

**MINUTES 2<sup>nd</sup> MEETING**  
**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**MAHE PLATEAU TRAP AND LINE FISHERY CO-MANAGEMENT PLAN**

SFA Meeting Room, Fishing Port  
Wednesday 6 March 2019  
09:30 A.M.

**Introduction**

The second meeting of the Implementation Committee for the Co-Management Plan (ICCP) of the Mahe Plateau demersal trap and line fishery was held at the Meeting Room of the Seychelles Fishing Authority Conference, Fishing Port, on the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

**1. Opening to the meeting**

Mr. Calvin Gerry, Deputy CEO, SFA, welcomed the participants of the meeting.

The Chairperson noted that a response was still awaited from the MFAG on the Summary Report of the First Meeting. The PS of MFAG undertook for the Ministry to send a response at the earliest. He did not envision any major changes to Rules of Procedure or of the Membership of the Implementation Committee. With these considerations in mind, the participants agreed to proceed with the Meeting, on condition that all the decisions made during the current meeting would be held waiting, pending a response from the Ministry to the Summary report of the First meeting.

**2. Election of Officers**

The ICCP decided to postpone the election of Officers until a response was received from MFAG endorsing the Rules of Procedure and Membership of the Implementation Committee.

It was agreed that the Deputy CEO of SFA would have the task of chairing the ICCP until such time as a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson was elected.

### **3. Adoption of the Agenda**

The agenda was adopted and is presented in Appendix 1. The list of participants is presented in Appendix 2. It was noted that the Agenda should include 'Other Matters';

### **4. Management Plans and their Implementation**

The consultant, Mr. Aubrey Harris, made a general presentation on management plans. He explained what a management plan is according to the FAO guidelines, how it should incorporate the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), the stages of preparation and implementation of a management plan, and how the importance of implementation needs to be emphasized as compared to merely preparation of a plan. He concluded that Mahe Plateau trap and line fishery management plan had been developed along the lines of the EAF, was as relevant today as it had been in 2015, and that it should be briefly reviewed and implemented.

Following the presentation, the ICCP discussed the development of management plans. It was agreed that the current discussions should not preclude consideration of other management plans, in due course. In particular, the implementation of the Mahe Plateau co-management plan should not preclude the implementation of the Praslin co-management plan if it included stricter regulations that would enhance the sustainability of fish populations within its proposed co-management area. Development and implementation of management plans, however, were subject to stakeholder support, availability of funds and the capacity of the SFA resource management and research sections.

### **5. Presentation of the Mahe Plateau demersal trap and line demersal co-management plan**

The SWIOFish3 Coordinator, Dr Jan Robinson, presented assessments that had been made of the trap and line fishery in the preparation of the co-management plan. He traced the historical context, showed how the commercial fishery resource on the Mahe Plateau was fully developed, and explained the three levels of assessments made. These were at the qualitative level (Scale, Intensity, Consequence Analysis - SICA), at the semi-quantitative level (Productivity, Susceptibility Analysis – PSA) and at the quantitative level (standardised CPUE, length frequencies and production modelling). Their results were presented. The conclusion of these assessments was that there was a high risk of overfishing and that the stocks of certain key commercial species were overfished. Quite apart from the assessment results, the fishery as operating at the time (and currently) was unsustainable because it was open-access and unregulated (there were no limits on the number of fish caught, the levels of fishing effort, the number of fishing vessels /licences, or number of people fishing).

Following the presentation, the ICCP discussed some of the long-term changes that had taken place in the fishery, including of spawning aggregations, such as vyey davryl, and recent developments such as the discrete export of bourgeois caught by rich visitors engaged in recreational fishing. There was agreement that spawning aggregations should be better

protected, that there had been a drop in abundance of some species, and that fishers were now fishing for longer periods to catch the same or lesser amounts of fish.

Mr Vincent Lucas, CFO SFA, presented the Mahe Plateau co-management plan for the trap and line fishery. He refreshed the memories of the participants of its background, scope, the intense process of consultation that had taken place, its goal, the issues that had been raised by stakeholders during the consultations including the importance of transparency, the management measures that had been agreed, and the actions that were included in the co-management plan to be undertaken in two phases in order to address the issues in the fishery.

After the presentation, the ICCP was informed that it would be provided the draft TORS for a fishery Liaison officer for its consideration and approval at the next meeting. A fishery Liaison officer would be recruited urgently as a first action under the plan. The person would spend a lot of time with the fishers to increase their awareness of the plan and assist in the culture change required to successfully implement its actions and regulations.

The ICCP discussed the inconsistencies that exist in the current licencing system including for example that beche-de-mer fishery licensees were also obtaining licences to fish demersal fish on the Mahe plateau during the beche-de-mer closed season. It was agreed that the licencing system needed review (one of the actions in the co-management plan), and the ICCP noted that it was administratively easier to remove such anomalies if fisheries were not open-access and a limited licencing system was in place for each fishery.

Discussions followed on the actual fisheries regulations included for implementation under the first phase of the management plan. Some inconsistencies existed that could reduce their effectiveness as useful management measures. For example, sometimes bag limits were set as an amount of catch per person on the boat (e.g. recreational and sports) whilst at other times it was a limit for the entire boat (e.g. semi-industrial longliners). Also, sometimes it was based on the total catch, whilst at other times it was based on the catch of particular species. The ICCP agreed in principle to all the types of regulation in the co-management plan but deferred detailed discussions to a subsequent meeting during the implementation of the plan, when it would consider changes, as may be required.

## **6. Consideration of the comments received by FBOA**

The ICCP reviewed the responses received from SFA with regard to the comments made by FBOA on the co-management plan (see Annex 3).

The FBOA was in general agreement with the responses received from SFA but also pointed out that in several areas its comments were correct as was acknowledged by the SFA. As such it felt vindicated that it had contributed towards the co-management plan though it was unfortunate that this had led to delays in the co-management plan's implementation. There were lessons to be learnt by all parties to the process.

## 7. Other comments and consideration of the co-management plan for review and adoption

The ICCP proceeded to review the scope of the co-management plan:

It proposed that the term demersal should be dropped from the name of the plan considering the some of the fish groups included in the plan such as carangidae were primarily semi-pelagic although reef-associated.

It confirmed the types of fishers involved as: artisanal (licensed commercial), recreational (including sports fishers) and charter (hire craft).

It confirmed the gears covered under the plan as: handline, rod and reel, dropline, bottom-set dropline and traps.

It confirmed the target species as the fish mainly caught by the fishing gears covered under the plan: snappers, groupers, jobfish, emperors, trevallies, rabbitfish, parrotfish<sup>1</sup>.

It proposed to include sharks within the co-management plan considering these were mostly caught by bottom set lines or handlines and that the use of nets to fish sharks was illegal. The ICCP recognised that sharks were the subject of a National Plan of Action (NPOA) and that any measures that it may consider during the implementation of the plan would have to be consistent with the NPOA Sharks.

It proposed to remove any of those tuna and tuna-like species that are under the IOTC mandate<sup>2</sup>. Kawakawa (bonit) is currently in the co-management plan list of demersal species.

It proposed removing octopus since this was rarely caught with lines and traps and subject to another dive/spear/reef-gleaning fishery.

It proposed reviewing the area of competence of the co-management plan because: a) the Mahe Plateau bathymetry in figure 1 on the plan was incorrect; b) it restricted the plan to a depth of 300m and some plateau edge demersal fish such as *Pristipomoides* (kalkal) or *Etelis* (job la flamm) with populations extending deeper than 300m also needed to be covered; and c) it was inconsistent with previous legislation<sup>3</sup> relating to the Mahe Plateau and more recently with the Marine Spatial Plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> The list of species included in Appendix 1 of the management plan is not exhaustive. It could be made broader by including family or generic groupings instead of only species. Currently species not included in the list of species would be considered as non-target species under the co-management plan.

<sup>2</sup> These are: yellowfin, skipjack, big-eye, albacore, southern bluefin, longtail, frigate, kawakawa and bullet tunas; the spanish and king mackerels; the blue, black and striped marlins; the sailfish and the swordfish.

<sup>3</sup> Zone 1 of the First Schedule of Fisheries Act, Regulations, 1991

Following the review of the Mahe Plateau Co-management plan, the ICCP unanimously agreed to proceed with the gazetting and implementation of the plan. It requested the reviewed plan in its form ready for gazetting be provided for its adoption at the next meeting.

#### **8. Other matters:**

In discussions during the meeting, the Secretariat agreed to set up a dropbox for the ICCP which initially would contain a socio-economic survey that had been undertaken as part of the IFAD/CLISSA project.

#### **9. Date and Place of the next meeting**

The next meeting of the Implementation Committee will take place on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> March at the SFA Meeting Room, Fishing Port.

# Appendix 1

## Agenda

### **1. Opening to the Meeting**

*Remarks by the SFA as Chairman a.i.*

### **2. Election of Officers**

*Members will elect a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson. This shall be for a period of two years from either primary or secondary stakeholder groups but both Officers **must not** be from the same stakeholder group. Their functions and responsibilities are described in the Rules of Procedure.*

### **3. Adoption of the agenda**

*To be moved by the new Chairperson*

### **4. Management Plans and their implementation**

*A general presentation on fishery management plans, their importance and implementation by the Consultant, Mr Aubrey Harris.*

### **5. Presentation of the Mahe Plateau demersal trap and line demersal co-management plan**

*A presentation on the co-management plan will be undertaken by Mr Vincent Lucas, CFO, SFA and Dr Jan Robinson, SWIOFish3 Coordinator. Participants are referred to three documents (ICCP2/WD/2, ICCP2/ID/3, ICCP/ID/4) on the management plan that will be provided before the meeting.*

### **6. Consideration of the comments received by FBOA**

*Participants are referred to a letter by FBOA and the response provided by SFA in two documents provided before the meeting. (ICCP2/ID/2; ICCP2/WD/3)*

### **7. Other comments and consideration of the co-management plan for review and adoption**

*The meeting will review the management plan deciding on the changes it may wish to make to the plan and consider it for adoption. (ICCP2/WD/2)*

### **8. Other matters**

### **9. Date and place of the next meeting**

*To be decided*

## Appendix 2

### List of Participants

#### Members and Stakeholders

Rose-Marie Bargain	Blue Economy Alternate
Jean Claude Hoareau	Fish Tech Representative
Beatty Hoareau	Fishermen and Boat Owners Association (FBOA) Alternate
Wilna Accouche	Green Island Foundation (GIF) Representative
Jude Talma	Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture Representative
Darrel Green	Praslin Fishers Association Representative
Calvin Gerry	Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA) Representative
Grant Heyer	Seychelles Sport Fishing Club (SSFC) Representative
<b>SFA Secretariat</b>	
Vincent Lucas	SFA Chief Fisheries Officer
Aubrey Harris	SFA Consultant
Elisa Socrate	SFA Fisheries Officer
Yannick Roucou	SFA Legal Adviser
Johnny Louys	SFA MCS Manager
Mellissa Joseph	SFA Technical Officer
Jan Robinson	SWIOFish3 Coordinator

Area	FBOA Comment numbers	ANNEX 3	
		FBOA concerns	SFA responses
Consultation process and involvement of FBOA in early planning	Introductory paragraphs and 15, 16	Top down approach; wish to pursue true co-management; need sufficient valuation of fisher knowledge; real stakeholder representation required throughout entire process of development and implementation; mutual learning and information sharing; Don't think there was heavy consultation; FBOA not implicated at the very beginning; complicated for fishers to be present at all workshops; meetings should be designed so fishers feel comfortable and engaged.	SFA rejects that the consultation process was a top down approach. Instead it was a plan for which there was probably the most consultation with stakeholders than ever before, with mutual learning and information sharing. FBOA was implicated from the very beginning (11 of its members attended the first workshop on 6 Nov 2014) and throughout. The development process very much tried to engage fishers in a casual and comfortable manner. <b><i>(The details of all the consultations are attached in Annex 2.)</i></b> A consultation process can always be improved. The members of the Implementation Committee (including FBOA) can direct and improve this process through the development of a stakeholder communication strategy which is one of the early actions within the co-management plan
Co-management Plan and the Marine Spatial Plan	1	Should avoid overlap between too many management tools (sic) instruments. Unclear of the relationship between the MSP and this co-management plan. Have been receiving different conflicting messages about their area of competencies (e.g. the territorial waters).	Agree particularly if the management frameworks lead to duplication of actions or overlapping, ambiguous mandates. This should not happen when there is good cross sectoral stakeholder consultation, and in an environment where the fisheries sector is showing responsible stewardship of its resources. Territorial waters are included under the MSP but will have to be surveyed and demarcated before any zoning. This is a complex and costly process. Mahe Plateau is demarcated as a zone 2 under MSP – a sustainably managed zone. Therefore, it is important that it is managed under a Management Plan. This co-management plan is for the Mahe Plateau and provides for the sustainable management of trap and line fish in that zone.
Implementation of actions that are in the management plan	2	Does SFA have to lead activities. Some activities such as regarding co-management should be coordinated by a neutral partner.	No, others including fisher associations can lead activities. The plan is adopting a co-management approach hence all stakeholders will be engaged in all stages of the process. This is one of the reasons for setting up an Implementation Committee.
The selection of consultants to develop the co-management plan	3, ending general comments	Wished counter-expertise to be sought; FBOA and fishers should be consulted regarding choice of consultant	The process of selection of consultants is usually determined by a selection panel operating in a process agreeable to the funding partner. The process followed the UNDP procurement procedures. There are technical skills and experience expected of the members of the selection panel. For that reason, it can be difficult to include particular fisher associations in the panel. Nevertheless, it can be something to consider further depending on the technical area and the funding partner's requirements. Selection of consultants – They were all highly respected scientists with vast experience in their specific field: Dr Nicholas Gutierrez; Dr Brigid Kerrigan; David Welch; Dr Jan Robinson; Dr Jude Bijoux.
Stakeholder groups and the intent of the plan	4,9,20,24	Definition of the fisheries sector and the various groups of fishers that will be impacted not clear enough; participations of processors, buyers, hotels and restaurants required; hotels have to be involved because they impact the market size of fish; sports and recreational fishery target demersal fish, more than artisanal boats, well-equipped; fisheries need to be described with regard to targeted species; areas of operation, limits or quotas, fishing effort (size of boats, engine capacity, no of men on board, gear, hooks etc); description required in the regulation section on long-line as a fishery targeting pelagic species only whereas licences issued to them	The Implementation Committee has a structured way by which various groups of fishers and other stakeholders will be able to represent their interests and contribute to implementation of the co-management plan.  The fisheries need not be described in great detail in the plan. The plan can refer to other documents that do. Too much description can detract focus on the actions which is the ultimate intent of the plan



		allow them to target demersal species as well. Proposed regulation refers to bag limits for semi-industrial fisheries, but semi-industrial fisheries not mentioned in scope.	Some of the comments relate to the scope of the plan which may benefit from some further consideration.  There is a revision of semi-industrial fishery licences taking place to prevent targeting of demersal species. The bag limit of demersal species for the semi-industrial fishery allows for vessel and crew consumption only.
Species involved	5,6,7	Octopus and semi-pelagic in fish list but no description given on them and their fishery; trevally, blue and gold fusilier, dolphinfish mentioned. Octopus included but not sea-cucumber, sharks and crabs; Fish regulated by the plan includes pelagic and semi-pelagic fish; will have effect on impact and user groups yet this is not acknowledged. We have to consider all species (bottom-dwelling) and perhaps include pelagic and semi-pelagic as well. Will they be subject of another plan? Trevallies are not demersal but considered in assessments as overfished demersal.	The management plan is for the fish caught by the trap and line fishery on the Mahe Plateau. This should be captured in the list of species which can be considered either as target species or bycatch. If there are errors in the list provided, they can be corrected.  In time, if stakeholders consider that their interests and the protection of fishery resources are not being properly advanced in this plan, they can move to develop other more specific plans for particular areas, fishing methods or species of interest, or extend the scope of this plan.
Co-management; implementation of the plan; Implementation Committee – rights and responsibilities	8, concluding general paragraph	Need to clearly define co-management. Co-management has to be a reality not only in the development of the plan but also in its implementation. Appropriate stakeholder participation is still insufficient. Consultation and real involvement of stakeholders is a key to success. Implementation (sic -Steering) Committee should involve representatives of all key stakeholders, should be more explicit what are the rights and responsibilities of such a committee and its legal basis.	Co-management is defined in the 2014 Fisheries Act. Co-management integral part of the implementation of the plan and structure envisaged by the plan and operationalised by the Implementation Committee provides a formal two-way engagement with government on management issues. The nature of this engagement is detailed in the Rules of Procedure of the Implementation Committee.
Independence from the Praslin Management plan	10,11,12,29	Considers that the Mahe Plateau co-management plan is largely based on the Praslin experience; besides the use of similar fishing gear however the communities, their functioning, fish handling, processing, and marketing are totally different; infers that the Mahe Plateau co-management plan is a copy of the Praslin co-management framework; need to examine how the Praslin co-management plan differs and overlaps with the Mahe fishery and what can be learnt from the Praslin example rather than copy and pasting; uses sentence from Mahe Plateau management plan document “the development of the co-management plan on Praslin preceded the development of this plan and thereby served as a pilot exercise for the development of the one for the Mahe Plateau” to justify its assertion.	It would have been irresponsible to develop a management plan for trap and line fish on the Mahe Plateau without considering one that had already been developing in Praslin. That said: 1) consultation process described in Annex 2 & list of stakeholders demonstrate that this was not a copying and pasting job of the Praslin plan. 2) Consultants for the two plans were different as was their final format. 3) Praslin plan was designed for the Praslin area only and mainly involved consultation with Praslinois stakeholders. 4) Mahe plan was for the whole plateau and involved stakeholders from Mahe, Praslin & La Digue. 5) Many of the issues in the Praslin and Mahe plan are similar as are some of the management options identified by fishers in each process. 6) Some consistency was required between the plans as they both address the same stocks in some cases so as to avoid transfer of effort and catch between zones if management measures are more favourable in one zone compared to the other.7) Actually, management options identified in the Mahe plan were used to revise measures in the Praslin plan to ensure consistency.  The relationship between the two co-management plans is still to be determined but since the Praslin and La Digue Fisher Associations are members of this Implementation Committee, the matter can be raised in subsequent meetings and resolved to the satisfaction of all stakeholders.
How objectives, management measures and other actions were identified and selected	2,13,22,23,31,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,43,45	Consultation with fishers to develop a framework to facilitate two-way engagement with government on management issues into the future should be worked out better; Asserts against the claims of findings of stakeholder workshops on Mahe and Praslin during November 2014. Despite identification of 180 fishery issues, claims the discussions were not comprehensive and did not reach a common position at the end of the workshop; sought Praslin fishers feedback on their management plan; consider that not only the mesh size is important, but also the non-biodegradable material increasingly being used and effect of ghost fishing; there should be a mandatory limit of the total number of traps to be fished by a fisher; each trap should have plastic tag linked to the owners boat no; during workshops fishers not prepared or informed that discussions would lead to actual measures; illegal fishing is a BIG issue and IUU fishing a priority;	The objectives and management measures were identified through stakeholder consultation ( <b>see Annex 2</b> ).  The comments are numerous, diverse and sometimes contradictory. Sometimes they are arguments for regulations, actions and management strategies in the plan, and sometimes they argue against. Sometimes they suggest additional regulations or propose how regulations should be implemented.

		<p>minimum size limit for bourzwa and job of 32cm is a good and important measure but wished to know if realistic; why is there a limit only for job and bourzwa as not the most endangered; referred to LABLE project; need to associate processors and buyers in enforcement; awareness campaign; may be difficult to enforce bag limit based on species; sale of fish caught by recreational and sports fishing should be restricted; combined demersal species bag limit of 20 fish per person per day could be enforced if they are not allowed to sell their catch; implementation and enforcement will depend on the involvement and good will of fishers; recreational fishers should not have an allocation of 2 traps per person; licencing system for long-line vessels inconsistent in relation fishing for demersal fish on the Mahe Plateau; Long-line boats should not be authorised to fish on the Plateau; questions whether impact study will be done between phase 1 and phase 2 of the co-management plan (40); supports the development of a licencing framework for greater monitoring, control and possible future reduction in fishing effort. Needs to be done together with better nomenclature/classification of the fleet and should be the first activity of the domestic department of SFA. Schooners and whalers should not be allowed to carry traps;</p>	<p>SFA suggests that FBOA holds on to its ideas, suggestions and proposals and raise these later in subsequent meetings when the detail of the actions and management strategies and their implementation is up for discussion.</p>
Socio-economic studies impact/assessments	14,25	<p>Convinced a socio-economic study and impact assessment should have preceded the management plan. Socio-economic study still needs to take place. Plan mentions 'socio-economic surveys conducted from time to time'. Any results? When were they conducted?</p>	<p>It is true that there has been a lack of socio-economic studies and that the ones previously undertaken are dated<sup>4</sup>. This is an aspect that can be taken up as an action under the co-management plan.</p>
Data and impact of the plan	17,30	<p>The management plan has to be an opportunity organise data collection through fishers, fish-buyers, and consumers. How can we evaluate the impact of any measure if we do not have reliable data at the beginning? (socio-economic study, level of exploitation of the stock, evaluation of impact of illegal activities) at the point of departure and indicators to measure the impact of the management plan.</p>	<p>There is opportunity to better organise data collection through fishers, fish buyers, sports and recreational fishers. But SFA has been collecting fisheries information since its inception in 1984. There are gaps in the data and the extent of their reliability and deficiency is known (e.g. sports, recreational and spatial fishing effort). However, it is wrong to say that there are no baselines upon which to evaluate impact of the management plan. This co-management plan has a <b>performance measuring framework</b> against which to measure its impact<sup>5</sup> which has also been circulated as an information document. Under the precautionary approach lack of full scientific certainty is not an excuse not to take management action (<b>see Annex 3</b>)</p>
The stock assessment methods	18,21,26,27,34;43	<p>Queried the concern voiced by fishers, processors, fisheries managers on the state of resources in relation to undersized fish, whether it was documented and whether there had been conflicts of interest; Fishers' knowledge should be used for data gathering and management of the fishery; queried whether recent risk and stock assessment results were based on reliable scientific data; that stock depletion may not be due to the fishing effort of the legal fishing fleet alone; the impact of IUU vessels; impact of sports and recreational fishing; whether there is an estimation of the stock that can be sustainably fished; whether there is any basis to the minimum size of bourzwa, job; minimum size limits and Lm50<sup>6</sup></p>	<p>The FBOA is referred to the attached detailed information on the <b>stock assessments used in support of the co-management plan provided in Annex 3</b>. Fishers' knowledge was used in the assessment of the risks to various species. The stock assessments were based on the best available scientific data at the time and in keeping with international best practices. Multiple approaches were taken to the assessments so as to improve their dependability. For the more common species, there are estimations of the stock that can be sustainably fished generally as guides rather than absolute values upon which to consider quotas. Lm50 is a measure often used internationally to determine minimum size limits particularly in heavily fished fisheries. The proposed minimum size of 32cm for bourgeois and job is a concession in response to the views expressed by</p>

<sup>4</sup> C. Mees 1989. Socio-economic survey of fisheries. SFA Technical Report; C. Mees 1990. The fishermen of Seychelles – results of a socio-economic study of the Seychelles fishing community. SFA Technical Report; R Wakeford 2000. Management of the Seychelles artisanal fishery. PhD Thesis.

<sup>5</sup> B. Kerrigan and D Welch 2015. Mahe Plateau demersal trap and line fishery: Performance Measurement System. GOS-UNDP-GEF

<sup>6</sup> Length at 50% maturity.

			stakeholders as the LM50 for those species is considerably larger. The available evidence suggests that the depletion of the stocks is not due to legal commercial fishing alone but include other impacts such as IUU, sports and recreational fishers. When increased regulation and management is required in a fishery it is normally required across all the identified sources of impact. The co-management plan is a dynamic process which will evolve and take into consideration other concerns.
Harmonisation of previous regulations and initiatives	19,28	Observes that while there may be no official management plan there are numerous other regulatory and other activities e.g. NPOA sharks; label project, research on maturity/size of bourzwa; sea-cucumber fishery management plan; control of lobster fishery; marine parks; gear regulations; the FISH CENTRE which is structure for valuating, control and data collection; management plan should help harmonise these activities; need to examine current measures in place and what can be learnt from them; label/eco-label is an appropriate solution for the management sustainability and valuation of demersal fish fully supported by fishers	Regulations, projects, initiatives and actions in themselves are not a management plan.  “A fisheries management plan is a formal or informal arrangement between a fishery management authority and interested parties which identifies the partners in the fishery and their respective roles, details the agreed objectives for the fishery and specifies the management rules and regulations which apply to it and provides other details about the fishery which are relevant to the task of the management authority”. (FAO Technical Guideline for Responsible Fisheries 1997)  Label/eco-labelling without a sustainable management plan????
Communication with the wider public and fishers	32,33	Stressed the importance of developing and implementing a stakeholder communication strategy. Required for stakeholders to be part of the plan; fishers wish to be engaged in designing a management plan but not necessarily meetings and workshops. Workshops should be geared to enhance their participation; fishers should be compensated for at least their travel costs and lunch and so on as they have to take a day off; if we need to exchange ideas with fishers from Praslin, a budget should be set aside for their participation(travel costs etc); a fishery liaison officer is a start but what is really needed is a department for the small-scale fishery. Sceptical as considers some of the sentences in the co-management plan document on consultation not truly reflective of the degree that they were consulted. Fishers feel very bad where their participation is not taken seriously	Communication and awareness were key elements of the development of the plan. It aimed to reach out to fishers who could not attend the workshops. All forms of media were used – radio, tv, newspaper and social media adverts to reach as wide as audience as possible. This included a media pack which detailed information about the project and the process and included a booklet, background information on the fishery, with Q&A. A local company, Metissage, was contracted specifically to provide media support and content. Promotional materials (e.g. caps + t-shirts were widely distributed to around 200 recipients in the fishing community) Agree that a stakeholder communication strategy is vital for the implementation of the plan. This is an action expected in the early part of phase one starting with the recruitment of a fishery Liaison Officer. It is expected that FBOA and other Fisher Associations will assist with the development and implementation of this strategy so that it uses appropriate means of communication with the fishers.
SFA domestic department	33,41,46	Real need at SFA to have a department dedicated to the DOMESTIC. fishery and with all the measures that are due to be implemented under the plan, unrealistic to think of a single officer. The fleet needs to be managed, all fishers need to be registered, traps tagged, number of men on boats limited, size of boats limited, etc. This is the work for a department, and it will be very positive for SFA.	The proposal for an SFA department [sic] or section dedicated to the domestic fishery/ies is noted. This is under consideration within the new financial autonomy status. SFA has a Strategic Plan 2018-2020 which will be guiding its work over the period. One of the 2019 actions planned under the strategy is the implementation of a new organisational structure for improved service delivery.
Management strategies	42, 44,46	One of the management strategies is ‘Introduce a revised incentive scheme’. Need more clarification on the proposed revision. Two Management strategies: “SFA to develop a framework to facilitate the ongoing capacity of the fishing industry to engage SFA on management issues” and “Introduce offset provisions to compensate ecosystem impacts affecting the fishery” should be defined and discussed with stakeholders and should be tasks of the new domestic department.	Members and stakeholders of the Implementation Committee (including FBOA) have the responsibility of oversight and approval or otherwise of any of the management strategies proposed under the plan. There is also monitoring, evaluation and review of the plan. All an inclusive process.
Enforcement	Concluding general paragraph	On MCS implementation, training is inadequate; no sufficient workshops with fishing industry representatives. There needs to be training/enforcement/involvement on the market side where the illegal product ends up.	Agree.



