



House of Commons
Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs Committee

Beyond the Common Fisheries Policy: Scrutiny of the Fisheries Bill

Eleventh Report of Session 2017–19



House of Commons

Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs Committee

Beyond the Common Fisheries Policy: Scrutiny of the Fisheries Bill

Eleventh Report of Session 2017–19

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 16 January 2019*

HC 1722

Published on 20 January 2019
by authority of the House of Commons

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Neil Parish MP](#) (*Conservative, Tiverton and Honiton*) (Chair)

[Alan Brown MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Kilmarnock and Loudoun*)

[Paul Flynn MP](#) (*Labour, Newport West*)

[John Grogan MP](#) (*Labour, Keighley*)

[Dr Caroline Johnson MP](#) (*Conservative, Sleaford and North Hykeham*)

[Kerry McCarthy MP](#) (*Labour, Bristol East*)

[Sandy Martin MP](#) (*Labour, Ipswich*)

[Mrs Sheryll Murray MP](#) (*Conservative, South East Cornwall*)

[David Simpson MP](#) (*Democratic Unionist Party, Upper Bann*)

[Angela Smith MP](#) (*Labour, Penistone and Stocksbridge*)

[Julian Sturdy MP](#) (*Conservative, York Outer*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/efracom and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the inquiry publications page of the [Committee's website](#).

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Philip Aylett (Committee Clerk), Sian Woodward (Committee Clerk), Ben Street (Second Clerk), Xameerah Malik (Senior Committee Specialist), Andy French (Committee Specialist), James Hockaday (Senior Committee Assistant), Ian Blair (Committee Assistant), Annabel Russell (Committee Assistant) and Joe Williams (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 7341; the Committee's email address is efracom@parliament.uk.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
	Our inquiry	3
2	Fisheries policy in the UK	4
	The Common Fisheries Policy	4
	The Fisheries Bill	5
3	Governance	7
	Reporting and assessment	7
	Delegated powers	9
	Fisheries management in England	11
4	Fishing Opportunities	14
	Additional opportunities	14
	Discards policy	16
5	Sustainability and coastal communities	18
	Maximum Sustainable Yield	18
	The UK's international commitments	18
	Sustainability in the Bill	19
	Coastal Communities	22
	EMFF Funding	23
	Recreational Fishing	24
	Conclusions and recommendations	26
	Formal minutes	29
	Witnesses	30
	Published written evidence	31
	List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	33

1 Introduction

1. The Fisheries Bill was published by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) on 25 October 2018. The Government described it as a Bill to “create powers to build a sustainable, profitable UK fishing industry and deliver a Green Brexit with new protections for our precious marine environment”.¹

2. During its Second Reading in the House of Commons on 21 November 2018, the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, explained that the Bill would create the powers the UK needed to operate as an independent coastal state after leaving the EU. He highlighted that:

becoming an independent coastal state will give us an opportunity to lead environmentally, to revive the fishing industry economically and to ensure that our coastal communities once more have the opportunity for a renaissance.²

Our inquiry

3. This Bill will shape the future of the UK fishing industry, impact upon coastal communities and the sustainability of the UK’s fisheries and those it shares with the EU and other coastal states, so we have closely followed its development. We were therefore extremely disappointed that the Government did not give us the opportunity to conduct pre-legislative scrutiny of the draft Bill.

4. **The Government should as a matter of course enable House of Commons’ Committees to conduct pre-legislative scrutiny on bills of this importance.**

5. We launched our inquiry, Scrutiny of the Fisheries Bill, on 1 November 2018.³ We received around 46 written submissions and held four oral evidence sessions with a range of witnesses, including George Eustice MP, Minister of State for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. We would like to thank everyone who contributed to this inquiry.

6. This Report is presented to the House before the Bill’s Report Stage to inform debate and scrutiny. We trust our recommendations will be considered by the Government and by Members from all parties. We have prioritised key areas raised in the evidence we received. In particular, Chapter Three sets out governance issues raised by the Bill, Chapter Four examines questions of fishing opportunities and Chapter Five discusses sustainability and coastal communities.

1 [Gove launches fisheries bill to take back control of UK waters](#), Defra, 25 October 2018

2 HC Deb, 21 November 2018, [cols 897–98](#) [Commons Chamber]

3 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Scrutiny of the Fisheries Bill inquiry](#), accessed 16 January 2019

2 Fisheries policy in the UK

The Common Fisheries Policy

7. The Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) governs European fishing fleets and fish stock conservation. It began in 1970 and was most recently reformed in 2014.⁴ The CFP grants all European fishing fleets equal access to EU waters to create fair competition. It aims to ensure that European fishing is sustainable, balancing fishing with conservation.⁵

Box 1: Scope of the CFP⁶

The primary policy areas covered by the CFP are:

- Shared access for EU fishing vessels to EU Member States' waters;
- Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and fishing opportunities for key fish stocks for each Member State, that are agreed annually in December between EU Member States;
- The representation of EU Member States by the European Commission in negotiations with third countries and in international fisheries agreements; and,
- Directly applicable fisheries management legislation.

8. The CFP manages fisheries in Member States through measures that control how many tonnes of fish can be harvested each year (quotas), and through technical regulations. It also provides structural funding to fishing communities and fishers,⁷ regulates marketing standards for fish products and sets autonomous tariff quotas for fish imports.⁸

9. Fisheries are prone to over-exploitation, and political borders do not apply; many species move freely between national territorial waters. According to the 2016 *Brexit: Fisheries* report by the House of Lords European Union Committee: “In the absence of co-operative management of stocks that are shared by two or more countries, fish become vulnerable to over-exploitation”, and co-ordination and a shared approach is often required in order to manage the resource.⁹

10. The CFP aims to ensure that fishing and aquaculture are “environmentally, economically and socially sustainable” and that they provide a source of nutritious food for EU citizens. Its stated goal is to foster a “dynamic fishing industry and ensure a fair standard of living for fishing communities”.¹⁰

4 European Commission, [Reform of the common fisheries policy](#), accessed 16 January 2019

5 European Commission, [The Common Fisheries Policy \(CFP\)](#), accessed 16 January 2019

6 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill \[Bill 278 \(2017–19 –EN\)\]](#), page 6; The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018

7 For example, in 2016, the UK was allocated €243 million from the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund. European Commission, [European Maritime and Fisheries Fund \(EMFF\)](#), accessed 16 January 2019

8 European Commission, [The Common Fisheries Policy \(CFP\)](#), page accessed 16 January 2019

9 House of Lords, *Brexit: fisheries*, Eighth Report of the Committee on the European Union, Session 2016–17, [HL Paper 78](#), page 6

10 European Commission, [The Common Fisheries Policy \(CFP\)](#), page accessed 16 January 2019

11. Historically, the CFP was criticised for mismanaging stocks and incentivising overfishing. In 2009, the Scottish Government described it as “the EU’s most unpopular and discredited policy”.¹¹ The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) told us that one of the worst features of the CFP had been its “inflexible rigidity”.¹² Prior to 2015, the discarding of undersized fish or fish that were over a vessel’s quota under the CFP caused particular concern.¹³ This was reformed from January 2015, obliging fishers to land all catches.

The Fisheries Bill

12. In July 2017, the Secretary of State announced that the UK would withdraw from the London Fisheries Convention that the UK had joined in 1964. This largely covers the management of fisheries within the North Sea, along with other Western European coastal nations.¹⁴

13. In July 2017, the Secretary of State announced that when the UK left the EU it would also withdraw from the CFP.¹⁵ In July 2018, the White Paper on *The future relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union* stated that:

On leaving the EU, the UK will become an independent coastal state under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). As a result, the UK will control access to fish in its waters, both in territorial seas and the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).¹⁶

14. The Fisheries White Paper set out Defra’s vision for UK fisheries policy, which was that “leaving the EU and the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) gives us the opportunity to introduce a sustainable, responsive and resilient new fisheries policy”.¹⁷ It explained that Defra’s “aim is to build a vibrant and sustainable UK fishing industry by taking responsibility for managing fisheries resources within UK waters, while continuing to protect and improve the marine environment, in line with [the] 25 Year Environment Plan”.¹⁸

15. The Fisheries Bill establishes the legal framework for the UK to operate as an independent coastal state under UNCLOS after the UK has left the EU and the CFP. Its provisions create the framework for a common approach to fisheries management between the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations and reforms fisheries management in England.¹⁹ It includes:

- Fisheries objectives and fisheries statements;
- Access arrangements to UK waters;

11 [Scottish Government’s Response to the European Commission’s Green Paper on Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy](#), December 2009, accessed 16 January 2019

12 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 2

13 Institute for Government, [Common Fisheries Policy](#), accessed 16 January 2019.

14 [UK takes key step towards fair new fishing policy after Brexit](#), Defra Press release, 2 July 2017

15 [“UK to ‘take back control’ of waters after exiting fishing convention”](#), The Guardian, 2 Jul 2017

16 HM Government, *The future relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union*, [CM 9593](#), Para 54

17 Defra, *Sustainable fisheries for future generations*, [CM 9660](#), July 2018, page 6

18 Defra, *Sustainable fisheries for future generations*, [CM 9660](#), July 2018, page 8

19 [Explanatory Note to the Fisheries Bill \[Bill 305 \(2017–19 –EN\)\]](#), page 4

- Licensing;
- Fishing opportunities;
- Discard prevention charging scheme;
- Protection of the marine environment, and;
- Cost recovery powers for the Marine Management Organisation.²⁰

16. The EU regulations of the CFP will be retained in UK law under the EU (Withdrawal) Act 2018. In addition to the Fisheries Bill, Defra plans to lay statutory instruments to correct retained EU law on fisheries to make it operable in UK law.²¹

17. Jim Portus, Executive Secretary, South Western Fish Producer Organisation, told us that:

If we get this Fisheries Bill right—and I think there is room for some amendments to it before it becomes law—we will be in the good position to transit from where we are to where we want to be simply because the common fisheries policy itself embodies in its legislation most of the tenets of the United Nations Convention.²²

18. In considering the Fisheries Bill, Parliament is presented with a once-in-a-generation opportunity to evaluate and address the concerns raised about the Common Fisheries Policy.

20 [Explanatory Note to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 305 (2017–19 –EN)], pages 4–5

21 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19), page 15; The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, pages 22–23

22 [Q119](#)

3 Governance

Reporting and assessment

19. The Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) involves a series of reporting processes whereby Member States gather data and report to the European Commission. The Commission reports annually to the European Parliament and the Council. The Commission is due to conduct a review and report to the European Parliament and the Council by 31 December 2022, on the functioning of the CFP.²³

20. Clauses 1 to 6 of the Fisheries Bill set out a number of fisheries objectives that the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations must aim to achieve when setting out their policies in two new policy documents: a Joint Fisheries Statement (JFS) and the Secretary of State's Fisheries Statement (SSFS).²⁴

21. The objectives in Clause 1 of the Bill reflect the CFP's objectives, and will become the objectives for the UK Fisheries Administrations and the Secretary of State. They are the sustainability objective, the precautionary objective, the ecosystem objective and the discards objective. The House of Commons Library noted that although the majority of the wording of the CFP's objectives has been replicated in Clause 1 and 2, "the CFPs commitment to achieve a maximum sustainable yield exploitation of fish stocks by 2020 is not included" (see Chapter 5).²⁵ Clause 1 adds two new objectives to those in the CFP:

- i) a 'scientific evidence objective', to "(a) to contribute to the collection of scientific data, and (b) to base fisheries management policy on the best available scientific advice" - a commitment in Defra's 25 Year Environment Plan to base fisheries policy on scientific evidence and which was supported by the majority of respondents to the White Paper consultation;²⁶ and
- ii) an 'equal access objective', guaranteeing equal access for UK fishing boats to all UK waters, which the Government included as a commitment in its Fisheries White Paper and which its Summary of responses said received strong support.²⁷

22. Clauses 2 to 6 cover the JFS and the SSFS. The Secretary of State and the Devolved Administrations will be required to publish a JFS setting out the policies which would contribute to the common achievement of those objectives; and the Secretary of State will publish a SSFS to address a set of more detailed objectives not covered by the JFS.²⁸

23. The Bill does not include a duty to meet the fisheries objectives but does impose a duty to produce the first JFS and SSFS by January 2021 (the end of the intended implementation period). The Secretary of State and the Devolved Administrations will be required to

23 Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Common Fisheries Policy, [\(EU\) No 1380/2013](#)

24 [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 28

25 [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 25

26 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 28

27 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 28–29; Defra, Sustainable fisheries for future generations, [CM 9660](#), July 2018; Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 4

28 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 28–29

pursue the policies outlined in the statements and review them at least every six years.²⁹ The Explanatory Notes explain that the purpose of the JFS “is to recognise that, although fisheries is devolved, none of the Fisheries Administrations acting alone could achieve the fisheries objectives. The intended effect of the statement would be to set out and coordinate fisheries policies after the UK has left the EU”.³⁰

24. Clause 6 of the Bill requires the relevant national authorities to pursue the policies outlined in the relevant fisheries statements which apply to them “unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise”.³¹ This condition is required to enable flexible decision-making. This allows divergence from JFS-policies, where occasionally required.³²

25. Inquiry respondents generally supported the fisheries objectives, although there was some difference of opinion, with many suggesting particular amendments. On the sustainability objective, fishing industry respondents favoured a less stringent approach; whilst environmental NGOs wanted stronger requirements (see Chapter 5). Most respondents supported using fisheries statements but had reservations. For example, the National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) said although policies in the statements will be legally binding, it appeared that a fisheries administration “can escape the provisions of the joint statement merely by providing a valid reason for departing from the agreed policy. There is therefore an inherent ambiguity over how [the Fisheries Objectives] would work in practice, especially in areas where frictions arise”.³³ The NFFO called for the establishment of a dispute resolution mechanism.³⁴

26. Most NGOs said they wanted there to be a duty on all relevant public authorities (not just national authorities as the Bill proposes) to achieve the fisheries objectives and a requirement for annual updates on progress against objectives.³⁵

27. Professor Richard Barnes, a Law Professor at the University of Hull (Law of the Sea), said “the Bill should include [a] provision requiring the Secretary of State or fisheries policy authorities to ensure that the fisheries objectives will be implemented [...] this would be best achieved by framing the objectives as duties”, replacing the weaker terms currently in the Bill.³⁶ He also said fisheries statements must be subject to full and transparent scrutiny and may need to be more rigorous and explicitly include statutory consultees and a minimum period for public consultation.³⁷

28. The Law Society of Scotland said it “welcome the requirements for review of the statements under Clause 5, however, suggest that this could be strengthened by a requirement to publish the conclusions of such a review”.³⁸ It said the wording in Clause

29 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 28

30 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)], page 17

31 [Fisheries Bill 2017–19](#), Clause 6(1) [Bill 278 (2017–19)]

32 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)], page 17

33 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 6

34 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 6

35 For example, Greener UK ([SFB0030](#)); Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) ([SFB0017](#)); and Nature Matters NI & Northern Ireland Marine Task Force ([SFB0019](#))

36 Richard Barnes ([SFB0016](#)), page 1, 3

37 Professor Richard Barnes ([SFB0016](#)), page 3

38 Law Society of Scotland ([SFB0026](#)), page 3

6 “unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise”, whereby fisheries administrations can diverge from JFS-policies depending on the circumstances, is unclear and requires clarification.³⁹

29. We asked the Minister of State for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to explain the basis for setting the review for Fisheries Statements “at least every 6 years”, under what circumstances the Government would expect to review the statements sooner and if they would be subject to expert assessment. He responded:

when you draft pieces of legislation [...] you try, as far as possible, to be consistent with what has been said in previous legislation and to have some consistency. If you needed to look for a review period, we looked at the Marine and Coastal Access Act, which had provisions for marine spatial planning. In that Act, they set six years as being the period over which you should review. We then took the view that, if things changed more quickly or there was a dynamic change in the scientific advice, you might want to review those plans sooner.⁴⁰

30. The Minister said the two circumstances where statements may be reviewed are “if there was a genuine fundamental change in the science of some particular element that you needed to reflect, and [...] [if] a new Government took over and had different priorities and manifesto commitments and therefore wanted to review and amend the joint fisheries statement”.⁴¹ The Minister said any expert assessment may be undertaken by the Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas).⁴²

31. The process of developing and reviewing the Joint Fisheries Statement (JFS) and the Secretary of State’s Fisheries Statement (SSFS) is an opportunity to provide clear direction and effective coordination for the UK’s fisheries policy as an independent coastal state. However, it is essential that the JFS and SSFS are subject to a shortened review period and independent expert assessment to help facilitate more rigorous scrutiny.

32. The Government should amend the Bill so that the Joint Fisheries Statements (for the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations) and the Secretary of State’s Fisheries Statement will: (a) be subject to an interim review every three years and full review every six years; and (b) comprise an expert and independent published assessment that can be subject to public and parliamentary scrutiny.

Delegated powers

33. The Common Fisheries Policy is set out in Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013,⁴³ and comprises approximately 100 technical regulations which provide for a common approach

39 Law Society of Scotland ([SFB0026](#)), page 4

40 [Q283](#)

41 [Q283](#)

42 [Qq286–287](#). Cefas is an executive agency, sponsored by Defra which collects, manages and interprets data on the aquatic environment, biodiversity and fisheries.

43 Common Fisheries Policy, Regulation ([EU](#)) No. [1380/2013](#)

to the sustainable management of fisheries across the EU and its waters. They are amended and superseded on a regular basis, in response to new developments such as changes in scientific advice.⁴⁴

34. The Bill's Delegated Powers Memorandum stated that the UK Fisheries Administrations, the fishing industry and environmental NGOs, share a consensus that the UK needs a dynamic system of fisheries management that can respond swiftly.⁴⁵ It explains that the Bill will create a "dynamic fisheries regime" which requires it to contain a number of broad delegated powers.⁴⁶ The purpose of the Bill's delegated powers will be to enable UK Ministers and the Devolved Administrations to:

- Implement new fisheries agreements and arrangements the UK will enter into with other countries as an independent coastal state;⁴⁷
- Allow Government policy to adapt to changing environmental priorities and social and economic circumstances;
- Respond to scientific and other expert advice; and
- Move away from the constraints of the CFP.⁴⁸

35. The Bill includes a number of Henry VIII powers, which are clauses that would enable Ministers to amend or repeal provisions in an Act of Parliament using secondary legislation. They include:

- Clause 9 (3), which allows the Secretary of State to add or remove exceptions to the types of British fishing vessels that do not need a licence;
- Clause 11(2), which allows the Secretary of State to amend the prohibition on foreign vessels fishing in UK waters without a licence;
- Clauses 31 (powers to make provisions about fisheries, aquaculture, etc) and Clause 33 (powers to make provisions about aquatic animal diseases) and Schedule 6 (which provides powers for devolved administrations) are not amendable. However, Clause 34 (7) and (8) provides that powers under Clauses 31, 33 and Schedule 6 to make regulations extend to amending, repealing or revoking "any enactment" as it relates to these clauses.⁴⁹

36. Jeremy Percy of the New Under Ten Fishermen's Association (NUTFA) said he did not see delegated powers as a problem, as fishing is "a very dynamic industry [and we] are used to responding quite quickly" to the types of challenges this may raise.⁵⁰ Mike Park, of the Scottish White Fish Producers Association (SWFPA), considered that the Bill's delegated powers would enable things to be changed and implemented quickly, and would give the devolved administrations "a degree of freedom to make adjustments", and would provide a "less rigid" framework than what currently exists under the CFP.⁵¹ However,

44 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 39

45 [Delegated Powers Memorandum to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)], page 3

46 [Delegated Powers Memorandum to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)], page 4

47 Under the [UNCLOS](#), the UK is obliged to cooperate with other coastal states to preserve fish stocks.

48 [Delegated Powers Memorandum to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)], page 5

49 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 27

50 [Q182](#)

51 [Q186](#)

NUTFA stated that the operation of delegated powers by Ministers required clarity and coherence at a UK-wide level, in order to prevent “different rules in different areas for different boats”.⁵²

37. The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) called for a statutory advisory body to act as a filter on proposals and also to make recommendations to ministers because “this has not found its way into the primary legislation and we think that is a fundamental mistake. It is certainly at odds with the collaborative tone of the Fisheries White Paper and rhetoric regarding a collaborative approach”.⁵³ The NFFO cited Norway and Australia as both having formal advisory processes and structures and called for “the inclusion of an advisory council on a statutory basis in the Bill”.⁵⁴ Greener UK, the RSPB, Nature Matters NI & Northern Ireland Marine Task Force and The Wildlife Trusts, all called for a formal consultation process to ensure effective scrutiny of secondary legislation.⁵⁵

38. We asked the Minister whether the Government would consider either amending the Bill to include a statutory advisory council or to establish a non-statutory advisory body. He responded that stakeholders are already consulted for annual fisheries negotiations, through a number of advisory groups. The Minister doubted that a “one size fits all” statutory advisory council was likely to work. However, the Minister said he was “planning to work with industry over coming months to develop a joined-up model of consultation, advice, and shared management which meets future needs”.⁵⁶

39. The Fisheries Bill is an opportunity to ensure the UK fisheries administrations can operate a dynamic fisheries management system, which can rapidly respond to changing circumstances. However, it is important that the use of delegated powers by the Secretary of State is informed by stakeholders in order to ensure that issues relating to their practical implementation are fully considered.

40. The Government should establish a non-statutory advisory body, which can provide a forum for consultation and communication with stakeholders, for the new fisheries management system that will be established when the UK becomes an independent coastal state. This will help to provide transparency and confidence in the decision-making process, including in the application of the Fisheries Bill’s delegated powers. This body needs to have the credibility to make a real and sustained impact, encouraging support and buy-in for the new system among all stakeholders, including the fishing industry, the scientific community and environmental groups.

Fisheries management in England

41. The enforcement and management of fisheries in England is mainly carried out by the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and the Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCAs), which were established under The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.⁵⁷ The MMO is responsible for licensing, regulating and planning marine activities

52 [Q181](#)

53 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)) page 3

54 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)) page 3–4

55 Greener UK ([SFB0030](#)); Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) ([SFB0017](#)); Nature Matters NI & Northern Ireland Marine Task Force ([SFB0019](#)); and The Wildlife Trusts ([SFB0006](#))

56 The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#)), page 3–4

57 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)]; [The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009](#)

in the seas around England so that they are carried out in a sustainable way.⁵⁸ IFCAs are committees or joint committees formed from relevant local authorities within 10 areas across England. They comprise representatives from their local authorities and different sectors, such as commercial and recreational fishermen, environmental groups and marine researchers. The IFCAs have byelaw making powers and their duties include the management of fisheries resources and the conservation of the marine environment within the inshore sea (0–6 nautical miles).⁵⁹

42. The Fisheries Bill proposes new powers and provisions with regard to the MMO but not IFCAs:

- Clause 38 and Schedule 7 extend the powers of the MMO and Scottish and Welsh Ministers (under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009) to make byelaws relating to marine conservation, to cover the whole of the UK Exclusive Economic Zone, which extends up to 200nm from the UK coast; and
- Clause 29 provides the Secretary of State with powers to put in place regulations to allow the MMO to charge for various functions relating to fisheries.⁶⁰

43. There was some doubt over whether the MMO had enough enforcement vessels to control access to UK waters in the future. Councillor John Lamb of the Kent and Essex IFCA told us: “I do have a concern that in fact does the MMO have the actual resource to fully control? It might be saying that we license them but, if they are coming into our waters, how do we ensure that we control them?”⁶¹ Phil Haslam of the MMO described in the Public Bill Committee how his organisation was planning to ensure that it had enough vessels to enforce the new system and prevent illegal fishing in UK waters by foreign boats.⁶²

44. The NFFO considered that the fishing industry would see MMO-charges as legitimate as long as there was an “even playing field” within the UK single market.⁶³ The Wildlife Trusts supported the proposed additional powers for the MMO to manage fisheries.⁶⁴ The Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership said the Bill should include a commitment for “adequate resources” for both the MMO and IFCAs to monitor and enforce the Bill’s policies. They also wanted to ensure that Clause 29 “does not mean that [the] MMOs only means of funding enforcement is from its charging policy”.⁶⁵

45. The Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership stated that IFCAs’ role in the future management of inshore waters needed to be recognised, and it wanted clarification on the role of IFCAs “in any future fisheries management governance framework and its subsequent delivery”.⁶⁶ The New Economics Foundation (NEF) stated that IFCAs were absent from the Bill, but their remit and competencies in England have

58 [Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)]

59 [Association of Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities; Explanatory Notes to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)]

60 [Delegated Powers Memorandum to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 278 (2017–19)]

61 [Q5](#)

62 Fisheries Bill, Public Bill Committee, [cols 43–44](#)

63 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 8

64 The Wildlife Trusts ([SFB0006](#)), page 3–4

65 Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership ([SFB0009](#)), page 4

66 Cornwall and Heart of the South West Brexit Resilience and Opportunities Group ([SFB0021](#)), page 3

been increased beyond those of their Scottish and Welsh counterparts. NEF said future cost recovery “should bear in mind that these inshore bodies will continue to grow as a primary point of management”.⁶⁷ However, the North Eastern IFCA stated that:

Whilst the devolved administrations have a clear framework through their parliaments and ministers to influence decision making such a framework is less obvious in England. Currently the Bill provides that the [MMO] will undertake such a role in England. England does however have an established regional management framework which is underpinned by national legislation in the form of the IFCAs. The potential use of that IFCA framework could be more formally enshrined in the Bill to support the MMO in the development of the ‘Fisheries Statements’ and provide for much stronger links to the coastal communities that will be subject to the decision-making process.⁶⁸

46. The Minister’s view on whether IFCAs would have adequate enforcement powers was that:

IFCAs have the enforcement powers they need for their current responsibilities, which do not change as a result of [EU] Exit. If their responsibilities were to change in the future, the Order making power in the Marine and Coastal Access Act would be the vehicle to do that, and that same power would be used to give them any additional enforcement powers.⁶⁹

47. The Fisheries Bill extends new powers and provisions to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) but not to Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCAs). The Government needs to ensure that new policy can be enforced in all English waters. IFCAs should be provided with the provisions and powers that a post-CFP regime will require. It is also important to ensure that both the MMO and IFCAs are adequately resourced to deliver their respective responsibilities and that unnecessary duplication is avoided. This means, amongst other things, that there must be an adequate number of fisheries protection vessels available to authorities.

48. *The Government should amend the Bill to more clearly designate the respective roles and powers of the MMO and IFCAs in relation to their duties for fisheries and marine protection, and to ensure they both have the necessary enforcement powers and resources of personnel and protection vessels to fully deliver the requirements of the UK as an independent coastal state.*

67 New Economics Foundation ([SFB0039](#)), page 4

68 North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority ([SFB0042](#)), page 1–2

69 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#)), page 2–3

4 Fishing Opportunities

49. “Fishing opportunities” refers to the maximum amount of fish that may be caught or the maximum number of days that may be spent at sea.⁷⁰ The CFP seeks to manage access to EU waters for the benefit of Member States, the environment, and the fishing industry by annually proposing total allowable catches (TACs) in a fishing area and allowing Member States to agree on local quotas and shared stocks management.⁷¹ This process is predominantly informed by scientific advice from the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) and the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), with a final decision made by Member States at the Agriculture and Fisheries Council every December.⁷²

50. The summary of responses to the White Paper consultation stated that as an independent coastal state, the UK would be responsible for negotiating with other coastal states - the EU, Norway, Iceland and the Faroe Islands - to agree the TAC and shares for stocks that are shared across each other’s waters. The Sustainable Fisheries White Paper states that: “under the CFP’s principle of relative stability, the UK receives a fixed share of fishing opportunities based on historical fishing patterns in 1973 - 1978. This is seen by many in the sector as unrepresentative of the fish now in UK waters”.⁷³ The Government has stated that it will also seek to move away from the CFP’s principle of relative stability towards what it intends to be a fairer and more scientific method for future TAC shares and that this will be a condition of any future access.⁷⁴

Additional opportunities

51. Under Clause 22, the Bill grants powers to the Secretary of State to sell English fishing opportunities for a calendar year based either on catch quota or effort quota (days at sea). The introduction of effort as a measure for quota is expected to operate largely on a trial basis. Similar considerations existed under the CFP but were largely discontinued after acceptance that limiting a vessel’s time at sea did not necessarily also limit the long-term intensity of its operations.⁷⁵ The Explanatory Notes to the Bill indicate the potential for these objectives to influence criteria for sale of opportunities. The Notes state that the Government’s “intention is that the scheme would be used to tender a proportion of the additional fishing opportunities that are gained following the UK’s withdrawal from the EU”.⁷⁶ The scheme could include the requirement that certain criteria are met in order to purchase fishing opportunities, for example environmental criteria. The Government says that it is not intended that the scheme would be used to sell fishing opportunities exclusively on the basis of price.⁷⁷

52. Upon the publication of the Sustainable Fisheries White Paper, the Secretary of State explained that:

70 [Explanatory Note to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 305 (2017–19 –EN)], page 22

71 [The Common Fisheries Policy \(CFP\)](#), European Commission, accessed 11 January 2019

72 [Scientific advice on managing fish stocks](#), European Commission, accessed 11 January 2019; [Agriculture and Fisheries Council configuration \(AGRIFISH\)](#), European Council, accessed 11 January 2019

73 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations](#), [CM 9660](#), July 2018, page 18

74 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 22

75 [Are Days the Answer?](#), NFFO, 3 April 2017

76 [Explanatory Note to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 305 (2017–19 –EN)], page 24

77 [Explanatory Note to the Fisheries Bill](#) [Bill 305 (2017–19 –EN)], page 24

as an independent coastal state, under international law, we will be in control of the seas that make up our exclusive economic zone. We will determine, in annual negotiations with our neighbours, who has access to our waters. We will also ensure that any additional fishing opportunities then available to our vessels are allocated fairly and thoughtfully to help support vessels of all sizes and communities across the UK.⁷⁸

53. The provision to allow quota to be tendered is not a new idea. New Zealand currently operates a tender process whereby Crown-held quota and annual catch entitlements can be sold to commercial fishers.⁷⁹ Despite this, the proposal to tender quota was controversial amongst witnesses. Jeremy Percy, Chief Executive of the New Under Ten Fishermen's Association (NUTFA), admitted that he "struggle[d] to understand where that came from or where the logic is".⁸⁰ Mr Percy considered that tendering would "inevitably benefit only those who have the financial resources to do so".⁸¹ Others were uneasy that the Bill sought to make such a significant change to the management of quotas without a more focused consultation and trial.⁸²

54. When we asked George Eustice MP, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, about the proposal to tender additional fishing opportunities, he told us:

to ensure that there is stability [...] we will leave the existing FQA [Fixed Quota Allocation] units as they are for existing fishing opportunities. As we depart from relative stability and have new fishing opportunities coming in, I do not think it makes any sense at all to compound the injustice of the FQA system.⁸³

55. In response to concerns expressed by representatives of the 'Under 10s', the Minister stated that "For the under-10 pool, you might do something very different. You might [...] simply just put some extra fishing opportunities in there and not tender it".⁸⁴

56. The UK will have additional fishing opportunities after leaving the EU. An opportunity now exists to allocate these more fairly and transparently across the sector, and in line with the Government's stated objectives in Clause 1. While we welcome the Government's commitment to establishing a new method of allocation, the proposals laid down in Clause 22 do not meet our expectations and lack detail. We are concerned that such proposals will marginalise owners of smaller vessels and will not represent a significant break from current practice, which is based on the situation many years ago when the UK joined the EU.

57. The Government should consult widely on the tender process for allocation of additional English quota and ensure buy-in from a range of stakeholders within the industry, including the operators of smaller vessels. Consultation should be followed by a trial, with feedback from affected parties to ensure workability and efficacy.

78 HC Deb, 4 July 2018, [col 338](#)

79 [Crown quota and ACE tenders, Fisheries New Zealand](#), accessed 13 January 2019

80 [Q122](#)

81 [Q129](#)

82 For example, [Q122](#) [Jim Portus]

83 [Q267](#)

84 [Q271](#)

Discards policy

58. A discard ban was introduced under the CFP's Landing Obligation, which aims to encourage fishing vessels, for example through more selective fishing gear, to minimise unwanted catch. The ban was introduced in 2015, with support of the UK Government, and came into full force on 1 January 2019, requiring all commercial species that are caught to be landed, whether or not they are target species. Fish landed in this way count against the TAC for a species in that area. TACs were given one-off uplifts to take account of extra landings due the discard ban, with Member States determining how extra quota is distributed. However, if TAC limits are reached because of the landing obligation it can result in fisheries being closed, which may particularly affect the UK's mixed fisheries, because reaching a quota limit for one species can mean fishing vessels have to tie up.⁸⁵

59. The Summary of responses to the White Paper consultation stated that the Government remains committed to ending the discarding of fish, which it has included as one of the Bill's sustainability objectives.⁸⁶ Clause 1 of the Fisheries Bill includes a discards objective which is unamended from the CFP regulations. Clauses 23–27 of the Bill provides a framework for the establishment of a “Discard charging prevention scheme” for charging English fishing-license holders that land fish in excess of their authorised quota.

60. There were mixed views on the discard ban. The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) saw it as only a partial solution, similar to schemes in Norway and New Zealand which each operate discard bans.⁸⁷ It predicted that the scheme would not remove all choke risks (where boats are prevented from going to sea because of the nature of their catch) but would be a useful instrument in reducing “the risk of the exhaustion of small bycatch species choking the main target species in a mixed fishery”.⁸⁸

61. Conversely, the South Devon Channel Shellfishermen considered that discarding could continue illegally or alongside fishers preferring to accept the charge rather than invest in more sustainable equipment.⁸⁹ The Eastern England Fish Producers Organisation expressed similar views.⁹⁰ The Law Society of Scotland was concerned the high-level Bill includes no provision for appeal or dispute resolution for the discard charging scheme, while others commented on the omission of a timetable for eliminating discards.⁹¹

62. We questioned the Minister about such concerns and on the possible implications of the proposed discard prevention charging scheme. The Minister acknowledged anxieties about the continuation of the Landing Obligation and explained that:

The discard prevention charge is designed to give the fishing industry additional flexibility to manage discard reduction. It gives them an option

85 The Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper Number 8442](#), House of Commons Library, 3 December 2018, page 36–37

86 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 23–24

87 The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), para 14.2

88 The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), para 14.3

89 South Devon & Channel Shellfishermen Ltd ([SFB0004](#)), para 2

90 EASTERN ENGLAND FISH PRODUCERS ORGANISATION LTD ([SFB0010](#)), page 5

91 Law Society of Scotland ([SFB0026](#)), page 2; Cornwall and Heart of the South West Brexit Resilience and Opportunities Group ([SFB0021](#)), page 4

to pay a charge to land catch in excess of quota but it will be priced in such a way that it is financially preferable to adopt more sustainable practices and avoidance measures to reduce unwanted bycatch.⁹²

The Minister assured the Committee that Defra would continue to define the scheme's practicalities and consult industry through a joint working party.⁹³

63. We support the inclusion of the discards objective in Clause 1. The introduction of a new discard prevention charging scheme in Clause 23 is also welcome as a means to mitigate the impacts on industry. However, industry has valid concerns about the workability of such a scheme in practice. These concerns need to be addressed with urgency, taking into account experience, both good and bad, of the current discard scheme.

64. The Government should trial and thoroughly consult on the discard prevention charging scheme and the associated secondary legislation to ensure it is workable, helps reduce discards and has stakeholder buy-in. The Government should establish a national research programme to identify new solutions to the issue of discard prevention with an aim of reporting its findings before the end of the transition period.

92 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#)), page 3

93 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#)), page 3

5 Sustainability and coastal communities

Maximum Sustainable Yield

65. EU-fisheries are currently managed under the CFP using the principle of Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY). The CFP regulations define MSY as “the highest theoretical equilibrium yield that can be continuously taken on average from a stock under existing average environmental conditions without significantly affecting the reproduction process”.⁹⁴ MSY can be expressed in two terms; either as Biomass MSY (BMSY), the biomass (total weight of fish) that can support harvest of the maximum sustainable yield or by Fishing Mortality Rate MSY (FMSY), the level of fishing mortality that will allow fish stocks to achieve the required size.⁹⁵

The UK’s international commitments

66. MSY is recognised in several international agreements as an appropriate measure of fishing sustainability. Article 2 of the CFP sets out that “the maximum sustainable yield rate shall be achieved by 2015 where possible and, on a progressive, incremental basis at the latest by 2020 for all stocks”.⁹⁶ The EU and its member states committed themselves to these targets at the World Summit on Sustainable Development at Johannesburg in 2002.⁹⁷ In 2015, the EU committed to targets in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), including SDG14 which set an ambition to, by 2020, “effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and destructive fishing practices and implement science-based management plans, in order to restore fish stocks in the shortest time feasible”.⁹⁸

67. Defra has confirmed its commitment to MSY, sustainable fisheries and the conservation of the marine environment.⁹⁹ The UK also has a number of international obligations related to fisheries and marine protection including the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention), the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, and United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.¹⁰⁰ These have been restated on several recent occasions.¹⁰¹

94 For more see the Fisheries Bill 2017–19, [Briefing Paper 8442](#), House of Commons Library, December 2018, page 29

95 The Wildlife Trusts ([SFB0006](#)), page 5

96 Common Fisheries Policy, Regulation [\(EU\) No. 1380/2013](#)

97 Common Fisheries Policy, Regulation [\(EU\) No. 1380/2013](#)

98 [UN Sustainable Development Goal 14](#), accessed 13 January 2019

99 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 20

100 The [Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic \(OSPAR Convention\)](#), accessed 13 January 2019; [Marine Strategy Frameworks Directive](#), accessed 13 January 2019; and [UN Convention on the Law of the SEA \(UNCLOS\)](#), accessed 13 January 2019

101 Defra, [A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment](#), January 2018, page 105

Sustainability in the Bill

68. Clauses 1 and 2 of the Fisheries Bill outline the introduction of new fisheries objectives and fisheries statements. Clause 1, on the fisheries objectives, revokes Article 2 of the existing CFP regulation but replicates most of the wording, introducing equivalent fisheries objectives relating to sustainability including the “sustainability objective”, the “precautionary objective” and the “ecosystem objective”.¹⁰²

69. Reflecting the stated ambition of the White Paper to meet existing international commitments, the Bill includes an objective to ensure that all harvested stocks are recovered to, or maintained at, a biomass above that capable of producing MSY.¹⁰³ However, in revoking Article 2 of the CFP regulation, it removes the target set under the CFP to achieve an MSY-level of exploitation of fish stocks by 2020. Furthermore, the Bill includes no duties or targets to achieve any other of the objectives listed in Clause 1. Instead, the Bill imposes a duty on the fisheries policy authorities and the Secretary of State to produce a first JFS and SSFS by January 2021, the end of the intended transition period, and a duty to review these statements at least every six years.¹⁰⁴

70. There was broad support in the evidence we received for UK fisheries management to be consistent with the UK’s existing international sustainability obligations.¹⁰⁵ However, there was disagreement about the importance of including more duties within Clause 1, and the retention of the 2020 target for MSY under Article 2 of the CFP. The fishing industry preferred a less stringent approach; the South Western Fish Producers Organisation (SWFPO) stated that “biomass levels fluctuate for reasons other than fishing pressures. The aim would be better explained by stating at or above biomass levels capable of producing high long-term sustainable yields, if possible at MSY”.¹⁰⁶ The Communities Inshore Fisheries Alliance presented similar concerns and insisted that the precautionary principle should not be used where “it is likely that communities would be endangered significantly in a socio-economic way”.¹⁰⁷ Industry instead preferred a more general commitment to work towards achieving MSY as stipulated by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).¹⁰⁸ Jim Portus of the SWFPO, argued the case for removing the CFP’s 2020 deadline date.¹⁰⁹ The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) welcomed the removal of “the arbitrary MSY timetable, and the unscientific and unachievable language with which the concept of MSY was expressed in the CFP”.¹¹⁰ It argued against inclusion of a target date in the Bill.¹¹¹

71. By contrast, NGOs and conservation charities criticised the Bill’s lack of clear duties, and absence of a deadline to implement MSY under the Bill’s precautionary objective. Oceana warned that “without a clear duty and deadline the UK may continue to overfish

102 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clauses 1, 2

103 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clauses 1, 2

104 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clauses 5, 4

105 For example, The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)); Oceana ([SFB0043](#)); [Q241](#) [Dr McQuatters-Gollop]

106 SOUTH WESTERN FISH PRODUCER ORGANISATION LTD. ([SFB0032](#)), page 3

107 CIFA ([SFB0035](#)), page 2

108 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 8

109 [Q144](#)

110 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 2

111 The National Federation of Fishermen’s Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#)), page 2

and may never actually deliver sustainable fisheries”.¹¹² This viewpoint was shared across the major environmental groups that submitted evidence, including Greener UK, the Wildlife Trusts, Sustain, WWF and the RSPB.¹¹³ Sustain underlined some of the potential positive effects of achieving MSY, stating that UK fisheries could yield 45 per cent higher landings, an additional Gross Value Added of approximately £150 million and an additional 2,400 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs if all stocks reached MSY.¹¹⁴ Greener UK observed that the most successful fisheries management regimes in the world, including the USA, Australia, New Zealand, all place a duty to ensure that fishing mortality is not set above the FMSY level.¹¹⁵ The RSPB stated that, in comparison to the White Paper, the Bill “generally lacks the ambition, clarity of detail and purpose, and courage of commitment that would put the UK on a par with the global best practice to which it aspires.”¹¹⁶ Oceana urged that the new Fisheries Bill should contain clear duties aimed at achieving “no less than the CFP standard that the UK was instrumental in helping develop, especially in terms of complying with the 2020 deadline for ending overfishing”.¹¹⁷ Professor Richard Barnes argued for restating the objectives in Clause 1 as duties, suggesting it would “aid decision-makers by providing a clear set of reference points that must be considered in the exercise of discretionary powers”.¹¹⁸

72. A further concern from conservation groups was the lack of a firm legal commitment that shared stocks would be managed sustainably and that the UK would meet its international obligations in the future. The UK shares over 100 stocks with the EU, and the Bill omits any firm commitment to shared stocks management.¹¹⁹ Dr Abigail McQuatters-Gollop stated that “the Bill is unclear about how we are going to link up with the Marine Strategy Framework Directive” and stated how important it was that fisheries management is thought about in an integrated way.¹²⁰ Oceana also expressed concern that a lack of adequate legal provisions and enforcement measures might undermine any shared commitment to fish below MSY and implement scientific advice.¹²¹ Overall, there was a desire to ensure that international obligations continued to be met.¹²²

73. When questioned on the Bill’s sustainability objectives and whether they should be restated as duties, Dr Carl O’Brien, Defra’s Chief Fisheries Science Advisor, responded:

From my own perspective, the fisheries’ objectives that are in the Bill—in terms of sustainability, precautionary, ecosystem, scientific evidence, discards and equal access—seem fine... The only thing that is missing is the date 2020. The UK Government are certainly committed to delivering MSY. Whether 2020 was ever achievable, as a scientist I have my doubts.¹²³

112 Oceana ([SFB0043](#)), page 2

113 Greener UK ([SFB0030](#)); The Wildlife Trusts ([SFB0006](#)); Sustain: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming ([SFB0031](#)); WWF ([SFB0040](#)); and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) ([SFB0017](#))

114 Sustain: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming ([SFB0031](#)), page 3

115 Greener UK ([SFB0052](#)), page 2

116 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) ([SFB0017](#)), page 1

117 Oceana ([SFB0043](#)), page 1

118 Richard Barnes ([SFB0016](#)), page 1

119 Oceana ([SFB0043](#)), page 3; Greener UK ([SFB0030](#)), page 2

120 [Q241](#)

121 Oceana ([SFB0043](#)), page 3

122 [Q135](#)

123 [Q37](#)

On the issue of the Bill's omission of the CFP's 2020 target for MSY, Dr O'Brien went on to say the following:

Regardless of whether there is a date there or not, coastal states are looking at management plans or are managing their stocks in an approach that is consistent with MSY. Depending on whether it is Iceland or the Faroes or Norway, they may or may not be wedded to 2020. They are more wedded to the idea of making gradual progress, and as long as things are moving in the right direction that is fine. That is the view that the UK should probably take and has been taking in the past.¹²⁴

74. When we asked the Minister whether the Government would amend the Bill to commit the UK to the shared management of stocks with other countries and alignment with MSY, he responded that there was "a very practical reason" for the omission of the 2020 target, in that many sections of the Bill may not be commenced until the end of 2020.¹²⁵ He argued that "you cannot have a statutory deadline and a target that has expired before a Bill even commences".¹²⁶ The Minister did however add that "it may be that when that statement is published it has commitments to keep certain stocks within MSY ranges, to get others there if they have not been able to get there."¹²⁷

75. The Government has committed, on numerous occasions, to setting objectives and goals for sustainable fisheries for future generations. The 25 Year Environment Plan also made promising commitments to sustainability and our international obligations, including a clear commitment to delivering UN Sustainable Development Goal 14 and to achieving good environmental status in our seas by 2020 under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive.

76. At present, this level of ambition is not fully matched by the Bill, which lacks clarity about how the UK's international obligations will be met once the UK leaves the Common Fisheries Policy. *The Government should amend the sustainability and precautionary objectives in Clause 1 to ensure the Bill commits the UK to: (1) its international commitments on achieving maximum sustainable yield under the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals; and (2) its obligations to marine protection under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention). The Government should also amend the Bill to enshrine a future commitment to shared management of stocks, based on the best available scientific advice. These commitments should not be left to the Joint Fisheries Statement but should be made explicit in the Bill itself.*

77. The Government should also commit to a target date for Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY)-level of exploitation of stocks. This should also be included within the next Joint Fisheries Statement, as suggested by the Minister, to ensure the UK can align with future international commitments for sustainable fisheries. Decisions for setting the target date must factor in both the likely timescale of the Bill and the stated ambition to achieve MSY as part of the precautionary objective.

124 [Q63](#)

125 [Q288](#)

126 [Q288](#)

127 [Q288](#)

Coastal Communities

78. The Fisheries White Paper acknowledged that the “commercial fishing industry and wider seafood sector are important to many coastal communities across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland”.¹²⁸ It highlighted that Defra wanted “to deepen and strengthen [its] partnership with the Devolved Administrations, as well as industry and other non-governmental stakeholders, to implement them in ways that work best for the seafood industries, coastal communities and the marine environment”.¹²⁹ Defra also stated that it was “reviewing the economic link conditions to ensure that UK registered vessels including foreign owned vessels, fishing for UK quota produce genuine economic benefits for UK coastal communities dependent on fisheries and fisheries related industries. [Its] aim is to ensure that UK communities derive maximum benefit from UK quota”.¹³⁰

79. However, the Bill only indirectly refers to the issue of economic regeneration of Coastal Communities. The “sustainability objective” in Clause 1, subsection (2) does include reference to economic factors in ensuring that fishing and aquaculture activities are “managed in a way that is consistent with the objectives of achieving economic, social and employment benefits, and of contributing to the availability of food supplies”.¹³¹ Clause 2, subsection (2) states that a purpose of the SSFS is to state the Secretary of State’s policies for “contributing to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing activities, bearing in mind coastal fisheries and socio-economic factors [...] [and] promoting coastal fishing activities, taking into account social-economic factors”.¹³²

80. Greener UK supported an amendment that would ensure “that UK domestic legislation delivers truly sustainable and accountable fisheries management that minimises impacts on the marine environment and supports dependent coastal communities”.¹³³ This view was supported by industry; the Orkney Fisheries Association and the Communities Inshore Fisheries Alliance both stated that:

a caveat to provide for such instances where social and economic stability are needed should be included [in the Bill]. Without this type of caveat remote islands and areas will suffer stock decline from unlimited fishing pressure from nomadic vessels.¹³⁴

81. Jeremy Percy from NUTFA also told us that the Bill could be improved by means of an amendment to ensure that quota should be allocated on social and environmental terms and the extent to which it provides economic benefits to often vulnerable coastal communities.¹³⁵

128 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: consultation document](#), Cm 9660, July 2018, page 7

129 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: consultation document](#), Cm 9660, July 2018, page 15

130 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: consultation document](#), Cm 9660, July 2018, page 27

131 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clause 1, 2

132 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clause 2, 3

133 Greener UK ([SFB0030](#)), page 1

134 Orkney Fisheries Association ([SFB0008](#)), page 2–3; CIFA ([SFB0035](#)), page 2

135 [Q158](#)

EMFF Funding

82. Many UK coastal communities are currently beneficiaries of the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). The EMFF is a European funding scheme that provides support to coastal communities in diversifying their economies. The current UK investment package under the EMFF, for 2014–2020 is €309 million with an EU contribution of €243 million.¹³⁶

83. The Bill seeks to replace existing domestic funding powers and allow new funding schemes to replace funding currently received under the EMFF. Under Clause 28 the Secretary of State will be given new powers to establish a support scheme to provide financial assistance, via grants or loans, in England for a variety of activities including “the promotion or development of commercial aquaculture or commercial fish activities” and “the reorganisation of businesses involved in commercial aquaculture or commercial fish activities”.¹³⁷ Schedule 4 of the Bill proposes to extend this power to the Welsh Government and DAERA, but not the Scottish Government.¹³⁸ However, the Bill’s funding provisions do not explicitly reference coastal communities.

84. The British Ports Association considered that a long-term sustainable fisheries policy “should include a successor scheme to the EU European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) that, at a minimum, matches the current UK allocation and is better focussed and adjusted to suit UK industry”.¹³⁹ Sustainable Fish Cities, (part of Sustain, The Alliance for Better Food and Farming), agreed.¹⁴⁰ Professor Richard Barnes suggested that the fisheries objectives would be enhanced by “linking the provisions on financial assistance under Clause 28 to the objectives in Clause 1” ensuring that decisions on financial assistance should have regard to the fisheries objectives.¹⁴¹ This, he argued, “would facilitate an alignment between developmental activities and the operational delivery of sustainable fisheries”.¹⁴²

85. On 10 December, the Minister told us that the Government had:

“committed £37.2 million of extra funding to boost the UK fishing industry during the Implementation Period. Indicatively, £37.2 million would be split with £14.6 million for England, £16.4 million for Scotland, £2.4 million for Wales and £3.6 million for Northern Ireland. This is in addition to the existing European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), which at €243m over seven years is broadly equivalent to £32m a year.”¹⁴³

86. The Minister also clarified that:

Clause 2(2) sets out a separate set of objectives to be addressed by the Secretary of State Fisheries Statement (SFSS) including an objective to “contribute to a fair standard of living for those who depend on fishing

136 [European Maritime and Fisheries Fund \(EMFF\)](#)

137 [Fisheries Bill](#), Clause 28, 16–17

138 [Fisheries Bill](#), Schedule 4, 50–53

139 British Ports Association ([SFB0041](#)), page 1

140 Sustain: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming ([SFB0031](#)), page 8–9

141 Richard Barnes ([SFB0016](#)), page 1

142 Richard Barnes ([SFB0016](#)), page 1

143 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0050](#))

activities, bearing in mind coastal fisheries and socioeconomic factors” (2(2)e) and “promoting coastal fishing activities, taking into account socioeconomic factors” (2(2)f).¹⁴⁴

The Government added that it was committed to replacing the EMFF with four new domestic schemes in each Fisheries Administration, to be put in place from 2021.¹⁴⁵

87. The Fisheries Bill is a significant opportunity for delivering a much-needed reversal of fortunes for vulnerable coastal communities and smaller scale fishers. Fair allocation of new and existing opportunities along economic, environmental, and social lines could lead to the regeneration of coastal communities and sustainable fishing practice.

88. We also welcome the review of economic link conditions promised in the White Paper, Defra’s commitment to close working with Devolved Administrations and the additional funding promised to the Fishing Industry during the implementation period. We recognise the importance of a suitable replacement for the EMFF funding scheme for after 2020 and support the proposed plan and the measures suggested by the Minister. However, given the emphasis in the White Paper, the Committee does believe the Bill should include more explicit reference to the issue of economic regeneration of coastal communities.

89. The Government should clarify what funding will be available to coastal communities after EMFF funding ends in 2020, and how eligibility for funding would be assessed.

90. We recommend that the Government commits fully to delivering its review of economic link conditions proposed in the Fisheries White paper. The Government should also make direct reference to this issue in the Bill by expanding Clause 2 to make specific reference to economic regeneration of coastal communities.

Recreational Fishing

91. In the summary of responses to the Fisheries White Paper, Defra acknowledged that “many respondents had highlighted the importance of recreational fishing to the economy and particularly coastal communities”.¹⁴⁶ Although respondents to the White Paper reportedly expressed a variety of perspectives on the impact of recreational fishing, Defra noted that “there was common agreement that recreational angling should be integrated into fisheries management”.¹⁴⁷

92. The Angling Trust highlighted that approximately 1 million people go recreational sea fishing each year, contributing over £2bn each year to the economy as well as employing over 20,000 people.¹⁴⁸ The Trust argued that the Bill was an opportunity to right the wrongs of the CFP and recognise recreational fishing as a direct user stakeholder of UK

144 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SFB0055), page 1–2

145 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (SFB0055), page 2

146 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 12

147 Defra, [Sustainable fisheries for future generations: Summary of consultation responses and government response](#) (October 2018), page 12

148 Angling Trust ([SFB0046](#)), page 1

sea fisheries and part of the catching sector.¹⁴⁹ Martin Salter, Head of Campaigns at the Angling Trust, lamented the fact that “there is virtually no reference to recreational fishing on the face of the Bill, apart from a concession that some of the EMFF grants might find their way into the recreational fishing sector”.¹⁵⁰ The New Economics Foundation stated that “the promotion of low-impact fishing and angling both as a livelihood for future fishers and skippers, for the visitor economy, and to highlight environmental credentials of low-impact methods is a clear opportunity for the future”.¹⁵¹

93. On asking the Minister whether he would accept amendments to the Bill to greater recognise the role of recreational fishing, he explained that given that the Bill has been introduced to ensure a functioning legal framework following EU exit, “specific reference to the recreational sea fishing sector as a stakeholder is unnecessary”.¹⁵² He did, however, make assurances that recreational sea fishing as a sector would be recognised in the forthcoming fisheries statement.

94. We regard the Bill as an opportunity to acknowledge the recreational fishing sector as a stakeholder in UK sea fisheries and recognise the advantages of more joined up thinking between the recreational and commercial sectors. We recommend that Clause 2(2)(h) be expanded to make explicit reference to recreational fishing.

149 Angling Trust ([SFB0046](#)), page 4

150 [Q193](#)

151 New Economics Foundation ([SFB0051](#)), page 2

152 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#)), page 4

Conclusions and recommendations

Introduction

1. The Government should as a matter of course enable House of Commons' Committees to conduct pre-legislative scrutiny on bills of this importance. (Paragraph 4)

Fisheries policy in the UK

2. In considering the Fisheries Bill, Parliament is presented with a once-in-a-generation opportunity to evaluate and address the concerns raised about the Common Fisheries Policy. (Paragraph 18)

Governance

3. The process of developing and reviewing the Joint Fisheries Statement (JFS) and the Secretary of State's Fisheries Statement (SSFS) is an opportunity to provide clear direction and effective coordination for the UK's fisheries policy as an independent coastal state. However, it is essential that the JFS and SSFS are subject to a shortened review period and independent expert assessment to help facilitate more rigorous scrutiny. (Paragraph 31)
4. *The Government should amend the Bill so that the Joint Fisheries Statements (for the UK Government and the Devolved Administrations) and the Secretary of State's Fisheries Statement will: (a) be subject to an interim review every three years and full review every six years; and (b) comprise an expert and independent published assessment that can be subject to public and parliamentary scrutiny.* (Paragraph 32)
5. The Fisheries Bill is an opportunity to ensure the UK fisheries administrations can operate a dynamic fisheries management system, which can rapidly respond to changing circumstances. However, it is important that the use of delegated powers by the Secretary of State is informed by stakeholders in order to ensure that issues relating to their practical implementation are fully considered. (Paragraph 39)
6. *The Government should establish a non-statutory advisory body, which can provide a forum for consultation and communication with stakeholders, for the new fisheries management system that will be established when the UK becomes an independent coastal state. This will help to provide transparency and confidence in the decision-making process, including in the application of the Fisheries Bill's delegated powers. This body needs to have the credibility to make a real and sustained impact, encouraging support and buy-in for the new system among all stakeholders, including the fishing industry, the scientific community and environmental groups.* (Paragraph 40)
7. The Fisheries Bill extends new powers and provisions to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) but not to Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities (IFCAs). The Government needs to ensure that new policy can be enforced in all English waters. IFCAs should be provided with the provisions and powers that a post-CFP regime will require. It is also important to ensure that both the MMO and IFCAs are adequately resourced to deliver their respective responsibilities and that

unnecessary duplication is avoided. This means, amongst other things, that there must be an adequate number of fisheries protection vessels available to authorities. (Paragraph 47)

8. *The Government should amend the Bill to more clearly designate the respective roles and powers of the MMO and IFCA in relation to their duties for fisheries and marine protection, and to ensure they both have the necessary enforcement powers and resources of personnel and protection vessels to fully deliver the requirements of the UK as an independent coastal state.* (Paragraph 48)

Fishing Opportunities

9. The UK will have additional fishing opportunities after leaving the EU. An opportunity now exists to allocate these more fairly and transparently across the sector, and in line with the Government's stated objectives in Clause 1. While we welcome the Government's commitment to establishing a new method of allocation, the proposals laid down in Clause 22 do not meet our expectations and lack detail. We are concerned that such proposals will marginalise owners of smaller vessels and will not represent a significant break from current practice, which is based on the situation many years ago when the UK joined the EU. (Paragraph 56)
10. *The Government should consult widely on the tender process for allocation of additional English quota and ensure buy-in from a range of stakeholders within the industry, including the operators of smaller vessels. Consultation should be followed by a trial, with feedback from affected parties to ensure workability and efficacy.* (Paragraph 57)
11. We support the inclusion of the discards objective in Clause 1. The introduction of a new discard prevention charging scheme in Clause 23 is also welcome as a means to mitigate the impacts on industry. However, industry has valid concerns about the workability of such a scheme in practice. These concerns need to be addressed with urgency, taking into account experience, both good and bad, of the current discard scheme. (Paragraph 63)
12. *The Government should trial and thoroughly consult on the discard prevention charging scheme and the associated secondary legislation to ensure it is workable, helps reduce discards and has stakeholder buy-in. The Government should establish a national research programme to identify new solutions to the issue of discard prevention with an aim of reporting its findings before the end of the transition period.* (Paragraph 64)

Sustainability and coastal communities

13. The Government has committed, on numerous occasions, to setting objectives and goals for sustainable fisheries for future generations. The 25 Year Environment Plan also made promising commitments to sustainability and our international obligations, including a clear commitment to delivering UN Sustainable Development Goal 14 and to achieving good environmental status in our seas by 2020 under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. (Paragraph 75)

14. At present, this level of ambition is not fully matched by the Bill, which lacks clarity about how the UK's international obligations will be met once the UK leaves the Common Fisheries Policy. *The Government should amend the sustainability and precautionary objectives in Clause 1 to ensure the Bill commits the UK to: (1) its international commitments on achieving maximum sustainable yield under the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals; and (2) its obligations to marine protection under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention). The Government should also amend the Bill to enshrine a future commitment to shared management of stocks, based on the best available scientific advice. These commitments should not be left to the Joint Fisheries Statement but should be made explicit in the Bill itself.* (Paragraph 76)
15. *The Government should also commit to a target date for Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY)-level of exploitation of stocks. This should also be included within the next Joint Fisheries Statement, as suggested by the Minister, to ensure the UK can align with future international commitments for sustainable fisheries. Decisions for setting the target date must factor in both the likely timescale of the Bill and the stated ambition to achieve MSY as part of the precautionary objective.* (Paragraph 77)
16. The Fisheries Bill is a significant opportunity for delivering a much-needed reversal of fortunes for vulnerable coastal communities and smaller scale fishers. Fair allocation of new and existing opportunities along economic, environmental, and social lines could lead to the regeneration of coastal communities and sustainable fishing practice. (Paragraph 87)
17. We also welcome the review of economic link conditions promised in the White Paper, Defra's commitment to close working with Devolved Administrations and the additional funding promised to the Fishing Industry during the implementation period. We recognise the importance of a suitable replacement for the EMFF funding scheme for after 2020 and support the proposed plan and the measures suggested by the Minister. However, given the emphasis in the White Paper, the Committee does believe the Bill should include more explicit reference to the issue of economic regeneration of coastal communities. (Paragraph 88)
18. *The Government should clarify what funding will be available to coastal communities after EMFF funding ends in 2020, and how eligibility for funding would be assessed.* (Paragraph 89)
19. *We recommend that the Government commits fully to delivering its review of economic link conditions proposed in the Fisheries White paper. The Government should also make direct reference to this issue in the Bill by expanding Clause 2 to make specific reference to economic regeneration of coastal communities.* (Paragraph 90)
20. We regard the Bill as an opportunity to acknowledge the recreational fishing sector as a stakeholder in UK sea fisheries and recognise the advantages of more joined up thinking between the recreational and commercial sectors. *We recommend that Clause 2(2)(h) be expanded to make explicit reference to recreational fishing.* (Paragraph 94)

Formal minutes

Wednesday 16 January 2019

Members present:

Neil Parish, in the Chair

Kerry McCarthy David Simpson

Mrs Sheryll Murray Angela Smith

Draft Report (*Beyond the Common Fisheries Policy: Scrutiny of the Fisheries Bill*) proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 94 agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Eleventh Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 23 January 9.15 am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 5 December 2018

Dr Carl M. O'Brien CBE CStat CSci FLS, Defra Chief Fisheries Science Adviser & UK Delegate to ICES, Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, **Dr Craig McAngus**, Lecturer in Politics, School of Media, Culture and Society, University of the West of Scotland, **Councillor John Lamb**, Chair, Kent and Essex Inshore Fishery Conservation Authority, and **Phil Haslam**, Director of Operations, Marine Management Organisation .

[Q1–103](#)

Wednesday 5 December 2018

Mike Park OBE, Chief Executive, Scottish White Fish Producers Association, **Jeremy Percy**, Chief Executive, New Under Ten Fishermen's Association, **Jim Portus**, Chief Executive Secretary, South Western Fish Producer Organisation, and **Andrew Kuyk CBE**, Director General, UK Seafood Industry Alliance

[Q104–191](#)

Wednesday 12 December 2018

Dr Thomas Appleby, representative, Blue Marine Foundation, **Martin Salter**, Head of Campaigns, The Angling Trust

[Q192–233](#)

Helen McLachlan, representative, Greener UK, **Dr Abigail McQuatters-Gollop**, Lecturer in Marine Conservation, University of Plymouth

[Q234–250](#)

Wednesday 12 December 2018

George Eustice MP, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, and **Anne Freeman**, Deputy Director for Domestic Fisheries and Reform, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

[Q251–292](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

SFB numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Angling Trust ([SFB0046](#))
- 2 Animal Aid ([SFB0022](#))
- 3 Barnes, Richard ([SFB0016](#))
- 4 British Ports Association ([SFB0041](#))
- 5 CIFA ([SFB0035](#))
- 6 Coastal Producer Organisation ([SFB0033](#))
- 7 Compassion in World farming ([SFB0025](#))
- 8 Cornwall and Heart of the South West Brexit Resilience and Opportunities Group ([SFB0021](#))
- 9 Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Local Enterprise Partnership ([SFB0009](#))
- 10 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0048](#))
- 11 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0050](#))
- 12 The Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([SFB0055](#))
- 13 EASTERN ENGLAND FISH PRODUCERS ORGANISATION LTD ([SFB0010](#))
- 14 European Subsea Cables Association ([SFB0028](#))
- 15 fishcount.org.uk ([SFB0023](#))
- 16 Greener UK ([SFB0030](#))
- 17 Greener UK ([SFB0052](#))
- 18 Greenpeace UK ([SFB0027](#))
- 19 The Heritage Alliance ([SFB0029](#))
- 20 Honor Frost Foundation ([SFB0015](#))
- 21 Law Society of Scotland ([SFB0026](#))
- 22 Life long pleasure angler ([SFB0001](#))
- 23 Macduff shellfish ([SFB0018](#))
- 24 Marine Alliance for Science & Technology Scotland ([SFB0034](#))
- 25 The National Federation of Fishermen's Organisations (NFFO) ([SFB0005](#))
- 26 Nature Matters NI & Northern Ireland Marine Task Force ([SFB0019](#))
- 27 New Economics Foundation ([SFB0039](#))
- 28 New Under Ten Fishermen's Association ([SFB0036](#))
- 29 North Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority ([SFB0042](#))
- 30 Oceana ([SFB0043](#))
- 31 Orkney Fisheries Association ([SFB0008](#))
- 32 The Pew Trusts ([SFB0003](#))
- 33 Robert Persey ([SFB0047](#))

- 34 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) ([SFB0017](#))
- 35 Scottish Creel Fishermen's Federation ([SFB0038](#))
- 36 Shellfish Network ([SFB0011](#))
- 37 South Devon & Channel Shellfishermen Ltd ([SFB0004](#))
- 38 SOUTH WESTERN FISH PRODUCER ORGANISATION LTD. ([SFB0032](#))
- 39 Stain, Mr Richard ([SFB0007](#))
- 40 Sustain: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming ([SFB0031](#))
- 41 UK Seafood Industry Alliance ([SFB0020](#))
- 42 Whale & Dolphin Conservation ([SFB0013](#))
- 43 The Wildlife Trusts ([SFB0006](#))
- 44 Williams, Chris ([SFB0051](#))
- 45 Wood, Mr Andrew ([SFB0044](#))
- 46 WWF ([SFB0040](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	2 Sisters and Standards in Poultry Processing	HC 490
Second Report	Pre-Legislative Scrutiny of the draft Animal Welfare (Sentencing and Recognition of Sentience) Bill 2017	HC 709
Third Report	Brexit: Trade in Food	HC 348
Fourth Report	Improving air quality	HC 433
Fifth Report	Performance of the Rural Payments Agency	HC 887
Sixth Report	The future for food, farming and the environment	HC 870
Seventh Report	Fur trade in the UK	HC 823
Eighth Report	Regulation of the water industry	HC 1041
Ninth Report	Controlling dangerous dogs	HC 1040
Tenth Report	Scrutiny of the Agriculture Bill	HC 1591
First Special Report	Food waste in England: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 444
Second Special Report	Forestry in England: Seeing the wood for the trees: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 445
Third Special Report	Feeding the nation: labour constraints: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2016–17	HC 446
Fourth Special Report	Post-legislative scrutiny: Flood and Water Management Act 2010: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2016–17	HC 447
Fifth Special Report	2 Sisters and Standards in Poultry Processing: Government Response to the Committee's First Report	HC 772
Sixth Special Report	2 Sisters and Standards in Poultry Processing: Food Standards Agency Response to the Committee's First Report	HC 861
Seventh Special Report	Pre-Legislative Scrutiny of the draft Animal Welfare (Sentencing and Recognition of Sentience) Bill 2017: Government Response to the Committee's Second Report	HC 984
Eighth Special Report	Brexit: Trade in Food: Government Response to the Committee's Third Report	HC 1021
Ninth Special Report	2 Sisters and Standards in Poultry Processing: Food Standards Agency Response to the Committee's First Report	HC 1070

Tenth Special Report	Improving air quality: Government Response to the Committee's Fourth Report	HC 1149
Eleventh Special Report	Performance of the Rural Payments Agency: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report	HC 1448
Twelfth Special Report	The future for food, farming and the environment: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report	HC 1598
Thirteenth Special Report	Fur trade in the UK: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report	HC 1675
Fourteenth Special Report	Regulation of the water industry: Government and Ofwat Responses to the Committee's Eighth Report	HC 1856