

Peer Review Comment	Response	Summary of Outcome
1. Bycatch management – suggestion that there needs to be specific bycatch management arrangements in place.	We recognise that bycatch can be an issue in some fisheries and we also recognise that we have insufficient data to make judgements. We have taken onboard the suggestion about utilising observers as a data collection tool and have factored this into the kick-off workshop that was originally only going to look at stock assessment. However, we consider that specifying bycatch management (spatial or temporal closures or gear based solutions) is, at this stage, not needed. Options will be reviewed once the data are on the table.	Discussed with Jim Daly and he is comfortable with this
2. Involvement of the Fishery Survey of India,	Local advice is that the brief of this organisation is restricted to offshore and deepwater fisheries, and in particular, tunas. They do not get involved in small pelagics.	Accepted by Jim Daley
3. Involvement of MPEDA	Our local consultant is a retired MPEDA officer and he believes that there is not much that MPEDA could assist with although they obviously talk within government and, if they feel we are doing a good job this will assist promote a positive view which may help us overcome some of the opposition which has mainly been driven by project opponents in other companies.	Accepted by Jim Daley
4. Involvement of the CIFT	CIFT has shifted its position on the FIP a couple of times. Its is now back to being supportive and very recent discussions has revealed they may be able to actively assist.	Discussed with Jim Daly and he is comfortable with this
5. Involvement of NETFISH	Our advice is that they are mainly involved in fishery quality issues despite having a broader remit on their website.	We will not involve them unless required.

6. Involvement of CMFRI	We won't be able to work with CMFRI at this stage as they have been lobbied to oppose the project. This is why we have looked for alternative providers of stock assessment advice and believe that we have a partner that is capable of doing the work, and has the ear of State governments. Its possible that having some new views may spur some more positive engagement. Recent (late February) discussions with the Ratnagiri School of Fisheries suggest that CMFRI may participate in the stock assessment workshop.	Discussed with Jim Daly and he is comfortable with this
7. Reference points	Specifying biomass and fishing mortality based reference points may not be appropriate for this type of fishery. There is an abundant literature on different types of reference points and we would prefer to review the options in consultation with managers, scientists and industry.	Discussed with Jim Daly and he is comfortable with this
8. NGO involvement	SFP has provided assistance and support but it has no representation in India. We are happy to involve local NGOs, especially those that support IFFO RS. We will continue to look for local NGOs	Discussed with Jim.
9. Catch composition	A key part of the proposed observer and landing site program	Added to FAP
10. Composition of fish going to fish meal plant – need evidence that sardines are the only/main species used for fish meal	Can be checked at the plant	Added to FAP
11. MoU's with participants	These were signed but were not attached to the draft FAP.	To be attached.
12. Highlighting as a specific goal the need to better understand the main species	To be specifically by the stock assessment workshop	Added to FAP
13. Information availability from the Maharashtra Department of Fisheries needs to be upgraded	Will be raised directly with the department but they have already prepared a report on MCS which is to be made available	Added to FAP
14. Stock assessments need to be subject to peer review	Will be covered during the proposed stock assessment workshop	Added to FAP

15. MCS in Maharashtra State – evidence that enforcement is taking place	This has been discussed with them and they say they have prepared a report. If it is available before the FAP is resubmitted it will be appended. If not it will become an action item	To be covered by FAP
16. Reference the National Marine Fisheries Policy in the FAP as it provides a template for improving MCS	Agreed	Added to FAP
17. Need for data on IOS from Maharashtra	Will be covered explicitly in the stock assessment workshop	Added to FAP
18. Data need to be obtained from southern States	Agreed. The Ratnagiri School of Fisheries is aware of this and can ask for it when the stock assessment method is decided upon.	Added to FAP
19. Species composition in catches - sardines	Agreed. Will be covered by observer program	Added to FAP
20. Data collection – ETP species	Agreed – covered in observer program	To be added to FAP
21. Ecological risk management strategy and information on how EwE can improve understanding of the impacts of fishing,	Our first step, in a couple of years, is to update and expand the existing EwE model and then see what may be required. Will add detail on EwE.	In FAP
22. Signatures – FAP consultants not signed up, agency staff not signed up	Having the FAP consultants named and signed up is not appropriate as it implies an ongoing contractual arrangement which may not be a commitment from the client.	No change proposed
23. More specific identification of entities to do improvement work	We can tie this down slightly more but naming individuals is inappropriate. Some of the responsible organisations will become clearer after the stock assessment workshop.	Added to FAP
24. Evidence of involvement by Ratnagiri School of Fisheries	We will provide some evidence	Added to FAP
25. Potential seabed interactions by purse seines	Will be covered by onboard observer program	Added to FAP
26. Budget matters	We will provide more detail	Added to FAP
27.		