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**1 Welcome & Introduction**

* 1. Participants were welcomed to the Demersal WG Meeting by the Chairman Barrie Deas. A particular welcome was extended to representatives of Member States, the scientists present, Eckehard Reussner from the Commission, and Brian O’Riordan from the Low Impact Fishers of Europe, who was attending his first NSAC meeting. Apologies had been received from Kenn Skau Fischer, John Pope and Durk van Tuinen. Norman Graham from the Commission would be attending later in the day to provide an update on progress with the Technical Conservation Regulation.

1.2 The agenda for the meeting was adopted.

**2 Report of the Last Meeting**

2.1 The report of the last meeting, held in Edinburgh on the 13th July 2017 had been circulated. It was approved with a small number of amendments, and would be placed on the website.

**3 Matters Arising/Action Points from the Last Meeting**

3.1 The Secretary Lorna Duguid went through the Action Points:

1. The report of the previous meeting in Den Haag had been approved with no amendments and was now on the website.
2. A Dialogue Meeting with ICES would be held in Copenhagen on the 1st November.
3. A NSAC Workshop on TAC setting would be held in Copenhagen on the 2nd November.
4. A report on TAC setting by Steve Mackinson of CEFAS would be made available to those attending the TAC Workshop, but it had not yet been finalised and at this stage it was not to be circulated or placed on any website.
5. The latest NSAC Landing Obligation advice had been published following approval at the ExCom meeting on the 4th October.
6. Mike Fitzpatrick would be providing an update later today on the Discardless project, and Jordan Feekings would make a presentation on his Selectivity and Avoidance work in Denmark.
7. A reply had been sent to the EU Director General of Fisheries in response to his request for advice on eel management.
8. An update would be provided later today on the trialogue process regarding the North Sea MAP.
9. A meeting had been requested with the Control Agency to discuss the implications of the Landing Obligation for control and enforcement. EFCA had received similar requests from other Advisory Councils and a DG Mare seminar on this topic will now be held in Brussels on the 16h November. There is one remaining vacancy for a NSAC member to attend.
10. A NSAC Workshop on saithe will be held in Hamburg on the 24th January 2018

3.2 Barrie Deas concluded that all the necessary actions had been taken or were underway.

**4 Landing Obligation**

4.1 NSAC work on the Landing Obligation (LO) had continued. In the first part of the year advice had been prepared on the joint recommendations for 2018. The NSAC had then moved on to prepare advice on how well the current toolbox could deal with the issue of chokes in mixed fisheries, and what alternatives beyond the toolbox might be relevant. That advice had been adopted at the ExCom meeting in Malta and had now been published. Throughout, the NSAC had engaged in strong dialogue with the Scheveningen Group.

4.2 Emiel Brouckaert, Pim Visser and Irene Kingma had recently attended a meeting of the Scheveningen Technical Group in Den Haag. Irene had made a presentation on behalf of the NSAC. Emiel reported that there had been favourable comments from the Group; the NSAC advice had been well received. Unfortunately, no-one from the Commission had attended the meeting, which had stimulated adverse comments from Member State representatives. A number of important points had been raised at the meeting including:

* What alternative measures should be put in place when TACs are removed?
* How would the major problems arising from 1st January 2019, when the discard ban is fully implemented, be dealt with?
* The choke mitigation tool developed by the Advisory Councils is extremely useful, but it requires more work to populate the mitigation table. Members of the NSAC must cooperate with the Scheveningen Group to achieve this.

The Commission is holding a Seminar on the Landing Obligation on the 15th November, which will allow an open exchange of views on the various issues.

4.3 The meeting continued with further discussion of the Landing Obligation and its future implications. A number of points were raised:

* Both the Commission and the Scheveningen Group have been pleased with the advice so far from the NSAC, and believe that it has been clear and comprehensive. It is now important for the NSAC to concentrate on developing further the choke mitigation tool. This must be done collaboratively with North Sea Member States. The Commission has emphasised that it needs concrete examples of the future problems that will arise. It is evident that there are some stocks where there are solutions, but dealing with other stocks will be more challenging. There is a need to identify the high risk choke stocks, and look at the options for dealing with them. The NSAC must now start to populate the mitigation tool. In some cases, industry representatives believe that the only solution may be to remove the TACs or increase them. The Commission accepts that removing TACs is a simple solution to resolving problems with a choke species, but it is too early to decide on that solution now. Other steps have also to be considered.
* How can any of the major discard problems likely to arise after 1st January 2019 be dealt with? The industry view is that we are sitting on a time bomb. Industry representatives believe that there is a need to decide in advance which problems are likely to emerge, and how they can best be resolved. If they cannot be resolved using existing tools, then political solutions may have to be found. The Commission has already been told by the Dutch that dealing with skates and rays will be a problem, followed by turbot and brill, and then by plaice. However, the Commission has not yet responded with possible solutions. A disaster is looming, and the Commission needs to find practical ways of dealing with the fact that some fisheries will be facing enormous problems. It would have been possible for the Commission to have tested these fisheries under discard ban conditions, but they have not yet done so. The problems may therefore have to be dealt with retrospectively. There will be particular problems for Member States in enforcing the discard ban in some fisheries.
* It was pointed out that an STECF Working Group is considering some of the problems that are likely to arise, but it is not yet clear whether solutions will actually be found before the discard ban is finalised. The Commission has stressed the need to focus on identifying concrete problems. This can best be achieved by the NSAC working closely with Member States to identify the problems. Firstly, there is a need to identify choke species, although the quality of data on discards is often poor and identification of some may prove difficult. Then, ways have to be found to deal with specific choke species. The Commission accepts, however, that finding solutions will not always be straightforward.
* Industry representatives again emphasised that it will not be possible to resolve in advance all the problems that are likely to arise in 2019. The Landing Obligation has been introduced rather quickly compared with other countries like Norway. The LO may not result in greater selectivity but simply lead to a lack of compliance. A pragmatic approach may be necessary to avoid the closure of key fisheries. Fishermen will in some cases need to continue fishing, and must not be punished if they do so. It was pointed out, however, that buyers will not be happy to purchase fish from fleets that continue to discard after the ban has been fully introduced. Markets may be lost. There is some justification for phasing out from the discard ban those fish stocks that do not fit with the ban. That is the logical way ahead. However, other interest groups have emphasised that they would not happy with such solutions. If the result of the discard ban is a lack of reporting of discards, then this will have to be dealt with. Moreover, it is probable that the Commission will not allow fishing to continue in these circumstances. It is important to find solutions to these problems before we get to January 2019.

4.4 Barrie Deas concluded that the main priority for the NSAC was to continue to work with the Scheveningen Group and scientists to identify chokes and adopt mitigation solutions, using the choke mitigation tool developed by the Advisory Councils. If we can identify any problems that cannot be resolved before the full discard ban is implemented in 2019, then this might assist the Commission with finding political solutions.

4.5 Initially, the NSAC would send a letter to the Scheveningen Group thanking them for their comments on the NSAC advice on “Managing Fisheries within the Landing Obligation". We would welcome a note from them providing their comments on specific elements of the advice. It will be necessary to stress, however, that our priority must be to identify chokes and especially those that will not be easy to deal with using the current toolbox. We need to identify the sensitivity of particular choke issues for each Member State. We especially need to give greater thought to what solutions might be necessary after the January 2019 implementation of the Landing Obligation. We must point out that the NSAC is keen to engage with the group as soon as possible. The NSAC can put together a team to work through the mitigation tool with representatives from the Technical Group. There is a need to discuss the timing of such a meeting, and there will be a need to appoint a chair person.

4.6 Later in the meeting, Norman Graham from the Commission was asked if he had any advice for the NSAC on the forthcoming Seminar on the Landing Obligation to be held on the 15th November. Norman replied that invitations had been sent out to the Advisory Councils; however, there were still some places available. The meeting would discuss what now needs to be done to fully implement the Landing Obligation. The scope would be wide and would not just deal with mitigation measures. The Commission was seeking the views of stakeholders on 4 main issues:

* Choke analysis
* The contribution of science and technology to gear innovations, and how best innovations can be introduced The DiscardLess findings would be discussed and Barrie Deas would be asked to participate in a panel on gear innovations.
* Catch documentation and the reporting of unwanted catches
* Marketing issues

4.7 The NSAC representatives currently planning to attend the seminar include Barrie Deas, Niels Wichmann, Michael Park, Irene Kingma, and Kenn Skau Fischer. The Commission would be sending additional information about the Seminar to the NSAC Secretariat. There is a possibility that additional participants might be accepted. Prospective candidates should contact Lorna Duguid.

**5 DiscardLess Update**

5.1 It is important for the NSAC to base its Landing Obligation advice on the best available information. The DiscardLess Project has a number of important strands that might help the NSAC in developing further advice. Mike Fitzpatrick had been invited to the meeting to update the NSAC on any insights gained from the project, on behalf of the DiscardLess Consortium. The full presentation is available on the NSAC website.

5.2 Work Package 1 of the project considers whether a discard ban is good for the ecosystem, and is working at a case study level through local workshops with stakeholders. The scavenging of discards by different species has been investigated. There will be some problems created for scavenging birds and marine mammals as a result of the discard ban, but there will of course be benefits to these animals and to demersal fish stocks from the improved selectivity of fishing gears.

5.3 Work Package 2 is concerned with Fishery Scale Social and Economic Assessment and is based on interviews with stakeholders, including fishers, scientists, administrators, NGOs, auctions and processing industries. There is an overall negative view from many stakeholders with regard to the Landing Obligation. The extent to which different measures might help reduce the adverse economic consequences of the LO upon fishers has been investigated using different economic models. Modelling shows particularly adverse impacts upon the *Nephrops* fleet, and a number of other serious issues have been highlighted. However, improved selectivity measures may increase overall economic results, relative to no discard ban, in the medium and long term. *De minimis* and quota flexibility may to some degree mitigate the negative effects of full implementation of the discard ban.

5.4 Work Package 3 is looking at gear selectivity. Lots of work on this has been done over the years although it is hard to access some of the data. A selectivity catalogue has been produced and fact sheets prepared. The project is working to establish generic protocols to encourage fishers to formulate their own problems and think about their own solutions. The project aims to establish standardised criteria for when better selectivity is achieved, and to validate such gears through scientific testing, so that gears can be accepted at both national and EU levels.

5.5 Selectivity is not the answer to every problem and Work Package 4 is looking at changes to fishing strategies that might enable issues arising from the Landing Obligation to be dealt with. Challenge trials are being conducted to define what the discard problems are, and how they might be dealt with through changes in fishing tactics, including when and where to fish. However, it seems that choke mitigation tools are probably the best way forward. Scientists may be able to assist with the task of identifying high risk species and how they might be dealt with through mitigation measures.

5.6 Work Package 5 deals with the onboard handling of unwanted catches. Equipment can be installed to deal with unwanted catches. Work Package 6 considers ways for adding value to the whole catch. Such work was welcomed by industry representatives.

5.7 Work Package 7 considers the framing & implementation of a discard policy and aims to define good practice for implementing such policies. As well as working with the Advisory Councils in identifying high risk chokes, the project may be able to investigate a whole range of different ideas on how choke problems might be resolved.

5.8 Finally, Work Package 8 involves the dissemination of information from the project, including the publication of scientific papers and other reports, the holding of workshops, meetings, and conferences, and dissemination through stakeholder interviews. Information is available through the website: [www.discardless.eu](http://www.discardless.eu)

5.9 NSAC participants provided a number of comments on points raised during the presentation:

* + Industry representatives thought that providing spatial information on high discard areas may be useful to fishers in enabling them to avoid discarding, but such maps cannot provide a sound basis for regulating the fisheries.
  + It is now apparent that there are many projects running on discard-related issues. Different countries have projects running, the results from which need to be shared with others.
  + It was emphasised that there are likely to be major benefits to demersal fisheries and to birds and mammals from improved selectivity and from any reduction in fishing mortality. However, implementing the Landing Obligation may not make a great difference to the ecosystem.
  + It is important to consider how we might integrate this research work with the NSAC’s activities

**6 Selectivity and Avoidance**

6.1 Jordan Feekings, of DTU Aqua (Denmark) gave a presentation on the work being carried out by this company on improving fishing gear selectivity. The full presentation is available on the NSAC website.

6.2 The project was investigating how industry-led gear development can help achieve successful implementation of the new CFP/ technical measures, and assist with implementation of the Landing Obligation. The project will take 2-3 years to be completed. Points that have already become apparent are that:

* Few gears are expected to suit all fisheries in an area
* There is a degree of inflexible – there is little opportunity for fishers to develop and test alternative gears
* Gears are often sensitive to small changes
* With changes to the CFP, fishers will need to modify their gears more actively throughout the year. Gears will need to match quotas and gear modifications will need to be made on a vessel not a fleet level

6.3 A fast-track project has begun to Identify and develop effective selective gears under the new CFP/ Landing Obligation. It is intended to make the process from idea to approval of gears easier, faster and more inclusive. The project is financed by the Danish Agrifish Agency and the EMFF. Fishers are involved in the whole process of defining solutions to their problems. The overall goal is to have the gears implemented into legislation, with permission to fish with them if they work.

6.4 It was noted by industry representatives that many similar projects are underway in a number of countries, and that there is a risk of work being duplicated. There is a need to align these initiatives, and it is possible that the NSAC can play a role in this. It was suggested that we could perhaps write to the Scheveningen Group, asking them to assign someone to listing all these projects, so that we all know what is taking place and its significance for fishers. However, Karin Linderholm from the Swedish Ministry pointed out that the group has already been discussing the need to share knowledge on gear innovations. Jordan added that there are plans as part of his project to organise a workshop of gear technologists from different countries. Michael Park said that Seafish in the UK is already attempting to coordinate such work by listing what is being done.

6.5 Barrie Deas thanked Jordan for his presentation. Such work is valuable. However, one of the problems is that the economic costs to fishers of carrying out such work are holding things back. Moreover, the Technical Conservation Measures Regulation is too rigid and gets in the way of carrying out such work. Both the Scheveningen Group and Seafish are listing such projects and there is currently no need for the NSAC to duplicate that work. However, we could place links to such projects on the NSAC website if those engaged in such work contacted the Secretariat.

**7 Farne Deeps Nephrops Fishery**

7.1 Michael Park reminded the meeting that in 2015 the NSAC wrote to the European Commission regarding special measures to protect a declining *Nephrops* stock within the Farne Deeps functional unit. The NSAC approach was based on an "of which no more than" provision, which would set an upper limit to the permitted removals. This very much followed the NSAC Long Term Management Plan for North Sea Nephrops, that had been submitted to the Commission and Member States. Although the NSAC advice may have influenced the outcome, the EU had largely overlooked the advice and had allowed the introduction of unilateral measures by the UK in preference to the NSAC suggestions. The UK Ministry (DEFRA) had introduced a range of measures involving minimum mesh sizes and prohibitions on larger multi-rig vessels fishing within the Farne Deeps.

7.2 The Farne Deeps stock is now showing signs of recovery. DEFRA therefore intend to continue implementing the current measures for the coming year and have asked interested parties to comment on their latest proposals. In essence, they propose to continue with the current package of recovery measures during 2018. However, the magnitude of the recent summer fishery has been exceptional and has been the principal cause of an increase of fishing effort by the 10 metre and under fleet during the recovery period. As a precaution, DEFRA proposes to cap this fishing effort by setting a reduced quarterly catch limit. The proposed measures only apply to UK fishers. DEFRA intend to review the measures again after the ICES advice for 2019 is published in June 2018.

7.3 Scottish and English fishers accept that the proposals offer the “least worst” option to rebuild the stock and are pleased that the indicators suggest that the stock is continuing to improve. Seabed surveys have shown an increase in the number of *Nephrops* burrows and the TAC is increasing. The gap is now narrowing between the TAC and what is being taken. Jenni Grossmann pointed out that the original NSAC advice had suggested that a “of which no more than” provision would be better than just technical measures. However, Michael Park replied that there would be problems in allocating the provisions to different classes of vessel, as the bulk of the TAC is assigned to larger vessels, which would give less support to the smaller artisanal vessels.

7.4 Eckehard Reussner remarked that the *Nephrops* advice for the coming year was good for one North Sea area, but that area was not heavily fished. The TAC would therefore tend to be taken from areas that were more heavily fished. However, no proposals have yet been formulated by the Commission for next year. Peter Olsson was concerned about the allocation of different types of fishing vessel to different areas, and hoped that this would not establish a precedent. It was pointed out, however, that these current measures in UK waters are essentially emergency measures. The vessel size restrictions had been devised only for one area, and they do not apply to wider areas.

7.4 There were no concerns within the meeting over the DEFRA proposals. It was agreed that the NSAC should write to DEFRA, reflecting that the stock is moving in the right direction. The proposal offers the least painful way of addressing the problems in the Farne Deeps; and the measures should continue for a further year. It was agreed to monitor the issue closely as it passes through the December Council process.

**8 Science Workshop with ICES**

8.1 An in-depth dialogue with ICES scientists is needed, concentrating on North Sea issues and the subject of how NSAC can best engage with ICES. A NSAC Workshop is therefore to be held in Copenhagen on the 1st of November. The topics to be discussed will include ICES Ecosystem Overviews, and Mixed Fishery Advice including data issues and the modelling of mixed fisheries. Kenn Skau Fischer will chair the meeting. Any further ideas on the topics to be discussed should be sent to the Secretariat.

**9 TAC Workshop**

9.1 On the following day in Copenhagen (November 2nd) a Workshop is to be held on TAC setting. The NSAC does not always respond to the Commission’s paper on fishing opportunities for the coming year, mainly because we cannot always agree, and because it is often too late to shape things. However, there are major issues in relation to the setting of TACs, including the application of an MSY approach. In the context of the Landing Obligation there is also the issue of whether we should be setting TACs, or simply managing the by-catches. The aim of the Workshop is to start a discussion that may lead to advice from the NSAC on the setting of TACs, and the role they should play in the future when the Landing Obligation is implemented. It is possible that such advice might be developed during 2018.

**10 North Sea Multi Annual Plan Update**

10.1 In 2016 the Commission proposed a multi-annual plan for demersal fish stocks in the North Sea. Pim Visser pointed out that in September the proposed North Sea MAP had been voted on in the European Parliament. Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) had proposed a number of amendments to the European Commission proposal. These now have to be discussed with the Council and the Commission. There are to be 3 rounds of trialogue, one of which has been held already. It is hoped that agreement can be reached by the end of November. The North Sea plan is rather different to the earlier Baltic plan, but some MEPs do not wish to to see major differences between the plans. The Parliament and the Commission are still quite far apart in their views and unless agreement is reached then the November deadline may not be met. Perhaps they needed advice from the NSAC in order to reach a compromise position? However, Eckehard Reussner thought it was appropriate to have an ambitious timetable. He hoped there could be final agreement at the December Council.

10.2 Michael Park pointed out that the North Sea MAP included some adjacent seas, including the West of Scotland – even out as far as Rockall. This did not seem sensible. Eckehard said that this was because the plan had to cover all the relevant stocks found in the North Sea. However, the Council had found the regional proposals within the original plan too complicated and had tried to simplify things.

10.3 Barrie Deas concluded that there was little the NSAC could do to influence things at the moment. He asked Pim Visser to continue to monitor progress with the trialogue meetings, and to report back to the NSAC, as necessary.

**11 Technical Conservation Regulation Update**

11.1 Norman Graham from the Commission provided an update on progress with the trialogue discussions on the new Technical Conservation Regulation. In May, the Council had finished its deliberations on the regulation, which aims to simplify the rules and places more emphasis on finding regional solutions. It was now being considered by the European Parliament PECH Committee. They have issued 750 possible amendments and are now trying to reach a compromise on these amendments. One issue is the re-introduction of catch composition rules, which would affect the regulation of mesh sizes, and raises issues with respect to the Landing Obligation. The conditions relating to the use of smaller mesh sizes also need to be defined. There are still substantial discussions to be held within PECH, and over the next month the Commission hopes to come forward with its responses to the proposed amendments.

11.2 Industry representatives pointed out that many of the proposed amendments would re-introduce high levels of complexity into the regulation. The more complex the rules the more difficult it will be for fishers to deal with discards. There will be a mismatch between the new regulation and the need to deal with the Landing Obligation. Norman Graham thought that some flexibility might be achieved through the process of regionalisation. The Commission was also trying to merge some of the amendments.

11,3 Environmental NGOs were interested in whether the reintroduction of catch composition rules was part of the Council’s approach as well as the outcome of deliberations within the Parliament. Norman replied that lots of discussion was taking place on this issue. The advice of the Advisory Councils had been useful on this topic. It was possible that a new set of catch composition percentage levels would be put into the regional annexes.

11.4 Barrie Deas concluded that we had submitted advice on the new regulation, and had also written to the Parliament, but clearly discussion was still taking place over the regulation. We see this regulation as an important precondition to ensure the success of the Landing Obligation. However, it is possible that we have done all we can to influence the outcome. If the regulation does become more complex, then there will be major problems. Norman Graham was optimistic that the Parliament would understand the argument that more prescriptive definitions within the regulation could lead to problems and should not be included.

**12 Review of NSAC advice forward plan**

12.1 Lorna Duguid provided an update on the preparation of advice by the NSAC. No new advice was currently being worked upon, but this would soon change. Paper 12.1 provides details of the NSAC advice pipeline, the dates of planned meetings, and the target completion dates for advice on various topics. If members believe that there are any new topics to be addressed, then they should contact the Secretariat.

12.2 Barrie Deas pointed out that we had discussed the need for new advice on the setting of TACs, and that some proposals may emerge from the Workshop to be held in Copenhagen on November 2nd. The meeting is intended to be an open dialogue with scientists, but it may lead to new advice. Barrie was asked what the difference was between a Workshop and a Focus Group. Essentially the Workshop is fact-finding, and decides what is relevant. A Focus Group is smaller and concentrates on the drafting of advice.

**13 Any Other Business**

13.1 Brian O’Riordan mentioned that ICES would soon be discussing advice on sea bass, and the NSAC may need to consider the outcome of those discussions.

13.2 Michael Andersen raised the possible need to develop new advice on the Control Regulation, especially in relation to the Landing Obligation. Barrie Deas agreed that we needed to restart the process of providing advice on that topic. This would be added to the NSAC advice pipeline. A DG Mare seminar on control issues is being held in Brussels on the 16th November. There is one remaining vacancy for a NSAC member to attend.

13.3 Caroline Ton announced that this would be the last meeting of the NSAC that she would be attend, as Caroline Gamblin would soon be returning as the CPNMEM representative.

**14. Date of next meeting**

14.1 The next meeting of the Demersal Working Group will take place in London on Wednesday the 7th February 2018.

**15. Action Points**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible** |
| 1. The report of the last meeting, held in Edinburgh on the 13th July 2017, was approved with a small number of amendments. The final version will be placed on the website. (2.1). | Secretariat |
| 1. A NSAC Workshop on saithe will be held in Hamburg on the 24th January 2018. (3.1). | Members  Secretariat |
| 1. The NSAC will send a letter to the Scheveningen Group thanking them for their comments on the NSAC advice "14-1617 Managing Fisheries within the Landing Obligation". The NSAC would now like a note from them providing their comments on specific elements of the advice. There is a particular urgency to identify chokes especially those with no "toolbox" solution, and to try to develop solutions prior to the January 2019 implementation of the LO. The NSAC wishes to work with the Scheveningen Group on further developing the choke mitigation tool. The NSAC can put together a team to work with representatives from the Technical Group. There is a need to discuss the timing of such a meeting, and there will be a need to appoint a chair person. (4.5). | Secretariat  Niels Wichmann |
| 1. The Commission will hold a LO Seminar on the 15th November. There is a possibility that additional participants might be accepted. Prospective candidates should contact the Secretariat. (4.7). | Commission  Members  Secretariat |
| 1. Both the Scheveningen Group and Seafish are listing projects aimed at improving selectivity and there is currently no need for the NSAC to duplicate that work. However, the NSAC will place links to selectivity projects on the NSAC website, if those engaged in such work contact the Secretariat. (6.7). | Those engaged in selectivity work  Secretariat |
| 1. The NSAC will write to DEFRA supporting ongoing measures for *Nephrops*. The letter will be approved by Ex Com prior to submitting (7.4). | Secretariat |
| 1. A NSAC Workshop will be held with ICES scientists in Copenhagen on the 1st of November. The topics to be discussed will include ICES Ecosystem Overviews, and Mixed Fishery Advice including data issues and the modelling of mixed fisheries. Kenn Skau Fischer will chair the meeting. Any further ideas on the topics to be discussed should be sent to the Secretariat. (8.1). | Members  Secretariat  Kenn Skau Fischer |
| 1. A NSAC fact-finding Workshop will be held in Copenhagen on the 2nd November to discuss the setting of TACs. Open discussion may later lead to advice from the NSAC on the setting of TACs, and the role TACs should play when the LO is fully implemented in 2019. NSAC advice on this topic may subsequently be developed during 2018. (9.1). | Secretariat  Members |
| 1. Pim Visser will continue to monitor progress with trialogue meetings on the North Sea Multi Annual Plan, and will report back to the NSAC, as necessary. (10.3). | Pim Visser  Secretariat |
| 1. The NSAC has prepared an advice forward plan, giving the dates of future planned meetings, and the target completion dates for advice on various topics. If members believe that there are any new advice topics to be addressed, then they should contact the Secretariat. (12.1). | Members  Secretariat |
| 1. ICES will soon be discussing advice on sea bass, and the NSAC may need to consider the outcome of those discussions. (13.1). | Members  Secretariat |
| 1. There is a need to develop new advice on the Control Regulation, especially in relation to the LO. The NSAC will restart the process of providing advice on that topic and this will be added to the NSAC advice forward plan. (13.2). | Secretariat |
| 1. A DG Mare seminar on the implications of the LO for control and enforcement is being held in Brussels on the 16th November. There is one remaining vacancy for a NSAC member to attend. (13.2). | Members  Secretariat |
| 1. The next meeting of the Demersal Working Group will take place in London on Wednesday the 7th February 2018. (14.1). | Secretariat  Members |

**16 Attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Family Name** | **Given Name** | **Organisation** |
| Andersen | Michael | Danish Fishermens’ PO |
| Birnie | Anne | NESFO |
| Bouts | Leon | EFCA |
| Breckling | Peter | Deutscher Fischerei Verband e.V. |
| Brouckaert | Emiel | Rederscentrale |
| Clark | Ned | NFFO |
| Davies | Jamie | Pew Trusts |
| Deas | Barrie | NFFO |
| Duguid | Lorna | NSAC Secretariat |
| Graham | Norman | EC |
| Feekings | Jordan | DTU Aqua |
| Fitzpatrick | Mike | MNRG |
| Hawkins | Tony | NSAC Secretariat |
| Lindberg | Fredrik | Swedish Fishermens’ PO |
| MacDonald | Paul | Scottish Fishermens’ Organisation |
| Meun | Geert | VisNed |
| Olsson | Peter | Swedish Fishermens’ PO |
| O’Riordan | Brian | LIFE |
| Park | Michael | SFF |
| Priddle | Erin | EDF |
| Reussner | Eckehard | EC |
| Ton | Caroline | CNPMEM |
| Visser | Pim | VisNed |