

MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING

94th Meeting

Brief notes and action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm

4th March 2019

Present:	William Peggie – Director Natural Environment (Chairman) Mike Taylor (MT) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Peter Moore (PM) – representing Ports of Jersey Don Thompson (DT) - representing Jersey Fishermen’s Association Paul Bizac (PB) – representing Jersey Fishermen’s Association Chris Isaacs (CI) - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Steve Mullens – representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Ian Syvret (IS) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen Garry Allen (GA) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen Martin Le Maistre (MLM) – representing Boat Owners Associations
In Attendance:	Gregory Guida (GG) – Assistant Minister for Environment John Young (JY) – Minister for Environment (for part of the meeting) Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Dave Yettram (DY) – Senior Fisheries Officer – Marine Resources Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager, Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist, Marine Resources Phil Langlois – Marine & Fisheries Assistant Officer Dot Miller (DM) - Minutes
Apologies:	Gareth Jeffreys (GJ) – representing Société Jersiaise

		Action
1.	Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	
	<p>The following amendments to the minutes were noted:</p> <p>2. Brown Crab – it was mentioned in the minutes that it was thought brown crab stocks in Guernsey seemed stable, however subsequent to the meeting, information from the JFA show that stocks in Guernsey had in fact decreased.</p> <p>European Seabass – JFA wanted an increase in take, depending on the condition of the stock.</p> <p>Subject to the above changes the Minutes from 19th November 2018 were approved.</p> <p>Matters Arising</p> <p>Aquaculture FB advised the meeting that Bay Shellfish application went to public consultation and no responses were received. Marine Resources have requested further information from the applicant and are currently awaiting this. It was noted that officers will be inspecting the Bay Shellfish operation.</p>	

	<p>IVMS</p> <p>DM stated that there was concern that agreement will be in place before funding is agreed. The JFA agree this is the way forward but fishermen cannot be disadvantaged financially.</p> <p>GM thought that there would probably be a staged implementation process. It was noted that it is an expense, especially for smaller boats, but the technology will be a requirement.</p> <p>PC advised that Marine Resources are waiting to be advised of the conclusions from the UK who are assessing trialling systems. Costs are thought to be approximately £1.5k to buy/install and £200 per annum maintenance.</p> <p>GM stated that this will be extremely useful for marine management as it will provide an excellent data set.</p> <p>PB added that the technology would be needed with regard to Brexit/Granville Bay.</p>	
	Brexit and Granville Bay updates	
1.	Scallops	
	PC advised that last September, Brittany suggested a permit scheme for the Bay of Granville. There has been no conclusion as yet, but Jersey will undertake some stock assessment to decide if permits are required.	
2.	Marine Stewardship Council	
	<p>Annual audit of lobster fishery</p> <p>Stock has been always sustainable before however the provisional figure is down by approximately 60 tonnes for 2018. Stock is still classed as sustainable but the health of the lobsters during 2019 needs looking into.</p> <p>Stocks are not in trouble but we cannot be complacent. The JFA and Marine Resources are working to identify what potential measures would be most appropriate.</p> <p>PC advised that Marine Resources are working with a lobster expert in Brest and awaiting data from him which will provide a much better analysis of the stock.</p> <p>Day 3 meetings</p> <p>DT explained that there was a gentlemen's agreement for west of Corbiere, however there needs to be compliance to the Treaty to resolve issues.</p> <p>A proposition for an alternative area outside the Bay of Granville, which was denied before, got support at this meeting. It was taken forward to the JAC meeting and was well received. PB advised the proposition would be taken to the Channel Conference later this year. It was noted that members of the JFA undertake this work and attend the meetings/conferences in their own time.</p>	

	<p>Brown Crabs Jersey's legislative change is being implemented to increase MLS to 15cms and to restrict landing of soft shell crabs. French fishermen were in support of this. DT kindly acknowledged that staff had worked hard to stop blocks that had previously happened and it was good to see department staff enforce the Treaty. DT felt things were moving forward to a new era, to which GM agreed, and that some French aspirations are in line with Jersey's.</p> <p>Granville Bay permits Norman fishermen proposed an access system for the Bay of Granville – to reduce from 627 to 360 permits in one fell swoop is an important step.</p> <p>Breton fishermen were not convinced by the proposal.</p> <p>Jersey felt it was a good start but not the final solution. Jersey was very pleased from an administration stance, and talks need to begin to further refine.</p> <p>IVMS IVMS came up and the French are keen to proceed. It was noted that after 29th March there may be some difficulty receiving the data.</p> <p>Licensing DT advised that UK legislation is being put in place to licence non EU in EU waters which is going against the Granville Bay Treaty. Jersey boats may need to be listed in the UK for access to EU waters.</p> <p>GM advised that Jersey is the licencing authority for Jersey waters. Waters outside the Granville Bay Treaty will have to go down the route mentioned above. GM also advised that Law Officers have been advised to draw up licencing for all vessels in Jersey waters.</p>	
	<p>Capture Fisheries</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Marine Panel review: submitted by the JFA</p> <p>DT referred to, and gave an overview of, the paper circulated to Panel prior to the meeting.</p> <p>WP enquired if members wanted to go down the route of making the Panel more formal. The disadvantage in doing this however, could be a cull from the Centre to reduce advisory boards.</p> <p>DT stated he didn't think the Panel was wrong, it just needs to be reviewed to ensure it reaches its objectives.</p> <p>CI stated that the Panel is advisory and therefore felt the current set up is sufficient, however he does get frustrated by the time it takes to implement what is agreed. A record of what has been implemented would be helpful, as well as feedback from the Minister so members know why something hasn't happened. CI also felt that a more formal criteria may require an increase in the amount of Panel members.</p>	

	<p>GG stated that it was helpful for the Minister / Assistant Minister to attend Panel meetings and would probably help in reaching decisions.</p> <p>GM reminded the Panel that whether officers agreed or not with the Panel's recommendations, the recommendations are taken impartially to the Minister.</p> <p>It was agreed that going forward a section could be included in the Annual Report to print implemented decisions/achievements.</p> <p>SM suggested bi-annual workshops on a specific subject.</p> <p>DT felt that it was not always clear, following discussions, what had been agreed and how/when it is taken forward, as well as the timeliness of what is implemented. It was suggested and agreed that decisions made during the meeting could be highlighted and given to the Chair to summarise at the end of the meeting.</p> <p>GM suggested that an electronic update between meetings to keep members abreast with what is happening could also be introduced if required.</p> <p>WP thanked everyone for their comments, and in the first instance would check with Ministers if they are happy with the set up of the Panel.</p>	<p>MR Officers</p> <p>DM</p> <p>WP</p>
4.	Stock Management Proposal: submitted by the JFA	
	<p>DT referred to the paper circulated to Panel prior to the meeting. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JFA have never been happy with the FMA between Jersey and the UK. • Scotland and Wales are both stating they want to look after their own fishermen and stock. <p>DT felt that the current mix of professionals around the table was the best its ever been, and while the FMA had its place at one point, it is detrimental to the fleet.</p> <p>GM agreed that working to the old FMA is out of date for the current situation. Several meetings with Defra have been held and they want to re-establish an FMA. The first question is, do we need one? The current imbalance needs addressing, Jersey is not the junior partner.</p> <p>Defra has an aspiration that FMAs with Crown Dependencies should look similar and all be agreed at the same time. However GM advised that there is nothing at present to present to the Panel, and nothing has been written about the re-allocation of quota.</p> <p>MT enquired if licences would be valid if there was no FMA, GM advised this could be seen as a perceived risk.</p> <p>Another point, raised by PB was that it was unknown what value the French catch in our waters.</p>	

5.	Brexit Update	
	<p><i>GM advised the Panel that the following information was sensitive and to please take care who this is shared with.</i></p> <p>Possible extension to June, perhaps longer but this is unpopular with Brexiteers and the Conservative Party.</p> <p>Fisheries UK minister has resigned from Government.</p> <p>Current dialogue being held around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jersey being responsible for their own health certificates. • UK are planning for a 'no deal'. <p>Product into France if no deal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Malo is keen to have an inspection point in place by 29th March; no restriction on landing; no need to use an agent. • Tariffs not known yet. • Open weekdays, maybe not weekends. • Other direct landings in Granville not known yet as meeting with the Normans has been postponed. 	
	<u>Next Meeting</u>	
	Monday 10 th June 2019 @ 2.15 p.m.	