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# Executive Summary

The Trustees of Fishing into the Future met at the Wesley Hotel in London on the 9th – 11th December 2015, their first face-to-face meeting since becoming a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (C.I.O. - January 2015). This meeting aimed to determine the current priorities of the charity, how these align with the priorities and interests of some key industry partners, and to set direction for a clear and coherent work plan for the next two years. The meeting also contained an official FitF AGM component, thereby delivering our constitutional responsibilities for the next 12 months.

## 1.1 FitF vision:

FitF is a strongly-supported and industry-backed organisation. Our USP is to fully-leverage the experience and insights of our active ‘Fishermen Trustees’: fishermen leading debates and leading by example is unique in the UK as we seek to build sustainable fisheries, food security and prosperity for future generations. Fishing into the Future is:

* Strong on values, action and engagement – if it doesn’t drive sustainability, if it isn’t strategic, and if it doesn’t have broad buy-in we won’t do it - we know collaborative action delivers the best results
* UK-wide, Industry-led and intelligent – the collective wisdom of the fishing industry can deliver positive change and sustainability for all through knowledge exchange and innovation.
* Neutral, credible and trusted – a new, unique platform for fresh and inspiring voices for sustainability direct from individuals in the fishing industry, stimulating debate and bringing people together.
* Agile, cutting-edge and respected – with a remit to improve fisheries science, management and practice through collaborative actions and projects.

We are looking to communicate a compelling story based around these broad-brush visions in order to establish a new paradigm for the fishing- industry – one based on sustainability, professionalism and leadership for a new generation of fishermen: fishermen for who sustainable practices will be second-nature, for who scientists and fishers work together to ‘count the uncountable’ as a matter of course, and who are able to build solid fishing businesses, whatever their scale.

## 1.2 FitF priorities

FitF Trustees discussed, then prioritised, the five original themes put forward from the Brixham workshops in 2013, which were: Science and Data; Training for Sustainability; Fisheries Management and Innovation; Rewarding Best Practice; Engaging with Consumers.

This exercise resulted in two clear priorities for Fishing into the Future to work on over the next two years, supported by a Communications sub-theme:

1. Science and Data
2. Training for Sustainability
3. Communications and Engagement (cross-cutting sub-theme)

The other themes from Brixham remain interesting ‘areas of search’. They will be addressed and delivered initially under the Communications and Engagement theme and might benefit from some discrete and targeted project funding (e.g. web-based resources and services) over this two-year period.

# Recommendations for Action - summary

## 2.1 Work Programme:

* Build work programme based on the two main priorities – Science and Data; Training for sustainability
* Develop clear work-streams and funding packages to support delivery of projects
* Develop funding applications and packages that support and enable strong communications capacity and delivery

## 2.2 Science and Data

* Establish strong connections across the industry with regard to the Science and Data effort
* Use the opportunity provided by the Fishermen-Science Interface Programme to ensure FitF adds the best value to ongoing efforts in survey protocols and working with industry – for example the Defra Sustainable Scallop Group
* Use the neutral and fishermen-led platform of FitF to facilitate the development of this work stream
* Ensure funding streams provide sufficient match-funding for European funds where possible – approach foundations for unrestricted Core Funds to help with this
* Ensure new projects (e.g. Project UK) make reference to and are compatible with the Fishermen-Science Interface Programme
* Consider how to resource overhead costs in all new project funding bids as a matter of course

## 2.3 Training for sustainability

* Co-design curricula for pilot projects with advice from other countries already offering such a service – e.g. GMRI, ProSea, South Africa
* Explore roll-out options for training courses assuming the pilots are successful
* Explore monitoring and evaluation methods for the courses – effective feedback to allow for progression and development
* Complete the ‘loop’ with Fishermen-Science work by devising a collaborative research element to the training – ensure these work-streams are mutually supportive
* Explore validation, future delivery options and the process of making such training mandatory as part of the pilot course proposal and development

# Discussion with partners - summary

* We are building a very compelling funding model, provided we can communicate what fishermen are buying into and why
* FitF makes a difference through knowledge-exchange – drawing on different groups within the industry
* We need to show new people coming into the industry that there is a future
* Fishermen leading debates, and leading by example, is unique in the UK
* FitF can take the initiative: bringing people together and delivering value through collective efforts
* The FitF model could serve as a blueprint for other organisations to follow globally – but needs some quick wins now to show value
* The messages need to be clear and concise to help people/the outside world understand what we are doing
* FitF is about enlightenment on the journey towards better and more sustainable fishing practices

# Detailed Discussions

##  Meeting Context

The Trustees of Fishing into the Future met for the first time since becoming a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (C.I.O.) at the Wesley Hotel in London, on the 9th – 11th December 2015. This meeting aimed to explore further the priorities of the charity, how these align with the priorities and interests of some key industry partners, and to also define actions and remits for a two-year period in order to construct a clear and coherent work plan for this period. The meeting also completed the constitutional requirement to hold an AGM every 12-15 months.

Fishing into the Future has been awarded funding to help establish the work and remit of the charity in its first year of independent operation. This ‘start-up’ phase is notoriously difficult and the finance has been aimed at ensuring FitF has a clear, deliverable and measurable work plan in place, around which other products and services can be organised. It will also act as a business-case for further core funding asks as well as project development.

It was felt that the charity needed to engage with a wider constituency of sectors and members than just the Trustees, and therefore a number of guests were invited to the afternoon session of the first day to help discuss the alignment of FitF priorities with the outside world. This was the first wider networking opportunity for the charity since an inaugural workshop in Brixham in 2015.

## 4.2 SWOT analyses

## 4.2.1 Science and Data:

**Background**

* Funded as the Fishermen-Science Interface Programme by Seafish Strategic Investment Fund
* Focusing on producing data collection protocols for fishermen and fisheries to follow
* We will test these protocols by co-designing a sentinel surveys for scallops
* We are looking to empower fishers to collect data and improve evidence for management

#### Strengths:

* An example of ‘Responsible Research and Innovation’ as coined by the GAP2 project – with an opportunity to show what this means in practice
* Could plug a time-lag in data leading to better and closer-to-real-time fisheries management
* FitF can facilitate the process to define data collection protocols, as well as the co-design process and promote this approach to science
* Has the potential to be a foundation for a new approach to fisheries science and data collection – as the next generation of researchers emerges
* Has a potentially global audience and application
* Offers a fully-integrated survey approach – co-designed with the industry
* Complements other processes such as those being taken forward by the MSC and other FIPs

#### Weaknesses

* Better data does not always change outcomes
* Outputs will need to be clear
* Will not work for fisheries with a recent Landing Obligation
* Data and its use will need to be transparent
* Fishermen will need to see a clear outcome from the project
* Unclear how fishermen will take ownership of the data

#### Opportunities

* There is huge value if fishermen can contribute their own data
* Automation of data collection will be a game-changer
* EMFF has specific priorities for data collection
* Several sectors might be able to contribute directly, including:
	+ MSC; SFF; FIS
* Better for non-quota and data deficient fisheries
* To coordinate with work on the ground by Defra, Cefas and others in scallop surveys
* To contribute better evidence to fisheries assessments and online risk assessments - RASS

#### Threats

* Would be too much too soon for fisheries like white fish
* No data entry resources to meet the new supply
* Data might not be used by fisheries scientists
* Feedback to industry might be lacking
* FSIP is not appropriate for TAC species

## 4.2.2 Training for Sustainability

**Background**

* 2 x curricula already under development – 80% complete
* Builds trust; drives understanding; supports collaboration; engages policy-makers
* Needs overseas advice to complete the curricula – learning from doing

#### Strengths:

* Adds value and has been initiated by the industry – the very people receiving the training
* Draws on a successful methodology that has been proven to work elsewhere
* Is flexible and able to be tailored to different situations and fisheries
* Is new, exciting and unique in the UK
* Meets current fisheries challenges

#### Weaknesses

* There is a lack of clarity over messaging about this undertaking at present – we need to be clear about the need and what we are doing
* There needs to be ‘stick’ as well as carrot to get people to attend
* Fishermen are time-poor, which might compromise attendance
* The curriculum could be complex
* Needs a clear post-pilot strategy

#### Opportunities

* There are great connections to be made with the Seafish Responsible Fishing Scheme and other training programmes they run
* Possible opportunities to tie in delivery with skipper’s ticket
* Could there be a collaborative research end-result? Could we co-develop the curricula in some way?
* This has some high-level components and principles that could be rolled out wider than the UK
* Management groups such as the EU Advisory Councils could be good audiences for this training – and might help them deliver their roles and functions better
* How would we go about validating the course, and who might be the long-term delivery body?
* Are we expecting the course to become mandatory in the future?

#### Threats

* The courses could easily become over-complicated
* They could also be over-simplified
* There is a need to avoid condescending and patronising the audience
* The curricula need to be strong and relevant to reflect the wider marine space if possible

#### Connections, motivations, funding and dependencies

* The Open University could be a delivery body for this programme, and Seafish has an obvious connection
* There is an actual need from industry driving this theme
* Industry will need to stand up for itself and be counted – but there needs to be motivation to attend the course
* The EMFF will be a better fit for funding this than the EFF was
* If POs, Associations and other bodies within the industry wished to sponsor students to attend the course, this would make it special – it could be by invitation only – and improvement engagement
* ICES and other EU-wide organisations need to be involved, and it would be best to build a blueprint in the UK that can be rolled-out elsewhere in Europe
* If the course is good enough, it will attract a fee and fishermen will be happy to pay this

## 4.2.3 Communications and engagement

**Background**

* Supports the themes above
* Includes:
* Reporting on innovations and management best practice
* Spotlights on good practice
* Stakeholder engagement and constituency-building

This theme was not discussed in depth by the Trustees and other guests at this time.

# Verbatim Texts

## 5.1 Vision-setting task:

* A training programme for fishermen
* Collaboration with like-minded organisations (e.g. FIS)
* T bring the entire industry together
* Shared vision
* Consumer trust
* Industry one voice
* A joined-up approach from industry to consumer
* To clear away myths
* Clear outputs that can say ‘we did this’
* Fishermen leading a sustainability agenda
* Fisheries are more sustainable
* Informed management debate
* Fisheries and govt co-management
* Management which works closer with industry
* Fishermen as businessmen
* Public perspectives changing
* Better use of fishermen’s data
* Good science – fisheries collaboration
* Accurate and unobtrusive data collection
* Effective
* Efficient
* Active
* Pro-active
* Industry-led
* Professional
* Useful
* Honest
* Having integrity
* Having purpose
* Neutral
* Great to work with
* Trusted
* Being approached by others to do business
* Respected, trusted, visible reputation
* Be recognised as being valuable to fishermen
* Trusted by industry, respected by management
* The go-to body for fish conservation
* Quota – discard ban
* Quick-wins – whelk

## 5.2 Vision-setting discussion

* One for all and all for one
* Industry one-voice
* Its about engagement and being part of the whole process
* Communication effectiveness
* NFFO / SFF already try to have one voice
* Its about the whole industry, rather than just fishermen
* Who is the industry?
* One-voice needs to be two-way, its about talk and listen
* The consumer perspective is important – but how important?
* Consumers are everything, everyone needs to be involved, working together
* One voice for three dimensions
* Consumers require food security
* Food security is an emerging theme that is becoming explicit
* There is also a new social aspect and responsibility
* Consumers are now concerned with the plight of farmers
* Prosperity means being able to understand markets and business-planning
* Fishermen are beginning to see themselves as businessmen at all scales of the fleet and are making decisions on this all the time
* A big theme for FitF is training – for a long-term and collective view for the future, we can’t decouple these things
* Efficiency
* Fishermen influencing the market
* New umbrella terms and ideas = food security, health, social responsibility
* Sustainability = businesses practice efficiency of catch value and return
* Tools for delivering sustainability/prosperity/innovation are:
	+ Education, economics and price and value of catch
	+ Markets re influenced by harvesters
	+ Vertical integration
* Data needs to be trusted – collected collaboratively rather than all science
* Integrated sources, compare, clarify, proper application of evidence,
* Accuracy and collaboration
* TRUST – relationships and forum for debate
* Partners, stimulating, facilitative, building staff
* FSIP – USP = fishermen led, inclusive, is new and different, fishermen are at the table
* Science-management Interface: can we influence this?
* There are lag times in data, decisions and
* Need to communicate effectively with others
* Need strong engagement
* How often do fishermen get together to act collectively?
* Data is a tool and process that makes all this come together
* Data is not integrated at the moment
* There is a lot of misuse of data
* Collaboration needs to be specific around data; there need to be standards for data; trusted data
* The lack of evidence leads to problems with data collection, which leads to distrust and a shrinking scientific resource
* Need to champion new approaches to data and acceptance of fishermen’s data
* ‘so what?’ for FitF?
* Cutting-edge
* Bringing things together
* Tackling issues collectively
* Are keen to engage
* Addressing practical issues
* There is a high speed of change at sea so we need a trustworthy relationship with scientists
* We need to make FitF investable
* Driven by fishermen, offering their insights
* Need to own the space about gathering data
* Leveraging the insights of fishermen
* This NGO will have a stronger voice as it grows – we need to know how we can influence policy and decisions
* Is there an opportunity for us to do more?
* Quota and fish-price issues are important
* The active involvement of fishermen and access to their insights is our USP
* There is a new concept of supply and demand
* We need a science and management interface
* Education programme needs to include elements about markets and demand
* We need entire industry engagement to make FitF unique
* Active fishermen are central and essential – inspired by fishermen
* We need to capture the ability of fishermen to drive and influence change
* Are policy-makers listening to our wish-list of great ideas?
* It is not within our powers to chance policy?
* We need to be stimulating, facilitating, and building partnerships
* We need to be active across the UK
* Bottom up is too simplistic a way of looking at this
* We need structures to allow things to happen:
	+ Tools
	+ Partnerships
	+ Capacity
	+ Collective knowledge
* Its all about engagement
* Fishermen come as individuals with a passion for sustainability
* Fishermen are at the heart of the collaboration
* Is this a strategic Partnership?
* It is a collaborative network – we need to show how we fit with others
* FitF should NOT be a lobbying body – rather we need to be pro-active and innovative
* We need to produce better outcomes as a result of our work
* What are the quick-wins for us = e.g. whelks?
* A United Kingdom Strategic Partnership – non-advocacy and empowerment

## 5.3 Panel Q&A with Trustees – morning of Day 1

* We are looking to change the perception of fishermen – we need to be portraying a younger image to the outside world
* Look ahead, not behind
* We need a formal AGM process – formalise minutes and adopt reports etc.
* What is our funding model going to be and how does this relate to the business model?
* Caution against funders who have an ‘agenda’
* Need to identify hands-off funders – these are OK
* WE need to know how FitF fits into other funding programmes such as EMFF etc.
* FitF is an NGO – a crowded space that we are now competing in
* We need to maximise our impact as a small organisation
* How are we going to fill official roles on the Board?
* Avoid duplication
* Needs to remain fishermen-led
* Trustees need to articulate vision and mission to drive forward comms and business model
* We need to ensure we have a compelling story to tell funders
* What does fishermen-led really mean?
	+ There is often a disconnect for fishermen, FITF brings a critical voice to the table early in the process
* FitF is trusted by the industry, as opposed to other NGOs who might not be
* We can bring segments of the industry together
* How can we get more fishermen to join FitF?
* We believe in innovation and testing new ideas

## Brixham Sense-Check and priorities

##  Science and Data

* Is this topic still relevant for FitF?
	+ Unanimously YES
* Changes
	+ There is a stronger need, more momentum
	+ Scallop fishing has led gear trials and data collection
	+ Looking at species and discards and low-impact trawls
* Who is working on this?
	+ EDF; FIS; CFRN (Canada); Brown Crab; Sea Scope; IVMS suckerfish; AFPIC
* Where can we add value?
	+ Bringing data collection together
	+ Collate all the efforts going on
	+ Format of the data – standardise
	+ Disseminate use of data – designated agents for the use of data – fishers allow use of catch data
	+ Analysis of the resulting data that is collected
* New ideas for this theme
	+ Deciding on the formats and protocols for data

## Training

* Is this topic still relevant for FitF?
	+ Unanimously yes
* What ahs changed since Brixham
	+ Nothing – still virgin territory
	+ Responsible fishing scheme (RFS)has started again
* Why is this topic important/where can we add value?
	+ It helps with industry prosperity
	+ Is important for industry entrants and skippers
	+ Develops skippers as leaders
	+ Everything else comes from this training
	+ Improves engagement with the public and science
	+ Helps build trust
	+ Shows why data is needed and drives understanding for the need to collaborate on stock assessments
	+ Helps engage policy-makers
* Who do we need to engage with?
	+ SeaSchool Belgium
	+ ProSeas Holland
	+ GMRI USA
	+ South Africa
* New ideas:
	+ Need to engage young guys – this may be mainly for the next generation of fishermen

## Management and Innovation

* Is this topic still relevant to FitF?
	+ This is not a stand-alone topic and comes under the Science and Industry Collaboration theme
* What has changed for this topic since Brixham?
	+ The need to better connect science to data and fishermen’s collaboration
* Where can FitF add value?
	+ Encourage skippers to understand management
	+ Industry collaboration
	+ Need to be clear about where we operate
* Who else is working on this them/topic?
	+ EDF
	+ FIS

## Rewarding Best Practice

* Is this topic still relevant to FitF?
	+ This is more relevant as a communications / strategic output, not a specific stream of work
* What has changed since Brixham?
	+ Consumers expect sustainability
	+ No real price increase because of MSC / RFS
	+ There is a need to explore traceability – examples of this?
* Where can FitF Add value?
	+ Stakeholder engagement
	+ Need to promote best practice
	+ There may be simple ways of promoting best practice through an online tool
	+ Share examples of where people are doing good things
	+ Does this include the industry as a whole or individuals?
* Who else is operating in this area?
	+ MSC / RFS / MCS / many others
	+ There are some pitfalls with this in the economic downturn
* New ideas for this topic?
	+ Online resources
	+ What is in it for the fishers?
	+ Can highlight the challenges e.g. the LO
	+ Stakeholder engagement

## Engaging with consumers

* Is this topic still relevant to FitF?
	+ Needs to fall out from other themes / activities
	+ It would give great profile for FitF
	+ It is a massive issue and much needed
	+ To do it well would be very costly
* What had changed for this topic since Brixham?
	+ To do it well would be very costly
	+ It is relevant but it is not a priority
* Who else is working on this topic?
	+ Celebrity chefs
	+ Fish is the Dish
	+ CatchBox
* Where can FitF add value?
	+ ‘Ask the skipper’
	+ Fishing Champions
	+ Seasonality and provenance
	+ Engagement through the supply chain
	+ TV and media coverage from chefs
	+ We need to work with others in this space
	+ Is a communications exercise again.

## 5.5 Theme summaries

**Science and Data:**

* New work stream called Fishermen-Science Interface Programme
* Focusing on data collection protocols
* Some specific fisheries to test protocols through co-design of surveys (scallops)
* We are looking to empower fishers to collect data
* We want to improve evidence bases for management

**Training**

* We have 2 x curricula already under development
* Remains virgin territory
* Needs overseas advice
* Builds trust; drives understanding; supports collaboration; engages policy-makers

**Communications and engagement**

* Supports the themes above
* Includes:
	+ Reporting on innovations and management best practice
	+ Spotlights on good practice
	+ Stakeholder engagement and constituency-building
* Feeds directly into the training work-stream
* Support the FSIP – they will be mutually dependent

## 5.6 AFTERNOON SESSION

## Delegate Q&A

* Funding model – what are fishermen buying into and why? This could be a very compelling argument for funding organistations
* How does FitF make a difference? Where – knowledge, different groups of fishers to engage with
* There is a need to maintain up-to-date contact with fishing industry to show people coming through that there is a future
* The work of fishermen is not being recognised – we need to get fishermen involved to help communicate their passion
* FitF can avoid polarisation through individual actions
	+ The organisation can be proactive
	+ Fishermen need to lead the debate
	+ This is a very unique position – USP = leading by example
	+ Collective efforts of the industry working together but we need other parts of the industry as Trustees
	+ Brixham brought everyone together and this group has the resources to deliver real value and services
* Innovation is critical – doing things better
* Evidence [or the lack of it] is a huge threat to the industry it can stop you going about your business
* The burden to gather evidence is going to fall to industry
	+ We need to roll up our sleeves and get on with it
* It is about taking the initiative
* FitF model can be used as a blueprint for elsewhere globally – there is a lot of interest to see how FitF grows
* FundingFISH
	+ Pigshed Trust (Harvey Jones)
	+ Oak Foundation
	+ Gulbenkian
	+ Waterloo
	+ Packard Foundation
	+ Adessium (NL)
* LIFE = funded by the Underwood Trust
	+ Came from the new CFP
* We need to make sure our messages are clear, transparent and add to the overall conversation
* There is a clear need for better data and evidence
* Landings Obligation
	+ There will be a reticence to share data and information for some fisheries that are going to be impacted by the LO – there would need to be some return for these fishermen in light of the new policy landscape
* LO will result in a deterioration of the information and evidence being gathered by fishermen
* The training programme improves the uptake of a desire to collect data
	+ Fishermen can see their role in date collection effort
* There has been talk of empowerment – this is empowerment to do what?
* It is important that FitF embeds itself in real-world data collection process and framework and how this intersects with management
* Fishermen can come up with ideas and innovations – which then becomes a two-way process
* Long term projects need to be about learning each-others language
* Species-specific focus groups that ty to understand how best to manage a fishery and are more confident to do so
* The outside world needs to be clear about why we are doing what we are doing
* Training will be about enlightenment on the journey towards better practice for the future

## 5.7 Theme SWOT analysis:

## **Science and Data**

## strengths

* Responsible Research and Innovation = output from GAP2 project -FitF could build this idea to show what it means in action – FitF can do this, and do it well
* There could be a framework for good practice and demonstration projects, there are 2/3 elements to do it well
* Transferrable – to a global audience
* We can develop best-practice for many applications e.g. FIPs
* This complements other processes such as MSC and offers a starting guide
* Offers a survey and design approach for industry
* Can identify survey pitfalls on data protocols
* Needs a co-design approach
* Meets data limited species needs for improvement
* Collaboration in design
* Plugs lag in data for assessments
* Ensure data can be useful in the long-term
* Meets the industry request to be involved in evidence gathering
* Plans or helps next generation of scientists to set new science standards – it’s the way of doing things
* LO will dive data needs, this supports new regime and future fisheries management needs
* There is an opportunity to feed back to fishermen
* A fully integrated process to collect, capture, use and feedback data
* Will improve management responsiveness
* Like the fact that it is transferrable as a model
* Co-design is a core principle – who do you involve and why?
* FitF can facilitate the co-design approach and promote this as a design principle
* FSIP will help deliver information for specific fisheries that are currently nested – with a lack of granularity
* Scallop fishery is the first in-road to this
* This is a collaborative approach to survey design

## Weaknesses

* Better data does not always change outcomes
* Guidebook – operationalisation is going to be an issue
* It is all a bit confusing and the outputs are hard to get head around
* What timeline is needed to deliver this project
* This project will be difficult in a fishery that is being impacted by the LO
* Need specific data “what you are collecting” answered
* It is hard to capture and communicate the values of the FSIP
* There are approximately 200 days spent by the most active fishermen at sea
* There is a need for assurances about the transparency for fishermen and the data sets
* Fishermen need to see an ‘outcome’ from their involvement in this process – i.e. something that is better than the current lag situation – we can look to plug the lag and lack of information
* LO will undermine efforts because of new dimensions in fisheries management
* We need to avoid ‘planning failure’ don’t go too far at this time
* Data capture is another thing to be doing at sea – how to do this with a reduced capacity?
* A larger budget might be needed to budget for scientists to actually do the work and analysis of the data once it has been captured
* The automation of data collection is going to be a game-changer
* This needs investment for technological developments
* Feedback needs to come at the centre of the survey design process and protocols

## Opportunities

* To advise on operational deployment
* Connect t monkfish case study – impact on stock assessments
* Non-quota species – bring them up to standards
* Huge value if fishermen do contribute their data
* Advocate application of protocol if developed
* Automation of data collection then becomes the issue to a set standard
* Need to develop a funding toolkit
* EMFF has a specific priority for data collections
* Also H2020
* FIS is involved in a compendium development of such projects
* The technology exists to do some measuring but there are still some opportunities
* There is an MSC research fund – linked to FIP and students
* There is an SFF Trust fund that might be available for us to apply to for match-funding
* Will FSIP do some groundwork for the Interreg bid?
* Will FSIP feed into wider global delivery?
* The guide book would be useful for fishers as a how-to protocol for survey design
* How will fishermen take ownership of the protocols?
* There is value in the learning process and people involved
* Funding Opportunity:
	+ SFF Trust is an example of the industry investing in itself
	+ The FSIP is right up the street of the EMFF
	+ Match funding is going to be key
	+ FIS is potentially an important partner
* One example where this would benefit is the monkfish fishery in Scotland – this is a reduced fishery due to a lack of data/evidence there is a need for fishermen to provide data and feed this back to management
* Will the scallop survey provide anything new for the industry?
* Defra is already doing some work in this area on how best to monitor scallop fisheries – there will be a conclusion in March how best to do this, there will be industry-led data collection
* Fishermen want to contribute to the collection of data – the collaborative approach signals a change in the culture and approach of scientists – we are looking to invest in the next generation of researchers and to embed new approaches to data collection / use and management feedback
* The legacy will be how we do standards
* The FSIP could be good for non-quota species and data-poor fisheries
* To improve their evidence = there is great value in this for all of us
* Is there a way of advocating the use of the protocols?

## Threats

* Too much too far e.g. for white fish
* No data entry resources or validation ability
* Data does not get used in science
* Feedback to industry is lacking
* EMFF may mandate broader framework vs. a local opportunity
* Is the FSIP appropriate for TAC species?

## **Training for Sustainability**

## strengths

* Added value
* Delivery organisation already active
* Methodology already exists
* No competition – virgin territory
* Has been initiated by industry
* Is a discrete deliverable
* Fills a gap
* Flexible and tailorable
* Is new and exiting
* Has an EU context
* Continuously improving and able to evolve
* Has transferability
* Meets current fisheries challenges
* Has a core plan that can be adapted to different situations
* Applies to multiple sectors + audiences and ages
* What about accreditation?
* How do we recruit attendees
* It develops leadership

## Weaknesses

* Lack of clarity over messaging revolving around this project – need to be clear about what we are doing and what the need is
* Who are we specifically aiming to attract
* The ‘stick’ as well as carrot is not apparent – where is the legislative driver to motivate people?
* Need to consider mandatory management
* Need to consider the time available of fishermen to attend
* Scheduling might be tricky
* There is a complex curriculum – who and how will it be delivered?
* Need clear next steps post any pilot project
* How will the project be evaluated?
* There is a lack of clarity about what we are promoting and why
* There needs to be stick and carrot – what’s in it for me?

## Opportunities

* Seafish RFS connections
* Scottish pilot on basic science as a test to learn from, that was aimed at the nephrops fleets
* Can we incorporate content into the skipper’s ticket process?
* Could connect pilot with the data theme to demonstrate collaboration and make it real, applied and practical?
* Could there be a collaborative research end result?
* This is for fishermen – make sure it is appropriate and approachable maybe use a questionnaire to get input
* Feedback from practice
* Advisory councils might be an audience?
* There are some higher-level components and principles that can be rolled out wider than the UK
* We need leaders to act as champions for the programme
* Consider the Anstruther Conversation from 3 years ago – all skippers thought it was very useful
* Needs to be tied in with management and supporting all efforts – so this then becomes a virtuous circle
* This will help make the training ‘real’
* How are the first cohort going to use the course?
* How will the course be evaluated?
* Can we co-develop the curricula?
* There is an opportunity to test a model – and collect intelligence to inform improvements
* Who validates the course? In the long-term this would need to be an external 3rd party
* How about using the MCA?
* We need discussions with a potential delivery body – e.g. the OU?

## Threats

* Could become over complicated
* Could be oversimplified
* Might result in telling people
* Could be seen as being condescending
* Needs to consider validation, which certification body might be used and how do we use external review to help with the evaluation?
* Needs to reflect the wider marine space and apply to multiple sectors as well
* Needs to be relevant to recipients
* How would we recruit people?
* How relevant will the curricula be?
* We need to tie-in relevance with the FSIP
* Language of the pilots needs to be clear and not condescending
* Needs to be an easy course to begin with

## Connections, motivations, funding and dependencies

* Use the Open University as an associated delivery body?
* There needs to be a fee for the course – if it is good enough
* Seafish is an obvious connection
* There needs to be a value proposition – in order for people to pay for it, and fishers need not be subsidised – need a transition path for this to happen
* There is an actual need and request from industry on this topic
* Course needs to avoid complexity and acronyms unless explained as this can shut-down skippers’ interest
* Learning occurs over time with repeat exposure and involvement
* Industry needs to stand up for itself and be involved
* There needs to be a motivation to attend the course
* EFF funding was OK – but EMFF might be an easier fit – 60% funding is available in some instances
* Fishermen’s Associations might be able to sponsor individuals to attend
* Producer Organisations might offer support
* Small amounts of sponsorship add up to match funding
* There is the pro-bono time of the FitF team
* Seafish might see this as being a good proposition in the long-term
* Develop a UK-wide and then take further – the ACs might be a good forum for this undertaking
* Consider the ICES connection – the content might need their input and they already deliver training on some subjects
* Need to set sights high enough
* The UK differs from the EU – there are not entirely the same needs but there is a good basis for adaptation
* There is a need to increase the levels of debate
* Fishers are already trying to do this in some areas of the UK
* There is a need for real-time management and feedback in order to improve quota allocation
* Is there a chance to sponsor delegates / candidates or for the project itself?
* This would make the course really special
* Would the course be application only?
* This would result in strong engagement
* NP – our PO might be able to help with this
* There is pro-bono time from the Trustees
* TL – can the ACs be used to develop and deliver the curricula? – or are the ACs observers?
* This could be training to help people perform roles within the ACs
* There need to be hooks at an EU level for funding leverage
* There needs to be a conversation with ICES as some ICES courses are already directly relevant
* There might be opportunities within H2020 and ERDF / ESF
* There needs to be a UK exemplar that can be taken to wider EU audiences

# APPENDIX I – Delegate List

|  |
| --- |
| **Fishing into the Future Trustees:** |
| **Name** | **Email** | **Role** | **Organisation / Sector** |
| Sandy West | Sandywest253@btinternet.com;  | Trustee | >15m trawl |
| Alan Steer | alan@superb-us.com | Chairman / Ex Com | 12m crabber |
| Peter Williams | freshfromtheboat@gmail.com | Trustee | <10m nets |
| Sean Dennison  | queline1138@gmail.com | Vice Chair / Ex Com | >12m crabber |
| Nick Prust  | nick@green-dale.co.uk  | Trustee | Scallop fleet |
| Gary Hodgson  | ventureseafoods@yahoo.co.uk | Trustee | Processing shellfish |
| Alex Philip | langdonandphilip@btconnect.com | Trustee | Beam trawl fleet owner |
| Michel Kaiser | michel.kaiser@bangor.ac.uk | Trustee | Bangor University |
| Steven Mackinson  | steve.mackinson@cefas.co.uk | Ex Com / Science Committee Chair | Cefas |
| Jim Evans  | jim@wfa-cpc.co.uk | Trustee | Welsh Fishermen’s Association |
| James Stephen  | harvesthope@outlook.com | Trustee | >15m white fish |
| Davey Hill  | davey@sea-source.com | Trustee | SeaSource NI |
| **Non-voting Trustees** |
| Ally Dingwall | Ally.Dingwall@sainsburys.co.uk | Trustee | Sainsbury’s |
| Alexa Dayton | adayton@gmri.org | Ex Com / Training Committee Chair | Gulf of Maine Research Institute |
| John Goodlad | john@nasfarms.com | Ex Com | International Sustainability Unit |
| Yiota Apostolaki | Panayiota.Apostolaki@defra.gsi.gov.uk  | Trustee | Defra |
| **Partners and Supporters (Afternoon of the 10th)** |
| Mike Park | mike@swfpa.com  | Scottish White Fish Producers Association |
| Tris Lewis | tris@fundingfish.eu  | FundingFISH |
| Klaas de Vos | kdevos@edf.org  | Environmental Defence Fund |
| Jerry Percy | director@lifeplatform.eu | Low Impact Fishers in Europe |
| Kenny Coull | K.Coull@sff.co.uk | Scottish Fishermen’s Federation |
| Dale Rodmell | dale.rodmell@nffo.org.uk  | National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations |
| Claire Pescod | claire.pescod@msc.org  | Marine Stewardship Council |
| Richard Slasky | execdir@fiscot.org  | Fisheries Innovation Scotland |
| Chris Leftwhich | Chris.Leftwich@fishhall.org.uk  | Fishmonger’s Company |
| Helen McLachlan | HMcLachlan@wwf.org.uk | World Wildlife Fund |

# APPENDIX II – Agenda

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Day** | **Session** | **Theme** | **Start time** | **Content** |
| 9th | **Evening** | Vision-setting | 19:30 | How would we like FitF to look in 5 years’ time? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **10th** | **Morning** | Registration | 08:30 | More vision-setting; orientation |
| Business meeting – AGM part 1 | 09:00 | Chairman’s AddressFinancial and Strategic ReportQ&A  |
| BREAK | 10:00 |  |
| Vision discussion | 10:15 | Offloading baggageLooking at themes and issues |
| Brixham sense-check | 11:00 | A first look at the outcomes from Brixham – are these topics still important to us? |
| Prioritisation of work areas | 11:50 | Which topics and work areas are now priorities for us? |
| LUNCH | 12:30 |  |
| **Afternoon** | Registration | 13:15 | Welcoming our guests for the afternoon |
| FitF briefing and Q&A | 13:35 | A chance for us all to get to know each other better – the priorities and visions for FitF |
| BREAK | 14:30 |  |
| Detailed discussions | 14:45 | Working in small groups to discuss each work area/theme in more detail |
| BREAK | 16:15 | Extended break for work-time |
| Consolidating outputs | 17:00 | Looking at outcomes from the day; decisions we can make; Project UK; briefing for tomorrow |
| **Evening** | **Meal** | **19:00** | We relocate to Spaghetti House on Goodge Street |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **11th** | **Morning** | Registration | 08:45 | Sign-in for the day |
| Charge for the Day | 09:00 | What struck you from yesterday? What guiding principles can we start to define for FitF? |
| BREAK | 09:45 |  |
| Action planning | 10:00 | What actions and measures of success can we now allocate to each work theme? |
| BREAK | 11:30 |  |
| AGM Part 2 | 11:45 | FitF governance issues; re-election of Trustee; voting on structures; Executive Committee members |
| Wrap-up | 12:45 | Summary of progress; leadership opportunities and commitments; feedback from the meeting – improving what we do |
| LUNCH/CLOSE | 13:30 | Depart  |