**Project UK Fisheries Improvements Stage One: Plaice and Lemon Sole**

**(Facilitated by the MSC)**

Wednesday 5th February 2020 9.30 – 14:00. FlatFish, Stirling Street, Grimsby, Lincolnshire, DN31 3AE

**Attending:**

AB: Anton Dietschel-Buehler Flatfish

BL: Bill Lart Seafish

CM: Cameron Moffat Young’s

JP: Jo Pollett MSC

KC: Kenny Coull SFSAG

KK: Katie Keay MSC

LH: Leendart Hakvoort Osprey

MK: Mike Kendrick Seachill

MM: Mike Mitchell M&S

MS: Matt Spencer MSC

MT: Melissa Tillotson Waitrose

RC: Rod Cappell Poseidon

**Dial in:**

AD: Ally Dingwall Sainsbury’s

IG: Iain Glasgow Defra

LR: Lisa Readdy Cefas

**Apologies:**

AJ: Aisla Jones Co-op

CC: Clarus Chu WWF

NE: Nigel Edwards Seachill

SJ: Scott Johnson Young’s

WD: Will Davies Seachill

WB: Wilem de Boer Osprey

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss progress on the Stage 1 Action Plan for Plaice and Lemon sole; to discuss the updates to governance and branding; and to develop further working for the year ahead.

**Minutes and Action Points**

JP announced to the group that there had been no feedback on the last minutes that were distributed and that they are to be uploaded to Fishery Progress in due course. All other actions were addressed in the meeting and are represented below.

**Discussion of UoA area**

CM illustrated to the group that Action 7 has proved troublesome due to the mismatch in alignment between the Unit of Assessment (UoA) for this FIP and ICES areas of advice. Previously the group had discussed where the UoA should cover, ICES areas 3a, 4 and possibly 7d, as the stock area for assessment is wider than just the North Sea. RC stated that this is a matter that is up to the group, with the group undecided on whether to include 7d into the UoA. CM asked Osprey and SFSAG where their key areas are and whether they would have included 7d, to which KC replied no. 4 and 2a are the keys areas; however, Osprey stated that they fish in ICES area 7 but not for Lemon sole (*LS*).

MK believed the reason why 7d is not widely considered could be down to supply. RC pointed out that currently only about 16 tonnes comes from 7d, and that area 7d currently does not have Total Allowable Catch (TAC) in place. MT questioned why ICES advice includes 7d but the TAC does not, to which RC stated it could be down to an operation procedure and that TAC had not kept pace. ICES scientists believed stock unit should be Skagerrak (Skag) and Kattegat (Katt) as well as 7d but the TAC had not been changed to reflect this.

MT stated that she believed, from a conservation point of view, that it is important to include 7d into the UoA. MT believed that it may only currently be 16 tonnes but that may change and with no TAC this could impact the fishery in the North Sea further down the line. RC concurred MT’s remark, and informed the group that P1 is about the entire stock (including 7d) and that the fact it doesn’t have a TAC will impact our assessment whether it is in the UoA or not.

This conversation transitioned into KC providing an update on what the future TAC of *LS* and witch looked like. KC informed the group that ICES noted *LS* as a joint TAC to prevent single-species over-exploitation, but there were options to be considered. KC stated that the removal of TAC for *LS* could be counter-productive for MSC certification, and that the uncertainty of Brexit and lack of support for UK fishing initiatives has hindered progress. KC informed the group that he had written to IG. KC recognised that this work is unlikely to come to fruition imminently, but that there had been progress made.

IG announced to the group the latest from Defra; that there had been no change to the advice since the last announcement in July, where a 25% reduction in TAC was administered for the jointly managed stock of *LS* and witch. IG also informed the group that the outcome from December Council was a 14% reduction in the TAC and that the next available information will be in June 2020.

IG asked whether the group were asking whether Defra supported joint TACs; or if the group was asking whether Defra had specific management plans for *LS*? IG illustrated to the group that Defra have had to place focus on other stocks; namely North Sea and Celtic Sea cod; where IG stated it is critical to agree a management plan and to continue the viability of the cod fleets.

RC followed this up and asked whether Defra would be supportive of the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) being developed, as *LS* isn’t a named species under the Multi-Annual Plan (MAP) and what would be done to manage *LS* stock in the need arose? IG was pleased that *LS* had not been identified as a named stock as it gives Defra greater flexibility if there were a need to recover the stock. IG stated that Defra would prefer a single-species TAC. IG continued, that Defra believed *LS* should be managed as the biological stock including 3a and 7d (in addition to ICES area 4).

RC asked IG the question of what could be done to disentangle from the current situation for *LS*. IG informed the group that Defra would have to ask the question of ICES but how *LS* is managed would be a political decision and would be heavily shaped by whatever the post-Brexit regime looks like. IG stated that he could give no guarantees that it could be done this year, and that it might be better to put it back a year as currently Defra have more important priorities (Cod).

The group then asked what the reason was for adding 2a to the TAC for *LS.* To which IG stated he didn’t know why. IG stated that he had information he could send over to the group for their viewing.

RC stated that he believed this could be a long process to complete this action. IG responded saying that is a question that is needed to be asked of ICES and what happens to witch; would it become a single TAC as well? BL added that both species are managed under the Precautionary Approach (PA) under the North Sea MAP.

RC brought the group back and stated in the intervening period we are creating an FMP for *LS* but as *LS* is a bycatch species in the MAP it would be down to managers of the fishery to decide the measures should the need for conservation arise. CM asked the group whether, in terms of action plan, there is a need to put the action into next year?

**Actions:**

* **IG to send over *LS* data to the group.**

**Action 1 and 2 Stock Status and Harvest Strategy**

BL informed the group that the production model ICES were using goes back to the 1960s, but ICES were not confident in some of the data due to differing gears being utilised, areas of surveys not aligning and some nations having not reported *LS*. As a result, they used the **SURBARD (CHECK)** method. BL stated that ICES now have good age-length keys.

BL continued by running over the latest ICES scientific advice and illuminated that SSB is down roughly 3% and that there were yet to be Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) reference points to be administered. BL continued and stated from the data, the year classes had been decreasing in recent years. As a result of this ICES had implemented a precautionary buffer.

LR agreed and informed the group that the precautionary buffer is used when it had not previously been used for a number of years. This process went through after assessing whether effort had reduced and whether SSB had gone up considerable amount not to implement a Precautionary Approach (PA) buffer. LR added if there is any uncertainty the buffer is automatically added. LR informed the group that in terms of reference points for *LS* the only one that is absent is for biomass, which has proven difficult due to the data limited methods used by ICES. However, this is something that the North Sea Working Group (NSWG) have worked on and in April they will be meeting again, with any results available to see in July’s advice.

BL asked whether there are data limited methods that would give SSB with a data limited model, to which LR informed BL that what the NSWG were looking at was an index of abundance and what SSB might be using a survey index. Other research has indicated that this approach can be accepted as a proxy for biomass. LR stated the intent is always to have some reference points so that managers can see how the stock is doing and that the working groups (WGs) are always testing and reviewing them.

LR then went on to state that for witch it is an ICES category one species, with reference points; but as it is mainly a bycatch species the EU decided to manage with a PA rather than as a category one species. RC asked why the most recent *LS* assessment had lost reference points and as ICES moves towards a new assessment method could the group see a return of reference points? Is this a temporary situation? LR responded by saying it would be difficult to say if its near-future, it would depend whether there are acceptable methods in place.

This information led RC to admit that it leaves the group at a score of 60 and will need amending in the Action Plan.

The conversation the discussed BL’s work on *LS* hotspot questionnaire. The group debated that the main difficulty is that *LS* seem to be caught over much of the UoA and how imperative it is to get solid data for *LS* distribution going forward. BL informed the group that he had drafted a questionnaire and a map which will be completed by fishermen, BL hoped that this will identify areas of high *LS* densities. LH stated that Osprey know their areas that are important to them as a mixed fishery – mainly for plaice – but also have high incidences of *LS*. The group decided to amend some of the wording of the questionnaire to be more user friendly.

CM thought that this map could provide a basis for implementing technical measures – avoidance areas etc - something RC support that if the group focussed on the mixed fishery results a heat map could be drawn out. An issue then arose as to what Brexit might mean for the work where the UK might lose access to, Skag & Katt, and the group agrees to taking a watching brief on this.

MT raised the question of what to include and remove from the map, with the group deciding to include 7d and remove 2a. BL stated he would amend accordingly but would also be interested to gauge statistics from Devon and Cornwall – where there is a targeted Spring fishery for *LS*, and compare the results with the work for this steering group.

The group decided that it would be best to have Seafish logo on the documents, as industry and fishermen are already used to supplying them information, and to have an area where they can put down gear type. The group felt this action could progress quickly, there is a need to get the questionnaires and maps out soon and review them shortly after. RC suggested the analysis be done to incorporated landing per statistical area, and not just taking *LS* in isolation.

**Actions:**

* **LR to keep a watching brief on development of reference points for *LS***
* **RC to amend score reduction into action plan.**
* **KC and LH to distribute questionnaire to fishermen**
* **BL to amend wording in the questionnaire.**
* **Steering Group (SG) to keep a watching brief and revisit this question once Brexit becomes clear.**
* **BL to amend maps to incorporate gear description and to exclude 2a but include 7d.**

**Action 3 Secondary Species Outcomes**

JP updated the group on some of the working form the Nephrops FIP and stated that, after commissioning a Harvest Stratgy report, effort and TAC per Functional Unit (FU) were ruled out and that the Nephrops steering group were following up technical measures that could be implemented.

JP continued, and made mention that regional workshops were to be conducted in the near future to ascertain feasibility and willingness to implement the technical measures. The groups to be formalised are likely to be the North Sea, West of Scotland and Irish Sea. CM pointed out it would be good to align this group with that of the Nephrops North Sea group.

CM then asked Osprey if they could pass over their report on Starry Ray.

The conversation moved to alignment with the Monkfish FIP (Seafish). BL mentioned that since the last *LS* meeting the Monkfish FIP had determined a pre-assessment and Action Plan but were needing industry support to progress it. RC stated it was good news that it had progressed but the group debated that if there is further delay to the Monkfish FIP then it might be better to align with the cod FIP for secondary species issues.

**Actions:**

* **LH to pass over report to CM.**
* **SG to keep a watching brief on this.**
* **SG to increase industry support for the Monkfish FIP.**

**Action 4 Secondary Species Management**

CM presented the work that had been done on alternative measures, an action that had progressed well but needed an updated gears matrix. CM asked whether the group will we need to share it independently if its included within the FMP? RC responded, that the two could go together but the risk is we send out an FMP and you don’t get feedback or recognition of what other users might be pulling out. The group should highlight you want some reaction to it. From an assessment point of view, RC believed we could state that the management authority has had a look at our alternative measures.

BL presented work by ICES that indicated a maturity curve, this work indicated that *LS* matures early at around 12cm and by 20cm length 80% of *LS* will be mature. There is no longer a Minimum Landing Size (MLS) for *LS*. In terms of what is utilised, LH stated that 110g is the minimum size *LS* Osprey work with which equates to approximately 25cm. BL believed there was discard data from the Shetlands that could be utilised, to which CM said that he and BL would sit down and develop this work further.

BL asked LR whether the data he presented came in a tabled form as he only accessed aggregated data. LR informed the group that they would have to ask ICES for the data and they should be able to provide it. LH also stated that Osprey data would be made available for use as well.

**Actions:**

* **CM to add updated gears matrix to the paper.**
* **BL and CM to work up alternative measures paper.**
* **BL to access Shetland’s discards data.**
* **BL to ask ICES for *LS*** **data tables for 2002-2018.**
* **LH to pass over Osprey data to CM.**

**Action 5 ETP**

Emily Gibb’s (EG) ETP list was completed for the Nephrops FIP and amended by MS for the Plaice and *LS* group. From the preassessment phase of the *LS* FIP Priority marine Features (PMFs) have now come into place in Scotland and will need to be included in the ETP list. Once this is completed MS is to pass the list on to WD for industry to lead on.

KC stated that the issue of PMFs has made things interesting as some of them are commercial species that are not deemed as threatened. RC clarified to the group that where it’s a commercial species we are not to list it as ETP. Discussion was had over alignment of this action with the cod FIP, similar geographical spread and have similar vessels.

LH informed the group that the only ETP species they have issue with is starry ray. KC stated it is important to get observer data from Marine Scotland, but whether they relinquish it is a different matter. KC believed Marine Scotland are not structured in a way that can accommodate those asks. KC went on to state that Scottish Fishermen’s Federation (SFF) have a large observer scheme and that Eleanor Blostry (**check name)** and Jenny (**Check name**) would be good points of contact to follow up with.

**Actions:**

* **MS to finish ETP list and pass to WD.**
* **KC to chase up SFF and SFSAG regarding observer and Marine Scotland data.**

**Action 6 Habitats**

JP informed the group that Cefas were charged with writing a report for habitats, which had been completed but had questions and clarifications needed. As a result, Gudreon Gundrun (GG) was brought in as a P2 expert to review it all.

KC stated that in demersal fisheries the limiting factor is often access to quota for vessels, not effort restrictions. KC went on to state that with the cod recovery plan there are several suggestions put forward. Real time closures had been put forward by Scotland. CM asked where overlaps might be e.g. BL’s map may be used for avoidance areas. RC stated that although PMFs are a Scottish thing we would need to include them across the entirety of the UoA. Something RC stated he had not seen is the full list of habitats encountered in the report.

RC informed the group that what we need to know is what the overlap is between VME habitats and UoA vessels. If the group discovered that it is not at an acceptable level, then what should the management measure be. E.g. this is a VME we know needs protecting and this is how we propose the protect it. The group then discussed the issue between indicator species occurrence and actual habitats. RC confirmed that one individual does not make it a VME, it would need to be an aggregate of these. RC also stressed the need for consistency between FIPs and other fisheries, and that the same vessels in the same area were adhereing to the same habitat rules & management processes.

LH informed the group that their re-certification is due this April and any reports or data this group has should be used to support it, as assessors can only go on the data they are provided.

The group then went through GG’s habitats report, with recommendation provided for example areas such as Eastern Gannet, Meltrose and Central Fladen. Some of the group feel that industry might not agree with some of what was in the report. KC informed the group that in Central Fladen, voluntary closures were already going ahead. The group decided it would be good to get a list of the current measures in place for areas SFSAG and Osprey fish. LH told the group that there they currently only have one voluntary closure and that is in the Dogger Bank, it is an agreement between WWF and Osprey. Something that is still in place.

KC then provided an update on from stakeholder events in Scotland. On 1st October 2019 there was a stakeholder event for the management of the 11 PMFs designated by Marine Scotland. KC informed the group that at the event a half mile limit around coastal features was proposed but since then Marine Scotland have effectively started from the beginning again. What was agreed was PMF management at a local/regional level, but when discussion was opened up to the Inshore Fishing Groups (IFGs) it became more complicated. KC stated that the next steps were to coordinate regional workshops for PMF management, with boundary issues to be discussed and refined so that areas aren’t closed off where features are not present.

Timelines have since changed with consultation period for Spring 2021. KC believed that inshore MPAs and PMFs will have little impact on *LS*. Off shore MPAs will have a degree of restrictions but timeline is uncertain. CM asked what would be the implications to nomadic fleets such as Nephrops? KC acknowledged it but stated industry well aware and will help build the management plans for each MPA. PMFs slightly different. The workshop had options for 0.5 miles protection and 3-mile protection of these areas, with 3-mile not taken into consideration by Marine Scotland. KC showed that the west coast of Scotland has a lot of work ahead with the number of MPA and PMFs identified but that there is little impact for the North Sea *LS* fishery.

**Actions:**

* **Group to make a decision on data provision for Osprey re-certification.**
* **Secretariat to share latest habitat report.**
* **Osprey and SFSAG to share list of current measures.**

**Action 7 Management Plan**

The group went through the Fishery Management Plan (FMP). Below are excerpts from the conversation for edits. It will be broken down in to the chapters it describes with subsequent actions listed immediately.

**Cover page:** Edits to be made to cover page and 1.1.1, to simply reference *LS*. Discussion over ownership, CM states that there are technically two client groups in the end. RC remarked that the FMP needs to reflect the vessels and what is acceptable to them, and thought it best to keep it broad for the time being.

**Action: BL, CM, WD to amend cover sheet accordingly.**

**1:** BL has an update on the biology of stocks to add in and that mention of Plaice can be removed. IG added that Cefas is concerned about *LS* in the Western Channel, which Cefas have a programme running for. IG hopes that the project will report in the next month or so as to whether there is any mixing between east and west stocks.

**Action: IG to update the group on Cefas Western Channel LS project.**

**Action: BL to add in biology information.**

**2.1:** The group decided that under the goal and objectives section there needs to be a greater reference to Brexit policy change and the Fisheries Bill. IG reaffirmed Cefas position of the UK being committed to the North Sea Management Plan, and that there are unlikely to be any radical changes to that. The group decided that it would be best to leave a note stating that this is pending the outcome of Brexit – EU/UK negotiations. There was a decision to make this section of the FMP to be more UK centric.

**Action: BL, CM, WD to edit this section to make more UK centric.**

**2.2:** BL informs the group that *LS* is managed in a PA approach and not to MSY as it is a bycatch stock. IG stated he would have to go away and check as he believed there should be analytical advice. BL believed the 2.2, long-term advice, needs more work. If ICES are concerned it’s an over exploited stock then it would trigger the PA buffer.

**Action: IG to check the status of *LS* and whether they have any analytical advice**

**Action: BL to amend 2.2 long-term advice.**

IG stated that *LS* and witch are to be fished to MSY in 2020, that was the advice Cefas had from the previous December (2019) Council meeting. RC asked why the latest ICES advice mentioned applying the precautionary approach to which BL said that this will just mean ICES imply managing to MSY which will include the precautionary approach, almost like an MSY+. JP mentioned that it would be worth noting in the FMP that there is further expected advice for *LS*.

For short-term advice RC stated that the group needs more information for the Harvest Strategy, the group needs to put in something that relates to ensuring the TAC is not overdone.

**Action: CM, BL, WD to amend short-term advice to be reflective of Harvest Strategy.**

**3:** CM informed the group that the group will need to go through and review current certification reports, but again there will be a hold needed until the outcome of EU/UK negotiations. Worth noting the issue and write it as the current climate. IG stated that during the implementary period, industry and NGOs will continue to attend advisory council meetings but after the transition ends he is unsure what it will mean. IG continued and made the group aware that the UK is unable to attend regional group meetings – Schweng group (**check name**).

**4:** RC started by stating that the HCRs and HS are the crux of the FMP, with existing documents such as the MAP are not specific enough with how *LS* will be harvested and managed from an MSC perspective. RC stated that this section needs to reflect what needs to be done rather than what is currently being done. Building on the MAP, for bycatch species such as *LS* we will manage in a particular way. The FMP will state that for *LS* what we are going to do if the needs arise. RC added that the FMP should also state how often the MAP and the FMP should be reviewed.

**Action: BL, CM, WD to amend this section accordingly.**

**Action: Secretariat to get detail of MSC HS review.**

**4.2:** In this section **-** description of HCRs RC stated that it needs to be sufficient enough to determine whether TAC is being used sufficiently; but, should the group be in agreement that TAC is not enough then additional measures will need agreeing. RC stressed the importance of these HCRs being well defined. RC stated that just reducing effort if it drops below a reference point is too vague. CM asked whether this can be done currently if we don’t have reference points, to which RC said it is possible but will have to be very precautionary.

For the review section it is the same for HS. Clear rules and a clear review cycle.

**4.3:** RC stated that this section will have to be changed, for December Council meetings etc; however ICES advice shouldn’t have to change. The group felt there will be more development from the progress of the Fisheries Bill. This section will be defining HCRs that you will be expecting the industry to follow. MM added that it will be a decision-making process which will be a challenge to the FIP timeline.

RC mentioned that from what he has garnered from the Fisheries Bill, it seems there is a move towards FMPs for fisheries, and so developing this FMP would be in line with the direction the UK is heading. IG confirms this but stated that as *LS* is taken in in a mixed fishery, what would be the group’s other management measures; other than TAC setting? RC mentioned that there could be options for spatial measures and selectivity, which IG said there could be issues with selectivity as it may have impacts on other stocks: whiting, haddock, megrim. RC agreed and stated this topic will crucial in deciding workable and manageable management with industry.

**5.1:** Group decided that a lot of this is based around plaice and feel this is where the alternative measures paper would come in.

**Action: BL, CM, WD to add in alternative measures paper.**

**5.2:** Group felt it best to make mention thatcurrent regulationsare in a state of flux. CM believed that this is where EG’s ETP work and the starry report could be inserted here and any gaps that are found or species missing will now be led by WD.

**Action: WD to insert ETP work here and identify any missing species.**

**5.3:** KC stated that the workshops done by Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and JNCC have identified measure that could be applied here, with the measures potentially differing from area to area. However, CM stated it will be interesting to note how those systems and its legislation will change once they are implemented. KC added that there shouldn’t be many more features coming through, although MPAs might be a different matter. In a few years, there will be measures in place which are known and fixed.

BL mentioned to the group that Matilda (Check name) at Seafish did a lot of work on this and produced JPEG files. He offered to ask for them.

**Action: BL to as for JPEG files from Matilda.**

**6.2:** CM stated this section had some comments when it was last assessed but he now believed that it would score an SG80 hopefully when we come to implement this. Additions from alternative measures paper to be put in here and gear matrix work.

**Action: CM to add in alternative measures section**

**7:** MM stated that we should replace plaice with *LS*. RC added that this section applies to stock and how control authorities implement management. KC raised concern about the TAC being brought down triggering alternative measure and potentially creating a choke situation. BL supported this view and said that currently its not an issue but in the future it could be. RC mentioned that there was suggestion of Cefas doing a piece of work into this front.

**Action: Secretariat to ask Cefas if there is ongoing work into *LS* quota.**

**7.1.1** CM stated that there is a need to put in the review system, to which RC added that section 7 is all about MMO and Marine Scotland and compliance.

**7.4:** Group decided that this is where the BMT should be added and that we should give smart indicators as well in preparation for when the fishery leaves FIP.

**8:** CM stated that this section harks back to who is inputting into this, who the main stakeholders are and who will continue to do this post FIP. RC believed as the group had a management plan there will need to be a management group. RC believed that Defra should convene a management group, that brings together fishers and other stakeholders. JP questioned whether it should be Defra or industry, to which RC stated it depends on the status of the FMP. If its official its Defra, but if it is a voluntary management process then it should be a group like this.

BL believed that Defra will want it as a mixed species management group, he was not sure Defra would be that bothered about a single species. RC felt that there could be a North Sea demersal management group and within that the issues with *LS* are addressed.

KC then discussed the percentage of *LS* catch for SFSAG. KC mentioned that Jenny (check name) was able to pass over more detail and he will chase her up for it. KC also mentioned that SFSAG receive weekly updates from POs but the results are for both *LS* and witch. Results showed uptake was within limits of TAC allocation and indicated that SFSAG land the majority share of UK landings for 2019, approximately 85% of UK quota. LH stated that Osprey is semi-covered in this figure and MM pointed out that Osprey land into Netherlands and so might not be reflected in this data.

**Plaice update**

Osprey have one new vessel to their certificate and that they have closed off their condition. RC added that the status for plaice is also looking good so there are no alarm bells.

**AOB**

KK announced that in the final terms of reference there was one issued raised by a Stage 2 member. KK offered this section of the meeting as an opportunity to state whether you are happy or not. KK furthered this and announced that the main changes were around voting and the proposed advisory boards moving forward. No concerns we noted.

The Project UK logo was then presented, with a map in the ‘O’ preferred by approximately 80% of responders. France removed and all the Islands included. Image to be shared in high resolution and shared alongside rule of use.

No issue or concern raised.

**Actions:**

* **Secretariat to share logo with SG and inform the group of updates to ToR.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Responsibility** |
| ***Discussion of UoA area***   * IG to send over LS data to the group. | **IG** |
| ***Action 1 and 2 Stock Status and Harvest Strategy***   * LR to keep a watching brief on development of reference points for LS * RC to amend score reduction into action plan. * KC and LH to distribute questionnaire to fishermen. * BL to amend wording in the questionnaire. * Group to keep a watching brief and revisit this question once Brexit becomes clear. * BL to amend maps to incorporate gear description and to exclude 2a but include 7d. | **LR**  **RC**  **KC & LH**  **BL**  **GROUP**  **BL** |
| ***Action 3 Secondary Species Outcomes***   * LH to pass over report to CM. * SG to keep a watching brief on this. * SG to increase industry support for the Monkfish FIP. | **LH**  **GROUP**  **GROUP** |
| ***Action 4 Secondary Species Management***   * CM to add updated gears matrix to the paper. * BL and CM to work up alternative measures paper. * BL to access Shetland’s discards data. * BL to ask ICES for LS data tables for 2002-2018. * LH to pass over Osprey data to CM. | **CM**  **BL & CM**  **BL**  **BL**  **LH** |
| ***Action 5 ETP***   * MS to finish ETP list and pass to WD. * KC to chase up SFF and SFSAG regarding observer and Marine Scotland data. | **MS**  **KC** |
| ***Action 6 Habitats***   * Group to make a decision on data provision for Osprey re-certification. * Secretariat to share latest habitat report. * Osprey and SFSAG to share list of current measures | **GROUP**  **MSC**  **LH & KC** |
| ***Action 7 Management Plan***   * BL, CM, WD to amend cover sheet accordingly. * IG to update the group on Cefas Western Channel LS project. * BL to add in biology information * BL, CM, WD to edit this section to make more UK centric. * IG to check the status of LS and whether they have any analytical advice * BL to amend 2.2 long-term advice. * CM, BL, WD to amend short-term advice to be reflective of Harvest Strategy. * BL, CM, WD to amend section 4 accordingly. * Secretariat to get detail of MSC HS review. * BL, CM, WD to add in alternative measures paper to 6.2 * WD to insert ETP work here and identify any missing species. * BL to as for JPEG files from Matilda. * CM to add in alternative measures section * Secretariat to ask Cefas if there is ongoing work into LS quota. | **BL, CM, WD**  **IG**  **BL**  **BL, CM, WD**  **IG**  **BL**  **BL, CM, WD**  **BL, CM, WD**  **MSC**  **BL, CM, WD**  **WD**  **BL**  **CM**  **MSC** |
| ***AOB***   * Secretariat to share logo with SG and inform the group of updates to ToR. | **MSC** |