

**Process group meeting following 2nd stakeholder group workshop
05-04-2010: Ribby Hall**

Present:

Kathryn Turner (Natural Environment)
Chris Lumb (Natural Environment)
Ron Graham (Commercial Fishing)
Dave Dobson (Commercial Fishing)
Graham Ford-Kyte (Industry)
John Amery (Recreation)
Sue Kidd (ISCZ Project Board Chair)
Julie Drew (Industry)
Diana Pound (Facilitator – Dialogue Matters)
Greg Whitfield (ISCZ)

DP opened by commenting that there had been several issues which had emerged during the period between the 1st and 2nd stakeholder group meetings. Some of these issues had been brought directly to her attention and others had been passed on to her by members of the ISCZ team (particularly the liaison officers). The aim of this meeting is to clarify some of the issues and look for potential solutions.

1. Balance of interests on the stakeholder group

DP commented that the group could not adequately reflect geographical representation of the stakeholders in the project area as it would have led to large and unmanageable numbers (in terms of stakeholder group workshops). This is the reason that the group has a balance of interests which may, in some circumstances, not be geographically representative of the stakeholder interests in the project area.

However, a problem has arisen given that IoM, Welsh and NI fishermen expressed a need to be on the stakeholder group. These changes were incorporated (i.e. the individuals were added to the stakeholder group), but this left an imbalance between the three largest stakeholder sectors – industry, natural environment and commercial fishing. This introduces equity issues for the facilitator, which need to be raised with the process group (see below).

2. No Scottish fisherman on the group

RG commented that John Hermes is a Scottish fisherman who is on the group. DD mentioned that although he is on the group, he sent a substitute to the first workshop and did not attend this workshop.

DP asked for clarification on what the breadth of interest was for Scottish fishermen in the project area, and can we capture this within the existing group. RG suggested that Kirkcudbright was the hub for Scottish fishing in the Irish Sea, so maybe a good idea to contact the Lockheed's who attended the Cumbria County Workshop. KT said that this was unfair and would disrupt the balance – especially if recreational stakeholders are being asked to represent natural environment. She asked why fishermen can't do the same. JA commented that if another fishermen came onto

the group it would add further pressure for another angler to come onto the group too.

There were uncertainties over the amount of Scottish vessels operating in the project area. GFK mentioned that scalloping was substantial. However, a Scottish scalloper, John Hermes, sits on the stakeholder group, so the process group decided that this can be deemed as adequate representation.

ACTION (GW and/or DP): John Hermes needs to be made aware that he needs to be actively involved in the process (he has not been to date).

3. The balance between fishing and industry

It was agreed that this balance was not as important as that for natural environment. JD commented that the industries are represented, and the emphasis on 'how many' industries is less relevant.

4. Sea Anglers

Questions on the number (1) of sea anglers on the stakeholder group (expressed through the liaison officers), given the complexity of their activities. JA stated that the problem lies in him convincing the anglers that he is adequate to represent their interests (which he is gradually doing so through group meetings etc.) and that this is not a voting process. In summary, JA is happy with the situation and therefore there is no need for additional anglers on the group. He also commented that now the charter boat seat had been taken, this would also ease pressure on him. GFK commented that the anglers (and other stakeholders) must be aware that JA is the route through which their comments are funnelled into the stakeholder group.

5. Location of the workshops

DP requested feedback about the venue, in light of the fact that we are moving to Lancaster University for the next workshop. DD commented that someone will always complain, and there will always need to be some sort of compromise when people are travelling from far afield to get to the venue. DD and GFK commented that this was a fabulous venue, which the MMO/MFA use a lot. JA noted that we also need to keep an open mind, as Lancaster University may also be very good.

6. Wider comments at the iteration stage

JA mentioned that with the sea angling forums on the web, the sheer amount of comments would be unmanageable, if made public. RG commented that if the iteration is not complete (or agreed) then there will be confusion – better to post iterations towards the end of the process when there will be more consensus.

JA commented that the protection levels won't be defined by the time the first iteration is ready, so there is danger that things will be misinterpreted. Similarly, GFK mentioned that it may be unwise to publicise an iteration given the current lack of

evidence base (e.g. with the FOCI still in draft format and the lack of confidence data for the broadscale habitats).

KT commented that the iterations need to be publicised early and also the rules for publicising the files – they can't be used to frighten people through the media.

GFK commented that legal data sharing needs to be sorted out now e.g. member state VMS data.

CL commented that it would be very difficult to keep three iterations quiet. We need a management strategy with caveats. Need to be clear that the comments come through the stakeholder group members.

RG stressed again that the group need to be happy with the iteration before it is publicised.

CL commented that all of the other regional MCZ projects have regional hubs/groups, but ISCZ don't. We need to address this inconsistency – possibly with facilitated regional sessions to accompany the 3rd iteration, whilst time still exists to refine the iteration.

KT stressed that she needs to report to her group members in the region – so surely all stakeholder group members will do this same? RG noted that this will not be case for commercial fishermen due to complex geographical variations and the lack of enthusiasm for meetings.

Action (ISCZ/Dialogue Matters): Need to produce a summary of the word for word reports as people won't read them.

Action (Dialogue Matters): Regarding a decision on what to do with the iterations, it was agreed that there needs to be a session at the next workshop (a communications activity) to find out what to do with the iterations and how comments could be dealt with