

Grouped plan for deep-water fish ()

Full report outputted on the 31/07/2003 09:01:05

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"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
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 Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002

Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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	Not known		
E			
NI			
S			
W			

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
Information last changed by JNCC on 03 April 2003

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.

Status of knowledge:	Knowledge sufficient to make some impact, but more research needed.
-----------------------------	---

Notes:

Enough is known of the general biological characteristics of deep-water fish species to argue for real caution in their management. However, as international fisheries agreements are as much about politics as science, the absence of specific detailed scientific information on the status and vulnerability of particular deep-water species is even now used as an excuse by some nations to continue an overly permissive approach to deep-water fisheries management. More, and certainly expensive, research needed to support the UK and the EU in their attempts to promote effective management measures, however it is not only biological research that is needed, but also research on management science as applied to fisheries as this is where better solutions to the problems of fisheries management is likely to be found

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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: Stabilise all stocks of commercially exploited deep-water species at or above safe biological limits by 2005.

Target start date:	<input type="text" value="1999"/>	
Target end date:	<input type="text" value="2005"/>	
Target units:	<input type="text"/>	

	Progress	Target	Current	Accuracy	Monitoring
UK	<input type="text" value="Some progress (behind schedule)"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Partial or sample survey"/>	<input type="text" value="Under active development"/>
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 Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002

Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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 current fisheries are largely unregulated (except for the general effort restrictions) and there is a major problem in recording what is actually being caught and landed. Misidentification of catches and landings by grouped categories such as 'deep-water sharks' make the situation more difficult.
- 2.2 The bulbous heads and elongate bodies of many deep-water fish means that bottom trawls with mesh sizes appropriate for shallow-water fishing are likely to retain a higher proportion of juvenile fish or smaller non-commercial species. In common with most other fish with gas filled swimbladders, few survive being hauled to the surface following capture and are already dead when discarded.
- 2.3 Deep-water fish also have large scales and are almost devoid of mucus. Fish that are caught by the trawl but escape through the meshes while the trawl is being towed are, therefore, likely to sustain considerable external damage and probably suffer a high mortality.
- 2.4 Although many aspects of the biology of deep-water species are poorly understood, the general consensus is that they are long-lived, slow-growing species with a relatively high age at first maturity. This is a characteristic of stocks that can only sustain a low level of exploitation. It makes them particularly vulnerable to overfishing from which they are likely to take a long time to recover.
- 2.5 The food-webs in the deep-sea are complex, but all the evidence suggests that the commercial species are top-level predators on benthopelagic fish and invertebrates. The indiscriminate mortality of their food, in the form of bycatch in trawls, is likely to have an effect on exploited stocks.
- 2.6 In addition, bottom trawling for deep-water fish can damage reefs of the cold water coral *Lophelia pertusa* and thereby reduce the habitat for their associated communities. Norwegian research has indicated that some of the deep-water fishes form part of these communities and may be affected adversely.

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"/>	2	Changes in native species dynamics Decline in food source / prey
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Habitat loss / degradation - fisheries Damage from bottom-trawling fishing gear
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Harvesting Overfishing

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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.

Constraint 1:	Country:
Constraint keyword: Policy, legislation and designation Common Fisheries Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UK <input type="checkbox"/> E <input type="checkbox"/> NI <input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> W

Solution:

Within the EU Council of Ministers, the UK is only one voice amongst many, and the necessary management actions that would be deemed to be most effective by the UK are not those of the other deep-water fishing nations who are competing for opportunities to exploit the resource. Nor indeed are they those of the Commission, that has to reconcile management of deep-water resources against the background of conflicting interests between EU Member States. The solution to this is not very tractable

Solution type:**Able to resolve:****Constraint 2:****Constraint keyword:**

Species and habitat management | International: lack of protection in other countries

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Outwith areas of EU management competency, NEAFC is the competent management commission. Agreement on effective management controls by the NEAFC contracting parties is even more difficult to attain than within the EU alone. This indicates an even less tractable solution.

Solution type:

Management

Able to resolve:

Constraint 3:

Constraint keyword:

Country:

UK E NI S
 W

Solution:

Solution type:

Able to resolve:

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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.

Delete: Organisation:

- The Steering Group comprises the fish sub-group of the Marine BAP coordinating group

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.)

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

Other (please specify):

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 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:

Country:

The EU now has regulations in place to limit catches of deep-water fish species, although this is not the preferred management mechanism of the UK.

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

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

Success 2:

Description:

The EU regulation, as well as regulating catches, also lays down a requirement on Member States to collect appropriate fisheries data on deep-water species, albeit at a modest scale

Country:

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

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

Success 3:

Description:

Country:

Since 2000, the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas has provided species-based advice on the status and management of deep-water fish species, including in 2002 deep-water sharks

UK E NI S W

Keyword:

Species and habitat management | Other

Information originally entered by Philip Kunzlik on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
Information last changed by Philip Kunzlik on Thursday, December 12, 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:

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