



Fisheries Advisory Committee
Thursday 14th September 2023 at 09:00
Fisheries Meeting Room

OPEN MINUTES

These minutes are draft minutes until confirmed by resolution at the next meeting of this committee.

Present:	The Honourable Teslyn Barkman– Chairperson	TB
	Director of Natural Resources – Dr Andrea Clausen	DNR
	Mr Michael Poole	MP
	Mr Drew Irvine	DI
	Mr Hamish Wylie	HW
	Ms Wendy Shelbourne	WS
	Mr James Bates	JB
	Mr Chris Moorey	CM
	Mr Matt Jenkins	MJ
	Mr Andreas Winter	AW
	Mr Frane Skeljo	FS
Minute Taker:	Mrs Claire Young	CY

PART I (Open)

		ACTION
1.	Apologies for Absence	
1.1	MLA Birmingham and MS Cheryl Roberts	
2.	Declarations of interest	
2.1	Industry representatives declared an interest for all items on the agenda. TB declared an interest in any SAAS related items	
3.	Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 08th June 2023	
3.1	The Minutes were confirmed as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair	
4.	Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting held on 08th June 2023	
4.1	5 Fisheries Update	
	5.3 DNR has circulated the summary of Terms of reference to FIFCA	
4.2	5.4 TB noted there was an Action point regarding FIFCA refreshing the	

	KPMG report and asked if this was shared or ongoing. MP Call next week to get a timeline but likely will be into October. Then will seek discussion with DNR.	FIFCA
4.3	8 FIFCA Update 8.2 TB Outlined the need for a Brexit group meeting is on-going. FIFCA confirmed the intention to discuss the best timing of a meeting with members.	FIFCA
4.4	8.4 MP acknowledged minutes were accurate but notes that his statement was based on his knowledge of Fortuna and not necessarily representative of the entire sector and that other companies did not find the first half of 2023 as strong.	
4.5	10 Finfish Licensing Advice 2024. 10.3 FIFCA had a discussion with AW. On agenda Item 11.	
4.6	11 G Licence Proposal 11.3 DNR stated that no feedback had been received. If no feedback is received a pragmatic approach will be taken taking into account the season and share this. FIFCA to provide feedback within 2weeks.	FIFCA
4.7	12 Compensatory Days DNR noted there was a meeting in her absence regarding this paper, which was not very constructive. DNR requested that if there is any further feedback from industry on the proposal, could this be submitted in writing. If there is a need for further discussion following receipt that can be arranged. DNR noted that the policy will be live from 1/1/2024. MP agreed to send written considerations.	FIFCA
5	Fisheries update	
5.1	DNR gave a brief update on the Fisheries.	
5.2	DNR happy for feedback on the format of the Fisheries update	
5.3	DNR acknowledged the ‘catches’ summary and the early closure of the Loligo season, noting that the 7day post recruitment survey demonstrated that the early closure decision was correct. In terms of the process the department followed, DNR welcomes feedback from industry.	
5.4	DNR stated Hake continues to have high catches, AW and scientific team are focusing efforts on hake stocks to get as much information as possible, catches of other finfish species were relatively low.	
5.5	Restructure proposal is going to ex-co at the end of September. All feedback including that from MLA’s has been compiled and considered and will be discussed by MLA’s for agreement or not. DNR outlined the anticipated process for changes if supported by MLA’s.	

5.6	Admin penalties- awaiting feedback from industry, MJ and SB working with Legal team on a first draft from previous consultation, the final proposal will come to FAC.	FIFCA
5.7	ITQ fees update - DNR has received a first draft of a proposed approach to setting fees. This model has used the Toothfish fishery as it's the simplest fishery to understand from a financial and accounting perspective. DNR shared the process and a rough timeline for briefings and discussions. DNR noted that early feedback from industry is imperative.	
	DI asked clarification on what information industry will be presented with. DNR explained it will be a proposal for an approach rather than the draft of as policy paper. Feedback from industry will be needed to test the proposed approach. Refinement to the proposed approach can then take place as needed.	
	MP asked if the Economist will present a number of options? DNR clarified the economist is to present an overall approach, then there will be options on regarding how that approach is applied.	
5.8	Economics of Illex – a set of tender documents are with industry for feedback. Progress will be made as soon as possible.	
5.9	A report reviewing our software surveillance system has been received. This looks at possibly replacing the outdated VMS system as well as how we can automate catch reporting. The report is being reviewing internally, once a preferred pathway is identified an early conversation with industry will be arranged.	
	HW asked for clarification if this was just fisheries' systems? DNR noted that modernizing the system might have impacts on industry also in terms of the responder units installed on vessels. There will be a need for a tender process regardless of which approach is preferred.	
	MP asked what prompted this review, had there been issues. DNR stated the MEP 2020 review was the first prompt to review control and enforcement and highlighted fisheries software systems, in particular to review in terms on capability. DNR noted that industry will be presented with a summary of the issues and the potential options to resolve.	
	HW asked if this looks to making use of AI and whether this will be reflected in the proposed restructure. DNR clarified that there is another piece of work being considered to look at specific activity on board vessels rather than just location. This is in the form of remote video monitoring. The FIFD team have being reviewing existing technology and are seeking to carry out a pilot project in collaboration with industry, so in due course will be looking for a volunteer in the fleet to test if/how this could work. HW acknowledged that looking holistically there could be expenditure in one area and savings in another. DNR agreed with this viewpoint.	

5.10	<p>MP asked if the catch verification and marine mammal observer contracts are still ongoing and out to tender. DNR confirmed that the catch verification tender for services has been pulled and that the department is re-grouping on that as part of considering the remote monitoring trial, as this could utilize underspent CV funds, as it is effectively a similar task.</p> <p>Regarding the observer contract – the team are currently discussing what FIFD needs are to ensure tender terms are flexible enough to capture requirements going forward. A tender process is expected in the coming month as a contracted service needs to be in place by Jan/Feb 2024.</p>	
6	<p>Maritime report</p> <p>6.1 Harbour Master is away at Cranfield University for 3week accident training course.</p> <p>6.2 Recruiting: an offer of employment has been made for a second Assistant Harbour Master- FIMA hope to be fully staffed by end of year.</p> <p>6.3 Accident reporting: Type error noted- 33 Accident report forms were received.</p> <p>6.4 Audit report: CM confirms work ongoing with MCA regarding corrective action plans from 8 findings from previous audit.</p>	
7	<p>Compliance Update</p> <p>7.1 AB is absent today. DNR asked AB to run quarterly update and note all items, DNR invited any questions but felt report showed improvement in compliance across all fisheries. DNR requested feedback from the format of the report. CM noted he was pleased to see Lilibet settled in to her role. MP felt the format was useful, TB agreed it was easy to digest. HW suggested an annual scoring to track progress.</p>	
8	<p>Illex Licensing Policy 2024</p> <p>8.1 DNR Thanked MJ for work with this paper DNR explained what will be included and the direction of the ExCo paper. DNR asked for market price and storage volume data for this year and any other relevant information within the next few weeks so that it can be included in the ExCo report. The paper included graphic illustration of the catch data for trawlers fishing on a G licence (Illex and Restricted Finfish). This data clearly demonstrates the high levels of by-catch taken in the trawl compared to zero by a jigger. DNR will therefore be recommending no trawlers are licensed to fish in the B fishery at this time. DNR did however, invite feedback from industry.</p>	FIFCA

<p>8.2</p>	<p>WS- Asked if FIFD want to rule trawling for Illex out forever with legislation? DNR accepted that policy could be enough and that amended legislation could be left for now. However, DNR noted she wasn't aware of any dual-purpose vessels and reiterated the policy direction is driven by concerns that are conservation based.</p> <p>DNR noted that the proposal for the early closure of G fishery (tabled at the previous Fisheries Advisory Committee) was based on evidence that Illex had left the fishing area and therefore there would be little to none of the permitted species remaining. DNR reminded industry that they had not provided any feedback on this paper either.</p> <p>HW felt this position represented bottom trawling and noted that new technology could develop to allow semi-pelagic trawling for Illex and that option to trawl for Illex should remain. DNR agreed and said she was happy to consider a proposal for an experimental licence to pelagically trawl for Illex if received.</p> <p>DNR stated that not changing the legislation would still 'leave the door open' for future applications to pelagically trawl. HW and MP clarified the change the policy as 'not inviting applications from trawlers in 2024'. TB agreed it seemed a sensible approach to just change the policy. DNR stated they will discuss the considerations and consider the feedback</p>	
<p>8.3</p>	<p>DNR noted that the scoring matrix is not changing. With regards to fees, it is difficult to say what the recommendations are likely to be in absence of data from industry, but based on catch levels, DNR was minded not to propose any increase. However, as normal MLA's would receive a set of options. DNR requested that if industry want any particular data or challenges, they are facing, to be taken in to account in the ExCo paper, then they need to submit this very soon.</p> <p>WS- Industry has had an IOG meeting about fees and would like to thank DNR for considering that vessels which hold a fishing licence are exempt for transshipment licence if they transship prior to collecting their licence.</p> <p>WS acknowledges that IOG have not fed back exact market prices yet. Indication across the board is that they are lower than last season. Catches are still in cold store from 2022, China market not fully open to Taiwanese caught squid, there is a release of water from Japanese plant, so Korean demand for fish has dropped negatively affecting South Asian Market prices. DNR stated that it would be really important to have this data for ExCo paper.</p> <p>WS- continued to state, improvement works on vessels require substantial investment for certification for Chinese registry. Consequence of these factors are that industry intend to write to FIG to request additional support and propose suspend the 2% reduction in early payment discount. DNR</p>	

	asked for ‘cost of money’ with interest rate to be included in report.	
8.4	DNR reassured regarding transshipment, intention to change behaviours and don’t want a penalty to encourage people to do something. TB requested a full suite of data for MLA’s to consider.	FIFCA/ IOG
8.5	DNR stated Licence conditions effectively become the law, therefore needs to formally to come through FAC for all fisheries, in draft, for industry able to provide feedback. Also, in response to an industry request they will also include areas that are usually outside “normal” fishing conditions, in order to support industry’s efforts to make continued changes on vessels. Legal feedback state they were not comfortable with some of these inclusions, but they understand and support FIFD’s intentions. Key point is that FIFD need to follow a minuted consultative process (i.e. FAC) with regards to the licence conditions.	
8.6	WS- B licence part2 specific conditions B2- Industry will comeback in writing with a more expanded wording. MJ confirmed that the suggested change is similar to original wording. MJ confirms no issues with this suggestion. DNR reiterated importance of feeding this back. B10- regarding accident reporting. Looking at clarifying threshold level for reports sent to DNR. Request further discussion regarding this. CM states excellent reporting requirements to FIMA. MJ confirmed that one of considerations was for FishOps to be copied in to FIMA reporting however, as FIMA reporting is limited to the 12mile territorial line, this wouldn’t be sufficient to capture the 12 to 200mile incidents. WS confirmed another suggestion was to use same reporting form for consistency. HW stated it was important to have clarity about what’s reportable for both sides with attention to harmony required. MJ stated draft proposal of the reporting form has been circulated, and noted ‘ongoing actions to be taken’ section with regards if support required from FIG.	FIFCA
8.7	WS- asked if MJ could send a draft licence application form ahead of the pack so companies can get ahead. MJ confirmed the form is the same as last year, and that there is no additional information on the form. The pre-licence checklist has been amended, there are no additional requirements but there is additional clarification on what is being looked at any why. DNR stated a draft can be made available as per legal feedback, but the final version will be in the pack.	FIFD
8.8	DNR explained that MJ is looking at creating a template format to make it easier to locate information in the application pack. HW noted this was requested in previous seasons and that companies are already putting documents together so it may be too late for some. DNR reassured that this will not be compulsory. MJ explained that it is a simple organogram showing where to separate company and vessel documents and vessel data presented in standardize format.	FIFD

8.9	<p>MP asked if there is flexibility with presentation dates as some people may be travelling.</p> <p>MJ confirmed that individual companies can approach with request for consideration, and that presentations are likely to start on 20th November due to flights. MP requested that 2025 could be set ideally in December to aid future planning.</p> <p>MJ Acknowledged the request for consideration.</p>	
9	Fishing Licence Conditions 2024 Amendments Proposal	
9.1	<p>MJ stated that previous comments have been that FishOps have used a blanket approach to vessels, however technology now exists that individual vessels can be identified and measures targeted at those individuals. TB agreed that it is a sensible approach to close down any loop holes as and when they are identified.</p>	
9.2	<p>MP no objections asked regarding the example, if the Company were made aware of it and feedback at the time. MJ reassured feedback was given.</p>	
10	FIFCA Update	
10.1	<p>TB reiterated the usefulness of the report for transparency around the association and thanked FIFCA for the report. No questions raised.</p>	
11	Finfish Licencing Advice Revision, 2024.	
11.1	<p>AW presented a covering paper with 3 separate sets of analyses.</p>	
11.2	<p>MP thanked AW for the presentation with analysis and adjustment for devising a method to take into account the biomass, MP noted his appreciation and stated it looks like a good model. MP noted that of course industry look at this data and their first question is what does this mean for fishing days and utilisation of fishing vessels. The general industry view is that this is great and there are no arguments with the numbers, but noted there are concerns for projections going into 2025, and so would welcome a discussion in the next 12 months about what more might be done to mitigate a large reduction in Vessel Units for 2025.</p>	
11.3	<p>DNR states that the work the scientific team are doing on Hake is important in helping to understand the stock. Once this work is completed, alongside the aging of otoliths, the team can probably improve the assessment models used for the stock assessment. DNR noted that in the interim AW has tried to come up with a system which is an improvement to what was previously in place. Its an evolving piece of work. FIFD is committed to making science more robust.</p>	
12	Summary of Catch Differences North vs. Within the Loligo Box	
12.1	<p>AW presented the paper about whether it's worth extending the Loligo fishing further north of the current limits. There is a need to assess the pros</p>	

	<p>and cons of fishing in this area and in particular considering commercially viable aggregations of Loligo squid versus the negative impact on other species in that area. A specific concern is that the Loligo fishery uses smaller nets and risks excessive bycatch of juveniles of other species.</p> <p>12.2 MP thanked AW for having coherently pulled together the presentation as conversations have been had around this for over a decade.</p> <p>12.3 HW acknowledged that bycatch will be different in Loligo box vs North of the box, and asked what is the difference in seabed bottom i.e. habitat in North and extra North compared to Loligo box? AW clarified it is not a drastic drop off but a gradual change in benthic ecology, this would be something we would also need to look at. The data does not suggest a dramatic change in the sea floor.</p> <p>12.4 HW asked what information determined where the northern line for the top of the Loligo box was placed. AW stated he was not aware of the details behind the decision, as it must have been pre 2008. DNR stated that we can look to see if the decision was documented but would expect it was a compromise between protecting other species rather than a demarked drop of Loligo. She noted however, that it is important to monitor what is going on in that northern area.</p> <p>HW asked if flexibility could be considered if it became clear that the stock had moved North, would FIFD then allow fishing north of the loligo box. DNR said it could be considered in an individual basis, noting that trawlers today are much more powerful than trawlers fishing when the loligo box was determined. DNR noted we would take a precautionary approach, perhaps allowing 1 or 2 vessels to see what was happening.</p> <p>DI asked why this stance as there are move on rules, data shared to Fisheries within 24hrs and it would also allow research data- why not open it up to all vessels? DNR stated that there isn't the data to indicate the "commercial" need to open this area. Continuing to collect baseline data from pre-season research cruises is valuable and will continue. DNR noted that our fisheries legislation makes provision to fish commercial stock sustainably and for the best economic return. Noting that there are still significant stocks of Loligo from 2022 and 2023 in storage and a slowdown in sales, it wouldn't appear to make economic sense to further maximise catches.</p> <p>HW stated we should be looking more long term than just at the current market downturn. DNR agreed and that sustainability and building a data set is important to do.</p> <p>DI expressed concern about the influx of Hake which had dispersed everything in the Loligo box in previous seasons. DNR acknowledged this concern despite Fisheries limitations to control this influx the science team are looking at Hake and will see what data</p>	<p>FIFD</p>
--	--	--------------------

	shows.	
12.6	<p>HW clarified that the decision to not open door to North and Extra North is due to concern on other species and not necessarily the impact on Loligo. DNR confirmed it is a delicate balance.</p> <p>MP asked if computations and research could be applied to the entire outskirts of the Loligo Box.</p> <p>AW confirmed computation could be applied. DNR reminded industry that FIFD does not have its own research vessel and relies on industry therefore there would need to be a valid case for doing it and confidence it is deliverable.</p>	
12.7	TB thanked AW for the interesting and substantive quality of the papers at this committee.	
12.8	DI asked if FIFD felt there was an issue with juvenile hake, given it's a straddling stock. AW stated the issue is we only see only partial data on the stock, so assumptions are made of the total biomass and how much of it comes here each year.	
12.9	DNR stated that when scientific team look at Falklands waters as well as other data sources hopefully many questions will be answered. DI asked if juvenile Hake is not an issue then is FIFD over sensitive to Loligo vessels using liners? AW highlighted that juvenile Hake are not only species taken and DNR pointed out that taking juvenile Hake may mean it is not available later for A licence, so it's a balance between protecting all fisheries.	
13	Toothfish bycatch in the calamari trawl fishery BY-2023-TOO – summary	
13.1	FS presented the paper using Toothfish bycatch data over a 10-year period. In summary there are two conservation measures to discuss: the move on rule and reduce the by-catch levels to a percentage more relevant levels for the very small juvenile Toothfish in the Loligo box and spatial and temporal closures to protect the strong cohorts of juvenile Toothfish while they are in the hotspots.	
13.2	TB thanked FS for an excellent and clear presentation of a substantial piece of work.	
13.3	<p>HW asked if there was a problem with the Toothfish stock.</p> <p>FS stated that there was no clear strong recruitment since 2017, which whilst not yet alarming, demonstrates it is unknown when the next one will be and the importance of protecting the strong cohorts while they are there. In terms of stock assessment, it will impact in 5-6years therefore less biomass for longline seasons for next 5-10 years would be expected.</p>	
13.4	MP asked if MSC assessment links in with stock assessment and could	

	<p>result in an updated TAC. FS confirmed a lack of big recruitments was considered. The data showed a dip but it is not yet worrying. There is still the chance that there were big recruitments that we didn't capture, but that could show up next year.</p>	
13.5	<p>MP noted historically a challenge has been with identification and confusion with Rockcod. Are FIDF confident vessels and observers are now accurately identifying species? And what is variance between vessels versus estimates of Captains? FS explained if observers are over sharing data with a vessel, 80% of the time it presents the same number (exactly), this means an estimate of discrepancy cannot be calculated. However, in 2017 discrepancy of 30% under reporting was noted. FS cannot comment on crew accuracy but reassured training is given with photos of species at same size in the observer manual and new observer protocols are in place. HW stated that in 2016 the Rockcod by catch was substantial so identifying Toothfish amongst this was more difficult. DNR stated a takeaway point is about what is shared with captains regarding compliance and how this affects confidence when there is no observer on board. In terms of vessel training, sharing data is not teaching.</p>	
13.6	<p>HW - Calamari fleet need reassurance that effort put in one fishery to increase escapement doesn't feed the finfish fishery, confidence is also needed that other fisheries employ rigorous compliance with escapement. FS agreed but stated the move on policy is triggered much more often in finfish but rarely in Calamari. So, levels are more effective in the other fisheries already. Due to the size of the Toothfish in the Loligo Box the number of juvenile Toothfish being caught can be high but not trigger the move-on percentage DNR reassured it will be rigorous and fair for all fisheries. HW stated need to consider a dynamic approach to managing this so that when there is a large recruitment the % doesn't skew the effective management. DNR stated a need for there to be some rigid limits as the current ones are not effective, a dynamic approach would be more applicable to hotspot management and closures. There is clearly a need to look at rigid limits now and improve what we have to protect future stocks. FS clarified hotspot management in 1st season was more important as the juvenile Toothfish presence is more compacted, whereas in the 2nd season it is more spread out.</p>	
13.7	<p>MP requested a dedicated session for all Loligo operators to talk through this. This was agreed.</p>	FIFD
13.8	<p>MP asked how viable it is to do closures smaller than a grid square? AW stated the computations are possible however DNR was unsure if FIFD currently have the capabilities for certain management strategies, e.g. managing a partial closure and ability to monitor activity. Hopefully in time it may be possible with new projects.</p>	

14	Date of next meeting 4th December 2023	
15	Exclusion of the Press and Public <i>Not for publication by virtue of paragraph 4 & 9 of Schedule 3 of the Committees (Public Access) Ordinance 2012, relating to Inshore Fishery proposal</i>	
16	Confirmation of the Exempt Minutes of the Meeting held on 8th June 2023. The Minutes were confirmed as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair	
17	Matters Arising from the Exempt Minutes of the Meeting held on 8th June 2023	
17.1	16 Inshore fishery proposal 16.7 Industry did not send feedback.	
17.2	DNR summarised the current position and industry were encouraged to send written feedback.	

The meeting closed at 11.25am

Confirmed this day of 2023

Chairperson