

Channel demersal nonquota species fisheries management plan

Working group presentations

31 January 2023





The Marine Management Organisation used a series of presentations to support the Channel demersal non-quota species fisheries management plan working group meeting on 31 January 2023. These presentation slides are shown within this document as they were to the working group on the day. As requested by the group, we have also included a previous presentation given in October 2022 that outlines the "Must", Should" and "Could" evidence.

Due to the fast-paced nature of the work being carried out on the FMPs and emerging evidence, all dates and commitments within this document are subject to change.



Channel demersal NQS FMP Vision and Goals update

Working group agenda item 31 January 2023





Vision – V3

Quick Vision update -

We have received and incorporated further feedback on the last Vision presented to the Working Group.

We are drawing a line under the Vision at this point and will move forward with carrying it through all aspects of the FMP development.

Version 3 will be published on the MMO landing page and open to the wider public ahead of the South Coast engagement.

Wider stakeholder input will be gathered through the stakeholder engagement and another opportunity for consideration and refinement will be given in March/April – taking a retrospective look at the developed FMP.



Goals - V2

Goals update -

We have concluded the 4 workshops (1 Dec + 3 Jan) run on defining the goals and have documented the Working Group feedback. Those unable to join were given opportunity to submit written feedback via email. Responses up to Monday (30th Jan) morning have been incorporated.

We have consulted with Defra and the Evidence Advisory Group on the goals alongside gathering WG feedback.

This feedback has now been collated into a feedback Log. There have been over 140 comments across the three themes to address and reflect on the goals V1. The FMP has reviewed these and are in the process of including your responses into the latest version.

A deconflicting exercise is underway to address some of the conflicting requests for amendment. A summary of these conflicts and highlights of the feedback has been given in the slides below.



Goals – V2 Timeline

Version 2 – once complete will go through internal review and sign-off before being published on the MMO landing page and open to the wider public ahead of the South Coast engagement.

Wider stakeholder input will be gathered through the stakeholder engagement and another opportunity for consideration and refinement will be given in March/April – taking a retrospective look at the developed FMP.

Date	Stage	
30/01	V1 feedback closure	
30/01-10/02	V2 development	
13/02-17/02	V2 Publication	
20/02-10/03	South Coast engagement – wider goals feedback	
March/April	V3 development and agreement with WG	



Goals – Response highlights

Rachel Thirlwall circulated a detailed summary of the feedback last week.

General feedback we are reflecting on -

- Simplification generally the goals were too complex and over ambitious should be easier to interpret.
- Responsibility identification of responsible parties for delivering goals through implementation and a future look as to how this will work.
- Funding how will the goals be delivered and funded?
- Prioritisation how do the goals align with species prioritisation or fleet prioritisation? Prioritisation of the goals themselves need to be investigated based on deliverability, timeframes, evidence needs.
- Nation-wide a number of the goals cannot/should not be delivered by this FMP alone, and should be inter-FMP if not a national approach across marine policy. A number of these were beyond the remit of the FMP to deliver and have been altered or removed.
- Evidence Link back to the evidence needs of what we need to address.



Goals – Conflict highlights

Given below are some (not all) example conflicts between comments made in the goals / actions feedback. Included with the goal / action are our thoughts to resolve this. Feedback on the resolution would be appreciated at this time, however, please note acceptance of the resolution lies with the Working Group and will be considered after the south coast engagement and review of the goals.

Technology approach to data gathering – understanding the role of REM

On reflection – this goal is beyond the scope of the FMP to drive. In particular, the uptake in REM will be driven by national policy decisions and is overambitious as a 'goal' for the FMP to deliver. Instead technology application and support for addressing the evidence base will be included as an action for the sub-goal of developing a data collection plan.

Long term funding of the FMP and evidence gathering

Is acquiring funding a goal for the FMP or a mechanism / process to be followed? For instance, acquiring funding could be a potential TOR for the WG to identify and support the fishery in seeking funding (external and internal), but not manage / allocate a pot of money for R&D. Funding instead should be a focus for national delivery of FMPs, with the WG responsible for requesting money be allocated – exact format of national funding delivery (i.e. R&D pot, scientific levy) is outside of the scope of the FMP.



Goals – Conflict highlights

Establishment of a WG responsible for the FMP

Is there a need for a WG post delivery of the plan? Yes – need to be clear on its responsibilities and how it will function. The WG needs to be truly representative and fit for purpose. Co-management requires true participatory approach – extension of membership (and decision making authority) to be broader that current composition. The need to be open to inclusion with representational balance between fishers (c+r), regulators, wider public, eNGOs, etc. Does this need to be a goal for the FMP or is instead part of the engagement plan/strategy?

Representation of fisher needs with respect spatial squeeze under this FMP

Considerable amount of work and resources are currently allocated to supporting fishers in matters relating to spatial squeeze. The role of the WG or FMP would be to align better with these processes rather than duplicate them. Support given should be at least considered on a regional level for which established fora exist, and provided across all FMPs.

Decarbonisation of the fishing industry and move towards 'greener' fishing

This goal is considered beyond the scope of this FMP. This area of decarbonisation will largely be driven and facilitated by national policy developments, the availability of technologies and funding to acquire these – largely out of control of the FMP or WG. A potential TOR of the WG may be to facilitate and support this transition in the fishery, and support the fishery resilience to climate driven stressors.



Channel demersal NQS FMP drafting update

Working group agenda item 31 January 2023





Where we are at

Evidence and goals -

Reviewing the evidence commissions and refining the FMP goals – these currently drive Chapters 2-5 and are where our attention is currently focused. These we be put in front of the WG in the coming weeks and shared with the wider stakeholders during the south coast engagement.

Chapter 1 – Governance and policy

Nearly finished – Vision V3 requires minor correction before inclusion in the FMP. Currently waiting on key policy linkages text (for consistency) to come from Defra in light of the T1 FMP submissions.

Chapter 2 and 3 – Fishery overview and biology of the stocks

In progress - Chapter 2 and 3 will be high level summaries of the commissioned evidence work, the bulk of the content will be included in the Evidence Statement for the 17 species.

Chapter 4 and 5 – Fishery management, Social and Environmental goals

In progress – intrinsically linked to the goals workshop and goals development. Chapters 4 and 5 will take shape in the coming weeks after V2 of the goals is complete. V2 of the goals will be road tested during the south coast engagement.



Where we are at

Chapter 6 – Fishery management strategy

Not started - The strategy to deliver the fisheries goals set out in Chapters 4, 5 and the evidence requirements – covering MCS, the role of regulators, implemented byelaws, ecosystem strategy (covering environment, bycatch, climate) and R&D. Will begin to take shape once Chapter 4 and evidence needs are defined.

Chapter 7 – Performance indicators and monitoring the effectiveness of the FMP

In progress – structure and content starting to take shape. Legal mechanism for monitoring being defined. Indicators linked to action outcomes being developed around the goals refinement.

Chapter 8 – Stakeholder engagement and future delivery of the FMP

In progress – what has been done up to date drafted. Roles and responsibilities for delivering the FMP using a co-management arrangement currently in development – pending further clarity on how all FMPs will operate post publication.

Chapters 9 and 10 – resources and plan review

Not started – contingent on the development of all the above chapters and to be left until these have been progressed further.



Timeline for review

Date	Stage
February	Chapter 1 – review. Process test with the WG.
February-March	Testing of vision, goals and evidence with wider stakeholders in the south coast engagement. Sense checking and verification of evidence in chapters 2 and 3. Input and refinement into the goals content of Chapters 4 and 5.
March	Draft chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 made available to the WG for review. Sense check and input required for chapters 6, 7, 8 and 10.
April	Completed FMP and ES draft made available to the WG for review. Series of workshops / engagements to review and refine content.



WG Chapter sign-off process

How do you want us to review chapters with you? Options -

- 1. Full draft text provided via a document distributed to the WG by email? How long do you need for response turn around time is tight for developing these so limited to 10 days for feedback.
- 2. Drafting workshops where we (virtually) sit down to review the full text?
- 3. Highlights hour long workshops or meetings to discuss highlights of the text and content.

Alternatively

- 1. A combination of the above? Contingent on WG / individual preference and availability.
- 2. Greater or lesser involvement in specific sections? Review of the FMP structure and poll on engagement preference per section.



Channel demersal NQS FMP south coast engagement

Working group agenda item 31 January 2023





Recap of purpose of the in-person events

- In-person events across the south coast (7d and 7e) to talk with wider stakeholders about the progress of the Channel demersal NQS FMP so far.
- To allow wider stakeholders to comment on drafted parts of the FMP
- Vision
- Goals
- Evidence
- Quayside/ venue events welcome to any stakeholders, but we do have some specific 1-2-1's scheduled and targeted recreational events.
- Will also be holding online sessions throughout the two weeks for those who cannot make it in person and having an independent facilitator in attendance.



Week 1 20th – 24th February (7d)

Date	Location	Time	Where
Mon 20th Feb	Poole	7-9pm	Broadstone Conservative Club
Mon 20th Feb	Folkestone	5-7pm?	Folkestone - TBC
Tues 21st Feb	Poole	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Tues 21st Feb	Rye	9am - 12pm	Harbour masters office
Tues 21st Feb	Hastings	3pm - 5pm	Quayside
Tues 21st Feb	Gosport	2pm - 5pm	Quayside
Wed 22nd Feb	Portsmouth	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Wed 22nd Feb	Hastings	11am - 2pm	Angling Club
Wed 22nd Feb	Selsey	2pm - 4pm	Quayside
Wed 22nd Feb	Arundel	7pm - 9pm	Comfort Inn
Thurs 23rd Feb	Shoreham	9am - 12pm	Lifeboat station
Thurs 23rd Feb	Eastbourne	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Thurs 23rd Feb	Brighton	2pm - 4pm	Quayside
Thurs 23rd Feb	Newhaven	2pm -5pm	Quayside
Thurs 23rd Feb	Brighton/Hove	7pm - 9pm	Hove Deep Sea Angling Club



Week 27th – 10th March (7e)

Date	Location	Time	Where
Tues 7th Mar	Weymouth	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Tues 7th Mar	Lyme Regis	6pm - 8pm	Fishing college
Tues 7th Mar	Falmouth	7pm - 9pm	Chainlocker Pub
Wed 8th Mar	Newlyn	10am - 12pm	CFPO office
Wed 8th Mar	Newlyn	2pm - 4pm	Quayside
Wed 8th Mar	Lyme Regis	10am - 1pm	Quayside
Wed 8th Mar	Axmouth	3pm - 5pm	Quayside
Thurs 9th Mar	Fowey	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Thurs 9th Mar	Exmouth	9am - 12pm	Quayside
Thurs 9th Mar	Looe	2pm - 5pm	Harbour Masters office - TBC
Thurs 9th Mar	Plymouth	4pm - 8pm	Quayside
Thurs 9th Mar	Looe	7pm-9pm	Shark Fishing Club - TBC
Fri 10th Mar	Mevagissey	10am - 1pm	Social club
Fri 10th Mar	Brixham	10am - 12pm	Quayside



Engagement Channel

We are using as many different channels as we can to raise awareness of these events

- Email update to all interested stakeholders
- Social media posts (Facebook, twitter, LinkedIn)
- Fisheries Bulletin
- Regional Fisheries Group Newsletter
- Angling Times, Hookpoint
- Posters in ports/ cafes/ handed out by Marine Officers
- Working Group! please share far and wide with people in your organisations/ areas



Testing the language and WG support

We need what we are taking to these in person events to make sense to stakeholders...

- Can anyone in the WG help support us when writing our material to take to the South Coast?
- Can any members of the working group attend the sessions in their areas to help support the FMP team?



Channel demersal NQS FMP Evidence Statement

Working group agenda item 31 January 2023





Where are we with the ES?

Quick update

We agreed a list of 'must have' evidence requirements with Defra (which we brought to the WG in October – will be recirculated with the slides following this meeting). They then commissioned Cefas, Seafish, NE and the MMO stats team on our behalf. Given the data poor nature of the species at hand, in many cases this exercise served to be more of a literature review.

We have now received this and are working through to pick out further evidence gaps, which we will add to our initial package of evidence needs.

We have been prioritising evidence needs by aligning them with the objectives of the Fisheries Act and the FMP goals evidence requirements, together with what is required to facilitate potential management considerations.



Evidence Statement Timeline

Date	Stage
February	Integrate commissioned evidence and collated in house evidence tasks
February/March	South coast engagement – sense check the evidence and capture stakeholder input into gaps and concerns.
WG March	Bringing a draft of the ES to the WG for review.
WG April	Complete and refined ES for WG review and sign-off.

How would you like to see the evidence put forward in the evidence statement? How do we present this to you and your members in a way that is easy to interpret?



Channel Non-Quota Demersal FMP Evidence Plan

Second FMP Working Group Session 31st **October 2022**



Marine Management Organisation Why develop an evidence plan?

The MMO has been commissioned to produce an evidence plan for its FMP.

This must set out (as a minimum):

- Evidence requirements to assess the listed species MSY or appropriate proxy (section 6 (3) of Fisheries Act 2020)
- What we already know about the listed species and fisheries including stock data, species biology, environmental impacts of the fisheries and social and economic evidence
- Evidence shortfalls and requirements to meet the goals of the FMP

The MMO have produced an evidence plan and a complementary 'Plan on A Page' to set out how best to address this task. This includes:

- The pertinent evidence themes and associated questions for each objective
- How they will be addressed in a phased manner



Phased approach

There are specific mandatory requirements which must be addressed (set out in Article 6 of the Fisheries Act (2020)) to enable it to be legally compliant.

However, the MMO's ambitions, go beyond this and it aims to scope in all eight objectives of the Act (2020) in a manner appropriate to the target species, fisheries and geographical reach.

However, due to limited time, and resources, these will be addressed in a phased manner over a number of iterations. These have therefore been separated out into:

- 'Must' this covers the mandatory considerations required for publication and those the MMO deem critical for this initial iteration
- 'Should' This also covers NE and JNCC's contributions with regards to significant environmental risks features of MPAs and Good Environmental Status (under UK Marine Strategy) as well as additional considerations which are important but not crucial
- 'Could' covers the wider aspects of the wider goals



Examples of 'Must' evidence themes and associated questions

Fisheries Act Objective	Associated evidence theme	Lead
Article 6 requirement	Relevant geographical boundaries (jurisdictional, biological and statistical)	In house
Links to equal access and ecosystem objective)		
Article 6 requirement	Scoping out commercial and recreational fisheries and their relevant methods	In house
Links to bycatch and ecosystem objectives)		
Article 6 requirement	Scoping out commercial and recreational economic dependence on FMP species	In house
Article 6 requirement	Chronology of formal/informal management measures implemented elsewhere	Cefas
Article 6 requirement	Economic importance of species to recreational fishers and charter vessels	In house
Linked to sustainability, national benefit, equal access and bycatch objective)		
Article 6 requirement	Species biology of the priority species (including basic biology of the species, life history, size at sexual	Cefas
Linked to sustainability, precaution, bycatch and	maturity/resilience of species to change	
ecosystem objective)		
Article 6 requirement	Species distribution of the priority species (I.e., geographical distribution; habitat associations –	Cefas
Linked to sustainability and ecosystem objective)	snawning nursery feeding overwintering grounds; seasonal variations; hathymetry)	
Article 6 requirement	Predator prey and ecosystem role (Food webs and forage fish)	Cefas
Linked to ecosystem, bycatch and sustainability		
Sustainability and Precautionary objective	Stock assessment programmes and scientific monitoring and reporting (MSY assessment or proxy arrangements)	Cefas
equal access objective	Current limits to equal access (legislation, policy and management restrictions	In house
Bycatch	Other species captured when caught as part of a mixed fishery	In house



Examples of 'Should' evidence themes and associated questions

Fisheries Act Objective	Associated evidence theme	Lead	Timeline
Ecosystem objective	Sensitivity to the UKMS descriptors from gear types with MPAs	NE	January 2023
Ecosystem and bycatch objective	Sensitive species bycatch	NE	Inside MPAs by November 2022 Outside of MPAs (GES) to be picked up in future iterations
Ecosystem objective	Predator/prey links	NE	Related to MPAs by November 2022 Outside of MPAs (GES) to be picked up in future iterations
Bycatch objective	Other species captured when caught as part of a mixed fishery	In house	January 2023
Bycatch objective	Bycatch impact on other species	In house	January 2023
National benefit objective (Linked to Sustainability, equal access and bycatch objectives)	Map out social and economic value and benefits	To be confirmed	Next iteration
Climate change objective (Link to ecosystem approach)	Species environmental thresholds and sighted changes to species distribution and seasonal availability	To be confirmed	Next iteration
Equal access objective	Associated key ports	In house	Next iteration



Developing inclusive ways of working

Based on feedback, we are reviewing the criteria to be used to evaluate evidence to see how the process can be more inclusive without losing scientific rigger. The following criteria will be trialled:

- **Geographical reach** i.e. in channel (high confidence), Atlantic waters (medium) or further afar (low)
- Species specific and closeness of species Study undertaken on the actual species/same genus (high confidence), within the class (medium) and on a different class (low)
- Species specific techniques Species specific (High confidence), non-specific (medium/low).
- Appropriate timeframe dependent on the ask i.e., highly variable data sets may be assigned a high
 confidence if collected within last six years, medium if collected within last 12 years or low if collected after
 12 years.
- Confirmability Is the study repeatable (high confidence), a single report, or unverified evidence (low)
- Credibility/trustworthiness Source a known expert or informed on the topic (e.g., fisher talking about their area of expertise or academic) (high confidence), non-expert with supervision or support (moderate), data collection undertaken by non-expert without sufficient supervision (low)
- **Validity** Has the study been taken through an appropriate quality assurance process or cross validated (higher confidence), if not would be marked down to low until verified elsewhere.

We welcome 'low confidence' data (e.g. unverified anecdotal evidence). We might be able to increase confidence by reviewing as a collective dataset with other anecdotes, not as individual narratives/anecdotes. If not possible, they can still help direct verification work or support hypothesis development.