

MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING

102nd Meeting

Brief notes and action points from meeting held on Teams

12th July 2021

Present:	William Peggie – Director Natural Environment (Chairman) Mike Taylor (MT) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Chris Isaacs – representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Ian Syvret (IS) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen Gareth Jeffreys (GJ) – representing Société Jersiaise Natalie Porrit (NT) – representing Jersey Merchants Steve Mullins - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Stanley Richard-Dit-Leschery (SRDL) – representing Ports of Jersey
In Attendance:	John Young (JY) – Minister for Environment Gregory Guida (GG) – Assistant Minister for Environment Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager, Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist, Marine Resources Dot Miller (DM) - Minutes
Apologies:	Royston Rimeur

		Action
1.	Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	
	<p>Brexit – change in wording to - increase minimum landing sizes of scallops.</p> <p>Matters Arising</p> <p>It was noted that Royston Rimeur was stepping down as president from the Greve de Lecq Boat Owners Association. WP thanked RR for his contribution to the Marine Panel.</p> <p>Bass Roe report – MR team measured roe throughout spring but need to do full season next year for a better indication, probably need to encompass the first two weeks of April to cover the spawning.</p> <p>Blue Fin Tuna – piggybacking on dolphin app – FB now been added to can be recorded.</p> <p>FMA agreement update – on the agenda, links into the previous two matters.</p>	
	Capture Fisheries	
2.	Blue Marine Foundation: introduction of Jersey Officer	

Appin Williamson (AW) – from Blue Marine Foundation – new project officer, joined us from the Environment Agency in Cornwall, and is now based at the National Trust for Jersey. AW presented BLUE's mission, broken down into:

- secure marine protected areas
- develop models of sustainable fishing
- restore marine habitats
- tackle unsustainable fishing
- connecting people with the sea, through education and engagement with the marine environment
- BLUE – UK charity but based all over the world
- working towards the UK fisheries model

Fully funded a PhD Student, co-supervised with Marine Resources.

Supporting 2 MSC students from the UK working in Jersey.

Developing a Jersey Hand Dived label – divers will sign up for free, get a permitted association with their licence, BLUE will support this.

Developing a Snorkel Trail in conjunction with sea users in Jersey and using 'citizen science', to get people engaged with their sea environment.

Educating school children.

Over the next 12 months:

- research
- supporting low-impact fisheries, Jersey Hand Dived, Local seafood campaign, seafood event
- fisher-led science, started speaking to the fishermen but need to involve more, trying to get an idea of the biggest issues they have across the fleet
- collaboration opportunities – anyone who is interested, as many people as possible, want to promote and sustain the Jersey Fisheries

WP mentioned Eco-schools and will channel names to contact to you.

JY – deputy minister feels all of our waters should be a Marine Park – is that the aim of the work BLUE is doing? AP advised that BLUE would like to see more areas protected but not a complete fishing ban, it would be about reducing the area open to mobile gear, making sure everywhere is being effectively managed, definitely not about banning fishing.

SM – if totally closed, would BLUE be aiming for 30% protection (globally) – a great place to start would be our RAMSAR site. AW advised that RAMSAR is already closed to mobile gear. SM suggested closing off to gill netting as well. AW advised that extensive consultation would be needed, but open to all management suggested. With regard to hand dived scallops, AW confirmed that only licenced divers will have the promotional material to apply to the scallops, so able to track and monitor.

SM enquired about the possibility of Portlet being a complete no take zone. AW advised that the Société Jersiaise and MR Officers are working on this. GJ advised that the law drafting is almost completed and there would be a public consultation next year.

WP

3.	North coast harbours: management of unused gear	
	<p>FB – on behalf of Royston Rimeur that there is concern from boat owners at Bouley Bay about the amount of gear being left in the sea. The request is that Government has a position on what action can be taken on gear sitting dormant in the water. Comments were invited from Panel.</p> <p>IS – the issue at Bouley Bay is down to one particular fisherman who has not been able to fish for some time. Can Marine Resources collect gear for fishermen who cannot go to sea for some time? FB advised that unless gear is illegal, MR don't have a mechanism for removing it even if it is laying dormant. Eco active looking at disposal methods for disposing of gear, but what we are discussing is should Marine Resources have the ability to do this.</p> <p>NP – the pots should have tags in, if not up to date should this not give the department the right to remove them? IS commented that tags are not required on recreational pots, but the problem is mainly commercial.</p> <p>WP – this is something we could take forward in house for now, but will need commercial input.</p>	
4.	Spider Crab closure: dates to be agreed	
	<p>1 September – 15 October midnight (new shell crabs), proposal to continue with these dates for 2021 and review more formally in future years.</p> <p>NP commented that Italy is refusing to take berried crabs, consideration should be given into banning this as well as there is no market for them.</p> <p>There was no opposition to changing dates, so dates will continue for 2021.</p>	
	<u>Aquaculture</u>	
5.	Proposed seaweed farm	
	<p>Proposal from Jersey Ocean Seaweed was circulated prior to the meeting. The farm is off the north coast of Jersey. FB – we do not have the legislation to control a farmed seaweed business. Applicant is aware and would like Jersey to consider putting in place the licencing required to allow this to happen. Should this go forward a full environmental impact survey and consultation would need to be held, taking at least a year, with plenty of scrutiny along the way.</p> <p>CI stated that the proposal seems like a desk top study at the moment. Sugar kelp would be doable, but not convinced by the information on restored kelp forest or kelp beds. Allweed goes down about 20 metres, forest diminishes after 20 metres and some species can go to 30 metres. CI not sure that any kind of kelp forest or bed</p>	

	<p>could be established in this sort of depth. Restoration implies that a kelp forest already existed. With regard to the use of ropes – kelp can grow on rope but may not be on the bottom. How do kelp forests help scallops and whelks, there is no evidence. Potentially a good idea, but a huge amount of work required before considering this.</p> <p>SRDL stated that regulation would only on safety, so marine space for a particular use is not a matter for Ports. There could be some displacement of vessels, not undoable, but the proposals seems to be asking for a complete ban and this is a decision that requires legislation to prevent current users doing what they are doing.</p> <p>GJ stated that a full EIA and other assessments are needed. Concession needs to be outside of an MPA. In agreement that EIAs need to be undertaken. WP stated that need a robust application process would be needed and there could be multiple sites.</p> <p>IS felt the proposal was very ambitious for a new company and disagrees with the applicant that the area is lightly fished. Seven or eight boats fish there, and it is fished heavily during winter months. Need to find out where/when they got the data. Cannot see how this would happen unless the area is completely closed.</p> <p>JY stated that politically he was very surprised at the scale of it. Possibility of winter storms bringing ropes loose which could be a hazard for small boats, kayaks etc., how could Ports safely control this? It would take a lot to persuade politically and isn't confident there is a case to take the legislation through.</p> <p>PC – reaffirmed the very scientific process would need to be undertaken and that would require considerable investment on the shoreside. There will need to be an awful lot of work before any of this can be taken further.</p> <p>SRDL stated, with regard to safety, if the approval was granted to close the area to all forms of navigation, that because of the numerous buoys they would be placing, would it be of its nature unsafe? The answer is yes, narrower area for east west traffic on the north coast. If the extremities were properly marked and charted, the risks would be manageable. To take this area out of use, that is a decision not on safety grounds but on a political decision on the merit of making this a commercial venture.</p> <p>WP summarised that Panel were cautious, apropos of increased info being available and political issues.</p> <p>MT stated that Aquaculture supports the idea, but concerned about the need of huge buoys to support this, it doesn't look as if someone who understands the Jersey Waters has put this proposal forward.</p> <p>FB will get back to the applicant with the Panel's views.</p>	<p>FB</p>
	<p><u>Other Matters</u></p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>MR Science update and Annual Report</p>	

	<p><u>FB - some underspend from prior years where projects couldn't be completed, so carried forward 2020 projects and granted more funding for 2021.</u></p> <p>FB ran through the timelines.</p> <p><u>Main new science projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atlantic blue fin tagging starting at the end of July, hoping to deploy 5 tuna tags, data will be included in the Exeter study. • Benthic habitat scallops – huge amount of data now available, producing a report on this. • Bream nest survey work – NLB deployed scanner system, worked very well, Cornwell about to undertake detailed analysis work from this study. Marine Resources will be building on this work next year. • Brown crab migration study. • Cetacean monitoring – ongoing with intern. • eDNA. • Lobster / crab catchability study. • Marine Temperature – MSC student working on this. • Netting study – full year's data available next month. • Portelet Bay NTZ – student doing some initial work this year, next season another student will take this forward. • Seagrass DNA – rolled into eDNA. • Vessel Satellite Monitoring – will be reporting back shortly and will be on agenda for the autumn Panel meeting. <p>Gathering lots of data, good locally but valuable to a wider audience.</p> <p>Annual Report has been drafted and will be shared with Panel members prior to next meeting, comments welcome.</p> <p>CI stated that the Marine Resources team have done a really good job with data and research over the last few years.</p>	FB
7.	<u>Wildlife Law Update</u>	
	<p>FB – sent to privy council, and received back within 3 months. Guidance is being written at the moment and there will be briefing sessions which you will be invited to. The definition of 'disturbance' has been greatly enlarged, which is good news.</p> <p>CI – when it comes to the marine guidance, it may be worth running it past the Panel before it's in its final form just to ensure it's all understandable. WP advised that the intention is to consult on this.</p>	
8.	<u>Brexit Update</u>	
	GM started the meeting for Brexit update as he was having to leave early.	

	<p>Main developments – extension to transition arrangements put in place. EU asked Ministers to give them more time to gather data on smaller vessels (non VMS). Ministers considered at length and decided to extend (with caveats) for several months. Extended date deadline to end June, which will be considered until the end of August and a new regime of licences at the beginning of September. In agreeing the transitions, Ministers wanted to ensure the EU and UK will put together a data exchange system in order to manage this going forward. Still quite a slow progress but getting there slowly.</p> <p>Another important part of the TCA is the relationship under the Partnership Council, underneath which sits specialised committees, one of which is fisheries – again will need to see how this progresses and works. Probably a lengthy process. Day to day management by Jersey via the Minister.</p> <p>SRDL queried if this is a delaying tactic by the French. Is there a risk they will overfish and claim this is the base line going forward? JY these questions are in all our minds and there is the possibility of this situation dragging on, however they are coming up with a way which should allow dialogue with fishing. Jersey needs to go along with this because we don't want to lose the support of the UK, they are at the table, not us, but we are included. Need to take the Crown Dependencies along with us; Guernsey thinks this is a wise thing to do. We have put several conditions on this and looking for them to be fulfilled. If we are asked to keep carrying on extending without progress then we have to face the inevitable, there is the likelihood at some stage of information we receive from the French not meeting the criteria and we therefore refuse a licence, but we need to give the French authorities a chance. Lawyers are telling us the there is a better understanding by the EU or the criteria for Jersey, talks are starting, at least it's moving to a degree which is better than a full stand off. With regard to unregulated conditions, the EU must provide us with catch information and we are expecting this to be provided, criteria set out in the TCA will not allow France to reset the clock.</p> <p>GM advised that the EU have many issues that they want to deal with in a reasonable time (providing of data). With regard to quotas, all the regulations and legislation remain in Jersey as do licence conditions for French vessels. How to move the management of catch data going forward is still being debated.</p> <p>JY – there is a three year cancellation clause on the TCA, at the moment what we're having to make a judgement on is that the agreement will be a good thing; if not we would be completely on our own which could be the situation if things go wrong.</p>	
	<p>Next Meetings</p>	
	<p>Monday 4th October 2021 Monday 24th January 2022</p> <p>All meetings to commence at 2.15 p.m.</p>	
	<p>There being no other business the meeting closed at 4.10pm</p>	