

## 23<sup>rd</sup> Eastern IFCA Meeting

*"Eastern IFCA will lead, champion and manage a sustainable marine environment and inshore fisheries, by successfully securing the right balance between social, environmental and economic benefits to ensure healthy seas, sustainable fisheries and a viable industry".*



A Meeting of the Eastern IFCA took place at The Boathouse Business Centre, Wisbech, Cambs, on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 1030 hours.

### Members Present:

Cllr Tony Goldson	Chair	Suffolk County Council
Shane Bagley		MMO Appointee
Roy Brewster		MMO Appointee
Cllr Peter Byatt		Suffolk County Council
Cllr Hilary Cox		Norfolk County Council
John Davies		MMO Appointee
Cllr Richard Fairman		Lincolnshire County Council
Paul Garnett		MMO Appointee
Tom Pinborough		MMO Appointee
Keith Shaul		MMO Appointee
Rob Spray		MMO Appointee
John Stipetic		MMO Representative
Cllr Tony Turner MBE JP		Lincolnshire County Council
Stephen Worrall		MMO Appointee
Stephen Williamson		MMO Appointee

### Eastern IFCA (EIFCA) Officers Present:

Andrew Bakewell	Head of Finance
Frances Burrows	Project Officer
Jason Byrne	IFCO
Nichola Freer	Head of HR
Luke Godwin	Staff Officer
Julian Gregory	Acting Chief Executive Officer (ACEO)
Ron Jessop	Senior Research Officer
Simon Lee	Senior IFCO - Compliance
Judith Stoutt	Senior Marine Environment Officer

### Outside Bodies

Emma Thorpe	Natural England
-------------	-----------------

### Minute Taker:

Jodi Hammond

### EIFCA16/20 Item 1: Welcome by A/CEO

The A/CEO welcomed members to the meeting and began by reminding members that the roles of Chair and Vice Chair required re-election on an annual basis.

### EIFCA16/21 Item 2: Election of Chair of the Authority

Nominations were requested for the role of Chair of the Authority.

**It was Resolved that Councillor Goldson should continue in the position of Chairman for a second year.**

**Proposed: Cllr Turner**

**Seconded: Mr Pinborough**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/22 Item 3: Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from: Messrs Bolt & Morgan (MMO Appointees), Donnelly (NE Representative) and Hirst (EA representative) and Cllrs Baker and Wilkinson (Norfolk CC).

**EIFCA16/23 Item 4: Declarations of Members Interest**

Messrs Bagley, Brewster, Garnett and Williamson declared an interest in Item 19 on the Agenda.

**EIFCA16/24 Item 5: Election of Vice-Chair of the Authority**

**It was Resolved that Councillor Cox remain in the position of Vice-Chair of the Authority for a second year.**

**Proposed: Mr Pinborough**

**Seconded: Cllr Fairman**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/25 Item 6: Minute of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Eastern IFCA Meeting, held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2016**

There was one minor amendment to item 16/10.

**Members Resolved to sign the minutes as a true record of the meeting.**

**Proposed: Mr Shaul**

**Seconded: Mr Garnett**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/26 Item 7: Matters Arising**

With regard to the question of whether or not the CEO on secondment could legally take decisions for Eastern IFCA ~~provide advice~~ Members were advised that whilst the CEO (Phil Haslam) was available to provide advice if required, he ~~but~~ would not be involved in decision making.

EIFCA16/13: The ACEO advised members that this had been addressed by being included as one of the research priorities in the Business plan.

**EIFCA16/27 Item 8: Health & Safety Risks and Mitigation**

The Head of HR had added a table for clarity which depicted the accidents / incidents which had occurred during the last three month period. During that period there had been three accidents all of which had been followed up and appropriate action taken.

Cllr Byatt questioned what was involved in the modifications which had been made to the throttle length. He was advised this ~~involved~~ would involve repositioning the throttle on FPV Sebastian Terrelinck, which ~~had~~ would not be ~~en~~ costly to put right.

Members were also advised that the H&S services which were provided by Norfolk County had been reviewed a comparison of the previous year's service had been provided as well as an outline of the safety risk at strategic level.

Members agreed to note the report.

***At this point the ACEO advised members there would be an item for discussion under Any Other Business, which would be discussion of the Whelk Byelaw.***

**EIFCA16/28 Item 9: MMO appointee appraisal process**

Members were reminded that the MMO makes appointments to the Authority members under MACAA. Each appointee can serve for a maximum period of 10 years, although the MMO have put steps in place to stagger the end date to ensure that the whole set of MMO Appointees are replaced at one time. In order to ensure members remain pertinent to the Authority the MMO had drawn up guidance for an Annual appraisal scheme for MMO Appointees.

The Chair, Vice-Chair and ACEO had discussed the guidance and felt the process was not too onerous and it was therefore proposed that the Chair and Vice Chair would carry out the appraisals during November each year.

Mr Spray felt the process seemed straightforward but questioned whether the 10 years maximum service was from the inception of the IFCA or from the current term. The ACEO advised it was from the inception of the IFCA.

Councillor Turner commented that he thought the MMO Appointees did a very worthwhile job and questioned whether it was possible to ask the MMO to cover expenses. The ACEO advised that the MMO don't pay expenses it is up to each individual IFCA to decide whether or not to pay Appointees expenses, which EIFCA considered annually and would be discussed during a later item on the agenda.

**Members Resolved to adopt the recommended process for the annual appraisal of general members.**

**Proposed: Mr Worrall**

**Seconded: Mr Brewster**

**All Agreed.**

**EIFCA16/29 Item 10: Review of the Eastern IFCA Constitution**

The Annual review of the Constitution had been prepared having taken advice from NPLaw. In line with that advice some amendments had been made all of which were set out in Appendix A. W, whilst none of the changes were significant they did bring the Constitution in line with the Localism Act 2011. There were some elements which required further negotiation but the ACEO asked members to agree to the changes as set out and agree to the ACEO continuing negotiations with regard to Registered Declarations of interest with regard to income and dispensations to vote.

Cllr Byatt questioned whether close family members should be part of the declaration of interest, the ACEO advised on the wording of the Localism Act ~~was unclear but~~ and said that the Authority may be able to take a view to take it further, however this had never been done in the past.

**Members Resolved to Agree to the proposed changes to the Constitution and Standing Orders**

**Proposed: Mr Stipetic**

**Seconded: Mr Worrall**

**All Agreed**

**Members further Resolved that the ACEO be delegated authority to continue negotiations with regard to Declarations of Interest.**

**Proposed: Mr Davies**

**Seconded: Mr Spray**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/30 Item 11: WFO 1992 Cockle Fishery 2016**

The ACEO reminded Members that the previous cockle fishery had been extended resulting in almost 5,000t being taken despite the original TAC being set at 2,000t. During the recent cockle surveys it had been possible to keep two beds open to maintain the fishery, at the request of the industry.

The initial indication from the recent surveys were that there may be significant levels of stock for the forthcoming season. If the anticipated outcome is correct members were advised that this could create potential issues with ridging out and die of due to A-typical mortality.

The ACEO advised it may be necessary to adopt contingency management measures to take the decision to open the fishery early, prior to the planned meeting in June to discuss the fishery. If this was the case any stock taken prior to the decisions being made in June would be removed from the 2017 TAC.

The Head of Research had analysed some data from the recent surveys but still had three major beds to analyse. However, he felt the threat of A-typical mortality was likely with the warm water temperatures and weakened cockles due to spawning. He also felt the risk of ridging out was probable in areas of high density cockles where they can no longer bury into the sand, this would also make them susceptible to loss as a result of rough weather. Members were advised of the initial findings from the surveys and the likelihood that the initial TAC could be in the region of 5,000t.

The ACEO advised members that the meeting in June would consider different mechanisms for the harvesting of cockles as well as considering opening dates and the potential to vary the total daily quota for a hand worked fishery in exceptional circumstances.

There was some concern as to the ability to vary the daily quota without going to the Minister for consent however the Staff Officer believed it would be possible with a policy in place. ~~I,~~ the ACEO acknowledged the need to investigate further whether the Authority had the ability to do this.

The ACEO also advised there was likely to be debate over whether or not the fishery should be open to dredging. Mr Bagley said that the success of the hand-worked approach was self-evident with an improved TAC each year. The A/CEO suggested, so members would need that members might want to to consider whether the fishery should remain be a as hand worked king fishery only, with and whether ddredging retained only as could be a contingency option.

Cllr Fairman questioned whether increased daily quota would eradicate the need for fishers to take more than the daily quota. The ACEO felt there would always be an element who would take more but it may be less of an incentive to take more. He did believe it highlighted the need for more flexibility in management measures.

Cllr Worrall felt it was important to be flexible to both methods.

Mr Garnett questioned whether opening the fishery early and applying the 2015/16 management measures would mean the same areas would remain closed. The Head of Research advised that the Thief Sand was closed and prone to ridging so it would ~~be included~~ be included in the open beds. Wrangle and Friskney were also likely to be affected by a-typical mortality so he felt they should also be opened.

The ACEO felt that the 2015/16 management measure would have some amendments but the daily quota and open days would remain the same.

Ms Thorpe questioned whether an increase in the Daily Quota would mean an increase in the amount of prop washing. The ACEO advised that prop washing ~~basically can often~~ releases more cockles than are required, which meant that cockles were sometimes left on the sands. although ~~he~~ He acknowledged there was a train of thought that a higher quota could lead to more prop washing ~~may be done~~.

Referring to the opening of some currently closed areas Mr Garnett suggested the industry should be consulted as he was fairly certain the industry would prefer to see the Thief Sand remain closed to allow further growth whilst some areas of the Gat should be opened.

The Head of Research advised caution as there was still a need to consider the fishery for the following year. Whilst some areas this year may be likely to suffer from A-typical mortality he felt these sands held sufficient stocks to satisfy the TAC, this would make it possible to close other areas of 12/13/14mm cockle to preserve a stock for the following year.

With reference to the suggestion of increasing the Daily Quota Mr Garnett felt it would be more prudent to increase the number of days in a week when the fishery was open, he felt this would be a more gradual approach.

Mr Brewster felt there was a need for an industry meeting to consider the options, he questioned the need to increase either as the previous year 5,000t had been taken without increasing the daily quota or the number of days open for fishing. If however there was evidence the stock was likely to be lost that would be the time to adjust the management measures.

Mr Williamson advised that from the processors point of view a ~~4-day~~ 4-day fishery was the best option. He noted that the suggested increase in daily quota was to go from 2t to 4t, however he felt 3t may be a satisfactory compromise. He also advised it was not just the industry who needed to be considered but whether or not the canneries would be prepared to start working to fit in with an early opening date. He also advised that if the fishery were to be opened early in May it should only be the beds at risk which were opened to avoid flooding the market which would reduce the price paid. The ACEO advised that he had received representation from some parties whose argument was that they find it ~~if~~ difficult to make it pay with a daily quota of 2 tonnes. The Wash based commercial fisher members indicated that the fishery was viable with a 2 tonne daily quota.

---

Mr Williamson noted that the proposal was for a handwork fishery, despite the unusually high proposed TAC, he questioned if this would be the case in any year even if the TAC was to be 10-15,000t. The ACEO believed it may be best to have it officially acknowledged that a dredge fishery will only be considered in very exceptional circumstances, this would mean everyone

knew where they stood, he questioned whether members thought this was worth exploring and there was general agreement that it was.-

Having fully discussed and considered the options, **Members Resolved to:**

**Agree that estimated stocks on Daseleys are adjusted to account for any stocks that were harvested during the period between being surveyed and closure on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016.**

**Proposed: Mr Worrall**

**Seconded: Mr Stipetic**

**All Agreed**

**Agree in principle that a continuation of contingency management measures may be appropriate in the Wash cockle fishery.**

**Proposed: Cllr Cox**

**Seconded: Cllr Fairman**

**All Agreed**

**Delegate decision making on the early opening of the 2016-17 fishery (or part of the fishery) to the ACEO in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Authority.**

**Proposed: Mr Davies**

**Seconded: Cllr Fairman**

**All Agreed**

**Agree that in the event of early opening the fishery would operate under the same management measures as the 2015-2016 fishery, subject to amendment of the closed areas.**

**Proposed: Cllr Cox**

**Seconded: Mr Stipetic**

**All Agreed**

**Agree that any stocks harvested following an early opening would be deducted from the TAC eventually allocated to the 2016-2017 TAC.**

**Proposed: Mr Worrall**

**Seconded: Mr Stipetic**

**All Agreed**

#### **EIFCA16/31 Item 12: Wash MPA Management (Shrimp Fishery)**

Members were reminded of the Marine Protected Area management which had previously been considered by the Authority. This paper was included to update members of the conclusions of the Habitats Regulation Assessment for shrimp fishing in the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, and to propose mitigation to account for potential impacts on the features of the site.

The Habitats Regulation Assessment had been revisited taking into account new evidence, the new findings had yet to be put to Natural England, and members were reminded they were subject to NE approval.

A short presentation was made to explain the revised findings to members and to explain that it now appeared the shallow areas were less sensitive as it seemed the features were likely to recover quite quickly. The deeper water remained more sensitive and vulnerable to the adverse effect caused by the trawl shoes. Taking the new information in to account the proposal was to

apply effort management to the fishery, effectively reducing the effort in areas not closed to fishing.

Five spatial closures were also being proposed ~~fundamentally~~ to protect the features.

The next step would be to seek NE advice and if the response was favourable then Regulatory Notices for the closures and introduction of effort management measures would be drawn up. If a favourable response was not received Officers would have to reconsider the mitigating circumstances.

The Regulation and Compliance sub-committee would be responsible for ensuring management measures were in place by the end of 2016.

Members were also advised that Shrimp Gear Impact Trials were being developed which would include standard gear as well as more innovative gears. It was anticipated this would be a 2 year project involving both EIFCA and the Industry. The ACEO advised this project was beyond EIFCA resources and would require a successful funding bid from EMFF and industry support.

Mr Garnett questioned whether the proposal took into account the fact that there would be no fishing effort on the closed grounds. He also advised that to state only 14% of the area would be affected was misleading as it would be 14% of the whole SAC, but represented much greater than 14% of the shrimp grounds.

Mr Stipetic questioned whether purely shrimp gear was involved, as in the next year the cod recovery scheme could come to an end and vessels could use beam trawls with 80mm nets which could possibly cause more damage in closed areas.

Ms Thorpe advised that NE were working through the assessment. Whilst there was agreement with the conclusion of adverse effect in deeper water there was some concern about there being no adverse effect in shallow water areas, however reduction of effort may give more confidence.

Mr Bagley noted that there were still a lot of closed areas being proposed and questioned whether EIFCA were trying to protect something which didn't need protecting when it was already thriving. He was advised that EIFCA had a legal duty to protect these sub-features of a bigger feature.

Mr Bagley requested a chart of the whole of the area which depicted what is actually closed throughout the district from all restrictions. The ACEO advised such a chart was available as part of the Eastern Area Marine Plans.

Members discussed in general a variety of projects which had resulted in areas closed to a fishing methods, they also questioned the reasoning behind repeatedly pumping sand into areas for sea defences when it is only moved away by the tide and ultimately effects the fishing grounds.

Mr Garnett also questioned the proposal to restrict the number of shrimp permits as he felt local fishers need access to both cockle and shrimp fisheries.

The ACEO advised that the regulatory byelaw would allow reaction if necessary but in the first instance it was necessary to take a precautionary approach. He also reminded members that Defra required management measures to be in place by December. The project would take two years after which changes could be made to the closed areas.

**Members Resolved to:**

**Note the updated assessment of shrimp trawling within The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC**

**Note the requirement to seek Natural England's advice on the assessment**

**Direct officers to utilise mitigation to develop management measures that meet the conservation objectives of the MPA.**

**Proposed: Mr Shaul**

**Seconded: Cllr Fairman**

**All Agreed**

**Agree that future shrimp management items are remitted back to the Regulation & Compliance Sub-Committee.**

**Proposed: Mr Spray**

**Seconded: Cllr Cox**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/32 Item 13: Shrimp Byelaw 2016**

Members were provided with information on the rationale used to reach the conclusion, there was a need to consider including shrimp fisheries in the permit scheme.

Members were provided with proposed management measures, these would include a permit byelaw being put in place with permit conditions to meet the requirements of the fishery to reduce the footprint over areas not closed. To comply with the byelaw fishers would require a permit which would have a requirement to provide catch data, it was suggested such a permit would attract a charge of £44.

Members were advised the proposed byelaw would be an enabling byelaw which would allow a mechanism to be put in place to enforce permit conditions, allowing EIFCA to sustainably manage the fishery.

Cllr Byatt questioned where this byelaw would be applicable, the Staff Officer advised it would be applicable throughout the EIFCA district including recreational fishing. Mr Garnett enquired whether this would also include a 2ft push net on the beach, the Staff Officer acknowledged that yes anyone fishing for shrimp would require a permit. Mr Pinborough questioned whether there would be different categories for commercial and recreational fisheries, he didn't think it was appropriate to expect recreational fishers getting a feed for their tea to pay £44 for a permit. The ACEO advised that maybe the permit would apply to vessels, however the Staff Officer felt the level of fishing needed to be considered and 20 people taking a small amount once a week could amount to a large amount. The ACEO felt there needed to be more consideration on this point, which Mr Stipetic agreed with as he felt it was wrong to apply a permit to a person, if a permit was applied to a vessel this would reduce the effort.

The ACEO advised that it was within the Authorities gift to permit recreational fishing but he felt this particular byelaw was aimed at commercial fishing.

**Members Resolved to:**

**Note the rationale for introducing shrimp fisheries in the permit scheme.**



**Agree to make the Shrimp Byelaw 2016**

**Proposed: Mr Stipetic**

**Seconded: Mr Spray**

**There were three votes against this proposal but with all other votes in favour the motion was carried.**

**Direct officers to undertake a formal consultation for the Shrimp Byelaw 2016.**

**Proposed: Mr Spray**

**Seconded: Mr Stipetic**

**One vote against was noted, all other votes were in favour therefore the motion was carried.**

**Delegate authority to the ACEO to revisit the issue of fishing from vessels and recreational fishing prior to going to consultation.**

**Proposed: Cllr Cox**

**Seconded: Mr Shaul**

**All Agreed**

**EIFCA16/33 Item 14: Marine Protected Areas Byelaw 2016**

Members were advised that following consultation no comments had been received. However, Defra were now indicating they were not happy with this style of byelaw, which could result in them not agreeing to the amended Schedule to the byelaw.

**Members Resolved to:**

**Note the outputs of the formal consultation for the Marine Protected Areas Byelaw 2016.**

**Note the rationale for requiring flexibility with regards to the application of Regulatory Notices in MPAs.**

**Agree to submit the Marine Protected Areas Byelaw 2016 to the Marine Management Organisation for formal QA.**

**Proposed: Cllr Fairman**

**Seconded: Mr Pinborough**

**All Agreed**

**Direct Officer to pursue the removal of Schedule One from the Byelaw in accordance with independent legal advice.**

**Proposed: Mr Worrall**

**Seconded: Mr Spray**

**All Agreed**

**Delegate to the ACEO the ability to amend the byelaw to introduce a schedule to specify the designated sites in which Regulatory Notices should it prove necessary to do so.**

**Proposed: Cllr Cox**

**Seconded: Mr Pinborough**

**All Agreed**

*At this point the meeting was adjourned for a 15 minute break for lunch*

**EIFCA16/34 Item 15: Report on a meeting of the Planning & Communication Sub-Committee held on 24 February 2016**

Members were advised that a decision had been taken to move from Annual Plans to a 5 year Business Plan with annual updates.

It was noted that, in relation to the effectiveness of outreach activity, a decision had been taken ~~to defer~~ not to repeat the benchmarking exercise on the basis it would incur expenditure, £15k of public money which it was not believed would be judiciously spent.

Members were then taken through the main priorities for 2016/17, whilst it was accepted these were ambitious it was in context with the 5 year business plan and inevitably some may roll over to the next year.

Mr Davies questioned why EIFCA were looking into flatfish when they were already covered by the MMO. The ACEO advised this was a shared responsibility with EIFCA looking at the inshore fisheries, with the hope that the gaps in data will be filled by working together. Mr Stipetic advised that any data for u10m vessels will only be from buyers and sellers. Mr Davies was still uncertain where EIFCA was going with this and was concerned the IFCA was branching into areas outside their district. The ACEO assured members nothing was being done outside the EIFCA district.

**Members Agreed to note the content of the report and the addition of Capital Expenditure projections to the Business Plan since it was improved.**

**EIFCA16/35 Item 16: Payments made and monies received during the period 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016**

Mr Shaul questioned what the Fixed Admin Penalty payments had been received for. It was advised that 19 FAPs had been issued for infringements of the closed area in the Wash. 14 of which had been received, with the other 5 being subject to a court case.

**Members agreed to receive the report.**

**EIFCA16/36 Item 17: Quarterly Management Accounts**

Members were advised this was an update of the Accounts, the final accounts for the financial year would be available at a later date. Early indications showed savings of £113k compared to the budget. This was largely due to savings in salaries as a result of the CEO being on secondment to the MMO.

The Head of Finance talked members through other variants in the accounts compared to the budget for the year.

**Members Agreed to note the report.**

**EIFICA16/37 Item 18: MMO Appointee Expenses**

The payment of expenses to MMO Appointees is subject to review on an annual basis, with the Authority being asked to consider whether or not the expenses should continue to be paid.

The Head of Finance advised that at the current time the expenses tended to fall below the budget amount and remains affordable.

**Members Resolved to approve the payment of expenses to MMO Appointees for a further year.**

**Proposed: Cllr Cox**

**Seconded: Cllr Fairman**

**One abstention was received, all other votes were in favour, the motion was therefore carried.**

**EIFCA16/38 Item 19: Le Strange Private Fishery**

Members were advised that the Le Strange Estate had previously been granted fishing rights to an area of the foreshore. In 2007 13 fishers took cockles from an area which they did not believe was part of the LSE. The LSE disagreed with this and took proceedings.

It was questioned whether sandbanks which were becoming attached to areas of the foreshore which the LSE have rights to should become part of their area of control. A Supreme Court had disagreed with this which suggested the fishers had been fishing legally.

With this ruling in place it meant there was potentially an area of the sea bed between the WFO and where LSE starts which was unregulated. However, until a boundary for the LSE was defined it was difficult to determine where this area was. Legal advice was being sort on the best course of action in the event of fishing activity taking place in this area.

Mr Garnett accepted there was risk to management of the area left between the WFO and LSE, however, he felt that prior to the judgement there had been a serious risk that LSE could take large chunks of the fishery for themselves.

Mr Williamson was disappointed in the ACEOs view on the outcome, he had hoped it would have been appreciated that the industry had gained back some of the grounds and finally the boundary was likely to be sorted, rather than implying the court ruling had created a problem for EIFCA. The ACEO advised ~~the activity had all taken place before his time and it was all happening outside of his control~~his comments had been intended to reflect that the case was outside the remit of Eastern IFCA and that whilst clearly interested in the outcome it was not a matter which the Authority could, or should have sought to influence whilst court proceedings were ongoing.

Mr Garnet felt it may be necessary for EIFCA to be involved in determining the boundary, however the ACEO questioned why there was a need to be involved if it was outside the boundary of the WFO. Mr Garnett advised the WFO boundary had been determined in area 5 not contended he felt it was now necessary to complete what was started in 1992.

Mr Bagley questioned whether any regulation applied to this gap of land, he was advised it was still part of the SSSI and those regulations remained in place.

**EIFCA16/39 Item 20: Defra Marine Review**

The ACEO updated members on Defras planned review on Marine Activity. A major review was being undertaken involving: MMO/ CEFAS / JNCC / NE / EA & IFCA's.

Phase 1 of the process was Evidence Gathering which 4 working groups were addressing. The timeframe for this phase was short with evidence required

to inform a meeting of the exec committee in June. This would form Phase 2 during which the intention was to identify areas to make improvements.

The ACEO believed the outcome would involve more joint working and cohesive working for stakeholders.

**EIFCA16/40 Item21: MMO/IFCA Collaboration**

The ACEO updated members on two key workstreams.

Accommodation Sharing: EIFCA had acquired space in the MMO offices in Lowestoft, which supported the decision to base the patrol vessel in Suffolk.

Intelligence, Tasking & Co-ordinating: this process was intended to improve intelligence held by the MMO/IFCAs.

**EIFCA16/41 Item 22: Quarterly progress against Annual Plan priorities**

Most Items were complete in line with the plan, with the exception of bio security which had been rolled over to next year.

**Members Agreed to note the report.**

**EIFCA16/42 Item 23: HR Update**

**Members Agreed to note the report.**

**EIFCA16/43 Item 24: Marine Protection Quarterly Reports**

Members were advised that due to changing roles there may be some difference in reporting styles, as well as some changes in the reporting of data. The data collection process was not considered to be particularly robust.

**Members Agreed to note the report.**

**EIFCA16/44 Item 25: Marine Environment/Research Quarterly Reports**

**Members Agreed to note the report**

**EIFCA16/45 Item 26: Any Other Business**

Whelk Byelaw: Members were reminded that Emergency Whelk Byelaw had come into force 12 months previously. Officers were actively looking to replace this with a permanent byelaw, however this was still being considered by the MMO.

The Emergency Byelaw process allows EIFCA to apply for a 6 month extension, which officers had done, this was also being considered by the MMO.

Once the permanent byelaw was in place the emergency byelaw would be revoked.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 1410 hours.

