



CONSEIL CONSULTATIF POUR
LES EAUX OCCIDENTALES
SEPTENTRIONALES

NORTH WESTERN
WATERS
ADVISORY COUNCIL

CONSEJO CONSULTIVO PARA
LAS AGUAS
NOROCCIDENTALES

MINUTES

WORKING GROUP 3 (ENGLISH CHANNEL)

**Conference Room 01, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh
Wednesday 6th of July 2016
12:05 – 13:30**

1. Welcome

The acting WG3 Chairman, Jim Portus, welcomed the members and the attendees to the meeting. The full list of participants is included as an annex to these minutes.

An apology for absence was received from Daniel Lefèvre. Paul Trebilcock kindly agreed to be rapporteur for this meeting.

The agenda¹ was adopted as drafted. The action points from the last meeting in Edinburgh (9th July 2015) had been completed, although it was concluded that the last action point, supporting investigation of funding streams to carry forward the work of GAP2 in association with NWWAC had not resulted in further funding of the GAP2 project.

The chairman noted that although it had been nearly a year since WG3 had formally met, the efficiency procedures introduced by the AC had proved successful and there had been significant progress made in focus groups meetings attended by WG3 members, where advice on seabass and a management plan for sole in 7d had been drafted.

2. Drafting advice to inform the development of the EU TAC proposal

The meeting was asked to provide input for a response from the NWWAC to the EC Consultation on the fishing opportunities for 2017, with reference to the information contained in the ICES advice.

In general terms, WG3 supported and endorsed the approach taken by WG2 on this issue, regarding, in particular, the issues raised on ultra-mixed fisheries, which were also considered relevant in the Channel.

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

Attention was drawn to the management plan for sole in 7d that had been submitted by the NWWAC last year. The Chairman commented that the December 2015 Council had received and had been aware of the NWWAC advice and it was felt that this should be adhered to when setting the TAC for 2017. The Commission and ICES delegates commented that if the NWWAC advice was to be applied in 2017, the biomass safeguard would have to be applied since the biomass was too low to keep the constant TAC. The harvest control rule, as advised implied using F_{MSY} as a basis for the TAC, which would imply a 22% reduction of the TAC. The meeting discussed if the maximum TAC variation of 15%, that the STECF evaluation in April had considered precautionary, should be invoked, but no conclusion was reached.

The meeting noted that the advice on seabass remained pessimistic and considered that the zero catch advice was unrealistic as there were unavoidable by-catches taken in mixed fisheries.

The meeting concluded that the NWWAC Focus Group on seabass (FGBass) should be re-convened following receipt of the Commission's response to the NWWAC framework advice that had been submitted earlier in the year. FGBass should also take into account the latest ICES advice and the work carried out in the North Sea. The Secretariat was asked to forward links to the work carried out in the NSAC to working group members. Specific mention was made to also consider targeted seabass fisheries in further discussions of the Focus Group.

It was noted that ray management remained a significant concern in many fisheries in the Channel and that the latest ICES advice was not expected until the autumn.

ACTION: Focus Group on seabass (FGBass) should be re-convened following receipt of the Commission's response to the NWWAC opinion;

ACTION: WG3 supported and endorsed the approach taken by WG2 on drafting NWWAC advice to inform the development of the EU TAC proposal. In addition, species specific issues, in particular skates and rays in subarea 7 (specifically undulate ray) and sole and cod in division 7d, and the calculation of quota uplifts should be raised.

ACTION: Secretariat to forward links to the progress made by the NSAC on the development of advice on seabass.

3. Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

It was recognised that the Channel was an incredibly important and busy area and that it was relatively small in terms of physical space. There was concern at the pace and distribution of MPA designations in the Channel, which created a patchwork of areas.

Comparing the different stages and areas that Member States had proposed, designated and eventually submitted for management, it appeared that there was a lack of consistency in approach and implementation between Member States.

The group concluded that it appeared that there was no EU level overview or global understanding of the network of spatial measures or the economic and social impacts between different EEZs.

ACTION: WG3 asked the NWWAC to request that a full economic and social impact assessment is carried out for the MPA network in the Channel. This should take into account the individual and cumulative impacts (both positive and negative) of all of the MPAs in the Channel.

The Chair presented a number of MPAs proposed by the UK, for which a consultation response was needed before 30th September 2016 (this may be extended to October). The group agreed to consider the provision of advice from AC members. The NWWAC would be consulted when measures outside the 6 nm zone are proposed by the NWW Member States group.

4. Technical measures

The meeting was asked to provide comments for input to the NWWAC response on the EC proposal for Technical Measures. In terms of western waters and the area covered by WG3 in particular, the greatest concern was in the proposed increase from 80mm to 120mm minimum mesh size.

The meeting commented that the ultra-mixed fisheries in the area would have significant problems with such a blanket increase in mesh size. The losses in terms of economically important, non-TAC species such as: squid and red mullet, was a real concern.

Clarification on the continuation or not of the 5% by-catch restrictions in scallop dredge fisheries was sought.

A process of adaptation and phasing of any new proposals would be essential to avoid the economic elimination of many parts of the fleet.

As a generic comment, it was suggested that the NWWAC might include in its response, that the new proposal was an improvement compared to previous descriptive management at EU level. The input from Advisory Councils in the consultation phase was recognised. Regionalisation of management was important and that should be reflected in the balance between the main body of the proposal and the Annexes. The meeting concluded that it was important to make decisions in close cooperation with the fishing industry.

ACTION: To draft input on the Commission's Technical Conservation Measures (TCM) proposals that ensure that the NWWAC advice reflects to concerns raised by WG3

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

ACTION 1: Focus Group on seabass (FGBass) should be re-convened following receipt of the Commission's response to the NWWAC opinion;

ACTION 2: WG3 supported and endorsed the approach taken by WG2 on drafting NWWAC advice to inform the development of the EU TAC proposal. In addition, species specific issues, in particular skates and rays in subarea 7 (specifically undulate ray) and sole and cod in division 7d, and the calculation of quota uplifts should be raised.

ACTION 3: Secretariat to forward links to the progress made by the NSAC on the development of advice on seabass.

ACTION 4: WG3 asked the NWWAC to request that a full economic and social impact assessment is carried out for the MPA network in the Channel. This should take into account the individual and cumulative impacts (both positive and negative) of all of the MPAs in the Channel.

ACTION 5: To draft input on the Commission's Technical Conservation Measures (TCM) proposals that ensure that the NWWAC advice reflects to concerns raised by WG3

NWWAC Document
Rapporteur: Paul Trebilcock
Review and editing: Barbara Schoute, Conor P. Nolan

Annex 1 – List of Participants

NWWAC members		
Armstrong	Bertie	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
Portus	Jim	South West FPO
Beaucher	Stéphan	Fundació ENT
Boyle	Hugo	Irish South & East FPO
Brouckaert	Emiel	Rederscentrale
Brouzes	Richard	OPBN
Crudden	John	European Anglers Alliance
Cuthbert	Dave	New Under Ten Fishermen's Association
Deas	Barrie	National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations
Françoise	Paul	CDPMEM 14
Gamblin	Caroline	CNPMEM
Le Bleis	Romain	CDPMEM du Finistère
Le Gurun	Marina	Blue Fish
Le Nézet	Olivier	CRPMEM Bretagne
Lynch	John	Irish Fishermen's Organisation
Coquet	Pascal	CRPMEM Haute-Normandie
McLachlan	Helen	World Wildlife Fund
Meun	Geert	Dutch Fisheries Organisation (2)
Hennuyer	Francois	FROM Nord
Lamothe	Julien	Pêcheurs de la Manche et d'Atlantique
Thomas	Dominique	Coopératives Maritimes Etaploises & Armement Cooperatif Artisanal du Nord
Trebilcock	Paul	Cornish Fish Producers Organisation
Venzat	Damien	OP COBRENORD
Young	Iain	The Scottish White Fish Producers Association
Observers		
Baxter	Emily	Cumbria Wildlife
Chaparro	Lydia	Fundació ENT
Chouinard	Ghislain	ICES
Duane	Paul	Sea-Fisheries Protection Authority
Griffin	Roy	European Commission
Grossmann	Jenni	ClientEarth
Poza Poza	Juana	Mº DE AGRICULTURA
Symons	Despina	European Bureau for Conservation and Development
Dougal	Ross	SFF
Ghiglia	Marc	UAPF
Coelho	Vera	PEW
Egan	Siobhán	Birdwatch Ireland
Kisieliauskas	Mindaugas	European Commission
Lanidal	Vincent	CRPMHT
Le Barzic	Franck	COBRENORD
NWWAC Secretariat		
Conor	Nolan	Executive Secretary
Barbara	Schoute	Deputy Executive Secretary
Sara	Vandamme	Project Development and Communications Manager
Aoibhín	O Malley	Financial Administrator and Event Manager