Brixham 26-2-2020 NOTES from workshop 1 [Brixham Lab]

The meeting was well attended (42) with a diverse group of 30 fishermen from around the South West, stretching from Mevagissey to Weymouth and including a wide range of vessel sizes and gear types.

The meeting began with the context of the project and wording of the fisheries white paper (FWP) with regards to 'low impact fisheries'.

Subsequently Defra gave an introduction to the rationale for the project, based on a feedback that the current under/ over 10m sharp divide is not working for those who fish against FQAs and those who fish out of the pool. The project focusses on environmental impacts of fishing and could contribute to, for example, changes in the allocation of fishing opportunities or the level of regulation for fisheries that are low impact. It was made clear that this project is going to be challenging and that these series of workshops are just one step towards hopefully arriving at a better way to manage and segment the fleet, whether through horsepower or other mechanisms which are being discussed with the industry in build up to White Paper (not in-depth).

It was made clear that this is the beginning of a different approach to fisheries management, and that the objective is to develop and agree measures, which are future proofed and don't lead to unintended consequences such as those that have arisen from management systems based on vessel length. The objectives for Defra's ongoing work are to make fisheries management better, to build on the 'future of our inshore fisheries' conference to get fishermen more involved in discussions around management and that there is a recognition within Defra that a new approach, which moves away from top-down management, is necessary. Examples from both the scallop and whelk management groups have shown that working together and combining knowledge and experience can help shape this at both local and regional levels. This project and series of workshops are part of a bigger conversation on co-management and while there will be differences of opinion, as there are a wide array of interests at stake, co-design at this early stage of possible policy development was seen as the best way to start to achieve this.

Questions from the participants focussed on the wording and prospects from the FWP as well as three specific questions: 1. About the likelihood of status quo (CFP) – which relies on negotiations and is impossible to pre-empt but may result in managing access of non-UK vessels and could be subject to annual agreements and therefore change over time (it was noted the Prime Minister stated he will be supporting the UK fishing industry in these negotiations) 2. On whether the project outputs (report) will be made public – yes they will, and 3. Why the focus is only England – due to fisheries being a devolved matter.

Discussion 1 – facilitator / scribe: Chris Williams / Nick Lewis

<u>GENERAL</u>

- History of Govt not listening (any level from Defra to MMO and IFCA)
- Govt say one thing and then just do what they want anyway
- Fishermen's input won't make any difference
- There is a communication issue. Relationships with the MMO and IFCA are bad.
- Low impact is not necessarily sustainable or environmentally friendly
- Trawling is not necessarily damaging to the environment
- For a classification of what low and high impact are not everyone is going to agree

- <10m> size isn't the best measure of impact
- HP/KW is not much use either as a proxy for impact and gear ratios also need to be considered
- Rules were set up a long time ago so it's less relevant for the modern industry
- Plastic waste is collected at sea and removed through the fishing for litter scheme, but the infrastructure to deal with it is insufficient.
- The Navy do significant damage to static gear, unsure what the impact of sonar is or whether they impact the seabed in the activities they run, but one positive is that there are no windfarms as a result - noise pollution - but
- Dredge spoil grounds - spoil was dumped into the middle of the lemon sole grounds and destroyed the fishery (contaminated waste from dockyard)
- In Norwegian fisheries a 35ft/11m is used and there are different examples of low impact fisheries
- Weather has a big impact on fishing and the environment, but fishermen often get blamed (e.g. impact of storms on pink sea fans)

LICENCING and ALLOCATION ISSUES

- Licensing in terms of KWH relates to towing power; its less relevant for static gear or rod and line, where other aspects e.g. ability to travel longer distances or need to fish drifts
- Capped licensing is having impacts on current industry and ability to operate
- It is also driving behaviour that is having negative impacts - if entitlements for whitefish, shellfish or bass are lost this limits the ability to diversify and increases reliance on single fisheries and therefore vulnerability to changes.. There is a genuine fear of losing entitlements but to keep them active there have to be catches at times where fishermen don't actually want to be targeting those species.
- Entitlements (e.g. bass) can be taken away if not used and people end up catching stuff they don't want to be targeting to ensure they keep these entitlements on their license (even if these have been paid for). Catching species for this reason is no good for fish stocks. Losing the entitlement affects smaller boats more than larger ones, and for trawling as the catches are mixed its less of an issue.
- Sudden changes in entitlements can make big impacts due to people going out and buying boats as a way to make the most of the opportunity
- Entitlement could be more sensibly applied - in the case of the bass track records for the entitlement everyone was given the 5tonnes, who had caught nay bass in the previous year so actually the bass catches increased as people with a license were then fishing as hard as they could up to the 5t limit.
- Changing allocation also means people encroaching on other fisheries (bass <> crabbing)
- Full-time (FT) v Part-time (PT) time fishermen needs to be considered in allocation: approach needs to be localised and make sense. Should someone who actually owns and runs another business but fishes a few weeks a year be treated the same as a full time fisherman?
- Allocation to those who fish FT is the same as someone who fishes part time which isn't fair; some of the Weymouth bass r&l boats are actually supporting 4 jobs so the 5t isnt actually that much compared to someone single handed having a 5t limit.
- Who is best placed to decide on allocation locally > could be done monthly and be adaptable

<10m> issues

- Do not want under 10m pool to be privatised and quota traded. Do not want auctions as only big business can afford it.

- Could a swap system be used between fishermen, e.g. for sole caught in the scallop dredge fishery that could be used for netters who don't have enough quota.

OTHER POINTS RAISED

- Lack of operating a viable businesses puts off new entrants to industry
- Catamarans can go out in harsher weather
- Larger vessels can stay out much longer
- Restrictions in the Newhaven sole fishery
- IFCA tensions in relationships with industry throughout England
- Aquaculture can also be a source of conflict with fishing industry e.g. Dorset seaweed farm proposals which are planned and located in key fishing grounds - will have an impact and fishermen forced to give up (more) ground
- Charter angling and fishing fleet can work together and be respectful of each other's business
- Bass: putting strain on different parts of the fleet and commercial - recreational; for the trawlers who are not targeting bass when they do actually catch them it might 1 or 2 big hits a year when it's the majority of the catch and unavoidable, but due to the 1% allowance rule it needs to be dumped which doesn't benefit anyone or the stocks - need a more flexible approach to solve this problem (e.g. monthly or annual limit rather than trip level bycatch allowance). Do not force those discards of bass.
- Drift netting for bass had bycatches of sea birds and cetaceans
- For crabbing it's important for ground to be turned over by trawling or dredging so while areas are closed to trawling they also need to be reopened to keep the area productive
- Quota causes displacement geographically and boats from Shetland fish the South Coast.
- Scalloping and crabbing and bycatch goes back and survives
- Diesel electric hybrids could be part of future classification
- In the Icelandic cod fishery there's a TAC and once its met by the industrial vessels the crew then shift to their own smaller boats - wages are 75K in Norway for fishermen.

Session 2:

UK policy overview

- The distinction matters because of FQAs vs the pool
- Quality / experience of skipper matters more than vessel size or gear in terms of impact. Behaviour and knowledge are key as someone who doesn't know what they are doing in a higher capacity boat might catch less than a less powerful vessel used better.
- Under 8m / under 6m / 7m? History has shown there is a drift up that limit.
- Similar things occurred when the 40ft rule was in place
- How to define and inshore boat; sometimes they may fish in the 6nM limit but they could also be fishing 50 miles away. How does one of those vessels get categorised.
- Low impact on fish stocks or on environment? What is the starting point is it to manage stocks or gears.
- If there needs to be some degree of separation or distinction then don't want it to be unfair.
- Low impact should be considered across the whole sector, not just u10s.How to lower the impacts for both inshore and offshore.
- What do we want low impact to mean? Is it about habitat, stocks, etc
- What if you are using multiple gears you could be high impact in the morning and low in the afternoon.

- Does having a low impact definition mean you also want to categorise high impact
- Under12m is the forgotten segment (e.g. there's no app but also not in the pool)
- What about tonnage? Tonnage could be used to set thresholds fore within the 6nm limit.
- Why does it say higher impact gear types in the NEF briefing > it's from FAO / global review
- Defining impacts in areas > could rank how things affect the ocean along a sliding scale
- Hard to see anything different happening at this meeting or anything in the future
- There is a nervousness about gears and division > need to give fishermen confidence to let industry help Defra > first chance to do this during a time of change > industry have heard it all. Nobody wants more division, we need to move to less division, if under 10s doesn't work maybe we need to think about license categories for management purposes, as well as quota management and management for non-quota stocks; could be done through gear categories and segmentation but not artificial barriers.
- Who wrote the FWP? > Defra policy team with input from industry, regulators, and others > also consultation.
- Opportunity to help support.
- Fishermen need assurances that they will be listened to
- Fishermen want to have healthy stocks, catch a bit more, and have less regulation
- Negotiations with EU re quota
- Perception of low impact for fishermen could be very different than from environmental groups
- Fishermen involvement in science is often only implemented several years afterwards
- Defra need to ensure they respond / follow-up in a way that builds social capital as the trust building takes time and needs to be continuous
- Fishing is so broad and diverse that the opinion of the status quo will be very different from those in different sectors.
- What are the implications of low impact - for fishermen? Why was u10 used? 10m is a line but a new line will do the same; it will be inadequate for the diversity of the industry.

- History of <10>: In 1985 licenses were introduced started at 80ft who were then able to transfer their licenses (40ft vessels were not licensed - this was taken to be approximately 10m as registered vessel length initially, then overall length). This was done purely for administrative purpose to meet regulatory requirements on fleet structures (for joining the European Common Market). This then led to rule beaters who wanted to enter the under 10m sector as they didn't need licenses and have to record catches. In 1986 logbooks were introduced which was then followed by licensing and categorisation. The u10s didn't have any FQAs and fished out of a Govt administered quota pool.
- Fishermen can't buy quotas, as FQAs are private property so they are forced into being under 10s to have access to quota through the pool, but this means they can't actually use / build the vessels they want, which are safer. (e.g. u15m)
- What will NGOs say about this work? Cuttle traps in eel grass beds that are washing away in winter storms but now conservation advice impacts trapping.
- Inshore management > fishermen want more control; need to focus on what they can influence.
- Fisheries science - Fishing into the Future is a great way to learn about the purpose, process and opportunity but only one workshop a year and can't do it for all fishermen.
- This is going to be a long, slow process > but do people want the status quo?
- What do other countries do? Are the UK learning from good examples elsewhere?

- Can't separate fishing from the environment. But is research going to be used against fishermen?
- Need real time data > not a 3 year lag.
- Need funding (from Defra or elsewhere) for bigger, longer term support. The MCZ process got £8million and this type of thing needs investment; needs to support the maximum number in the industry.
- Beam trawl sector - there has been 100% increase in sole quota. There has been 100% increase in plaice quota. The stocks are doing well. According to ICES. There are hardly any discards (according to Cefas). So we are doing everything right.
- At the next workshop can we share outputs from the SAIF (sustainable access to inshore fisheries) report please? > Defra - Yes.

ACTIONS:

- Share notes (NEF)
- Share summary (NEF)
- Look into a newsletter (Defra)
- Share draft literature review thorough website (NEF + CCRI)
- Set up a website with the TOR and relevant docs, notes and updates (CCRI)

Scribe/facilitator: Harry Owen, Lydia Osbourne

Session 1 –

Majority of fishers using towed gear (dredge and trawlers) and one charter/netter/potter.

Q 1 - What are the main environmental impacts to the marine environment?

Main Impacts

- Target stock- regional. Depends on the size of stock
  - Fishers will take CEFAS out quite often to demonstrate they are complying and the stock are not undersized. Also demonstrate no bycatch on beam trawlers. They have control with their gear- mesh size, doors.
  - Sole stock has increased as a result. Belgian boats don't fish like them where they are being selective. Belgian boats are coming into 6-12 and not modifying their gear (F&G areas).
  - Anecdote; in Cherbourg there are no checks and log books are filled out by the landing man on quay.
- Seabed
  - They want voluntary dredge reductions for bigger scallop boats in Brixham.
  - Beam trawling doesn't cause as much damage as people think or as much as the damage of nature. They rarely go over reefs because it damages their gear. In Weston Super Mare there was a demonstration on the beach of beam trawling. Showed the impact to the seabed but didn't show how it was restored when the tide washed over. *There was general disagreement on this point within the group.*
  - Can't leave the ground alone for too long or it loses viability (like ploughing a field).
- Ghost gear
  - Bad practice can happen anywhere and the gear will drift. If it's down to currents it could even be global.
  - Crabbers and netters are the ones who leave ghost gear. With beam trawling they can guarantee they bring their gear home.
-

Wider Ecosystem Impacts

- Scallop divers (if close to shore, there is a worry they will take every breeding individual);
- Pollution;
    - Rotting bait from whelk pots; and
    - Ballast water.
- Invasive species outcompeting and bringing diseases;
- Wrasse removal for salmon farms;
- Aggregate dredging causing sand bank collapse and damage to eco-system;
- Offshore installations (wind farms and cables – not oil platforms);
    - Causing negative consequences for fish stocks (possibly vibrations [wind], or heat [cables].
    - Whelk/ crab are attracted to it which depletes the stocks outside the area
- Noise, from all sources;
- Closed areas;
    - Causing displacement of fishing effort;
    - Stops fishing digging up the bed which provides nutrient enrichment / food / stimulates growth;
        - Others on the table disagreed – Lyme was thought good for fishing and was described as the "best thing that ever happened". Good for pollock and bream at least.
- Aquaculture in general;
    - Seaweed farming;
    - Salmon; and
    - Mussels.
- Climate change.

Q 2 – What are the environmental impacts of fishing? What scale (local/regional/global)?

- Seabed impacts (but positive impacts sometimes) – local > global
- Target stock / reproduction – regional
- Fuel use – global
- Plastic pollution – local > global
- Other pollution – local
- Ghost gear – local > global
- Bycatch – local > global
- Wider ecosystem impacts (food sources etc) – local > global
- Bycatch other – local > global
- Noise – local

White Paper (whole room discussion)

- Should be managed in smaller classes e.g. under 7m
- Size of vessel of gear doesn't matter- it's the quality of the skipper that determines the catch.
- Distance should be considered. They could stay within the 6nm but end up 50 miles away.
- What about boats that could be both high and low impact? Will they need to pick a side and restrict their activities? It's not desirable for anyone to be high impact.

- Under 12s are the 'forgotten' category. No app but still considered inshore. Suggestion to use tonnage use as a measurement. Correlates to gear and damage etc.
- Reluctance to engage in something which will pit fishermen against each other- this has happened repeatedly.
- How do you manage industry within known impacts?
- They want less division- remove O/U 10m. Licensing- Scotland ABC categories to comply with landing obligation. Gear categories can control segmentation but remove artificial barriers such as the O/U 10m limit.
- The impact and restriction of nature and weather cannot be overstated enough.
- What were the results and actions from projects such as SAIF and Cefas 5050?
    - Information on 'project 50%' is available here:
    - https://www.seafish.org/geardb/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/project_50_printed_final_report.pdf
    - and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LnZrpdgebek

Scribe/facilitator: Jack Bradstreet / Rob Forster

Discussion 1

- Confusion over distinction between first and second discussion (difference between impacts on marine environment and impacts of fishing).
- Concern over 'playing Chinese whispers' – information being passed down the chain from fishers to industry to government incorrectly/inaccurately.
- Belief that fishers haven't complained themselves about the u10/o10 distinction, curious about where industry complaints have come from.

Participants felt uncomfortable reporting impacts of fishing, and therefore did not directly report any impacts, however these were drawn out when discussing general impacts on the marine environment. There was a sense that participants didn't want to be set against one another and report that one fishery/sector is more destructive than another.

Impacts on the marine environment:

- Aquaculture – example of farmed salmon, artificially warming waters, and mass farming of plankton. 'Overexploitation'
- Acidification of oceans
- Algae bloom
- Pollution – specifically waste disposal
- Global warming - water temperature, sea levels rising
- Noise pollution (sonar)
- Drilling, disturbance of the seabed
- Wind farms
- MPAs/MCZs/SPAs
- Vandalism, littering (from tourists)
- Jet skis, recreational activities
- Fresh water waste
- Polluted water from factories, toxins, acid rain
- Cable laying and burying
- Carbon emissions from boats (non-fishing)

- Man-made fibres
- Seals

Impacts **of fishing** on the marine environment:

- Towed gear, dredging
- Ghost gear
- Stocks depleted
- Bycatch
- Carbon emissions of vessels
- Removing food that other marine species eat
- Management
- Discards
- Marine species e.g. seabirds being caught

Other comments:

- Identifying weaknesses or 'high-impact' behaviour is difficult to do when there are IFCA representatives in the room, as well as Defra staff. There was an IFCA rep on our table, who the fishers didn't feel comfortable sharing their behaviours in front of.
- Environmental methods of fishing aren't always economically viable for fishers. Value isn't placed high enough at markets for fish that is caught in an environmentally friendly way. Fishers at the table expressed that they would love to do line-fishing every day if they could get a good price for the fish they caught, but this isn't realistic as larger 'high-impact' vessels can quickly catch far more fish.
- Fishing will always have an impact on the marine environment because, by nature, it involved removing fish from their habitat.
- Experience of Alaskan fisheries that the fishers didn't feel like they were competing with one another between sectors of the fishery. Sense of unity that isn't found in UK fisheries.
- Contention over the cumulative impact of the u10m fleet compared to the impact of fewer o10m boats. Smaller boats are higher impact, but there are far more of them. Questions raised over whether these impacts are equal.
- UK boats in the Channel that might be categorised as 'high-impact' will still be far lower impact than the large Dutch boats that fish there.
- Concern around the displacement of high-impact boats. If new regulations cause them to move further out (e.g. to the high seas) then fish stocks will still be depleted there.
- All fishers from different sectors will argue that they are low-impact because there are different ways of justifying gear types.
- Unintended consequences of management, although originally well-intended, have caused greater discards. The UK fleet looks very different to how it did in the '70s, so the management system needs to be updated accordingly.
- Concerns around loopholes in any new system that is designed, fishers always find a way to get around legislation e.g. creating boats that are u10m but can catch lots.
- 'Low' is a relative term. What is 'low'?
- Important to differentiate between 'sustainable' and 'environmentally-friendly'.

- Smaller boats can still catch more fish than some larger ones e.g. 9m catamarans can catch greater quantities more efficiently than older 11m boats. Length/size is arbitrary.
- 'Life-cycle analysis': analysing whether certain environmental impacts are greater or lesser than other. Potential to rank these impacts and determine low-impact from this.
- Fishers are blocked from moving to using electric boats by economic barriers. Many fishers cannot afford this transition, and shouldn't be punished for this. This makes determining low-impact by engine type problematic.
- Participants didn't want to discuss the scale of the impacts.

Discussion 2

- Smaller classification (<7m; <8m?)
- Not synonymous with size
    - Quality of the fisher is more important than vessel size
    - A good skipper can catch more fish on a smaller boat than a bad skipper with a larger boat
- How to define 'inshore' boat? Definition is difficult
- Fish stock impact vs. environmental impacts
- What do we want low impact to mean?
    - Sea – fish stocks
    - Environmental – litter, waste
    - Micro-bid level?
    - Carbon emissions
- Defra needs to have long-term investments to build social capital
- <12m are the 'forgotten category'
- Tonnage? Might be a better way of defining low-impact
    - Gear? Horse power?
- "Everybody in Brixham would be high impact fisher" – nervousness for all fishers
- Perception that Defra has previously used a "divide and conquer" strategy to set fishers from different sectors against one another
    - "Battered and bruised"
    - "Nobody wants to see more division" – the only way to have less division is to get rid of categories
    - Use criteria and quota management
- Idea of ranking impacts on the marine environment, then asking fishers how we can use management to lower these impacts.
- Questioned who wrote the White Paper – Defra officials, scientists, stakeholders etc.
- Terms of reference
    - Catch increase
    - Negative impacts decrease
    - Stocks protected
- Destructive impact of nature (e.g. wind) > fisher activity
- Lessons to be learned from other countries – Canada, New Zealand, USA
- Why define low impact? Without understanding this we can't define it/set parameters.
- o10 quota managed by government, fishers forced into the o10m with smaller engine
- Low impact on the environment vs. the broader environmental movement.

Scribe/facilitator: Angela Muench / Phil McBryde

1.1. What are the impacts on marine environment?

- Sonar
- Waste/ordnance
- Marine noise
- Ship strikes marine mammals
- Weather/storms → benthos
- Shore-based activities
    - Effluent
    - Farming
    - Pollution
    - Plastic
    - Eutrophication
    - Fuel
    - Top soil loss
    - Nitrates
    - Litter
- Leisure activities→ untrained/unregulated boats
- Shipping (commercial) = invasive/non-native species; algae bloom
- Aquaculture/mariculture
- Aggregate dredging
- Ocean acidification

➔ 80% water, everything impacts the marine environment

➔ Strong seasonality

1.2. What are the environmental impacts of fishing / angling independent of fishing type?

➔ Question is too divisive; therefore, rather pointed out what “we” would do if we would be king for one day

- Deregulate <8m?
- Not all <10m are “broken”!
- Length can be arbitrary?
- <10m is naturally restricted?
- Operating costs more
- Location, weather, impacts
- Fishing zones?
- Denial of value of licences. Authorised Recognitions?
- Diversification and flexibility is key.
- ££ - quota holders?
- Trust issues.
- Data from fishermen free → utilise fishermen as “scientists" at sea.
- Artisanal has a definition, low impact doesn’t
- Environmental impacts; divide? “High impact” (=careful) vs. “low impact”
- Status quo & discussion on dropping <8m/<7m from <10m would be valid due to beach boats? Oct end of season? Seasonality.
- Quota? More available?
- Environmental links? Lower level of regulations?
- Vessel capping? 5m=punt → handicap system

- Ecosystem approach vs. “environmental impacts” → lock at environment, fish, fuel/emission, etc.
- Holistic look at fishing activity
    - Testing tech: size, location, catches, etc.
    - Building; efficiency [vessel]
    - Latent capacity action
- Capping redressed: small boats (<6.5/7m) shouldn’t be restricted
- Diversification key
- Benchmark for size
- 21ft Cygnus:
    - License amalgamation
    - Aggregation?
    - Beach boats?
- Regulation drives innovation
- Progression in industry
    - Polarizing
    - Big companies: investment
    - Where is the money from
    - Fishing <u>not</u> tied to community
    - Small boats too restricted
    - “grants” for first-time fishermen?
    - Funding? <u>Opportunity</u>? **<u>Work for.</u>**
- Categories?:
    - <7
    - 7-12
    - 12-15
    - 15-18
    - >18

---

1. General notes from discussion
    - Concerns about what the definition will be used for → finger pointing?; be used against “us”?
    - Might create conflict between mobile and static gear
    - Do we need a new definition? Might be just a small fraction of fishermen unhappy about the <10/10+m definition → what’s the % of the industry who want to move away?
    - Definition of <10/10+ is linked to quota not to environmental impact
    - License/quota management “one rule fits all” does fit anyone. Current quota management is not great as <10 would need support because of weather/storm dependency of activity
    - Smaller <10 would like effort management to allow flexibility. Restricted by weather anyway and the engine power is rather indicator for weather dependency (overcome storm) then towing strength
    - Past management measure went wrong: “why should we trust that it gets better”
    - Not all <10 are “broken”/need fixing → length arbitrary
    - 12m can be less efficient than 9m boats due to fuel efficiency. Operating cost are very high – needs to be accounted for.

- Paperwork doesn't differentiate so far between the really small boats and <10m. The small ones are governed by the weather (capping/license value should be reflect this)
- Simpler management
- "lowest impact" would be mainly people licensing their quota
- 10 years of data providing and not listening to
- CatchApp → impact on fish
    - No way of getting true reflection of total environmental impact. There is always conflict between gear types
    - How to measure impact? Regional? What is the evidence?
    - Are we pushed into the 6-12nm zone considering MCZ, MPAs, …
- Increased recreational use of shoreline's → disturbance of marine mammals/ birds nesting grounds…
- Fisheries are very regional
- New entrants/ latent capacity creates additional pressure & diversification is taken away
    - For example: investment from Scotland in big boats → reduced fishing communities, no license for small activity ("the young can't work their way up and grow sustainably their business"). Cost-hurdle to start your own fishing business → industrialization in potting and trawling → increased effort/fishing pressure to reach break-even point/show profit to investors
    - Quota capping led to reduced quota for species → more fishing pressures on other (unregulated) species to make a living
    - Points made here go beyond attracting new entrants into the industry and capture the challenge around retention. 'Natural progression' > in all/most workplaces people want to progress, and that fishing is no different. This had been lost. Scottish investment point and monetisation of quota as a barrier here.

Scribe/facilitator: Jim Masters

Session 1: Impacts

Question 1.1 Impacts affecting the marine environment

GENERAL CONCERNS

- Whenever we've done this before the information has been used against us
- Reference to Lyme Bay – why is this process any different?
- Government bodies _IFCA, MMO etc. – all take and no give back to the industry – all trust has gone (refer to Brian Tapper email thread – Brian was on my table)
- They use 'environmentally friendly' too easily – developments like the mussel farm in Lyme Bay and seaweed farms are all closing areas to fishing as a result
- There has been no research about the impacts of this aquaculture on the environment, which is another example of why should fishermen trust this process
- You can't have a blanket approach to fisheries, they are all so different and each fishery has a different characteristic
- There needs to be a discussion around license capping and management but want opportunities each year to decide how and where to fish, rather than a fixed allocation that doesn't change each year
- There are significant economic issues at play that influence the decision fishermen make about which species they are going to target. If they don't have enough quota they won't invest in the gear needed to target them, but the current system means

that they don't have the option of deciding this each year as their license to fish species is taken away if it is not used.

- So fishermen want flexibility year on year, but also certainty to help them plan their businesses and build a business model that supports long-term fishing practices based on yearly allocations
- QUESTION: how to enable the MMO to work more constructively with the Under 10m sectors so that they can remain viable and flexible?
- There is a need for an 'app' that enable people to state how much they intend to catch of any one species in a given year and therefore support exchanges of quota within and between fisheries more easily (I am guessing this is in the absence of a PO)
- QUESTION: can we assume that aquaculture is not included in this process?
- There need to be annual entitlements – but these points have all been made to Defra already and this links in heavily to the removal of arbitrary rules
- There are issues around the other unintended consequences of management such as boarding boats. If you get boarded more fish die – you have to land all you catch.
- The issue of selectivity is being ignored more now (I didn't really follow this thread of the conversation very well. There is something about how management is making fishing mortality higher whilst trying to reduce it)
- The basic point is: There is a need to do away with blanket categories and to have a more refined way of defining fishing to allow people to operate to diversify as needed within their licenses.
- Under 7m was proposed as a potential new threshold for managing and defining fishing effort as it is hard to make a 7m boat anything other than what it is – many do not even have cabins or wheelhouses.

IMPACTS:

- Dredging: dredging companies give government loads of money and they get things that suit them in return. Trawlers make less of an impact than dredging.
- Dredging spoil does as much damage as anyone else
- Coastal defence works also cause damage – e.g. the silt and sand from Teignmouth
- Windfarms have an impact
- Landfill and run-off entering the marine environment
- It is not just the fishermen who have an impact.
- The scallop industry is impacted by run-off -it has closed fisheries in the Fal for example
- Horsepower of engines is a ridiculous way of judging impact. Bigger horsepower does not equate to more impact. It depends entirely on the type of gear you are using, and where.
- People would find a way around any impacts associated with horsepower (drifting up against the limits) as it depends entirely on the type of gear you are using and the type of fishing you are doing
- Horsepower is only really relevant to towed gear – arbitrary rules lead to people finding ways around them or of avoiding them
- Therefore, focus efforts on each individual fishery
- Rule Beaters can do more damage but other small boats are classed just the same

- litter pollution, tanker scrubbing, angling gear and commercial fishing gear (ghost gear), shore angling, natural events (storm damage), anchoring of boats in eel-grass areas
- Kelp and eel grass also subject to natural damage, seasonal variation and die-back
- Rubbish at sea and marine litter (from tourists)
- Climate change and sea temperatures
- Dissolved CO2
- Seal predation
- Gear needs to be properly marked so that if it is lost/found then it can be traced back to its owner.
- Gear interference between static and towed gear
- Ocean currents are changing – other fish are moving in, some fish are moving away. Fish follow bait fish, these changes are different at different depths
- There are too many private angling boats on wrecks and it has become too easy for people to find fish/wrecks, meaning there are more impacts on these places than there were even 5 years ago
- Improvements in all technology has had a big impact – e.g. slave haulers, GPS,
- Leisure angling is not regulated and can't be policed but has a big impact – e.g. they are not on a quota for cod but can significantly impact cod stocks when fishing with a full charter boat.
- Charter skippers catch to sell fish -to pay for their trips etc. Not a level playing field.
- Most fishermen are brilliant – but there will always be rogues
- Small Scale Fishermen are more impacted by the weather so they have less impact than bigger boats
- You need to think about the combination of 'tonnage' and power for towed gear
- Static gear – there are gear limitations on how much they can fish. There is a need for a pot limit per man to ensure you give a living to the families of each person involved
- This would influence how many people you carry and therefore would be difficult to regulate
- Need to also regulate string length
- Can we rotate 'closed areas' – people move on to opened areas and annihilate them after they have been closed
- Fish 'ownership' and slipper-skippers is a massive issue – quota can be bought and leased by other countries who are not regulated the same as us
- Smaller rod and line fishermen don't need quota

Session 2: Question and answer session

JM scribed the Q&A session as best he could. The content below might help augment notes from other people made during this open debate.

- U10m definition is tricky- it is unwanted and inappropriate but hard to change
- The skipper is the key component – good skippers catch more fish
- If there was a new breakpoint which removed U10m altogether you will still get 'snow' drifting up against this limit – you always will, no matter what level you set it at – wherever you set something there is always a tendency to drift up against it
- U10m can fish "inside 6nm but 50 miles from home" – what category does that put them in to?

- Are there other ways of defining or management the huge variation in fisheries and therefore fisheries management?
- Inshore is not a helpful limitation on thinking here as everyone needs to think about lowering their impacts
- What is the current definition of Low Impact?
- There is currently no definition but we need one
- What do you do for boats that fish either side of the 'low impact' division – are we looking at categorising fishing on these grounds too?
- Is there a better way of categorising fishing activities than low/high impact?
- The U12m is a forgotten category – can we refer to tonnage as a better measure of impact
- Demersal fishing gear is all defined as high-impact by the FAO – and this is a concern
- This project does not want to single out gear types
- There is a nervousness for all fishermen there has been a history of 'divide and conquer' we need confidence to help you, we have heard all this before
- The literature does a job of defining impacts – can you come to fishermen with a framework of options of how best to manage fisheries within known impacts?
- Nobody wants to see more division in the industry than there already is – does this project imply there is going to be less division by doing away with the U10m category?
- We also need to look at license categories: as reworking these could provide opportunities for managing different sectors more easily.
- E.g. in Scotland they have done away with license A,B,C but retained non-quota license components and criteria, which means there is some segmentation
- These recommendations were made 10 years ago (Sustainable Access to Inshore Fisheries project) – can this project be revisited rather than re-inventing the wheel?
- Where does the White Paper content come from – were there extensive consultations about what should be in there at all?
- There were consultations, conversations and stakeholder engagement
- The people in this room want some Terms of Reference to enable them to feel confident about participating in the process
- There needs to be a level of regulation to demonstrate fisheries management
- What will the impacts of defining low impact be?
- Where did the U10m definition come from in the first place?
- It was purely administrative – based on the old 40ft definitions
- It was used as reflection of joining the Common Market (decimalisation…)
- How will this project 'square' the impacts we choose to define with those already put forward by NGOs?
- We need more context about what is possible in terms of management – a reality check with how things are going to work at a legislative level
- What can fishermen actually influence here through this project?
- It's about how we can enable regional and sustainable fisheries
- Personal Observation: Investing in group formation could prove a worthwhile investment – social capital – the short-term nature of this project is a weakness and something that could be worked on at Stage II
- Fishermen need to be able to feed-in intelligence about fisheries and as to what data is needed/what questions do people want answered in terms of improving science and management

- Fishing into the Future is recognised as a good vehicle for building trust
- We need to giver regulators more information and we need to interact with them to try to influence what happens
- Defra is looking at the long-haul for this project – a serious commitment from them
- These resources are not guaranteed in terms of supporting dialogue
- Can we assess what is right/wrong with the status quo – for stringent interrogation – before we continue so that we can really scrutinise what is working and what needs to change?
- ACTION: Summarise definitions of low impact from other countries – how and where were these derived?
- Bring back the Sustainable Access to Inshore Fisheries project outputs as a starting point for more information and ensure we don't cover old ground and waste time.

4th March 2020