

# **SFSAG North Sea cod SFSAG North Sea whiting**

## **Corrective Action Plan**

Author	Jo Gascoigne
Fishery client	SFSAG
Report Type	FIP Action Plan
Report Version	Final, reviewed by stakeholders
Report Date	18 December 2019

## Contents

1	Glossary.....	2
2	Introduction .....	2
3	Units of Assessment.....	3
4	Explanatory notes on the Action Plan.....	3
5	FIP Action Plan .....	4

## 1 Glossary

Blim	limit reference point
$B_{MSY}$	biomass giving MSY as equilibrium yield
Btrigger	trigger reference point; lower bound of estimates of $B_{MSY}$
CEFAS	UK marine and fisheries research centre, Lowestoft
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK government
FMAC	Fisheries Management And Conservation group; stakeholder group in Scottish fisheries chaired by Marine Scotland
$F_{MSY}$	rate of fishing mortality leading to equilibrium biomass $B_{MSY}$
GITAG	Gear Innovation Technical Advisory Group; forum in Scotland to put forward and test ideas on gear innovations to improve selectivity
HCR	harvest control rule
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea; provides fisheries management advice to EU and Norway
LO	landing obligation (discard ban)
MMO	Marine Management Organisation (agency for day-to-day fisheries management in England)
MSS	Marine Scotland Science
MSY	maximum sustainable yield
PRI	point of recruitment impairment
Q1, Q2	First quarter, second quarter etc.
SFF	Scottish Fishermen's Federation
SFSAG	Scottish Fisheries Sustainable Assessment Group
TAC	total allowable catch
UoA	unit of assessment
Y1, Y2	Year 1, Year 2 etc.

## 2 Introduction

The document provides an Action Plan for the SFSAG North Sea cod and whiting fishery, based on a pre-assessment and scoping study conducted by the same author. The Action Plan provides for actions, objectives, milestones and detailed activities for each PI in the pre-assessment scoring <80. The actions are prioritised based on the pre-assessment score and other criteria (explained in the scoping document). For each activity, a lead organisation, other associated organisations and an end date is proposed. The activities should be necessary and sufficient to meet each annual milestone for each action in the Action Plan.

### 3 Units of Assessment

Below is a summary of the Units of Assessment for the FIP. Note that UoAs are not divided up by gear at present, since all relevant PIs score in the same scoring category for each gear type.

UoA definition	UoA1	UoA2
Name of the fishery	SFSAG North Sea cod fishery	SFSAG North Sea whiting fishery
Species common name	cod	whiting
Species scientific name	<i>Gadus morhua</i>	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>
Target stocks	North Sea, Skaggerak and Eastern Channel (Subarea 27.4 and Divisions 27.7d and 27.3a)	North Sea and Eastern Channel (Subarea 27.4 and Division 27.7d)
Commodity group	human consumption	
The fishing method or gear type(s) and/or practice	Demersal otter trawl (single and twin), <i>Nephrops</i> trawl (single and twin), Danish seine, pair trawl, pair trawl-seine	
The fishing fleet or group of vessels, or individuals fishing operators pursuing that stock (client group)	Members of organisations belonging to the Scottish Fisheries Sustainable Accreditation Group (SFSAG)	
Fishing area	North Sea (Divisions 4a and 4b)	
Country	UK / Scotland	
Continent	Europe	
FAO major fishing areas	NE Atlantic (FAO 27)	

### 4 Explanatory notes on the FIP Action Plan (for information)

- The FIP will start in early 2020; for convenience, FIP years can be equated to calendar years; i.e. Year 1 (Y1) is 2020, Y2 is 2021, Y3 is 2022 etc.
- The dates provided in the right-hand column under the 'Activities' part of each table are the end dates of the relevant sub-activity – i.e. the date that this activity should conclude.
- Dates for the first part of action plan (very urgent activities to initiate rebuilding of the cod stock) are given as specific dates; all subsequent dates are given by quarter.
- The cod part of the FIP is expected to take 4 years to complete, the whiting part 5 years. This is because of the proposed timing of benchmarking of stock assessments and reference points for each stock, which is largely outside the control of the FIP.

## 5 FIP Action Plan

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 1 – Rebuild the cod stock above the PRI</b>		
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod		
<b>MSC PI</b>	1.1.1a – The stock has a low probability of recruitment overfishing 1.1.2 – Where the stock is reduced, there is evidence of rebuilding within a specified timeframe		
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An interim rebuilding timeframe for North Sea cod is specified which brings the stock above the PRI in the shortest feasible timeframe.</li> <li>• Evidence such as stock assessment projections suggest that the agreed harvest strategy will be able to rebuild the stock within the rebuilding timeframe.</li> </ul>		
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action 1 focuses on short-term emergency action to recover the stock above the PRI, before the stock assessment is benchmarked (which has a fixed timetable). Action 2 below focuses on putting in place a robust harvest strategy in the longer term to maintain the stock at a level consistent with MSY.</li> <li>• Milestones are consistent with ICES' timetable for benchmarking of the North Sea cod stock assessment (i.e. data preparation late 2020, benchmarking early 2021).</li> <li>• For Action 1, the rebuilding timeframe refers to short-term rebuilding to the PRI (Blim) and hence it is an interim rebuilding timeframe.</li> </ul>		
<b>Priority</b>	high		
Milestones:			
Year 1 (Dec. 2020)	Key stakeholders (EU, Norway, UK if not EU) have agreed and implemented a reduction in the TAC consistent with scientific advice, and discussions on other measures to protect the stock are underway.		
Year 2 (Dec. 2021)	Additional measures to protect the stock are agreed and implemented (e.g. time/area closures, selectivity measures or other). Stock assessment is benchmarked and rebuilding projections under different scenarios are available (see Action 3).		
Year 3 (Dec. 2022)	Decisions on the TAC and other measures are consistent with scientific advice on rebuilding to MSY within the required timeframe.		
Year 4 (Dec. 2023)	Decisions are taken following the agreed long-term management plan (see Action 2).		
<b>Actions and sub-actions</b>	<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>	<b>End date</b>

1.1	Work with European and UK partners to influence EU/Norway decision-making on TAC for 2020			
1.1.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input into the Scheveningen Group submission to the Commission on the 2020 TAC.	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	SFSAG member organisations	31 Dec. 2019
1.1.2	Work with industry partners in Europe to put forward a joint proposal on the TAC for 2020.	SFSAG members	European cross-industry cod group	31 Dec. 2019
1.1.3	Work with Scottish stakeholders to put forward a joint proposal on the TAC for 2020, based on projections provided by MSS.	FMAC	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	31 Dec. 2019
1.2	Work with European and UK partners to agree additional measures for 2020			
1.2.1	Evaluate options for additional measures with SFSAG members (e.g. seasonal closures, juvenile closures, RTCs, move-on rules, identification of sensitive areas, selectivity measures, other as appropriate), considering effectiveness and enforceability	SFSAG	SFSAG member organisations, Marine Scotland	Feb. 2020
1.2.2	Work with Scottish stakeholders to put forward joint proposals for options on additional measures (as above).	FMAC	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	Feb. 2020
1.2.3	Work with industry partners in Europe to put forward a joint proposal on additional measures for 2020.	SFSAG members	European cross-industry cod group	March 2020
1.2.4	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input into the Schveningen Group submission to the Commission on additional measures for 2020.	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	SFSAG member organisations	March 2020
1.3	Work with European and UK partners to ensure that an appropriate interim rebuilding timeframe to bring stock above Blim / PRI is agreed			
1.3.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input to the Scheveningen Group on interim rebuilding target (interim because prior to benchmarking of stock assessment and because objective is PRI not MSY).	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	SFSAG member organisations	31 Jan. 2020
1.3.2	Work with EU industry partners to put forward a joint submission to the Commission on interim rebuilding target.	SFSAG members	European cross-industry cod group	31 Jan. 2020

1.3.3	Work with Scottish stakeholders to put forward a joint proposal on interim rebuilding target, based on projections provided by MSS.	FMAC	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	31 Jan. 2020
1.4	Work with European and UK partners to agree TAC and additional measures for 2021 consistent with the interim rebuilding target			
1.4.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input into the Scheveningen Group submission to the Commission on the 2021 TAC and additional measures, as in 1.1.1 and 1.2.4 above.	SFSAG, FMAC, Marine Scotland, DEFRA	EU cross-industry cod group, other industry partners, NGOs	Y2 Q1
1.4.2	Work with industry partners in Europe to put forward a joint proposal on the TAC and additional measures for 2021, as in 1.1.2 and 1.2.3 above.	SFSAG members	European cross-industry cod group	Y2 Q1
1.4.3	Work with Scottish stakeholders and DEFRA to put forward a joint proposal on the TAC and additional measures for 2021, based on projections provided by MSS.	Marine Scotland, DEFRA	SFSAG member organisations	Y2 Q1
1.5	Evaluate based on the revised stock assessment whether the agreed TAC and additional measures are sufficient to rebuild the stock above the PRI; if not, put forward proposals for further short-term action			
1.5.1	Evaluate based on revised stock assessment and projections whether the TACs and additional measures to date are consistent with the agreed rebuilding target	MSS	SFSAG, FMAC, Marine Scotland	Y2 Q2 or when stock assessment available
1.5.2	Repeat process in 1.4 as required for 2022, depending on process with long-term management plan (Action 2 below), ensuring that TACs and additional measures are consistent with the agreed rebuilding target under the new stock assessment and projections	SFSAG, FMAC, Marine Scotland, DEFRA	EU cross-industry cod group, other industry partners, MSS, NGOs	Y3 Q1

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 2 – Long-term management plan for North Sea cod</b>
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod
<b>MSC PI</b>	1.1.1b – The stock is at a level which maintains high productivity 1.1.2 – Where the stock is reduced, there is evidence of rebuilding within a specified timeframe 1.2.1 – There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place

	1.2.2 – There are well defined and effective harvest control rules (HCRs) in place		
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rebuilding timeframe for North Sea cod is specified which rebuilds the stock to a level consistent with MSY within a maximum of 14 years.</li> <li>• A harvest strategy is in place in which the elements work together to achieve management goals (consistent with MSY).</li> <li>• Evidence suggests that the strategy is achieving or able to achieve these management goals.</li> <li>• There is a well-defined HCR in place which is implemented in full.</li> <li>• The HCR has been evaluated with respect to uncertainty and found to be robust.</li> <li>• The tools used to implement the HCR are able to achieve the intended exploitation rates.</li> </ul>		
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action 1 above addresses the short-term requirements to rebuild the stock above the PRI. Action 2 addresses the broader long-term harvest strategy. This division is required because a long-term harvest strategy requires benchmarking of the stock assessment (see Action 3), which is not due to take place until 2021. Since this is a pre-requisite for Action 2, there are no milestones in Year 1.</li> <li>• MSC does not require a formal management plan (i.e. a document called ‘plan’) – an agreed management approach such as the MSY approach is also consistent with MSC requirements.</li> <li>• For Action 2, the rebuilding timeframe refers to rebuilding to a level consistent with MSY (above Btrigger), consistent with MSC requirements as specified in PI 1.1.2.</li> </ul>		
<b>Priority</b>	high		
<b>Milestones:</b>			
<b>Year 1</b>	No milestones – see Action 1 and Action 3		
<b>Year 2</b>	Improved stock assessment available, projections show rebuilding time under difference scenarios		
<b>Year 3</b>	Long-term management plan agreed which provides for stock rebuilding to the MSY level within a maximum of 14 years		
<b>Year 4</b>	Tools in place to implement long-term plan; data or projections show they are able to achieve the intended exploitation rates		
<b>Activities and sub-activities</b>		<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>
2.1	Work with European and UK partners to agree an appropriate rebuilding timeframe to bring stock to a level consistent with MSY		

2.1.1	Work with MSS to evaluate timeframes of rebuilding to above Btrigger under different management scenarios, to inform decision-making about long-term stock rebuilding	MSS	SFSAG, Marine Scotland, ICES	Y2 Q2
2.1.2	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input to the Scheveningen Group on a rebuilding timeframe to MSY (above Btrigger), consistent with MSC requirements.	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	SFSAG member organisations	Y2 Q3
2.1.3	Work with EU industry partners to put forward a joint submission to the Commission on the rebuilding timeframe.	SFSAG members	European cross-industry cod group	Y2 Q3
2.1.4	Work with Scottish stakeholders to put forward a joint proposal on the rebuilding timeframe, based on projections provided by MSS.	FMAC	Marine Scotland / DEFRA	Y2 Q3
2.2	Work with partners to push for a review of long-term management plan based on the revised stock assessment when available			
2.2.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to ask Scheveningen Group and Commission to request review of long-term management plan for cod, based on revised stock assessment when available; ensuring that reference points, TAC calculations, TAC constraints and other measures are consistent with the rebuilding target	Marine Scotland, DEFRA	SFSAG and member organisations, ICES	Y2 Q4
2.2.2	Work with EU industry partners and Scottish and UK stakeholders to put forward joint submissions on the long-term management plan for cod, if required.	Cross-industry cod group, FMAC	SFSAG member organisations, Marine Scotland, DEFRA, ICES	Y2 Q4
2.3	Work with partners to support changes to the management plan (reference points, approach to TAC, additional measures or other) to ensure that the stock able to rebuild on the agreed timeframe			
2.3.1	Depending on the outcome of the review work with partners as in 2.2 above to put forward proposals for revision of the long-term management plan to be consistent with the agreed rebuilding timeframe	As 2.2	As 2.2	Y3 Q1
2.4	Ensure that decision-making follows the long-term management plan as revised above			
2.4.1	Continue from Y3 to work with partners as in 2.2 above to ensure that management decision-making (within the UK, within the EU and EU/Norway or EU/Norway/UK) follows the revised long-term management plan and is consistent with the rebuilding timeframe.	As 2.2	As 2.2	Y3 ongoing

2.5	Continue to work on the development and evaluation of additional measures for cod management			
2.5.1	Continue research work on selectivity with Scottish industry via GITAG	GITAG	SFSAG members, Marine Scotland	Y1 ongoing
2.5.2	Continue other research work on selectivity with UK industry, via Fishery-Science Partnerships	SFSAG members, CEFAS	Marine Scotland, MMO	Y1 ongoing
2.5.3	Continue support for data collection (observers and other as required) and other support to MSS as required to evaluate implementation of management measures	SFF, MSS	SFSAG	Y1 ongoing

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 3 – Improve the stock assessment for North Sea cod</b>			
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod			
<b>MSC PI</b>	1.2.4 – There is an adequate assessment of the stock status			
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	The stock assessment has been revised such that it no longer shows strong retrospective bias providing a strong source of uncertainty; the stock assessment and estimates of reference points are robust and provide a basis for a long-term management plan.			
<b>Background and notes:</b>	The benchmarking of the stock assessment is a pre-requisite for Action 2 (long-term management plan; above), since previously estimates of stock status and trends were biased, and the reference points need to be re-estimated for a robust long-term management plan.			
<b>Priority</b>	high			
<b>Milestones:</b>				
<b>Year 1</b>	Planning / data preparation meeting held			
<b>Year 2</b>	Benchmarking completed, retrospective bias eliminated / improved, reference points re-estimated			
<b>Year 3</b>	Proposed long-term management plan evaluated for consistency with precautionary approach			
<b>Activities and sub-activities</b>		<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>	<b>End date</b>
3.1	Support the process of data preparation and benchmarking			

3.1.1	Continue providing support to data collection on discards via SFF observer programme	SFF	MSS, SFSAG members	Y1 ongoing
3.1.2	Support MSS with supplementary data collection from the fishery as required to ensure that the data required for the stock assessment is available	MSS	SFSAG	Y2 Q1
3.2	Work with partners to ensure that the benchmarking takes place as scheduled at latest			
3.2.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to ask the Scheveningen Group to underline the importance of benchmarking the cod stock assessment in their submissions to the Commission	Marine Scotland, DEFRA	other Scheveningen Group members, ICES	Y1 Q4
3.2.2	Continue to liaise with MSS to emphasise importance of benchmarking and timetable	SFSAG	MSS, ICES	Y1 Q4
3.3	Ensure that stock rebuilding projections are available which show rebuilding time to a level consistent with MSY under various management scenarios			
3.3.1	Request projections from ICES or MSS once revised stock assessment model is available	SFSAG	MSS, ICES	Y2 Q2
3.3.2	Use projections to inform work on rebuilding timetable and revision of long-term management plan (see Action 2)	See Action 2	See Action 2	See Action 2
3.4	Ensure that ICES is requested to evaluate the proposed long-term management plan for consistency with the rebuilding timeframe			
3.4.1	See Action 2 – 2.2	See Action 2	See Action 2	See Action 2

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 4 – Put in place a robust harvest strategy for North Sea whiting</b>
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea whiting
<b>MSC PI</b>	1.1.1b – The stock is at a level which maintains high productivity 1.1.2 – Where the stock is reduced, there is evidence of stock rebuilding within a specified timeframe 1.2.1 – There is a robust and precautionary harvest strategy in place 1.2.2 – There are well-defined and effective HCRs in place

<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stock is fluctuating around a level consistent with MSY</li> <li>• Reference points for defining the PRI and a level consistent with MSY are clearly and appropriately defined and consistent with the precautionary approach</li> <li>• A harvest strategy is in place in which the elements work together to achieve management goals (consistent with MSY).</li> <li>• Evidence suggests that the strategy is achieving or able to achieve these management goals</li> <li>• The tools used to implement the HCR are able to achieve the intended exploitation rates</li> </ul>				
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<p>The issue with whiting is that while <math>F</math> is estimated to be above <math>F_{MSY}</math>, the reference points need re-estimating; hence the stock status is unclear and the harvest strategy needs revision based on improved estimates of reference points. The approach taken is the same as for cod, except that because the stock biomass is estimated to be above the PRI (Blim) with a high degree of certainty, there is no requirement for short-term measures to rebuild the stock above the PRI, before the reference points are re-estimated (cf Action 1). Unfortunately, a benchmarking of the stock assessment for North Sea whiting is not planned by ICES in the near future. For this reason, the milestones have been set later than they would otherwise be. (It also allows the FIP to focus on the cod activities, in particular Action 1, in the first year, since these are critical for the stock which is in much worse condition than the whiting stock.)</p>				
<b>Priority</b>	high				
<b>Milestones:</b>					
<b>Year 1</b>	Re-estimate of reference points and review of long-term management plan for North Sea whiting requested				
<b>Year 2</b>	Reference points and management plan reviewed by ICES				
<b>Year 3</b>	Stock status evaluated based on revised reference points				
<b>Year 4</b>	Revised management plan agreed based on revised reference points				
<b>Year 5</b>	Management consistent with revised management plan				
<b>Activities and sub-activities</b>			<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>	<b>End date</b>
4.1	Work with partners to request review by ICES of reference points and long-term management plan for whiting				
4.1.1	Work with Marine Scotland and DEFRA to provide input into a Scheveningen Group submission to the Commission on the need for a formal request to ICES for review of reference points and management plan for North Sea whiting.	Marine Scotland, DEFRA	SFSAG, ICES	Y1 ongoing	

4.1.2	Work with MSS to push within ICES for a review of reference points and the management plan for North Sea whiting.	SFSAG	MSS, ICES	Y1 ongoing
4.2	Work with partners to support scientific work on whiting reference points and management plan			
4.2.1	Continue to work with MSS to support data collection on whiting, particularly on discards	SFF, SFSAG	MSS	Y1 ongoing
4.2.2	Support MSS with other data collection requirements for whiting as requested	MSS	SFSAG	Y1 ongoing
4.3	Depending on the outcome of the stock assessment based on revised reference points, work with partners to support changes to the management plan to ensure that the stock can be maintained at a level consistent with MSY			
4.3.1	Work with partners as in 4.1 above to put forward proposals for revision of the long-term management plan to be consistent with the agreed rebuilding timeframe	As 4.1	As 4.1	Y4 Q1
4.4	Ensure that decision-making follows the long-term management plan as revised above			
4.4.1	Continue to work with partners as in 4.1 above to ensure that management decision-making (within the UK, within the EU and EU/Norway or EU/Norway/UK) follows the revised long-term management plan	As 4.1	As 4.1	Y4 ongoing
4.5	Continue to work on the development and evaluation of additional measures for whiting management			
4.5.1	Continue research work on selectivity with Scottish industry via GITAG	GITAG	SFSAG members, Marine Scotland	Y2 ongoing
4.5.2	Continue other research work on selectivity with UK industry, via Fishery-Science Partnerships	SFSAG members, CEFAS	Marine Scotland, MMO	Y2 ongoing
4.5.3	Continue support for data collection (observers and other as required) and other support to MSS as required to evaluate implementation of management measures	SFF, MSS	SFSAG	Y1 ongoing
<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 5 – Ensuring that bycatch of starry ray and common skate is not having an impact on recovery of the stocks</b>			
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod, North Sea whiting			
<b>MSC PI</b>	2.3.1 – The UoA does not hinder recovery of starry ray and common skate 2.3.2 – The UoA has in place precautionary management strategies designed to ensure the UoA does not hinder recovery of starry ray and common skate. The UoA regularly reviews and implements measures, as appropriate, to minimise the mortality of starry ray and common skate.			

	2.3.3 – Relevant information is collected to support the management of UoA impacts on starry ray and common skate.			
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The UoA is highly unlikely to hinder recovery of starry ray and common skate</li> <li>Available information suggests that the management measures in place are able to ensure that the UoA is not having an unsustainable impact on starry ray or common skate</li> <li>Sufficient quantitative information is available to evaluate the impact of the UoA on starry ray and common skate and inform decisions about additional management measures to reduce impacts if required</li> </ul>			
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common skate is a species complex of three species (<i>Dipturus batis</i>, <i>D. flossada</i> and <i>D. intermedia</i>); they are retained here as one species group because scientific advice remains for ‘common skate’.</li> <li>This Action was a condition on the North Sea cod fishery prior to suspension, and remains a condition on the Northern demersals fishery (both fisheries being in practice part of the same mixed fishery). The FIP activities below are taken from the Client Action Plans for these fisheries. The timeline for the FIP Action 5 is taken from the Northern demersals fishery, which at time of writing is undergoing the Year 3 surveillance audit. Year 4 of the Client Action Plan is Year 1 for the FIP, and the FIP actions run for 2 years or until the condition is closed out by the CAB for the Northern demersals fishery.</li> </ul>			
<b>Priority</b>	medium			
<b>Milestones:</b>				
<b>Year 1</b>	Data on skate bycatch is being collected; a provisional analysis shows spatial and temporal distribution of bycatch.			
<b>Year 2</b>	Data on skate bycatch is being collected; full data analysis is available to evaluate whether additional management measures are available and if so to inform decision-making.			
<b>Year 3</b>	Additional management measures are put in place, if required.			
<b>Activities and sub-activities</b>		<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>	<b>End date</b>
5.1	Support bycatch data collection			
5.1.1	Continue support for observer programme (SFF observers), integrated with MSS data collection programmes	SFF	SFSAG members, MSS	Y1 ongoing
5.1.2	Ensure that skate identification cards are available for all SFSAG member vessels	SFSAG	SeaFish	Y1 ongoing
5.1.3	Support MSS with other data collection requirements for skates as requested (e.g. self-reporting, size measurements, other)	SFSAG	MSS	Y1 ongoing

5.2	Analyse bycatch data for information to inform management if required			
5.2.1	Preliminary spatial analysis of available data for any evidence of bycatch hotspots or information about bycatch by area or depth stratum	MSS	SFSAG	Y1 Q1
5.2.2	Complete spatial analysis of available data for any evidence of bycatch hotspots or information about bycatch by area or depth stratum	MSS	SFSAG	Y2 Q1
5.2.3	Preliminary analysis of data for seasonal or temporal patterns	MSS	SFSAG	Y1 Q1
5.2.4	Complete analysis of data for seasonal or temporal patterns	MSS	SFSAG	Y2 Q1
5.2.5	Preliminary analysis of data by gear type or vessel type, as possible consistent with legal requirements for confidentiality	MSS	SFSAG	Y1 Q1
5.2.6	Complete analysis of data by gear type or vessel type	MSS	SFSAG	Y2 Q1
5.3	Evaluate available information on status and trends in starry ray and common skate stocks			
5.3.1	Review ICES analyses and advice on trends in starry ray and common skate stocks and evaluate based on information about trends whether there is evidence that stocks are recovering or declining	SFSAG	MSS	Y1 Q1, Y1 Q4 (advice in Nov.)
5.4	Put in place additional management measures if required			
5.4.1	Based on the review of data on stock trends, evaluate whether the stocks are recovering, or whether additional management measures are required, taking advice from MSS as required	SFSAG	MSS	Y2 Q1
5.4.2	If additional measures are required, evaluate the bycatch data to inform options for spatial or temporal management, and/or if management should focus on particular groups of gears or vessels	SFSAG	MSS	Y2 Q1
5.4.3	Discuss a range of management options with stakeholders	SFSAG	SFSAG members, MSS, Marine Scotland, any other interested stakeholders	Y2 Q2
5.4.4	Discuss enforceability of different management options	SFSAG	Marine Scotland Compliance	Y2 Q2
5.4.5	Agree and implement supplementary management measures for starry ray and common skate, which might be i) voluntary measures for SFSAG members; ii)	SFSAG	Others depending on selected approach	Y2 Q4 or longer

Scotland or UK measures or iii) EU measures – or any other approach as appropriate. (Note that if an EU-wide approach is selected, the process for implementation of the measures will most likely extend into Year 3; this is fine as it is still within the FIP timeframe.)			depending on approach
---	--	--	-----------------------

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 6 – Ensuring that the fishery is not having a serious or irreversible impact on seapens in the Fladen Ground</b>			
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod, North Sea whiting			
<b>MSC PI</b>	2.4.2 – There is a strategy in place to ensure that the UoA does not pose a risk of serious or irreversible harm to seapens			
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	There is evidence that the UoA complies with the voluntary closure for seapens in the Fladen Ground			
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Action was a condition on the North Sea cod fishery prior to suspension, and remains a condition on the Northern demersals fishery (both fisheries being in practice part of the same mixed fishery). The FIP activities below are taken from the Client Action Plans for these fisheries. The timeline for the FIP Action 6 is taken from the Northern demersals fishery, which at time of writing is undergoing the Year 3 surveillance audit. This condition was imposed at the end of Year 2 of the certificate for that fishery, so Year 2 of the Client Action Plan is Year 1 for the FIP.</li> <li>• The condition does not relate to the relevant management measure itself (a voluntary closure by SFSAG of an area known to contain seapens) but instead to the enforcement of the measure.</li> </ul>			
<b>Priority</b>	medium			
<b>Milestones:</b>				
<b>Year 1</b>	All incursions at fishing speed into the Voluntary Closed Area are recorded and there is evidence of contact with each vessel.			
<b>Year 2</b>	All incursions at fishing speed into the Voluntary Closed Area are recorded and there is clear evidence of how any incident of non-compliance is dealt with.			
<b>Activities and sub-activities</b>		<b>Lead organisation</b>	<b>Other organisations involved</b>	<b>End date</b>
6.1	Continue to work with Marine Scotland Compliance to flag up incursions into the Voluntary Closed Area at fishing speed			

6.1.1	Incursions within agreed boundaries of area at fishing speed are reported to SFSAG by Marine Scotland Compliance VMS monitoring division, following agreed protocol	Marine Scotland Compliance	SFSAG	Y1 ongoing
6.1.2	SFSAG records all such contacts from Marine Scotland Compliance	SFSAG	Marine Scotland Compliance	Y1 ongoing
6.2	Contact relevant vessels and deal with any incidents of non-compliance			
6.2.1	SFSAG contacts relevant vessels, following SFSAG's agreed policy and procedures	SFSAG		Y1 ongoing
6.2.2	If non-compliance is established, SFSAG follows the agreed enforcement procedure with the vessel, recording the process at each step	SFSAG		Y1 ongoing

<b>Action #</b>	<b>ACTION 7 – The fishery complies with the Landing Obligation (LO)</b>
<b>Stock</b>	North Sea cod, North Sea whiting
<b>MSC PI</b>	2.3.2 – Monitoring, control and surveillance mechanisms ensure that the management system is enforced and complied with
<b>IPG (FIP objectives):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MCS system operated by Marine Scotland Compliance can demonstrate an ability to enforce the requirements of the Landing Obligation</li> <li>The available evidence suggests that fishers comply with the Landing Obligation</li> </ul>
<b>Background and notes:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Action relates to a condition that will be applied to the Northern demersals fishery at the Year 3 audit (currently underway) (and to North Sea cod as a non-binding condition for the duration of suspension). The condition arose as a consequence of an objection procedure on an overlapping fishery, followed by a process of harmonisation across all North Sea demersal certificates. The milestones given below are those provided by the CAB and are an outcome of the harmonisation process.</li> <li>Because the condition has not yet (at time of writing) been applied, there is not yet a Client Action Plan available. It is not guaranteed that at the end of the process of developing the Client Action Plan (which may involve discussion with stakeholders and other fisheries) it will align with the FIP activities set out below. This means that the FIP Action Plan may need to be changed during Year 1 to align with the agreed Client Action Plan for this new condition.</li> </ul>
<b>Priority</b>	medium
<b>Milestones:</b>	

Note: These milestones are still under discussion for the certified fisheries. If they are changed, the FIP workplan will be revised accordingly.

<b>Year 1</b>	See P3 LO Condition
<b>Year 2</b>	See P3 LO Condition
<b>Year 3</b>	See p3 LO Condition
<b>Year 4</b>	See P3 LO Condition