

**ON A STRATEGY FOR TAKING EAF WORK FORWARD – NEXT STEPS**

D S Butterworth

1. An early presentation summarising current structures and the processes of provision of advice, ultimately to the Minister, would be helpful, in particular to understand what changes to this are envisaged in the structures proposed in the discussion document circulated. This needs to clarify the change in role, if any, envisaged for the current species-based Scientific Working Groups.
2. The existing ERA's (Nel *et al.* 2007) provide a valuable first step in the process of developing list of issues and prioritising them. However, these lists next need to be subject to a rigorous review process, and discussion is required over how this is best effected, taking due cognisance of the best practice of incorporating simulation testing via the MSE/OMP approach (see recent email circular from É E Plagányi).
3. The lists in Nel *et al.* are split under three sub-headings, and different groups would seem appropriate for the reviews in each case:
  - a) Ecological well-being: the pertinent scientific species WG would seem the appropriate body, certainly where single-species issues are involved; however where species-interactions play a role, are these better split on a case by case basis between the species WG and the EAF WG with the latter handling more overarching issues which have commonality across the scientific species WGs?
  - b) Human well-being: here the species-specific resource management WGs have primary responsibility for the socio-economic issues concerned, though there may be a need to include invited specialists for those discussions; there would also seem first to be a need for a broader discussion on the relative merits of case-specific evaluations vs the adoption of default targets (cf. Australia).
  - c) Governance: in the first instance, shouldn't MCM management be asked for response/review, noting that much has happened since the discussions upon which Nel *et al.* (2007) were based?