

Appendix J: Workshop Consultation

This Appendix is provided in support to the following report:

Marine Planning Consultants Ltd. (2014). Lyme Bay Fisheries and Conservation Reserve: Integrated Fisheries Management Plan. A report produced for the Lyme Bay Fisheries and Conservation Reserve Working Group, UK.

The report, submitted 18/09/2014, addresses comments made by the wider Lyme Bay Fisheries and Conservation Reserve Working Group at this Workshop, 09/09/2014.

Contents

Overview	1
Workshop Feedback	2
Habitat risk assessment.....	2
Fisheries sustainability assessment.....	2
SWOT Analysis.....	3
Management options.....	3

Figures

(No figures)

Tables

Table J1: Project workshop attendees	1
---	---

Overview

A workshop was held on 9 September 2014 at the Royal Lion Hotel, Lyme Regis, to present the project findings and consult with the Lyme Bay Working Group (WG) committee members. A full list of attendees is shown in **Table 1**.

Table J1: Project workshop attendees

Attended	Organisation
Adam Rees	Marine Institute, Plymouth University
Alex Jones	Commercial fisheries operator
Andy Woolmer	Blue Marine Foundation
Angus Walker	Commercial fisheries operator
Aubry Banfield	Commercial fisheries operator
Caroline Chambers	Marine Planning Consultants
Dave Hancock	Commercial fisheries operator
Dave Sales	Commercial fisheries operator
Harriet Yates-Smith	Blue Marine Foundation
Jess Woo	Marine Planning Consultants / Spindrift
Jim Newton	Commercial fisheries operator
John Worswick	Commercial fisheries operator
Liam McAleese	Marine Planning Consultants
Neville Copperthwaite	Blue Marine Foundation
Rachel Irish	Marine Management Organisation
Simon Pengelly	Southern IFCA
Tim Glover	Blue Marine Foundation

The aim of the consultation was to present the full process, assessments and findings of the project, to explore the responses to this from the WG committee members and to incorporate feedback into the project outputs. Feedback is summarised here in this Appendix and there have been slight updates to the assessments / main report to reflect comments made. These changes are few in number and reflect presentation rather than method, approach or data used.

The agenda was as follows:

- Context to project
- Habitat risk assessment
- Fisheries sustainability assessment
- Question and answer session / clarifications
- Management assessment
- Question and answer session / clarifications
- Exploring some of the recommendations
- Conclusion to the workshop and any final comments

Workshop Feedback

The workshop was received as a useful summary of the project and was agreed that there were no real issues other than limitations in the data. One of the key messages coming out of the workshop was the good position that the Working Group are now in the promote their successes in Lyme Bay and that this should be pushed forward, potentially drawing on funding such as the Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAG). Minor points on data presentation were made and these have been addressed in the report as detailed below.

A question and response approach has been used below to present discussion at the workshop. WG is used to show a comment is from the Working Group; and PROJ used to show it is from the project team. Bold denotes subsequent changes to the report.

Habitat risk assessment

Fishing gears

WG: Some gears presented overlap, e.g. dredging / scalloping or cuttle potting / potting.

PROJ: This is a relic of the data provided by IFCAs and MMO on fishing activity where different gear type classifications were used, and was necessary to provide a transparent approach and to inform the GIS modelling. Whilst the workshop presents graphics that are not included in the report, the workshop material is not being used outside of the Working Group. The only place such overlap appears in the report is in the Habitat Risk Matrix, where a **foot note will be added**, and the main report summary of risks, where **gear types will be combined**.

Data

WG: Data needs to be accessible to inform future work.

PROJ: **Habitats and species database is available and will be provided in CD to Blue Marine Foundation, including summary spreadsheet data and GIS, where data licences allow.**

Fisheries sustainability assessment

Approach

WG: The assessment will provide a useful reference point to compare year on year as new data is collected. It will be a constant process of catching up on new data recorded.

Lobster

WG: Lobster is shown as failing, however it is known that lobster stocks have improved greatly over the last few years and the fail seems to reflect historic conditions rather than the present. It is important to present the achievements of this fisheries and show how the Lyme Bay Reserve has been working together to achieve such goals. Fishermen need to be credited for their efforts and public awareness of this success should be strengthened.

PROJ: This is due to using two sets of data due to the divide between IFCA districts that is governed by County borders and not the marine ecosystem; the data used is the most recent stock assessment (by Cefas) available, although this is dated 2012. The worst case was used between the two datasets to take the precautionary approach. However Lyme Bay sits in the middle of two major lobster stocks, with the Western Channel stock passing with conditions (Devon and Severn IFCA district) and the Eastern Channel failing (Southern IFCA district), yet one may be more dominant in Lyme Bay as a whole. This is discussed within the Fisheries Assessment, with the suggestion that the WG seek to find clarification on which stock the Lyme Bay lobsters are “most like”. **Consultation will be carried out with Cefas and the categorisation re-addressed to fairly present lobster for Lyme Bay as a whole, where possible and supported by the data.**

Sole

WG: Have never seen sole to be out performing crab and lobster before. Catching sole is more incentivised as do not have to declare it all. However there is only one company in Lyme Bay that has the whole quota and there is an issue that they may take all quota from one small area increasing impact there (or may not). This shows how the management system can be improved as clearly presents a risk.

Bycatch

WG: Fishermen know that much of the bycatch returned does survive but this does not seem to be reflected in the findings, i.e. owing to the source data. Cefas data (i.e. that which is collected as part of normal monitoring, biosampling) should include undersized lobsters, v-notched animals, bycatch, etc.

PROJ: **Some qualification on limitations will be added to report, including data collection period and data gaps.** However whilst we have access to one Cefas report, the other is not yet published.

SWOT Analysis

Comments incorporated into relevant sections in this Appendix to help consolidate in areas of work / consideration.

Management options

Marketing

WG: One of the most important things to happen next is to show the general public the successes identified for the Lyme Bay fisheries sector. It is fundamental they understand the positives. This is also relevant to getting the message to public bodies. This is an action for the Working Group.

WG: Benefits of the working group need to be emphasised in conclusions section of report.

PROJ: **Will incorporate benefits to the Working Group fully into the conclusions.** But it would also be useful for the Working Group to create a webpage with key points. All project material will be made public on the Lyme Bay Reserve website.

WG: A 2-3 page summary document will help feed into talks with wholesalers etc, need to market properly. Need a roadmap.

PROJ: Table 4 in the main report provides this.

WG: Marketing may be supported by certain funding opportunities. There are opportunities now for new FLAGs (Fisheries Liaison Action Groups). The EMFF is due to make a decision in January 2015 on the categories for funding, and the process will then start in April 2015.

WG: Does report need to encompass all Working Group work in progress, e.g. on branding?

PROJ: These are already referenced and outlined and this is a second stage of work post project.

Monitoring

WG: The inclusion of mammals and turtles in the assessment does not seem to reflect their scarcity within Lyme Bay.

PROJ: All data presented at the workshop and in the main report are those with stronger evidence, whether recent 'vintage' or high in abundance. However the actual presence / regularity of these species would benefit from monitoring sightings by fishermen. This could also be added onto the Fully Documented Fisheries App. Monitoring of recreational bass removal might be achieved with the help of the angling fraternity, potentially through the Angling code of conduct.