Progress & Adaptive Management

Can these headings be used by the other groups? Or will each group need to develop its own template?

- 3.2 In discussion it was agreed that the two RACs were taking a big step forward. They had chosen different approaches, with actual fisheries chosen for the North Sea, whereas mixed fisheries in geographical areas had been chosen for North West Waters. However, there was no conflict between these two approaches. The saithe and monkfish development groups could extend their area to include area VI, thereby avoiding overlap. However, the headings which had been defined would require a great deal of information to be gathered on the fisheries. Who would do this? If we were to be proactive and dynamic would this mean we would have to collate the data ourselves?
- 3.3 There was a more fundamental question. Were we all agreed that the RACs should respond to the challenge to take part in the preparation of long term management plans. There was an element of 'turkeys voting for Christmas' about this process. The RACs could only deliver solutions that were beneficial to fishers. Moreover, we had until 2015 to achieve sustainable fisheries. Should we be rushing into this? Could the RACs commit to it, and were they mandated to do so?
- 3.4 In reply, it was pointed out that the RACs were committed to improving governance within the CFP. This did not mean that we had to buy in to all the Commission's plans or proposals. We certainly had to seek a compromise with the Commission but this did not mean we had to bow down to them. The preparation of long term plans, with clear objectives, was a means for moving away from crisis management. The process could move at different paces for different fisheries. However, we had to take responsibility for our own future, by seeking more sustainable yields from our fisheries. The RACs needed to work side by side with experts in looking at the future options. In doing this the RACs would not be taking over management of the fisheries. They would be telling the Commission what needed to be taken into consideration.
- 3.5 A particular issue would be the preparation of the information inventory for the development groups. Providing all the information on the fisheries would take time, and coordinators could not achieve this themselves. What help would be available? How soon could it be done? This was a critical point, as the RACs did not have the resources themselves. Should we be seeking funding to commission others to collect the information for us?
- 3.6 It was agreed that in principle, STECF, ICES & member state institutes could be asked to help. Such requests could be forwarded through the Commission. All

these organisations were very busy but the right organizational set-up was available. Most of the background information was not controversial. Moreover, member states had agreed to assist the RACs and they could help here by providing background information and technical expertise. There might be some difficulties in obtaining information on social issues. There was often little substance to consultants' reports on such topics and the RAC itself might have to do some work itself. However, it was items 6, 7 & 8 (in italics above) which raised the real issues, where people within the fisheries would have to take measured judgments. Thus, the entire process of preparing long terms plans essentially had several phases. The development groups could decide on the scope of each fishery. The Commission could then be asked to provide the relevant background information, although the development groups would need to combine with the Commission in looking at trends and uncertainties. The real work of the RACs would then be in setting objectives for the fisheries. Once these objectives were formulated the Commission would wish to have these evaluated by STECF before the Management Plan was completed.

- 3.7 The Commission's view was that there would be a challenge for the RACs in deciding what objectives could be achieved. Only certain options were viable. Information would be required to assist the RACs. This would require major effort from the scientific community which was already hard pressed. The RACs themselves would have to operate within their current budgets. However, the Commission itself will need advice from STECF to fulfill its own obligations to prepare long term management plans. Once the preliminary information had been gathered it saw the process as having three further phases. Firstly the RAC would ask the Commission to give terms of reference to STECF to prepare possible options for the fisheries. There would then be a policy debate on those tentative options. STECF would then be asked to carry out impact assessments of the selected options.
- 3.8 There were fears that there were insufficient resources within the RACs to take this process through. It was pointed out, however, that each development /area working group could proceed at its own pace. In some cases, it might only be possible to list concerns about particular plans. Dutch fishers pointed out that the EU/Norway agreement required a flatfish management plan before the end of the year. Although we could not produce recommendations for a flatfish management on that timescale we could not ignore that plan. The NSRAC had already responded to the Commission's proposals. Nevertheless, it would be better if we could take a longer term view of the flatfish and other fisheries. In the Netherlands, discussions had started with beam trawl fishers, and IMARES had been asked to evaluate proposals coming forward from fishers.
- 3.9 Tom Pickerell of WWF believed that the RACs should be proactive. RACs did not need necessarily to generate long term plans themselves, but they could provide options for achieving sustainable fisheries. Others stressed the adaptive nature of long term plans. They need not be carved in stone. Long term objectives had to be developed and adjusted over long time periods. It might take two years to prepare concrete proposals for the Commission.
- 3.10 In terms of funding, there were several options. Member states could be asked to provide funding. DEFRA in England had already been helpful and the RACs

should exert pressure on other member states to join in. Member states had signed up for RACs and had therefore accepted a commitment to supporting them. When the RACs were reviewed, next year, the need for stronger support in the future should be emphasised. RACs could also ask the Commission to make special provision for providing expert advice and information to assist the development of long term management plans. The Commission had already allocated additional funds to ICES to assist the RACs. The new European Fisheries Fund was a further potential source of funding. There is provision for Producer Organisations to draw down funds.

3.11 Barrie repeated the question – how comprehensive should the RACs' involvement in the plans be? Some development groups might wish to prepare comprehensive plans while others might not. There was scope for differences in how far each development group went, and on what timescale. The pace would reflect the wishes of those dependent upon a particular fishery.

3.12 Barrie Deas concluded that what was emerging was a staged process:

Stage 1: Coordinators decide which sectors within the fishery the management plan would apply to and refine the inventory of information required. Request background information from STECF and others via the Commission

Stage 2: Start the process of Information gathering (1-5 above), through the Commission, STECF, ICES and perhaps the JRC, and with an input in some cases from the RACs themselves, to allow the issues to be debated. The information would encompass the current condition of stocks exploited by the fishery, the economic position, and how matters stood in relation to the target of a sustainable fishery. STECF might wish to suggest some preliminary options

Stage 3: The development /area working group would debate the issues and engage with those represented on the RACs, coming up with a series of scenarios for the fisheries which took account of biological, economic and social factors. The group would decide how long a transition period would be required to reach a sustainable condition and what management measures would be required

Stage 4: The Commission would ask STECF to examine the options, evaluate their biological, economic and social impact and report back

Stage 5 A debate would ensue between the RACs and Commission, within the development /area working group, aimed at deciding how far the group wished to go in the formulation of a long term management plan.

- 3.13 The Commission accepted that if the RAC wished to give advice on such matters as target fishing mortalities, and the timescales over which these could be achieved, then it would require knowledge of the technical background. The Commission is more likely to listen if the advice from a RAC is science-based. The Commission could help with providing the science. Fishers expressed concern that the scientific advice might not be correct and might need to be corrected. John Casey thought that an STECF subgroup might be able to provide some of the background information, and it could invite appropriate people to its meeting, so that all views could be considered. Barrie Deas emphasised that it would also be for the RAC to decide how it treated information from different sources. There would need to be a dialogue between the scientific community, the Commission and the RAC, and a full debate of all the options. Others agreed that background information was needed to allow the RACs to build scenarios and that dialogue between experts and stakeholders would be an important element. STECF could not do the thinking for the RACs; it could only address specific questions.
- 3.14 Concern was expressed that the Commission is pre-occupied with short term measures. There is currently a crisis. Fishing intensity has been reduced and will be reduced further next year through fleet reductions and cuts in days at sea. There is a need to emphasise to the Commission when preparing long term plans that changes have already taken place which need time to work. Fishers now need a period of respite. Others stressed that other measures were also in the pipeline, aimed at reducing discards. These too would affect any long term plans. There was scepticism that the Commission would consider ideas coming from the RACs. However, the RACs had to assume that the process would work and go ahead on that basis, taking account of changes that had already been made to reduce fishing intensity and achieve sustainability. Time was needed to implement changes. A central part of the process would be a continual re-evaluation and reconsideration of what had already been done.
- 3.15 For the Commission, Ken Patterson remarked that though there had been big changes in some fleets nevertheless fish stocks continued to go down. The history of the CFP was one of failing resources, where measures taken had been insufficient to halt decline. The move to MSY was intended to get away from that. The Commission's approach was focused on the needs of each stock. The Council was expected to respond to the Commission's Communication on MSY in October but the Commission did not expect any progress this year on implementing sustainability through MSY.
- 3.16 It was pointed out that despite reductions which had taken place in fishing effort, intended to halt decline, stocks had not recovered, largely because recruitment had failed. With North Sea herring, which had received MSC accreditation, and which was close to MSY, recruitment failure had still taken place. Long term management plans would have to deal with such events.

4. The next steps

- 4.1 The joint working group considered the timetable for going forward with the development /area working groups. Could the collection of background information be initiated by coordinators and their groups this year, with some of the groups then meeting early next year to formulate options?
- 4.2 A proposal is already being prepared for DEFRA funding, involving CEFAS and the NFFO, to acquire information for the Cod/Haddock/Whiting development group. A case study will be conducted, using multi-species, multi-fleet simulation modelling to examine scenarios for the North Sea fleets exploiting these species. Consideration would be given to where we wanted to go, and how we could get there, in terms of achieving sustainable fisheries. The effects on yield, revenue and biomass would be modeled for different options. Ecosystem impacts would also be explored together with the impact of mammalian predation. The study would take account of existing management agreements. Essentially, a tool would be made available to the development group. The approach would be exploratory. By next spring the initial outputs of the model would be available for consideration. Other work was underway in the Netherlands to investigate proposals from fishers for flatfish. Initiatives were under way to seek funding for other development/area working groups.
- 4.3 Thus, it was hoped that some groups, after initial preparations this year, might be ready to define provisional objectives to go forward to STECF by the spring of 2007. The proposals would also be circulated to the RACs themselves. STECF subgroups could be convened at any time – but they would need time to produce information or respond to questions or options. It might be possible for the groups to meet back-to-back, but some would undoubtedly move faster than others. A flexible framework has been suggested where progress can be delegated to the coordinators. The Basque Government would be asked by Spanish participants to host the group meetings in Bilbao.
- 4.4 Some concern was expressed over the load this would place upon coordinators. They would need resources to start the process off, to consider the areas and stocks to be covered, define their membership, look at the fleets to be included and to list the information they would require. Consideration would need to be given to how this would be organised.
- 4.5 Spanish fishers asked whether a development group could be formed for hake and megrim. Others asked whether this task could be undertaken by the relevant area working groups, together with the South West Waters RAC, which has yet to be constituted.

5. Action Points

<p>1. The NSRAC and NWWRAC will take forward proposals for the preparation of long term management plans through a series of development groups (NSRAC) and area working groups (NWWRAC), each headed by a Coordinator. These groups will define for themselves how far and how fast each of them is willing to go. Each group will maintain close contact with those</p>	<p>Secretariat & Coordinators</p>
---	---------------------------------------

its represents (para 3.1 & following).	
2. Coordinators for the different development/area working groups will look at the areas and stocks to be covered, their membership, the fleets to be included and the information they will require for forwarding to STECF. Resources may be needed for meetings before the end of 2006 to achieve this (paras 3.12, 4.1 & 4.4)	Coordinators & Secretariats
3. Some development/area working groups may have received initial responses from STECF and be in a position to begin preparing options for management, for further appraisal by STECF and others, by February 2007 (para 4.3)	Coordinators
4. Consideration will be given to holding the February group meetings back-to back in Bilbao (para 4.3)	Spanish delegation & Secretariat to explore

6. In Attendance

Barrie Deas	Chair
Ann Bell	NSRAC Secretary
Patricia Comiskey	NWWRAC Secretary
Tony Hawkins	Rapporteur
Michel Goujon	France NSRAC
Willem de Boer	Netherlands NSRAC
Nathalie Steins-Oosterling	Netherlands NSRAC
Michael Andersen	Denmark NSRAC
Niels Wichmann	Denmark NSRAC
Tom Pickerell	WWF NSRAC
Mike Park	Scotland NSRAC
Antoine le Garrec	France NSRAC
Bertie Armstrong	Scotland NWWRAC
Borja Velasco Tuduri	Spain, Ministry
Hugo Gonzalez	Spain NWWRAC
Victor Badiola	Spain NWWRAC
Jacques Pichon	France NWWRAC
Jason Whooley	Ireland NWWRAC
Ken Patterson	Commission
Lorcan O'Kinneide	Ireland NWWRAC
Lothar Fischer	Germany NSRAC
Luc Mellaerts	Belgium NWWRAC
Malin Karlsson	Sweden, Ministry
Mark Dougal	Scotland NSRAC
John Casey	STECF
Patrice Leduc	France NSRAC
Paul Trebilcock	England NWWRAC
Sean O'Donoghue	Ireland NWWRAC
Fred Normandale	England NSRAC
Andri Gueguen	France NWWRAC
Katie Halter	England, Ministry