

## Grouped plan for commercial marine fish ()

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 09:00:38

### 1. Status of the habitat / species

Please give your most accurate assessment of the status of your species or habitat for the UK and for each country. Leave the row blank where the species or habitat does not occur in that country.

	Amount:	Units:	Year:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	2002	Partial or sample survey	Information and advice on stock assessments for commercial marine species are provided by the ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management. Their reports are available on the ICES website (www.ices.dk)
E	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on 23 December 2002

---

## 2. Trend in Biological Status

Please give your best estimate of the current trend for your species or habitat for the UK, and each appropriate country, using the following categories. Please give an estimate unless there is absolutely no information on which to assess status.

	Trend:	Accuracy:	Reference for data:
UK	<input type="text" value="Declining (continuing/accelerating)"/>	<input type="text" value="Partial or sample survey"/>	<input type="text" value="ICES Advisory Committee on Fishery Management reports"/>
E	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on 23 December 2002

---

## 3. Status of knowledge

To what extent is our scientific knowledge of the habitat / species (e.g research information, autecological knowledge, knowledge for effective re-introduction or habitat restoration/re-creation) sufficient to deliver the plan targets?

Please give an assessment for the UK overall but if there is significant difference in knowledge between different countries this should be noted.

<b>Status of knowledge:</b>	Know ledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed. ▼
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>ICES who provide advice to the European Commission on stocks in EU waters have expressed concern over the quality of catch (both landing and discard) data and effort data for most of the important fisheries in these waters. ICES advise that this impacts on its ability to provide reliable estimates of stock sizes and forecasts for use in setting effective Total Allowable Catches. Survey data can only help in part to overcome these problems. There is also a lack of knowledge of the biological dynamics of stocks when the spawning stock biomass is at historically low levels as is the case for cod in the North Sea, Irish Sea and West of Scotland.</p>

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on 20 December 2002

---

## 4. Progress on targets

Each of the revised targets from the 2001 Targets Review is listed below.

For each one please give a qualitative assessment of progress for the UK and each country. You can also enter quantitative information on progress by entering data in each of the target boxes and entering the current amount in the amount box. For more information see Help.

**T1: Bring all stocks identified in the plan within precautionary reference points as defined by ICES within 5 years.**

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1999"/>
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="ongoing"/>
Target units:	<input type="text"/>

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="No progress"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Partial or sample survey"/>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>
E	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
NI	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
S	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
W	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
 Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on Thursday, December 05, 2002

## 5. Current factors affecting the habitat

When your plan was published the factors (threats) that were thought to be causing loss or decline were listed (in section 2). Re-assessing the current situation may help prioritise actions for your species or habitat. In addition, this enables identification of the main threats to biodiversity across all plans. It is useful to assess whether the importance of different factors is changing and whether there are new issues emerging.

The threat section from the original plan is duplicated below, and a first attempt at categorising the threats has been made. Please confirm that you agree with the categorisation of the original threats identified in the plan (by deleting any wrongly categorised threats and adding the correct category). Please also add to the list any significant threats that have emerged recently, being mindful of environmental issues that have increased in profile or been recognised since plan publication (e.g. climate change). Once you are happy that the list contains all the threats identified in the published plan together with any new ones, please rank them in order of severity (1= highest threat). If the situation has changed and one of the published threats is no longer significant, please leave this in the list but give this rank = 0.

### Current factors affecting the habitat from the original publication:

2.1 The principal factor causing the decline in spawning stock biomass is summarised simply, but effectively, as ‘too many boats chasing too few fish’, i.e. the collective fishing power of the EU nations’ fishing fleets is much greater than the productivity of the stocks can support. Hitherto, the methods available under the CFP have proved ineffective in controlling the deployment of this fishing power. One contributory factor to this ineffectiveness has been that decommissioning has removed the smaller and least efficient vessels from the fishing fleet. In addition, there are socio-economic pressures to maintain employment in the fishing industries of the EU nations. These pressures also contribute to the widespread practice of illegal, unreported landings which are excess to quotas (so-called ‘blackfish’).

2.2 These factors together result in overfishing of many stocks with the consequence that most stocks of the species listed above are close to or below SBL.

### Keyworded factors:

To add factors click the add button, to delete factors check the delete box and then click the delete button.

Delete:	Rank:	Keyword:
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Accidental mortality   Fisheries bycatch - netting

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	Harvesting   Overfishing
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	Intrinsic Factors   Low population density / size

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
 Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

## 6. Constraints (optional)

Select the three most significant constraints to achieving the targets of the plan, and indicate the order of priority (1-3 with 1 being the most significant constraint). Only include constraints that are acting as a real blockage to delivering the plan targets or leading to a substantial delay in their delivery. For each constraint, please indicate whether you feel that it is within the ability of the lead partner or steering group to resolve the constraint.

<b>Constraint 1:</b>	
<b>Constraint keyword:</b>	<b>Country:</b>
Policy, legislation and designation   Common Fisheries Policy	<input type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W
<b>Solution:</b>	<b>Solution type:</b>
Effective reform of the CFP to bring effort in line with available stocks. Requires agreement by EU Member States.	Legislation and policies

**Able to resolve:**

## Constraint 2:

**Constraint keyword:**

Policy, legislation and designation | Common Fisheries Policy

**Country:**

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

**Solution:**

Illegal and unreported landings of fish excess to quota - to be addressed through increased and improved enforcement of CFP.

**Solution type:**

Legislation and policies

**Able to resolve:**

## Constraint 3:

**Constraint keyword:**

Research, survey and information | Autecology - poor know ledge

**Country:**

UK  E  NI  S  
 W

**Solution:**

**Solution type:**

A further constraint on achieving stock recovery is the lack of know ledge of biological dynamics of stocks w hen spawning stock biomass is at historically low levels	Management
<b>Able to resolve:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

---

## 7. Steering Group

Please list all organisations that are represented on the steering group for your species/habitat (include all organisations that have contributed either directly or by correspondence within the last 3 years). Where a steering group does not exist please leave this form blank.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

---

## 8. Other Groups/Organisations

Please list any additional groups/organisations that are actively involved in implementing your action plan. (This is to try to assess which groups are involved where there is no steering group and any additional contributors). If you do not have any other organisations involved, click here.

To add organisations click the add button, to delete organisations check the delete box and then click the delete button.

---

## 9. Linkages to LBAPs

a) Which of the following most accurately describes your interaction with LBAPs, up to now?

b) If you have been in contact with LBAPs how was it initiated?

c) Irrespective of current contact, how important do you consider LBAP co-ordinated action will be in achieving the targets of the plan? Select from category:

d) If you consider LBAP action to be anything other than unimportant, which of the following forms of engagement do you think would be appropriate? (Note, you may tick more than one category.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Indirect contact (e.g. posting information on UKBAP website, sharing work programmes, meeting schedules, articles in Biodiversity News, newsletter)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provision of generic information on habitat and/or species (e.g. advice and guidance on habitat/species ecology and management)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Direct provision of advice (e.g. proactive approach to LBAP, response to consultations from LBAPs, advice on LBAP target setting)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reciprocal attendance at meetings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Development of collaborative projects

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002

>

## 10. Successes (optional)

Have there been key successes in the implementation of your plan that should be drawn to the attention of government, the wider BAP partnership, or the public? Please give a brief description (i.e. 2-3 sentences) of up to three successes and allocate a topic area to each of them:

### Success 1:

Description:

CFP review proposals published in 2002 by the European Commission broadly in line with UK priorities.

Country:

UK

E

NI

S

W

Keyword:

Policy, legislation and designation | Beneficial changes to Common Fisheries Policy

### Success 2:

Description:

Country:

Introduction in 2001& 2002 of EU technical measures to improve the selectivity of fishing gear and assist the recovery cod stocks in the Irish Sea, North Sea and West of Scotland and the Northern hake stock. Since 2000, areas closed to certain types of fishing have also been introduced to protect cod stocks in the North Sea, Irish Sea and the West of Scotland.

UK  E  NI  S  W

**Keyword:**

Policy, legislation and designation | Beneficial changes to Common Fisheries Policy

**Success 3:**

**Description:**

Decommissioning led to the removal of approximately 160 vessels from the UK fleet in 2002. This will have some impact in reducing effort on cod and other vulnerable stocks.

**Country:**

UK  E  NI  S  W

**Keyword:**

Funding and incentives | EU funding secured

Information originally entered by Anthony Hynes on Wednesday, December 04, 2002  
Information last changed by Anthony Hynes on 23 December 2002

---

Thankyou for answering the questions. You have not yet completed all of the questions. You can go back and answer the additional ones or edit the ones you have already answered whenever you want.

**Sign-off:**

When you have completed all of the questions that you are able to, you must sign off your reporting.

I agree that the steering group (if present) have agreed the information in this report and that the following contact point has also signed it off:

<b>Contact point:</b>	<input type="text"/>	<b>email:</b>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Your name:</b>	<input type="text"/>		
<b>Date:</b>	<input type="text"/>		

---