

**ISSUES RAISED IN STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS
ON PROPOSED FISHERIES RESEARCH PROJECTS
AND MINISTRY OF FISHERIES ANALYSIS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

**LIST OF ORGANISATIONS MAKING SUBMISSIONS
ON THE DRAFT FISHERIES RESEARCH PROPOSALS FOR
2006/07**

Full name of organisation	Short version
The New Zealand Seafood Industry Council Ltd	SeaFIC
Te Ohui Kai Moana Trustee Ltd	Te Ohu
New Zealand Big Game Fishing Council	NZBGFC
Te Runanga o Ngati Awa	Ngati Awa
Te Kupenga Whiturauroa a Maui	Te Kupenga
Mahia Coastal Marine Representing: - Rongomaiwahine Iwi Trust - Mahia Boating and Fishing Club	MCM
The Deepwater Stakeholder Group Ltd	DSG

INDEX OF ISSUES RAISED

Issue No.	Issue title	Page
18	General commentary on research process	7
19	Uncertainty of the research programme	11
20	Contingency programme	13
21	Tender rounds	14
22	Allocation of overheads to projects	15
23	Conditional nature of projects	16
24	Inappropriate bundling of projects	17
25	Project costings	18
26	Antarctic research	19
27	Deepwater research – general comments	20
28	OEO2006/01 - Estimation of the abundance of black oreo and smooth oreo in selected areas	21
29	OEO2006/02 - Oreo stock assessment	23
30	OEO2006/03 - Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment purposes	24
31	ORH2006/01A Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas	25
32	ORH2006/01B - Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas	26
33	ORH2006/02 - Orange roughy stock assessment	28
34	ORH2006/03 - Stock assessment of orange roughy fisheries outside the New Zealand EEZ	29
35	DEE2006/03 - Monitoring the abundance of deepwater sharks	30
36	OBS2006/0 - Research Observer Services – Deepwater Fisheries	31
37	HOK2006/01 - Hoki population modelling and stock assessment	32
38	HOK2006/02 - Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Chatham Rise using trawl surveys	33
39	HOK2006/03 - Estimation of spawning hoki biomass using acoustic surveys	34
40	HOK2006/05 - Hoki stock structure	35
41	HAK2006/01 - Stock assessment of hake	36
42	LIN2006/01 - Stock assessment of ling	37
43	MDT2006/01 - Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Southern Plateau using trawl surveys	38
44	MID2006/01 - Determination of catch at age in hoki, hake and ling fisheries	39
45	MID2006/02 - Catch sampling and ageing of hoki and ling in the Cook Strait fishery	40
46	MID2006/03 - Characterisation and fishery monitoring of middle depth species	41
47	MID 2006/04 - Determination of commercial fishing gear and changes in commercial fishing gear in all middle depths fisheries	42
48	SBW2006/01 - Stock assessment of southern blue whiting	43
49	SKI2006/01 - Stock assessment of gemfish (SKI 1 and 2)	44
50	OBS2006/03 - Research Observer Services – Middle Depths Fisheries	45
51	EEL2006/01 - Recruitment of freshwater eels	46
52	EEL2006/02 - Catch per unit effort analysis of the commercial eel fishery	47
53	FLA2006/01 - Productivity of green back flounder	48
54	FLA2006/02 - Monitoring FLA 3	49

55	GMU2006/0 - Relative abundance of grey mullet in GMU 1	50
56	INT2006/01 - Estimation of inshore fish abundance off the west coast South Island using trawl surveys	51
57	INT2006/02 - Estimation of inshore fish abundance off the east coast South Island from Kaikoura to Shag Point using trawl surveys	52
58	JDO2006/01 - Monitoring JDO 2	53
59	GUR2006/01 - Monitoring GUR 8	54
60	SCH2006/01 - Relative abundance of school shark in SCH 1 and 2	55
61	SCH2006/02 - Movement of school shark	56
62	COC2006/01 - Stock assessment of Snake Bank cockles	57
63	OYS2006/01 - Foveaux Strait oyster stock assessment	58
64	PAU2006/01 - Paua commercial catch sampling	59
65	PAU2006/02 - PAU 2 CPUE Analysis	60
66	PAU2006/03 - Stock assessment PAU 5B	61
67	PAU 2006/04 - Fine scale growth in paua populations	62
68	SCA2006/01 - Stock assessment of Coromandel scallops	63
69	SCA2006/02 - Stock assessment of Northland scallops	64
70	SCI2006/01 - Stock assessment of scampi	65
71	SCI2006/02 - Estimating the abundance of scampi	66
72	SCI2006/03 - Scampi biology and catchability	67
73	OBS2006/04: Research Observer Services – Shellfish Fisheries	68
74	AKI2006/01 - Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area	69
75	REC2006/01 - Shellfish harvesting in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area	69
76	BCO2006/01 - Estimation of relative biomass of pre-recruit and recruited blue cod in the Marlborough Sounds and Tasman/Golden Bays	71
77	CUS2006/01 - Monitoring S186A closures	72
78	EEL 2006/03 - Spawning escapement of female longfin eels	74
79	EEL2006/04 - Motu River eel fishery population survey	75
80	EEL2006/05 - Turaekaetai River eel population survey	75
81	EEL2006/06 - Customary eel fisheries in the Taharoa Lakes	76
82	EEL 2006/07 - Estimating the customary harvest of eels	77
83	EEL 2006/08 - Ngai Tahu customary eel fisheries	78
84	MUS2006/01 - Riverton Rocks and Katiki Beach mussel bed survey	79
85	PAU2006/06 - Survey of paua stocks within the East Otago Taiapure	80
86	PAU2006/07 - Survey of paua and kina populations in Tory Channel	81
87	REC2006/02 - Chatham Islands marine recreational fishing survey	82
88	REC2006/03 - Estimation of recreational snapper harvest in SNA 2	84
89	REC2006/05 - Taranaki recreational rock lobster survey	85
90	REC2006/06 - Monitoring recreational fishing in the Kaikoura – North Canterbury area	86
91	REC2006/07 - Motivations and perceptions of recreational fishers	87
92	SCA2006/03 - Abundance of scallops in Northland and Coromandel recreational fishing areas	88
93	SNA2006/04 - Selectivity of recreational catches in SNA 1	89
94	TOH2006/01 - Distribution and abundance of toheroa	90
95	TOH2006/03 - Estimation of growth and age in toheroa	91
96	TOH2006/04 - Toheroa abundance	92

97	PRO2006/01 - Data collection of demographic, distributional and trophic information on selected seabird species to allow estimation of effects of fishing on population viability PRO2006/02 - Modelling the effects of fishing on the population viability of selected Seabirds	93
98	PRO2006/03 - Modelling of the effects of fishing on the population viability of Hector's Dolphins	97
99	PRO2006/04 - Estimating the nature and extent of incidental captures of seabirds in New Zealand commercial fisheries	101
100	PRO2006/05 - Estimating the nature and extent of marine mammal captures in New Zealand commercial fisheries	103
101	PRO2006/06 - Identification of marine mammals captured in New Zealand fisheries	105
102	PRO2006/07 - Characterise non-commercial fisheries interactions with seabirds and marine mammals	107
103	OBS2006/05 - Research Observer Services to estimate the nature and extent of incidental captures of protected species in the Squid Trawl fisheries	108
104	ENV2006/01 - Bycatch and discards in ling longline fisheries	109
105	IDG2006/01 - Finfish field identification guide	110
106	ENV2006/02 - Productivity of rattail bycatch species	111
107	ENV2006/03 - Bycatch and discards in squid trawl fisheries	112
108	BEN2006/01 - Mapping the spatial and temporal effect of fishing in the EEZ	115
109	BEN2006/02 - Assessing the adverse effects of fishing on soft sediment habitats and fauna	117
110	BEN2006/03 - Effects of fishing on seamounts, hills and knolls	120
111	BEN2006/04 - Identification of archived bycatch	122
112	BEN2006/05 - Risk assessment framework for assessing fishing and other anthropogenic effects on coastal fisheries	123
113	BEN2006/06 - Productivity of deepwater invertebrates	125
114	ENV2006/04 - Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries	127
115	ENV2006/05 - Climate and oceanographic trends relevant to New Zealand fisheries	128
116	ENV2006/06 - Trends in relative mesopelagic biomass using time series of acoustic backscatter data from trawl surveys	129
117	ENV2006/07 - Cumulative and historical effects of fishing and other relevant factors on New Zealand ecosystems	130
118	GBD2006/01 - DNA database for commercial marine fish and invertebrates	131
119	HAB2006/01 - Biogenic habitats as areas of special significance for fisheries management	132
120	HAB2006/02 - Rhodolith beds as habitats of significance for fisheries management	133
121	EMA2006/01 Commercial catch monitoring of blue mackerel	135
122	JMA2006/01 - Multi-year monitoring of the species composition of the commercial catch of jack mackerel	137
123	JMA2006/02 - Stock structure of the native jack mackerel species	138
124	KAH2006/01 - Stock structure of kahawai	139
125	KAH2006/02 - Stock monitoring of kahawai – using recreational catches	141
126	KIN2006/01 - Stock monitoring of kingfish	142
127	KIN2006/02 - Commercial handling mortality of kingfish	143

128	PEL2006/01 - Design of a multi-purpose aerial survey for pelagic fisheries	144
129	PEL2006/02 - Bycatch of pelagic fish from other fisheries	145
130	SHK2006/01 - Characterisation of pelagic shark fisheries	147
131	STM2006/01 - Multi-year stock monitoring of striped marlin including logbook programme implementation	148
132	STN2006/01 - Catch-at age of southern bluefin tuna	149
133	TAG2006/01 - Management of data from the gamefish tag recapture programme	150
134	TAG2006/02 - Determination of habitat preference using electronic tags	151
135	TAG2006/03 - Management of the archival tag recapture program	152
136	TRE2006/01 - Monitoring the length and age structure of commercial landings of trevally in TRE 1 and TRE 7	153
137	TUN2006/01 - Commercial catch sampling programme for highly migratory fish species	154
138	OBS2006/06 - Research Observer Services – Pelagic Fisheries	155

FISHERIES RESEARCH SERVICES FOR 2006/2007

Note: The following projects are all contained within the Output Class: Fisheries information and Output: Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured. The tables will therefore refer only to the specific projects and the relevant page numbers in the Ministry proposed services document and the stakeholder written submissions

Issue 18 –General commentary on research process

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 19, para 75 and paras 96 – 99 MCM: page 3 para 5 and 25 - 34

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

64. We note that \$1 million has been transferred from research activity for 2006/07 to fisheries operations. We have been advised that the impact of this budget reduction on research activity has not yet been assessed. The Ministry has also advised that, since no resources will be transferred between the business units, a \$1 million reduction in expenditure on approved research projects is likely. However it is uncertain at this stage which projects will not proceed in 2006/07.

96. SeaFIC's submissions on the proposed fisheries research services for 2006/07 has been compiled by SeaFIC staff in consultation with relevant members of the seafood industry and builds on the brief submission we made on 31 October 2005. Before commenting on the specific projects we make some general comments.

97. SeaFIC was impressed with the improved process for the 2006/07 consultation with most project proposals having clear objectives and a better defined rationale than provided in the past. It is good that MFish has responded positively to the submissions we made in previous years.

98. The Research Coordinating Committee was chaired well in 2005 and it was heartening to see MFish in the main being responsive to stakeholder suggestions, deferring low priority or weak projects and making changes to the proposals after the meeting. However, we note that there was some "unevenness" in the Research Planning Group process. In some cases fishery managers gave input at that stage but in other cases fishery managers' first consideration of projects seemed to be at the Committee stage. In our opinion, managers' input should be at an early stage, so that projects without an established management rationale do not reach the Committee.

99. We also note the unevenness of the Medium Term Research Plans. It would be useful if they were reviewed for MFish by someone who is outside the Research Planning Group process. The brief should be to identify the plans or sections of plans which need

improvement, ensuring clear linkage to specified management needs. We understand that the Medium Term Research Plans are fluid documents which evolve over time, but this is no excuse for documents which at times appear to be an afterthought rather than the foundation document which guides research.

Mahia MCM comment

5 There needs to be more research emphasised in statistical areas of QMA, as this will provide a more detailed/intimate assessment of what is truly occurring with various spp, in particular, shellfish. This would then lead to providing an increase knowledge base of what happens to each spp which then leads to effective management decisions on each spp. This type of research can also be complimented with research data collection for Mataitai, 186a Temporary Closures, Taiapure, and Regulations 27 A aspects when these issues are ready to be assessed.

Fisheries Research proposals that have been declined should receive a written explanation of the reasons why the proposed project was declined.

26 Increased research projects on rock lobster as this is a highly valued spp across the board of all stakeholder groups.

27 Increased funds to the non commercial projects as the harvest levels as there is little known.

28 All information on completed projects is made public, available to public.

29 Localised research in general and stock assessments should be encouraged as it assists mataitai and other customary management tools with in the Act.

30 Non commercial projects should include at diverse range of stocks and that are of high value to the groups.

31 Projects that have an enhancement/rebuilding of stocks that have a non commercial gain component should be accepted.

32 There should be alternate ways to carryout a project. In particular to Stock assessment projects. Certain parts of the primary data collection for stock assessments can be carried out by those who live in the area, thus reducing the cost of the project, and putting the money into another project that needs addressing in that same section.

33 Need a stock assessment for the CRA 3 area. This was indicated as a high priority, and yet there is no project accepted in Tier 1 and no possible project as indicated in Tier 2.

34 Include all non commercial and other customary related projects proposals and partial decision making under the DoSIP especially if the recreational groups are combined with this forum, as this sector knows what is best needed to be research.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry thanks SeaFIC and Mahia MCM for their positive comments about the Research Planning process this year. In turn, we would like to express our gratitude to all stakeholders who participated in the process for the generally constructive comments that were made throughout the process via the Research Planning Groups (RPGs), the Research Coordinating Committee (RCC) and the first set of written submissions to which we have already responded. This is a large and difficult task for all players and the overall increase in the spirit of cooperation was notable this year.

In response to some of the individual points:

Regarding paragraph 75 of the SeaFIC submission, we assure SeaFIC that total expenditures on research will not exceed the total research budget.

Regarding paragraph 98 of the SeaFIC submission, the MFish Science team engages MFish managers throughout the entire research planning process. Although, in some cases, managers may not have been able to attend particular RPGs, they participated in the planning processes leading up to these meetings and the scientists discussed the outcomes of the meetings with them afterwards. We also held a lengthy meeting involving all Senior Fisheries Management Advisors subsequent to the RCC to enable further discussion and deliberation.

Regarding paragraph 99 of the SeaFIC submission, we believe that the RPGs are the appropriate group for reviewing the Medium Term Research Plans, and note the lack of resources and time for conducting external reviews of these plans. Most plans are revised annually following several intensive months of stock assessments and sustainability rounds, just prior to entering the research planning round of annual activities. However, if stakeholders wish to point out some specific problems, we would be happy to discuss further.

Regarding paragraphs 5 and 29 of the Mahia MCM submission, we note and agree with the need for finer-scale research, but also note that we are limited in budget and resources in terms of how much fine-scale research is feasible.

Regarding paragraph 26 of the Mahia MCM submission, research on rock lobsters is already extensive compared with many other QMS species, and the research plan receives considerable input from stakeholder groups.

Regarding paragraph 27 of the Mahia MCM submission, funds to non-commercial projects have already been increased recently, including an additional \$800,000 per year for recreational projects, and increased emphasis on supporting customary projects.

Regarding paragraph 28 of the Mahia MCM submission, there is a general requirement to write up and publish research projects. These reports are available to the public.

Regarding paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Mahia MCM submission, we endeavour to consider all projects that meet specified management objectives.

Regarding paragraph 32 of the Mahia MCM submission, we routinely examine the most cost-effective mechanisms for accomplishing research objectives. Indeed, this is one of the key aspects of the elaborate consultation process that we conduct each year.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 19 – Uncertainty of the research programme

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: pages 19 – 2- paras 100 - 104

Submission Details

SeaFIC asks:

100 We are concerned at the level of uncertainty affecting the research programme for 2006/07. The Proposed Fisheries Services document should be a statement to interested parties of the services to be provided by the Ministry. Once the services are agreed they should form the basis of the contract between the Minister and the Chief Executive of the Ministry for services to be delivered in 2006/07.

101 There is no certainty as to what will be delivered on the research programme. At the output level, there is to be a reduction of \$1 million in the budget. The impact of that reduction has not been factored into the research programme and it is possible that some research projects will be curtailed to achieve the savings.

102 In addition to the uncertainty of the overall budget and programme, the Ministry is seeking to introduce a contingency measure whereby Tier Two projects will be substituted for High Priority projects if a high priority project is withdrawn. With tenders being sought already for three Tier Two projects, we have little confidence in the integrity of the process being proposed. We have found that in the Orange Roughy fishery, the Ministry has proposed a placeholder project to be undertaken in the event that a primary project does not proceed. There is no indication as to the risk of the primary project not proceeding. With different stocks to be levied under each project, the industry is unable to determine what research project will be undertaken.

103 At the project level, there is significant uncertainty. Many projects are conditional on development or confirmation of the research design or the completion of existing research projects. Some projects do not have the research content specified and provide an “either this or that” content.

104 In summary, the industry is uncertain as to:

- what will be spent in aggregate on research projects in 2006/07;
- which research projects will be undertaken in 2006/07; and
- what will be delivered for some projects.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As detailed in the Ministry’s response to SeaFIC’s submission points 76 to 79, the Ministry has a thorough and robust process in place to identify and consult on fisheries research projects. This process typically results in a portfolio of potential research projects, all considered as priority projects, the projected cost of which exceeds available budget funding. By necessity, the Ministry must manage a process to identify which priority projects are to be budgeted (Tier 1) and which priority projects are initially unfunded (Tier 2). The objective of

the Tier 1 and Tier 2 structure is that any Tier 1 projects that do not proceed can be replaced, after and subject to further consultation requirements, by Tier 2 projects. It is stressed that only projects that are considered priority projects, after having been through the research planning and consultation processes, would be designated Tier 1 or Tier 2 projects.

Some 2006/07 projects were tendered in 2005/06 in anticipation of potential funding being available following the cancellation of some 2005/06 projects. It has transpired that the potential funding is not available and the tendering process will be halted.

Regarding paragraph 103, the Ministry believes that, given the long lead times necessary to conduct the comprehensive Research Planning process that we have in place (a minimum of a year, and possibly as long as two years for some projects), it is necessary to have flexibility in the system.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 20 – Contingency programme

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 20, paras 105 - 106

Submission Details

105 In Peter Murray’s letter to stakeholders (dated 31 January 2006) regarding the consultation on the Fisheries Services Proposed for 2006/07, he states that MFish is proposing a research programme that exceeds the current appropriations on the basis that each year some projects do not proceed. We have discussed this proposal in detail earlier in our submission and we reiterate here that SeaFIC does not agree with this approach. **Please note that while in this part of our submission we have made comments on the merits or otherwise of the proposed second tier projects, the comments are not to be construed as an endorsement of the approach.**

106 Examination of research proposals should be rigorous with clear outcomes related to well-specified management needs. This is necessary for good planning both by the Ministry and by stakeholders. The proposed method of proceeding has the potential to seriously undermine stakeholder ability to plan business finances. The proposed method also runs the risk of promoting a lax approach to the planning, prioritisation and procurement processes.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As SeaFIC acknowledged in earlier paragraphs (e.g., paragraph 75), the process undertaken by the Ministry this year was more rigorous than ever before, with most projects having clear objectives and a better defined rationale than provided in the past. The proposed method will not be lax; rather, it will require the highest level of scrutiny, as well as frequent consultation with the industry.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 21 – Tender rounds

Proposed research services page no.	21
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 8

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

107 SeaFIC has a problem with the Ministry tendering 2006/07 projects in February 2006 which are still the subject of the current consultation round. It is difficult to see the integrity of the consultation process being maintained in the face of such a process.

108 While there could be a rational argument made for such a practice if it was necessary to have data collection and sampling underway early in the fishing season, only five of the 22 research projects for 2006 already tendered have a need for field survey or sampling. The remainder are reviews of historical data, literature reviews or scientific study of existing biological material. For these projects, an early start before the consultation process is complete is totally unnecessary. There is little justification, therefore, for 2006/07 projects to be tendered before consultation is completed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The practice of tendering projects prior to final approval by the Minister has been in place for several years. Again, this is a reflection of the inherent lags in the system created by the necessity for thorough consultation with stakeholders and thorough evaluation of research tenders. We assure SeaFIC that no contracts will be awarded until final approval by the Minister. If the Minister disapproves a project, research providers will be advised that any tenders they provided are no longer valid. We would also like to point out that the projects that are tendered early have already been through three rounds of consultation with stakeholders: in the RPGs, the RCC and the first set of written responses to which the Ministry has already responded.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 22 – Allocation of overheads to projects

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 21 para 109

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

109 SeaFIC believes that the current Ministry practice of allocating all science overheads on the basis of research project value is resulting in an inequitable distribution of the costs across the fish stocks. SeaFIC has asked for but not been provided with a breakdown of the overhead costs levied on the research projects. Nevertheless, we would advocate that the Ministry review its cost allocation policy. A fairer means might be to allocate the science group costs and the inherited corporate charges on a port price basis across all stocks and distribute only the contract management costs by the value of the projects.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry acknowledges the comments from SeaFIC.

The present cost allocation policy was set three years ago and the Ministry would encourage further interaction with SeaFIC to understand why they believe the current approach leads to inequitable outcomes.

However, the Ministry believes that any amendment to the policy could more profitably be undertaken at the same time as the review of the cost recovery framework.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by the submitters;
- b) **note** the response from the Ministry.

Issue 23 – Conditional nature of projects

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 21, paras 110 - 111

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

110 There are a number of projects for which the research design or the viability of the project is conditional on other work or projects being completed. The Ministry has not provided any statement as to the status of the prior project and whether the data will be available in the form expected for the 2006/07 project to commence as scoped.

111 We do not believe it is sound management of the research programme to approve projects with conditional impacts without an assessment of the risks constituted by those conditions. We would expect that the Ministry would provide updated status positions for the associated work to enable the industry to assess the probability of work progressing as scheduled in 2006/07. Conditional projects carry the risk of being withdrawn. If there are conditional projects which already are likely to have to be withdrawn, then they should be withdrawn before being approved for funding in 2006/07.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry believes that, given the long lead times necessary to conduct the comprehensive Research Planning process that we have in place (a minimum of a year, and possibly as long as two years for some projects), it is necessary to have flexibility in the system. We have not included any projects that are more likely than not to be withdrawn.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 24 –Inappropriate bundling of projects

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: pages 21 – 22, paras 112 - 114

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

112 A number of projects contain a first objective relating to the development or confirmation of the methodology to be applied for the undertaking of the sampling survey also proposed. We do not believe that it is good practice for a research project to contain a methodological perspective and a physical survey. Since the methodology will impact on the utility of the final outcome, SeaFIC expects to be consulted on the methodology prior to commencement of any survey or scientific study employing that methodology. We believe that such proposals should be divided into two projects, one relating to methodology and the other to the physical study. The second project would not be tendered until there was wider agreement on the suitability of the methodology.

113 The bundling of the projects prevents parties who may be able to provide the data collection aspect in a more cost effective and efficient manner from competing for the bundled project. We are sceptical of the wisdom and the rationale for the bundling of some projects.

114 We are also concerned at the bundling of a number of projects into one composite project without there being separate time frames and budgets established for the sub-projects. This results in a loss of transparency and accountability for the achievement of the individual subprojects. We believe that the Ministry should manage projects and budgets at the subproject level.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry frequently invites approved research providers to tender for individual parts of projects in those cases where it is not necessary that a single provider undertake the entire project. We believe that it is more transparent and expedient to put related objectives together into a single project, rather than dividing these related objectives into several projects, where the relationship between them may not seem apparent.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 25 – Project costings

Proposed research services page no.	N/A
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 22, para 115

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

115 SeaFIC is concerned at the expected costings of some of the research projects. There are a number of projects which are, in essence, a literature review or an analysis of historical data. These projects are estimated to have a cost of between \$25,000 and \$75,000. That price range appears excessive given the nature of the project and the absence of any field work. It is likely that the provision of the range has set an expectation of where providers are expected to tender, to the detriment of the industry.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Literature reviews and analyses of historical data tend to attract multiple tenders, including research providers represented by a single individual. We assure SeaFIC that we will accept the lowest bid that passes our quality assurance protocols.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments made by SeaFIC, along with those made by other stakeholders in previous submissions on fisheries research services;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS

ANTARCTIC PROJECTS

Issue 26 – Antarctic research

Proposed research services page no.	12 - 25
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 22; para 116 - 117

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

116 SeaFIC supports the four proposed projects in this section:

Project ANT2006/01	Biology of fishes in the toothfish fishery
Project ANT2006/02	Stock assessment for the toothfish fishery
Project ANT2006/03	Ecosystem modelling of the Ross Sea
Project OBS2006/01	Research Observer Services – Antarctic Fisheries

117 We would like to be kept up to date with changes to the proposals as a result of the July and October 2006 meetings of the CCAMLR Working Groups.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the SeaFIC support for the Antarctic fisheries research projects. SeaFIC, as an active member of the Antarctic Fisheries Stock Assessment Working Group will be kept informed of changes to the proposals as a result of the July and October 2006 meetings of the CCAMLR Working Groups.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that these projects remain as Tier 1 projects; and
- (d) **approve** these projects as required fisheries services.

DEEPWATER PROJECTS

Issue 27 – General comments

Proposed research services page no.	Pages 26 - 51
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: pages 22 – 23, para 118

Submission Details

118 It is crucial that the Deepwater projects and research plan are reviewed following the orange roughy workshop which concluded on 9 February 2006. A review also needs to be undertaken on completion and reporting of the experimental acoustic work, to be conducted during June/July 2006.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry agrees.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses.

Issue 28 – OEO2006/01: Estimation of the abundance of black oreo and smooth oreo in selected areas

Proposed research services page no.	27 - 29
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	23

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

119 We support the Deepwater Medium Term Research Plan which outlines the need to estimate the abundance of oreos in each of the main fisheries in the New Zealand EEZ every 3 to 5 years. However, we submit that for the smaller, low value fisheries such as OEO3A, it would be appropriate to survey at 5-year intervals, assuming there are no immediate sustainability concerns.

120 Black oreo in OEO 3A is due to be surveyed after 4 years. We caution, however, that the acoustic methodology is at its limits especially with respect to depth and species mixture. The multiple species nature of the marks being investigated (black and smooth, with blacks being much stronger in relative target strength than smooth) and the reliance on "mark type" designations (which is at best subjective) makes the reliability of these surveys questionable. There is a flaw in the assumption that the trawl selectivity for each species in each "mark type" is the same.

121 We are concerned about the ambiguity in the proposal. Depending on the outcome of the November 2005 workshop on acoustic techniques, and pending results of experiments that are planned as part of the OEO2005/01 survey in OEO 4 in October/November 2005, we note the intention to either go ahead with the survey or to replace it with directed experiments to better characterise species distribution and address acoustic assumptions and uncertainties.

122 Two months after the workshop and survey, there is still no certainty about whether the survey will go ahead. No information has been provided on how the outcome of the November 2005 workshop might impact on the research design and costs.

123 If the content of the project that is finally undertaken is dependent on the “need for preliminary work to evaluate whether relative time series of acoustic estimates are robust”, the final project should not be approved for 2006/07 until the preliminary work has been completed. With industry funding this project, we have a right to know what research services we are purchasing. An “either /or” project provides no certainty to the industry as to the nature, risks or benefits of the project.

124 We submit that this project is not ready to be undertaken in 2006/07 because of the uncertainty as to the research design and its dependence on the outcomes of other projects.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

SeaFIC seems to be implying that research planning should be suspended if there is other ongoing work that may inform the validity or design of the research. If this were to be the norm, the only research we would undertake would be research on species or issues that have

never been studied before. Given the long lead times necessary to conduct the comprehensive research planning process that we have in place (a minimum of a year, and possibly as long as two years for some projects), it is necessary to have flexibility in the system. The Ministry believes that one of the essential strengths of the current system is, in fact, its flexibility. We assure SeaFIC that we will take account of current knowledge prior to tendering any particular project, with a view to modifying that project appropriately. And, of course, any project that is modified from the form it takes in the SOI will be consulted upon with the industry.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 29 – OEO2006/02 Oreo stock assessment

Proposed research services page no.	30 - 32
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 23, para 125

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

125 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry acknowledges SeaFIC's support.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 30 – OEO2006/03 Ageing of smooth oreo otoliths for stock assessment purposes

Proposed research services page no	33 - 34
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 23, para 126

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

126 SeaFIC supports this proposal in principle. However, while this project is contingent on the need “for development of ageing protocol and samples” there is no discussion of these risks.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry acknowledges SeaFIC’s support. In terms of the need for the development of ageing protocols and samples, the Ministry believes this requires further examination. While the Workshops on data and assessments for orange roughy concluded that current ageing techniques were inadequate for providing reliable or useful orange roughy ages, it is not necessarily true that this conclusion can or should be extrapolated to oreos on the basis of existing knowledge. The Ministry believes that a prudent amount of additional research should be conducted to make this determination and, if ageing is successful, to develop age-length keys for use in stock assessments.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 31 – ORH2006/01A Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas

Proposed research services page no.	35 - 37
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 24, paras 127 - 128

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

127 SeaFIC notes that only one project out of ORH2006/01A and ORH2006/01B will go forward and that recommendations from the workshop to improve biomass estimates of orange roughy (24-25 November 2005) will be incorporated.

128 We agree with the conclusion that “acoustic estimates of orange roughy biomass in the spawning box and eastern flats were relatively low and therefore it is essential to conduct a second survey as a check on the 2004 estimates and potentially as a second point in a continuing time series”. We support a trawl survey here, but not one adopting the same approach as the trawl/acoustic survey in 2004, as the November 2005 workshop demonstrated this survey methodology was flawed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Objective 4 of project ORH2005-02, which is already underway, requires the research provider (NIWA) to:

“analyse the results of the winter 2004 combined trawl – acoustic surveys on the Northeast Chatham Rise to determine how frequently, if at all, these surveys should be repeated.”

We expect results from this objective to be available for the Deepwater Working Group to examine and discuss in July or August 2006. Results from the planned acoustic experiments should be available at about the same time or shortly thereafter. These and other relevant sources of information will be considered long before the survey design is finalised.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 32 – ORH2006/01B Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas

Proposed research services page no.	38 - 40
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 24, paras 129 - 133

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

129 We note that this project is a placeholder in case the Mid-East Coast orange roughy survey planned and approved for winter 2006 does not proceed. We see no essential difference between the “placeholder” concept and the Ministry’s proposed Tier One/Two contingency programme. Just as we oppose the Tier programme, we do not support the Ministry’s proposal of “placeholder” projects.

130 We have read nothing in the summary of ORH2006/01A that suggests that the project is under some risk of not proceeding. The Ministry proposal of a placeholder suggests that the Ministry is aware of some risks which it has not shared with industry.

131 In addition to the problems of the Tier proposal, this placeholder adds an extra concern as to which fish-stocks will be levied in 2006/07 given that the projects related to different fish-stocks and the project costs are significant. SeaFIC does not accept that the Fisheries Act provides for levies to be set to recover costs for both projects and as a matter of principle does not accept that the Minister should approve the Statement of Intent while it contains this placeholder project.

132 If this project is assessed as having high priority but cannot be justified for undertaking in 2006/07, then it should be deferred to a later year as is the case with a number of other high priority projects.

133 However, we note that while only one of these projects will proceed, the cost of both appears to be included in the funding summary, thus giving a \$1 - \$2 million contingency.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry does not consider the Mid-East Coast orange roughy survey to be a “placeholder”. A survey is proposed for either the Northeast Chatham Rise or the Mid-East Coast, not both. Therefore, orange roughy quota holders will not be levied twice. The total cost will be \$1 - \$2 million, not double this amount. It should also be noted that the Mid-East Coast survey for winter 2006 has already been withdrawn and the associated levy will be refunded to the quota holders if there has been any charge at this stage. The Ministry has heeded previous comments made by SeaFIC and others and is not planning to conduct any orange roughy surveys in 2006.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 33 – ORH2006/02 Orange roughy stock assessment

Proposed research services page no.	41 - 44
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 24, para 134 Te Ohu: page 7, para 45 - 46

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

134 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Te Ohu comment

47 We note the caveat on undertaking a MEC assessment.

48 We are concerned though that once again there is no proposal for work on the ORH7A fishery. That fishery has been effectively closed to all activity since year 2000. In our view the Crown cannot just keep on ignoring its responsibilities to ascertain if the closure has achieved its objective of stock restoration. Six years is quite long enough to prove whether or not closure of stressed ORH fisheries is a valid management tool and the Crown needs now to ascertain if the closure in 2000 has achieved its nominated purpose.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal.

Regarding paragraph 48 of the Te Ohu submission, we would like to remind Te Ohu that the (then) Orange Roughy Management Company undertook a survey of ORH7A in winter 2005, and the results were examined by the Deepwater Working Group on 23-24 November 2005. Estimates of biomass were similar to those obtained on the last survey in the early 1990s just prior to the effective closure of the fishery. The Deepwater Stakeholder Group is planning another survey in winter 2006.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

**Issue 34 – ORH2006/03 Stock assessment of orange roughy fisheries outside the
New Zealand EEZ**

Proposed research services page no.	45 - 46
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 24, para 135

Submission Details

SeaFIC Comment

135 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry acknowledges SeaFIC's support.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	47 - 48
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 24 - 25, para 136 - 137

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

136 SeaFIC supports this proposal but questions whether it should be high priority and have a Tier 1 classification because trawl survey data indicate that population sizes of most species are reasonably stable.

137 Since this is solely an analysis of already held records, the costs should not be in the \$25,000 - \$75,000 bracket.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Deepwater sharks are a suite of species considered to be susceptible to overfishing as they are likely to have high longevity, low fecundity and late maturation. They have declined dramatically in other parts of the world. There are no recent comprehensive analyses of potential abundance indicators for deepwater sharks. For these reasons, the Ministry believes that the project should proceed. It should also be noted that the Ministry is currently developing an NPOA for sharks and this type of analysis is needed to support the NPOA.

The Ministry will accept the lowest bid for this desktop exercise, provided that the tender passes our quality assurance protocols.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	49 - 51
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 138 Te Ohu: page 7, para 49

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

138 While SeaFIC supports this proposal in principle, there is an inconsistency between the allocations of days as contained in the argument of the project and the cost recovery information. The costs should be attributed according to rule 8 of the Fisheries (Cost Recovery) Rules 2001 in the manner specified in the project detail.

Te Ohu comment

49 We disagree with the cost allocation proposals (p.51) for this project. The commercial industry in general should bear **no** costs for ORH work outside the EEZ – costs involved should be directly recovered from those who fish such locations. For those ORH and OEO fishstocks where sub-area limits apply, we consider costs should be allotted to the relevant sub-areas, rather than to the stocks as a whole.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry acknowledges the comments from SeaFIC and Te Ohu with respect to the inconsistency in the application of the Cost Recovery Rules to Observer projects. All Observer costs are allocated on the basis of the number of days coverage for each fish stock rather than being levied against specific research projects. The reason they are shown in the proposed fisheries research documentation is to enable stakeholders to see how many Observer days are allocated to the various fishery areas (ie deepwater, middle depths). The Ministry has amended the Observer project information so that it is clear what Cost Recovery Rules are being applied.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** that the Ministry has amended the Observer project information so that it is clear what Cost Recovery Rules are being applied; and
- c) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

HOKI AND MIDDLE DEPTHS PROJECTS

Issue 37 – HOK2006/01 Hoki population modelling and stock assessment

Proposed research services page no.	53 - 54
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 139

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

139 SeaFIC supports the proposed research content but believes that the two components making up the project should be tendered as separate projects because of their differing natures.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC. The second objective is a minor piece of work which informs the Fishery Assessment Working Group about any changes in the fishery during the last fishing year. Therefore it is important that this objective is completed in time for the meetings but it does not warrant a separate project considering the cost and effort involved.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 38 – HOK2006/02 Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Chatham Rise using trawl surveys

Proposed research services page no.	55 - 56
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 140 Te Ohu: page 7, para 50 - 51

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

140 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Te Ohu comment

50 We are surprised that there is no objective in the 2006 proposal relating to HAK or LIN work. This has been a traditional part of the Chatham Rise survey – as noted in the project *Rationale* – and we can see little reason to discontinue the practice.

51 Te Ohu proposes that this project be extended to include an objective relating to either HAK or LIN.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments of SeaFIC and Te Ohu. The first objective of this project includes “other middle depth species on the Chatham Rise”. Within the design of the survey, consideration of hake and ling is explicitly covered in the allocation of stations to meet the target CVs of the survey. Collection of ageing material from hake and ling on the Chatham Rise is also required from the survey under the agreed protocol for middle depth trawl surveys. The otoliths sampled from hake and ling will be processed within project MID2006/01 (objectives 3 and 4).

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	57 - 58
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 141

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

141 SeaFIC supports further acoustic surveys for hoki as appropriate but that this should be in the 2007/08 year. Additionally, such surveys should not be provided as part of MFish services but should be directly purchased by the stakeholder company.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments of SeaFIC. The direct purchase of research by the stakeholder company may be possible in future when fisheries plans are in operation. The timing of the next acoustic survey in this area in winter 2007 was recommended by the Research Planning Group for hoki and middle depth fisheries.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	59 - 61
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 142

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

142 SeaFIC supports this proposal. However, we note the uncertainty with the completion date (30 September 2007?) and that this project is contingent on progress with research in 2005-06 to differentiate between fish from different spawning grounds. We assume that if research in 2005-06 is not successful then this proposal will not proceed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project. There is some uncertainty about the timing of this project as the preliminary study has been delayed and the project will not proceed unless this work is completed.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 41 – HAK2006/01 Stock assessment of hake

Proposed research services page no.	62 - 63
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 25, para 143

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	64 - 65
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 26 - 27, para 144

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

144 SeaFIC supports the content of the proposal but has problem with the bundling of the project and the lack of certainty as to what will be delivered. In particular, we are concerned that while objectives 1 and 2 relate to all ling stocks, stock assessments under objective 3 will only be undertaken for two ling stocks, to be determined at a later date by the Middle Depths Fisheries Assessment Group. While it is appropriate that the research costs for Objective 1 and 2 should be spread over all ling stocks, it is inequitable to spread the stock assessment costs over fish stocks for which no assessments were made. It is not acceptable that the target stocks for stock assessment have not been predetermined and that industry is being asked to pay for unspecified research projects.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project. It is not possible to determine which stocks will be assessed this far in advance. The stocks to be assessed in the current project LIN2005/01 have not yet been determined. Cost recovery adjustments would appear to be the appropriate mechanism to correct the proportion of levies paid by the various ling quota holders.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 43 – MDT2006/01 Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Southern Plateau using trawl surveys

Proposed research services page no.	66 -67
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 145

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

145 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 44 – MID2006/01 Determination of catch at age in hoki, hake and ling fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	68 - 70
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 146

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

146 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	71 - 72
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 147

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

147 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 46 – MID2006/03 Characterisation and fishery monitoring of middle depth species

Proposed research services page no.	73 - 74
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 148

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

148 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 47 – MID 2006/04 Determination of commercial fishing gear and changes in commercial fishing gear in all middle depths fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	75 - 76
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 149 Te Ohu: page 7, para 52

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

149 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Te Ohu comment

52 In our view costs of this project should be attributed only to the target fisheries involved, to avoid double-counting. This would mean omitting FRO, GSH, GSP, LDO and probably SWA stocks from the cost allocation calculations.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project and the comments by Te Ohu. The assessment of all middle depth fish stocks could potentially benefit from this work, particularly the bycatch species, therefore it is appropriate to levy all the QMS species in these fisheries.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	77 - 78
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 150

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

150 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	79 – 80
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 151

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

151 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 50 – OBS2006/03 Research Observer Services – Middle Depths Fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	81 - 83
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 152

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

152 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses; and
- c) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

INSHORE FINFISH AND EEL FISHERIES PROJECTS

Issue 51 – EEL2006/01 Recruitment of freshwater eels

Proposed research services page no.	85 - 87
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 27, para 153

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

153 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 52 – EEL2006/02 Catch per unit effort analysis of the commercial eel fishery

Proposed research services page no.	88 - 89
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 154

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

154 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 53 – FLA2006/01 Productivity of green back flounder

Proposed research services page no.	90 - 91
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 155

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

155 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 54 – FLA2006/02 Monitoring FLA 3

Proposed research services page no.	92 - 93
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 156 Te Ohu: page 8, para 53

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

156 SeaFIC supports this proposal as being classified as Tier 2.

Te Ohu comment

53 There is no clear rationale for this project. The CELR data will be patchy at best, because of the long-term use of the FLA code, and the results could be misleading. We would suggest a better approach might be to seek the assistance of a few processing plants to analyse their records and see what data is available, plus talk to South-East Inshore.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC and Te Ohu. Recent research in FMA 1 demonstrated it is possible to develop CPUE indices of abundance for individual flatfish species based on preliminary analysis that indicates a substantial proportion of fishers in FMA 3 use species specific flatfish codes. The fishery characterisation (specific objective 1) is included to ensure undue confidence is not placed in “misleading” results.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 55 - GMU2006/0 Relative abundance of grey mullet in GMU 1

Proposed research services page no.	94 - 95
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 157

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

157 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

**Issue 56 - INT2006/01 Estimation of inshore fish abundance off the west coast South
Island using trawl surveys**

Proposed research services page no.	96 - 98
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 158

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

158 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	99 - 101
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 159

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

159 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	102 - 103
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 160

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

160 SeaFIC supports this proposal as being classified Tier 2.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project and the current priority ranking.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 59 – GUR2006/01 Monitoring GUR 8

Proposed research services page no.	104 - 105
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 161

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

161 SeaFIC supports this proposal as being classified Tier 2.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project and the current priority ranking.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 60 – SCH2006/01 Relative abundance of school shark in SCH 1 and 2

Proposed research services page no.	106 - 107
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 162

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

162 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 61 – SCH2006/02 Movement of school shark

Proposed research services page no.	108 - 109
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 163

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

163 SeaFIC does not support this project for two reasons. First there is a large potential to misinterpret tagging data. Second, there is a high cost. SeaFIC recalls that there was agreement at the RCC that continuation of the ad-hoc design of previous projects was not adequate and that a better design was required. We would support this project if it is to provide a design for a project which will then be reviewed by the Inshore Working Group before a dedicated tagging study project is put forward.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's comments. The purpose of the second specific objective is to ensure that the tagging information is not misinterpreted. This objective will also provide recommendations on the design of future tagging programmes to provide quantitative information on the movement of school shark around New Zealand.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

SHELLFISH FISHERIES PROJECTS

Issue 62 – COC2006/01 Stock assessment of Snake Bank cockles

Proposed research services page no.	111 - 112
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 28, para 164

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

164 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	113 - 114
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 165

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

165 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 64 – PAU2006/01 Paua commercial catch sampling

Proposed research services page no.	115 - 116
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 166

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

166 SeaFIC supports this proposal in principle. However, given the need for consultation and acceptance of the sampling programme, the possibility of delay before the sampling programme is commenced and the exclusion of possible alternative service providers if the projects are bundled, we believe that the project should be divided into two projects – one dealing with the design of the sampling programme and the second being the collection of data using the approved sampling programme.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC for this project. The combination of the separate objectives to design the sampling programme and to undertake the catch sampling, does not preclude co-operation between different service providers.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	117 - 118
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 167

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

167 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2. We note a mistake on page 110 of the FRS where this proposal is named as ‘Stock assessment PAU 2’.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	119 - 120
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 168

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

168 SeaFIC supports this proposal. We note on page 110 of the FRS that this proposal is named as ‘Paua 5B abundance and stock assessment’.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 67 – PAU 2006/04 Fine scale growth in paua populations

Proposed research services page no.	121 - 122
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 169

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

169 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	123 - 125
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 170

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

170 SeaFIC supports this proposal in principle. However, as it is conditional on consultation in April 2007, it is unlikely to proceed until after June 2007. We submit that the project should not be levied until 2007/08 and should be introduced in the planning processes for that year.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project. The project will be undertaken within the 2006/07 fishing year.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	126 - 128
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 171

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

171 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	129 - 130
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 172

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

172 SeaFIC supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	131 - 133
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 173 Te Ohu: page 8, para 54 - 56

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

173 It is agreed that applying the photographic technology to the sub-Antarctic waters presents potential technological challenges and risks. SeaFIC maintains that preliminary work should be undertaken, prior to embarking on this full scale project to see if the photographic methodology is feasible in these waters.

Te Ohu comment

54. Te Ohu does not support this project at this time. In our view, until a satisfactory means of assessing SCI abundance is available the project should be delayed. The photographic survey system is recognized as being considerably less than optimal, although used for SCI 1 and 2 stocks, but that does not mean we should continue to expand the use of an expensive, sub-optimal system.

55. We would also question the practicality of tagging SCI in depths of 300-500m, as required by objective 2.

56. To us, spending \$500,000 - \$1 million on such a doubtful project in a relatively small fishery is a ridiculous proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC and Te Ohu. The Ministry needs to plan for extending the methodology of photographic surveys to other scampi stocks and SCI 6A is the highest priority stock. The Ministry will consider the feasibility of extending the methodology as a pilot and will consider this and the practicality of tagging at the time of evaluation of any tenders and any subsequent tender negotiation.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	134 - 136
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 174 Te Ohu; page 8, para 57

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

174 SeaFIC agrees that this proposal should be in the Tier 2 category.

Te Ohu comment

This project also has a serious feasibility question over it. Objective 3 in particular implies the need to keep SCI alive to allow adequate laboratory work. While not flatly rejecting the proposal, as we can see the value of the data sought, Te Ohu suggests further thought be given to practicality before the project is allowed to proceed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC and Te Ohu. The methodology proposed for Objective 3 will be evaluated at the time of tender evaluation.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 73 – OBS2006/04: Research Observer Services – Shellfish Fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	137 - 139
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 29, para 175

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

175 SeaFIC supports this proposal subject to the following proposed changes:

- Deletion of the fourth objective - Design of the observer coverage is a scientific research task to be undertaken by the Science group and should therefore not be included as an objective for Observer Services projects nor funded from this output.
- Determination of the allocation for observer days by an allocation based on TACC - there is an inconsistency in the allocation of observer days in the Ministry proposal. In the discussion, the Ministry proposes to use a standard allocation of 40 observer days for each scampi fishery. In the Cost Recovery Information, a proposal is to allocate the days required by TACC. Assuming that 200 days is an appropriate sample for the fishstock in aggregate, a standard allocation of 40 days for each of the stocks will result in over and under represented results, with the larger and more critical fish-stocks being significantly under-represented.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments made by SeaFIC. Previous observer services projects have involved the design of the observer coverage required to meet the objectives of the observer coverage.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses; and
- c) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

NON-COMMERCIAL FISHERIES PROJECTS

Issue74 - AKI2006/01 Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area

Proposed research services page no.	141 - 143
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 176 Te Ohu: page 8 para 58

Issue 75 - REC2006/01 Shellfish harvesting in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area

Proposed research services page no.	165 - 167
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 188 Te Ohu: page 8 para 58 Ngati Awa: page 2 – 3

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

176 SeaFIC notes that the current project AKI2005/01 will provide a review of the methodology of the shellfish monitoring programme and will provide advice on future monitoring. We are happy that this project is subject to this review.

188 SeaFIC supports this proposal and agrees that this project should be undertaken in conjunction with the shellfish resource abundance surveys (*Project AKI 2006/01 Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area*). We note the different title on page 140 of the FRS i.e. “Non-commercial shellfish harvesting in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area.”

Te Ohu comment

58. These projects appear to repeat considerable parts of the activities to be undertaken. Te Ohu suggests thought be given to combining the two projects.

Ngati Awa comment

The project appears to focus on shell-fish harvesting on beaches and in estuaries but not in harbours. We note also that the Waiotahe (or Waiotahi) Estuary is also identified as a place where surveying will be undertaken.

There are three points Ngati Awa would wish to raise here:

Firstly, Waiotahe Estuary is not an arm of the Ohiwa Harbour as stated in the consultation document.

Secondly, Ohiwa Harbour is a place that would benefit greatly from such a project.

Thirdly, harbours can also be recreational and customary shell fish habitats that can face strain from over fishing.

Te Runanga o Ngati Awa therefore requests that the Ministry of Fisheries include the Ohiwa Harbour in the proposed project and that the Ministry also provides sufficient funding for that project to be undertaken in a thorough manner.

Te Runanga o Ngati Awa further requests that in the preparation of methodologies for such a project at Ohiwa, the Ministry of Fisheries consults with statutory and iwi/ hapu parties that contributed to the development of the Providing for Kaitiakitanga component of the Ohiwa Harbour Strategy prepared by the Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Environment Bay of Plenty).

Reasons:

- The Ohiwa Harbour is a significant customary, recreational (and limited commercial) fishery. It is possible that over-fishing may be occurring.
- The Ohiwa Harbour Strategy prepared by Environment Bay of Plenty presents a good and timely opportunity to integrate management of such natural resources. The Ministry of Fisheries has been invited to participate in the development of this strategy over a period of 3.5 years, however due to restructuring it has not been able to participate as much as it might have wished to
- The Ohiwa Harbour Strategy provides opportunities for all stakeholders including the community and iwi (Ngati Awa, Tuhoe, Whakatohea and Upokorehe) to integrate their management of resources in the harbour and its catchment
- The management of fisheries appears to be a function of the Ministry of Fisheries, while the management of the habitat appears to be shared by other statutory agencies. Adjustment to the research project in the manner briefly outlined above would allow the Ministry to become involved in the management of shell fish and other species found in the Ohiwa Harbour alongside iwi, hapu, statutory organisations including the two district councils and regional council and, (importantly) the Ohiwa community.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC, Te Ohu and Ngati Awa on these projects. The selection of beaches for these projects will be undertaken in consultation with local iwi representatives so that the interests and priority of local iwi are taken into account.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that these projects remains as Tier 1 projects; and
- d) **approve** these project as required fisheries services.

Proposed research services page no.	144 - 145
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 177

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

177 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	146
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 178 Ngati Awa: page 1 – 2 para 2 - 5

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

178 It is assumed that this two year project is the beginning of a longer term time series and will provide a baseline for data collection in the future.

Ngati Awa comment

Rahui are sometimes utilized by Maori to prevent fishing or shell-fishing in places where stocks are depleted or a death has occurred.

From time to time Maori request the Ministry of Fisheries impose a formal temporary closure under s186A of the Fisheries Act. When such a closure is imposed in a depleted shell fish ground it is usually so stocks or habitat can recover. Maori and non-Maori consider it sensible to survey the closed beds prior to their reopening to determine whether the habitat or stocks have recovered sufficiently so that a decision can be made as to whether the formal closure should be lifted or extended.

This type of scenario has played out in the Ohiwa Harbour recently. Iwi felt we needed a survey of the mussel beds before we could request an extension or lifting of the 186A temporary closure. Unfortunately iwi were required to carry out that survey themselves and while the intention was to provide that information in time, the reality is that iwi were not sufficiently resourced to be able to carry out those works in time to meet the Ministry's timeframes.

While excellent advice was provided by ministry staff, very limited practical assistance was available from the Ministry of Fisheries to vary out the survey using underwater video equipment and transect methodologies.

As a consequence, iwi were late with their recommendation for the extension of the closure. This meant that the flood damaged mussel beds in Ohiwa Harbour and the seriously depleted stocks in those beds are now officially open for harvest until the 186A closure can be reinstated.

Another unfortunate and regrettable result was that Ministry staff were compelled to undertake a full consultation round for the extension of the mussel closure, where they may have had an opportunity to simply extend the closure for a further 2 years had the survey data been provided to the Ministry in time.

The lack of timely survey information also contributed to a minor (but potentially serious) adverse effect on relationships between iwi, and with the Ministry.

It is submitted that this would have been avoided if the Ministry of Fisheries had undertaken to carry out the mussel bed monitoring itself rather than allow that task to be undertaken by iwi, or the Ministry could have worked co-operatively with iwi to ensure the survey was completed on time, and in a robust fashion.

2. Does the Ministry of Fisheries propose to undertake surveys of shell fish beds to determine the sustainability of those species in areas where recreational and customary harvest are undertaken?

3. Will the Ministry of Fisheries provide for iwi or statutory surveys of shell-fish habitats prior to the re-opening of shell fish beds it has formally closed under s186A of the Fisheries Act?

4. Or, will the ministry continue to require iwi to undertake that function, without practical or financial assistance to ensure the methodologies used in such surveys are robust enough to endure public and statutory scrutiny?

5. Do the proposed research services proposed by the Ministry provide for such activities or will these activities become a core function of the Ministry?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments made by SeaFIC and Ngati Awa. This project is designed to survey selected fisheries resources in areas closed to fishing under S 186A and provide baseline data for future monitoring. The other issues raised by Ngati Awa are outside the scope of the description and objectives of this research project and need to be discussed with Auckland Ministry Fisheries Operational staff.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issues 78 - EEL 2006/03 Spawning escapement of female longfin eels

Proposed research services page no.	147 - 148
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 179

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

179 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 79 - EEL2006/04 Motu River eel fishery population survey

Proposed research services page no.	149 - 150
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 180 Te Ohu; page 8 para 59

Issue 80 - EEL2006/05 Turaekaetai River eel population survey

Proposed research services page no.	151 - 152
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 181 Te Ohu: page 8 para 59

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

180 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

181 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Te Ohu comment

59. We support this project but we would like to see the project extended to encompass customary estimates and a commitment to do this work across all eel QMAs.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments and support of SeaFIC and Te Ohu for these projects.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the projects remain as a Tier 2 projects; and
- d) **approve** these projects as required fisheries services.

Proposed research services page no.	153 - 154
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 30, para 182

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

182 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	155 - 156
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 183

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

183 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	157 - 158
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 184

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

184 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	159 - 160
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 185

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

185 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	161 - 162
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 186

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

186 SeaFIC supports this proposal but notes the different title on page 140 of the FRS i.e. "Paua abundance in the East Otago Taiapure"

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	163 - 164
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 187

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

187 SeaFIC supports this proposal but notes the different title on page 140 of the FRS i.e. "Paua and kina abundance in Tory channel"

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	168 - 169
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 31, para 189 - 193

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

189 SeaFIC does not support this proposal and notes that it is classified as Tier 2.

190 All stakeholders at the RCC meeting in 2005 agreed that a robust estimate of recreational and customary harvest from the Chatham Islands was highly desirable. However, the advice from stakeholders was that this project is not likely to succeed given the past lack of success for practically every other research project that has been mounted on the Chatham Islands. We agree that an “innovative way of addressing these problems would be required”.

191 It was further noted at both the 2005 Recreational Research Planning Group and the Research Co-ordinating Committee that estimates of recreational harvest from areas other than the Chatham Islands were required more urgently. This project was therefore not supported by the Recreational Research Planning Group.

192 SeaFIC maintains that the lack of robust estimates of recreational and customary harvest of all fish stocks is a significant failing on the part of the Ministry of Fisheries, but we are pleased that new ways of gaining this information are being progressed. However, previous experience demonstrates the difficulty of obtaining these estimates via one-off research projects rather than through appropriate management of recreational fishing.

193 We note the comment made in the rationale that “estimates of the recreational harvest from most fishstocks have been undertaken by two national surveys in 1996 and 2000”. This statement should be qualified with the caveat (taken from Project REC2006/03) that:

The results of these surveys have raised concerns as to the accuracy of the harvest estimates using the telephone/diary methodology. For many fishstocks the national diary surveys have produced harvest estimates that are possibly only accurate to an order of magnitude.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC. Concerns about the methodology and applicability to the Chatham Islands will be considered during the tender evaluation process if the project proceeds. However, given that the project is Tier 2 and of Medium priority, it is unlikely to go ahead in 2006/07.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	170 - 171
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 32, para 194

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

194 SeaFIC supports this proposal. It is satisfying to see all the good suggestions that were made at the RCC being incorporated into the objective

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	172
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 32 para 195 - 197

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

195 This proposal is given a high priority rating on page 140 of the FRS but is considered to be Tier 2. We assume this is a mistake and that it is intended to be classified as Tier 1.

196 Nevertheless, we consider that other areas are higher priority than Taranaki (for example, the Bay of Plenty, Hauraki Gulf, Gisborne or the Wairarapa).

197 We also caution against the use of telephone diary surveys to develop seasonal local area profiles because of the likelihood of bias caused by keen fishermen becoming, and remaining as, the diarists.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the comments from SeaFIC. The methodology to be used for this survey will be evaluated during the tender evaluation process.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	173 - 174
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 32 para 198 - 200

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

198 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2.

199 We note the comment that:

“Recreational fishers are currently expressing concern about the performance of recreational fishing across a number of fish stocks in the Kaikoura – North Canterbury area.”

200 Due to the way recreational fishing is managed and the lack of data this creates, fishery managers have to respond to anecdotal concerns such as this. These views may just be based on personal perception. The conundrum is that this concern may be justified because without effective limits on recreational harvest, local depletion of conveniently located inshore stocks is inevitable. Effective monitoring of recreational harvest is essential but needs to be accompanied by effective management.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	175 - 176
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 32 para 201 Te Ohu: page 8 para 60 - 61

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

201 SeaFIC supports this proposal being Tier 2 because the requirement for this ‘nice to know’ information is not as essential as some of the more fundamental recreational information, such as the size of the catch component or where the fishing takes place is needed far more urgently. We consider “the reasons why people go marine fishing” are already well established (food, recreation, tradition, freedom, health, time with family etc) and we would be surprised if there were any new findings. Having said this, surveys such as this are useful even though there are more pressing matters to contend with. We note that the rationale states that there is strong opposition to licensing and yet recreational fishing groups struggle for funding and managers struggle to know who is going fishing. Without licensing, recreational fishing harvests will likely continue to be poorly estimated and the recreational sector will be under-funded

Te Ohu comment

60 It is quite unclear from the proposal text if this project is supposed to be a national survey, a methodology trial, a local survey or what. Te Ohu considers the project extremely doubtful and probably unnecessary, bearing in mind that the long completed Soundings survey work covered the same ground.

61 If the project is to proceed though, it needs to be carried out on a national basis to consistent standards across regions to produce any useful data

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC and Te Ohu for this project. If the project proceeds, it will be undertaken on a national basis and will follow a previous survey undertaken in 1998.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	177 - 179
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 202 Te Ohu; page 8 para 62 - 63

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

202 SeaFIC supports this proposal but we pose the following question. If a relationship between abundance in the surveyed commercial and recreational areas cannot be determined, will the annual pre-season abundance surveys for the commercial areas be extended to include recreational areas?

Te Ohu comment

62 We support the project but would expect that if no strong correlation can be shown between abundance surveys of commercial and non commercial areas, that annual pre-season abundance surveys will be required for the non commercial beds.

63 Note that much of the material in the project *Rationale* relates to the commercial SCA fisheries and is inappropriate to include in the *Rationale* for a non-commercial fishery proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support and comments from SeaFIC and Te Ohu for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 93 - SNA2006/04 Selectivity of recreational catches in SNA 1

Proposed research services page no.	180 – 181
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 203

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

203 SeaFIC supports this proposal (pending the results of SNA2005/04)

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	182 - 183
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 204

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

204 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	184 - 185
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 205

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

205 SeaFIC supports this proposal and its Tier 2 ranking

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	186 - 187
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 206

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

206 SeaFIC supports this proposal and its Tier 2 ranking. However we question why tenders have already been sought for this project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project. The project will not proceed unless there is funding within the total 2006/07 research budget.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT PROJECTS

Te Ohu general comment on projects PRO2006/01 to PRO2006/07

64. This whole suite of project proposals appears to repeat, or in some cases continue, work previously done under the Conservation Services Programme (“CSP”). It is more than a little distressing to find that the substantial cost sums foisted on the industry under the CSP over the years effectively have gone for naught with no credit for that expenditure allowed to the industry.
65. In addition, many of the proposals have a substantial Public Good component which has not been recognized in the cost allocation suggestions. Many of the projects also contain a considerable component of “nice to do” research and “research for the sake of research” - elements which used to be rife in fisheries research activities in the 1980s and early 1990s but which had since been weeded out.
66. Te Ohu would be extremely concerned if Maori were now being called on to pay again for work previously done but now deemed inept or insufficient; to pay twice – under both CSP and Fisheries - for the same work; or being called on to pay for Public Good activities.

SeaFIC general comment

207 The additional ranking (“urgency”) given only to aquatic environment proposals is unnecessary. It adds nothing to the filters of Tiers 1 and 2 and high or medium priority rankings.

Issue 97 - PRO2006/01	Data collection of demographic, distributional and trophic information on selected seabird species to allow estimation of effects of fishing on population viability
PRO2006/02	Modelling the effects of fishing on the population viability of selected Seabirds

Proposed research services page no.	189 - 198
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 33 para 208 - 219 Te Ohu; page 9 para 67 - 69

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

208 SeaFIC is strongly opposed to these major research proposals going ahead at such a premature stage with such significant price tags (up to \$2.5 million dollars). The research is concerned with seabird ecology but the nub of the matter is whether any estimation of the effects of fishing will be possible after five years. The rationale is unconvincing; the ability of a five year population study to even determine the population trend, let alone yield useful information on the consequences of fisheries interactions with the populations is troubling. The Department of Conservation’s Conservation Service Programme approach to a similar

study on White Capped Albatrosses (POP 2005/02) is to treat the first year as a feasibility study to ascertain whether the study should proceed. That is a sensible approach.

209 We are perplexed by the statement in the Rationale on page 190 of the FRS that “the species studied each year may be reviewed in light of any changing priorities for MFish and DOC.” Seabird studies are long term – the studied species cannot change mid stream.

210 This project is so wide reaching that it has lost focus. It aims to gather data from a suite of seabird populations identified in Table 1. The risk this poses is that after 5 years we will know a little more about seabirds in general but nothing that can help in mitigating seabird interactions and no concrete evidence of adverse effects of commercial fishing. The Ministry could be so much more effective and get some real results and industry support if it instead focused this money on seabird mitigation methods.

211 SeaFIC agrees that populations of protected species should be monitored but emphasises that the majority of the research is ‘public good’ in nature. It is entirely inappropriate that seabird populations should be monitored only when there is an opportunity to place the entire burden of research funding on the fishing industry, unless it can first be demonstrated that the effects of fishing are the major threat to population viability. This is particularly true for such a major body of research which is estimated to cost between one and two million dollars (the 100% difference in the two figures gives us no confidence).

212 The fact that the Ministry of Fisheries proposes to take up seabird population monitoring appears to be more symptomatic of a failure on the part of Government to adequately monitor protected species, than a clear understanding that commercial fishing is the main threat to seabirds.

213 An even more fundamental question is whether the Ministry of Fisheries has the mandate to embark on research dealing with protected species populations. In our view, the Ministry does not have a mandate. These studies are legally the domain of the Department of Conservation. The Ministry is proposing these studies within the aquatic environment research framework - i.e. research into the natural and biological resources comprising an aquatic ecosystem (general provision). A basic tenet of statutory interpretation, however, is that a specific provision prevails over a general one, and the specific provision for research into protected species populations gives the mandate to the Department of Conservation in “conservation services”.

214 Furthermore, we do not accept that the Fisheries Act allows for the costs of population monitoring and modelling undertaken by the Ministry to be levied on the industry. Only Ministry research that deals directly with the effects of fishing on the aquatic environment can be levied on fish-stocks. Population studies by definition are not included.

215 These projects are contingent on the outcomes of ENV2005/08. We have significant reservations over the progress made on this project and doubt that it will provide adequate guidance on whether population information such as population surveys and mark-recaptures studies can provide managers of fisheries with information to assess the effects of fishing on protected species or provide adequate designs for such studies.

216 Previous research proposals have implied that robustly designed population research might be considered a stand alone tool to identify and estimate the magnitude of any adverse

effects of fishing. There is a need for adequate capture estimates in order to properly use population studies to assess the effects of fishing on seabird populations. Current observer coverage and analyses do not allow estimation of numbers of seabird captures on a species by species basis for NZ fisheries, and no research has been proposed that is likely to alter this situation. Without this data we question the feasibility of the proposed population modelling. SeaFIC considers it premature to plan major seabird population monitoring studies until their utility as fisheries management tools is established.

217 SeaFIC wishes to emphasise that the “draft NPOA Research Plan” is indeed only a draft. The Plan requires a considerable rewrite, since it is repetitive and disjointed; needs to provide robust background text, with resulting priorities condensed into a few key research areas; needs to specifically address the objectives for observer coverage of protected species and ensure that other research is appropriately aligned with these objectives; needs to clearly document the rationale for seabird population studies, specifically state what these are intended to achieve, and clearly identify the required precision to meet these objectives

218 We believe that the draft NPOA Research Plan requires substantial further work before it can usefully guide the research required to meet the objectives of the NPOA. The current draft is of limited utility as many of the assertions made are unsubstantiated.

219 Finally we do not see how this project relates to all trawl, longline and setnet fisheries. Cost recovery would be determined by which seabird populations are studied and which fisheries have interactions

Te Ohu comment

PRO2006/01

67. This project appears to repeat CSP-contracted work by Manly et al. In addition, there is no indication it will provide information on population effects from other causes, as well as from fishing – an essential requirement for management and cost allocation.

68. If the project, as alleged on p.192, relates to “all trawl, longline and setnet fisheries”, why do the cost recovery proposals omit all inshore trawl and setnet target species except SNA?

PRO2006/02

69 As well as questioning the practicality and utility of this project, we would also question the cost allocation proposals. The same costing problems apply as for PRO2006/01

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

This project seeks to estimate specific parameters about seabird populations that are sensitive to effects of fisheries-related mortality. The work covers a range of species, all of which are caught in New Zealand fisheries at relatively high rates relative to their population sizes and threat classification. This makes these species a high priority for research into the effects of fishing. These priorities were developed with Department of Conservation and consulted with the Technical Working Group for the NPOA and the Aquatic Environment Working Group. Several population-based projects were combined to reduce costs through the potential for

sharing of logistical costs and equipment. This suite of species selected recognises that substantial work is needed to understanding the risk to population viability for a high number of New Zealand's endemic and native protected seabirds. The species chosen are those for which an adverse effect of fishing is most likely.

The work programme described was derived from a detailed analysis of research conducted in the last 10 years on assessing the effects of fishing on seabird population viability. This review was presented to the Aquatic Environment Working Group in 2005, and sets out in full the rationale behind using population based indicators of seabird performance to assess effects of fishing on population viability. The research plan was consulted with stakeholders over a period of several months, and remains a living document with an annual review period. From this perspective, the research plan remains 'draft' and the Ministry retains a desire to be able to change species priorities as new information becomes available.

Studies of five years in this area are necessary for several reasons. First, estimation of basic population parameters such as population size can take several years to achieve the necessary precision (i.e., several consecutive counts of the breeding population are required to adjust for inter-annual variability). Similarly, studies of birds' feeding distributions relative to fisheries activity must span several years to account for interannual variability in response to changes in the richness of available natural prey and fisheries waste. In terms of the estimation of demographic parameters such as survival or recruitment, five years can give enough information to adequately estimate adult average survival, a key factor in assessing whether a population's viability is at risk from fisheries mortality. Several populations targeted for study in this project have existing data sets of one or more years which will be augmented by the addition of more data to give a solid basis for integrated modelling of fisheries effects.

The work does not constitute monitoring of populations, rather estimation of particular parameters which are most likely to be most useful in assessing the effects of fishing. The target populations have been chosen to act as indicators for a larger range of species and populations. Designation of five years of work at the outset is intended to achieve a higher degree of transparency in the project design than several iterations of one-year project would achieve.

The work has been designed to have a data collection phase (PRO2006-01) and an analysis phase (PRO2006-02). These must be interlinked to allow maximum transparency and technical input from working groups.

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's support for increased observer coverage to assess fisheries removals of some of our key seabird populations at risk from fisheries effects on population viability.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the projects remain Tier 1 projects; and
- d) **approve** these projects as required fisheries services.

Proposed research services page no.	199 – 201
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 35 para 220 - 230 Te Ohu; page 9 para 70

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

220 We note that this proposal is Tier 2 and in the event that it goes ahead after the withdrawal of a Tier 1 proposal we hope that it will improve on some of the less than satisfactory research that has been carried out in this area in recent years i.e. Martien et al 1999¹ and Burkhart and Slooten 2003². The research tender will need to go to independent scientists that are not strongly involved with lobby groups such as the NZ Whale and Dolphin Trust.

221 We also hope that this proposal will establish a sound basis for understanding the Hector's dolphin population in the face of unsubstantiated assertions by environmental lobby groups such as the following:

“Since 1970, more than 12,000 Hector's and Maui's dolphins have been killed in fishing nets” (see Appendix 1).

222 Using the results of one observer programme in 1997/98 on the South Island East Coast to estimate bycatch for the entire New Zealand coast for the past 36 years is irresponsible and is not the approach that researchers should take for this proposal.

223 We note a mistake in the Priority Section on page 200 of the FRS i.e.

“This project is designed to examine the risk to protected species population viability as a result of fishing mortality and trophic interactions, for two endemic species of Dolphin”.

224 Hector's dolphin in the South Island is one endemic species. This project will not be concerned with Maui dolphin in the North Island.

225 With regards to the Strategic Relevance section, reference must be made to the Ministry of Fisheries/Department of Conservation 'Hector's Dolphin Threat Abatement Plan' and the draft Department of Conservation 'Hector's Dolphin Population Management Plan'.

¹ Martien, K. K.; Taylor, B. L.; Slooten, E; Dawson, S.1999: A sensitivity analysis to guide research and management for Hector's dolphin. *Biological Conservation* 90: 183–191.

² Burkhart S.M, Slooten E. 2003 Population viability analysis for Hector's dolphin(*Cephalorhynchus hectori*): a stochastic population model for local populations New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research, 2003, Vol. 37: 553–566

226 The 'Hector's Dolphin Threat Abatement Plan' will collate all information on Hector's dolphin and analyse the significance of risks and efficacy of current management measures in mitigating those risks. The goals of the plan are:

- a) To ensure the long-term viability of Hector's dolphins.
- b) To reduce impacts of human activities as far as possible, taking into account advances in technology, knowledge, and financial implications.

227 More detailed objectives consistent with these overarching goals will be developed for managing the Hector's dolphin populations. The plan is intended to identify threats to achieving the objectives and outline strategies to mitigate those threats. A consultation document will hopefully be released in July 2006, with submissions due by end of August 2006 and the 'Threat Management Plan' completed in October 2006.

228 Regarding cost recovery, the following statements are made in the proposal:
"The research should cover both commercial and non-commercial fisheries, although it is recognised that data are sparse for non-commercial fisheries."

"Objective 2 has an additional crown-funding component, due to the need to model effects of fishing and effects of management actions on non-commercial fisheries."

229 We maintain that the greatest risk to Hector's dolphin is from amateur setnet fishing and therefore submit that the majority of this project should be Crown funded. For example, four Hector's dolphin were killed by recreational setnets at Neil's Beach near Haast on 30 October 2005. The fishermen were interviewed by DOC and explained that the nets were left out for days because the weather was rough. After this incident was reported, the Minister of Fisheries, Jim Anderton, stated that:

"Nets set by recreational fishers are one of the biggest threats to Hector's dolphins. I encourage anyone using set nets to familiarise themselves with the Set Net Code of Practice, which is on the Ministry of Fisheries website: www.fish.govt.nz," (Minister of Fisheries Press Release 4 November 2005).

230 At Kaikoura 18 animals have apparently been killed in gillnets during the last two summers (Appendix 1). Beachcast animals have come from areas where amateur setnets were prevalent. Very few Hector's dolphins have been reported or observed captured by commercial fishermen since 1998 due to the strong mitigation measures enacted including the introduction of comprehensive voluntary codes of practice, the use of "pingers" to alert the animals of the presence of nets and the introduction of voluntary closed areas to setnet fishing and bottom trawling. A number of government observer programmes have been funded by industry to monitor any setnet or trawl interactions including electronic monitoring

Te Ohu comment

70 Again we question the cost allocation proposals. The project is nominally directed at Hector's dolphin, that is, the South Island species, but the cost allocation proposals include a number of stocks which fall in the Maui dolphin areas

Dolphin plan must include four new sanctuaries

26 August 2005 - Wellington

Contact: Dr Liz Slooten, Deputy President, 0274 474 418

Kevin Hackwell, Conservation Manager, 04 801 2215(w), 04 389 4815(h), 021 227 8420

Forest and Bird is calling for better protection of New Zealand threatened Hector's dolphins and critically endangered Maui's dolphins, including the establishment of four new marine mammal sanctuaries.

"The outlook for the Hector's dolphin and the even rarer Maui's dolphin is grim. Since 1970, more than 12,000 Hector's and Maui's dolphins have been killed in fishing nets," said Forest and Bird Conservation Manager, Kevin Hackwell, speaking to a joint paper** with WWF New Zealand at the New Zealand Marine Sciences Society Conference in Wellington.

"The Maui's dolphin is the world's rarest marine mammal and could be extinct in a matter of a few years because there are only 111 animals left. Hector's dolphins are also declining at an alarming rate. Local populations have already disappeared from the southern half of the North Island and the Marlborough Sounds and Nelson."

"It is vital that the Government's management plan includes the establishment of four new marine mammal sanctuaries," said Forest and Bird Deputy President, Dr Liz Slooten, a leading authority on dolphins who won the prestigious Sir Charles Fleming Medal earlier this year for her research on Hector's dolphin with Dr Steve Dawson.

"The existing marine mammal sanctuary along Banks Peninsula and the setnet ban on the West Coast of Auckland which protect these dolphins are too small to be sustainable. These should be extended and four new protected areas also set up," said Dr Slooten.

The main threat to these dolphins is gillnetting or setnetting. These nets are similar to the "wall of death" driftnets that were once widespread in the Pacific Ocean. The difference is that in New Zealand waters most gillnets are anchored (setnets) rather than left drifting in the water column (driftnets).

Dr Slooten also pointed out that Hector's dolphin populations at Kaikoura and Porpoise Bay are very small and 'high risk.' "For example, at Kaikoura 18 animals have been killed in gillnets during the last two summers," she said. "there are no regulations to stop this happening."

Conservation Manager Kevin Hackwell welcomed the Government's announcement that a new management plan for both Maui's and Hector's dolphin should be ready by Christmas: "The Government needs to ensure the existing sanctuaries are sustainable by extending their boundaries, improving regulations within the sanctuaries to include sandmining and trawling, and the creation of four new protected areas."

"New sanctuaries would need to be established at two high-density areas on the West Coast of the South Island and at Te Waewae Bay, and at two high-risk areas at Porpoise Bay and Kaikoura," he said.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

This work is to be focussed only on South Island populations of Hector's Dolphins, so errors following revisions of the project will be corrected to reflect this intent, in particular, in the Priority statement. In relation to the fish-stocks identified for cost-recovery of the work, these should be from areas 3-7 only and not area 8.

Cost recovery allocation should be removed from the following fishstocks:

BNS8, BCO8, GUR8, SPO8, SCH8, SNA8, SPD8, TAR8.

The project description will be updated before the work is tendered to take into account the latest available work on setting management objectives and other information deriving from the development of the Dolphin Threat Abatement Plan. This work had not started when the project description was developed and consulted.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	202 - 205
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 37 para 231 - 235 Te Ohu; page 9 para 71 - 72

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

231 This project has been undertaken for many years. SeaFIC supports the suggestion that a technical group review model selection and data inputs to models during the course of the work. We urge caution at the use of seabird capture information from fisher-submitted Non Fish Incidental Catch Forms and refer research providers to the findings of Alistair Dunn in his report to the MFish AMP Working Group (NIWA 2004). For example, there is no specific linking data to other Ministry of Fisheries databases, “nil” returns are ignored by the database manager, seabirds are identified to broad species categories only such as large or small bird, and the poor data recording and collection processes would result in ambiguity even if response rates were high. SeaFIC notes that under the Fisheries Act 1996 the form was not mandatory and many skippers still do not know of or have copies of the form. Whether the proposed new Non Fish Incidental Catch Form will provide any data in time for this project remains to be seen.

232 We believe that there is considerable overlap with the proposed Department of Conservation CSP project INT 2006/03 ‘Examination of the factors affecting capture probability of protected species in selected New Zealand fisheries’. For example this \$75,000 industry funded DOC project has the objectives of:

Examin[ing] data on injury or capture details of protected species caught in New Zealand fisheries to identify which factors are associated with high likelihood of capture.

Examin[ing] which factors affect the probability of capture of protected species in relation to taxon, age, sex, maturity, fishing method, area, target species, vessel characteristics, and use of mitigation measures.

233 The DOC project proposes to use fisher-submitted non-fish bycatch data, observer data (including diary entries and observer debrief forms) on protected species captures and the particulars of these incidents, and catch effort data by target species.

234 We question how that differs from the MFish \$150,000 proposal which aims to “examine the representativeness of observer data in relation to fishing effort by season and area, and by vessel type (e.g. processing type, size or power, mitigation used), recommendations on improved sampling design for observer-gathered datasets will be required, in relation to the deployment of observer effort across fisheries”.

235 MFish and DOC must talk urgently to prevent this wasteful duplication of analysis, time and industry funding especially when the existing data available have already been determined to be highly questionable. It would be far more appropriate to defer this project

until a year after the new Non-fish Incidental Catch Form has been in place and analyse the new (and better quality) data then.

Te Ohu comment

71 We feel this proposal is half-baked. By concentrating solely on fisheries bird captures, skewed answers must result unless there are also available measures of the total numbers of birds by species in the area at the times of capture. There is no indication these wider population data are available. Similar skewing will result from concentrating on warp strike data.

72 It is noted that the cost recovery proposals include highly migratory species, middle depth trawl species and deepwater trawl species only. No inshore trawl species and no setnet species are included. Why?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's and Te Ohu's concerns. Data from fishers will be reviewed and used only if appropriate. Although the review of data available up until 2004 indicated that these data held little useful information, new protocols and forms for collection of non-fish catch data are planned from around mid 2006. Therefore, some better data may be available by the time this project starts.

Concerns about overlap with Department of Conservation projects for this and other projects are noted. The Ministry of Fisheries worked with Department of Conservation over a period of several months to develop complementary research plans. This was discussed at length at the Research Planning Group and at the Research Coordinating Committee. There will be no duplication of research effort between the two departments.

Fishstocks were selected for cost recovery levies on the basis of the number of seabirds recovered in the past. This information is updated annually.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 100 - PRO2006/05 Estimating the nature and extent of marine mammal captures in New Zealand commercial fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	206 – 210
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 38 para 236 - 237 Te Ohu: page 9 para 73 - 74

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

236 Our comments on PRO2006/04 (above) regarding the considerable overlap with the proposed Department of Conservation CSP project INT 2006/03 and the poor quality of fisher-submitted Non Fish Incidental Catch Forms are also valid for this proposal.

237 The Priority section on page 209 of the FRS is incorrect Under the DOC Threatened Species Classification which was updated in 2005, the New Zealand fur seal *Arctocephalus forsteri* is classified as not threatened

Te Ohu comment

73 Again the proposal repeats work undertaken under the CSP. Te Ohu also notes that the proposal assumes that the New Zealand fur seal population is at risk. As DoC staff has been reporting for some years now that the seal population is growing at a compound rate of more than 5% pa, that assumption is patently untrue. In our view this whole project is unnecessary

74 The cost recovery proposals display an appalling level of ignorance of commercial fishing by the proponents. The proposals need to be reworked.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As noted above, data from fishers will be reviewed and used only if appropriate. These data will be used only to supplement and compare with Ministry of Fisheries Observer data. Although the review of data available up until 2004 indicated that these data held little useful information, new protocols and forms for collection of non-fish catch data are planned from around mid 2006. Therefore, some better data may be available by the time this project starts.

We thank SeaFIC and TOKM for drawing to our attention the error in the classification of New Zealand Fur Seal; this will be corrected in the project description. However, regardless of its threat classification, New Zealand Fur Seal is a protected species, and the requirement to estimate captures of this and other protected marine mammals species remains.

The Ministry notes Te Ohu's comments, but is not sure which elements would require reworking to meet these concerns. Concerns about overlap with Department of Conservation projects for this and other projects are noted. The Ministry of Fisheries worked with Department of Conservation over a period of several months to develop complementary research plans. This was discussed at length at the Research Planning Group and at the Research Coordinating Committee. There will be no duplication of research effort between the two departments.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 101 - PRO2006/06 Identification of marine mammals captured in New Zealand fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	211 - 213
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 38 para 238 - 242 Te Ohu: page 10 para 75 - 76

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

238 SeaFIC notes that this proposal is Tier 2. This proposal is to necropsy sea lions, tagged fur seals, other pinnipeds etc. to characterise the age/sex profile of these mammals and to also determine inter alia, the cause of mortality.

239 Objective 1 provides justification for the project in that MFish observers, whose task it is to assess the species and sex of the animals do get it wrong and this project will be a verification of their identifications. We submit that this is a question of MFish training their contractors to an acceptable level of skill and that the industry should not have to pay for the same task twice.

240 SeaFIC recognises that the retrieval of carcasses would allow the extraction of teeth and other sources of information which in principle will allow the determination of the sex, maturity and age of accidentally captured animals. Such additional information is potentially important in assessing the effect of the fishery on the population. For instance, the assessment of the effect of a fishery would be very different if it were only killing immature males as compared to mature females.

241 The project, however, appears to be a revival of the Department of Conservation CSL Marine Mammal Carcass Recovery projects without any reference or linkage to those projects. The CSL projects ended as soon as enough data had been collected and the “Approved 2001/02 CSL Plan of 16 July 2001” clearly stated that enough fur seal carcasses had been collected and a sufficient collection of sea lion carcasses was also reached in 2001.

242 We also question the costing of the project (up to \$150,000). This is a considerable sum of money to necropsy an unknown number of specimens. While the proposal states that the cost of the research will be relative to the number of carcasses processed, since the research project costs are set and levied “up front”, this could result in a significant over or under recovery.

Te Ohu comment

75 Te Ohu needs to be satisfied that this proposal entirely replaces the identical CSP project. There is certainly no case for double charging.

76 We note that the previous agreement between DoC and the industry – that costs for the CSP project would be allotted in accordance with the numbers of mammals killed in each fishery in the last known preceding year i.e. 2004/05 for the 2006/07 year cost allocations – has been ignored. Why

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's support for the retrieval of carcasses in order to characterise the age, and maturity of animals affected by the fishery. These data have been used extensively in models of fishery effect on sea lion populations and have a very high value. Without data on maturity schedules for animals captured in fisheries, it would be difficult to predict the effect of removals on the population dynamic of sea lions.

The Ministry notes that the cost of such work has increased in recent years. This has been largely in response to requirements for greater health and safety safeguards in the handling and disposal of marine mammal material. The Ministry will ensure that costs remain as low as possible, and will explore the possibility of the project being costed per carcass. The current estimated price provides an indication of the likely cost of estimated sealion and fur seal captures. More marine mammal carcasses will probably be returned if catch limits are increased.

Concerns about overlap with Department of Conservation projects for this and other projects are noted. The Ministry of Fisheries worked with Department of Conservation over a period of several months to develop complimentary research plans. This was discussed at length at the Research Planning Group and at the Research Coordinating Committee. There will be no duplication of research effort between the two departments.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 102 - PRO2006/07 Characterise non-commercial fisheries interactions with seabirds and marine mammals

Proposed research services page no.	214 - 216
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 243

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

243 SeaFIC supports this proposal and considers the capture of Hector’s dolphin by amateur setnet fishermen the most important interaction to investigate

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project but does not agree that the capture of Hector’s dolphin by amateur setnet fishers is necessarily the most important interaction to investigate.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 103 - OBS2006/05 Research Observer Services to estimate the nature and extent of incidental captures of protected species in the Squid Trawl fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	217 - 219
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 244

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

244 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this project. The observer coverage for this fishery is important for estimating seabird captures as well as marine mammal captures. The SQU trawl fisheries have some of the highest seabird bycatch rates for fisheries in New Zealand, and ongoing monitoring is required to ascertain whether efforts made by industry to improve their performance have lead to reductions in seabird captures, and to provide information about ways to mitigate captures.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 104 - ENV2006/01 Bycatch and discards in ling longline fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	220 - 221
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 245

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

245 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 105 - IDG2006/01 Finfish field identification guide

Proposed research services page no.	222 - 223
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 246

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

246 SeaFIC supports this proposal (we note as with a number of proposals, the different title for this project on page 188 of the FRS)

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project and the variation in project titles.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 106 - ENV2006/02 Productivity of rattail bycatch species

Proposed research services page no.	224 - 226
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 247

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

247 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project being classified as Tier 2. However, the Ministry considers that this information is required to assess the risk posed by fishing to deepwater communities of which rattails are an important component.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 107 - ENV2006/03 Bycatch and discards in squid trawl fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	227 - 228
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 248

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

248 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project being classified as Tier 2. The Ministry considers this analysis to be less urgent than that for the ling longline fishery but that it will become more urgent as the existing analysis becomes more dated.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Te Ohu general comment on benthic projects

77 In light of the BPA proposals that are currently being consulted on this work should be put on hold until an outcome of those decisions.

DSG general comment on benthic projects

1. We write on behalf of The Deepwater Stakeholder Group Ltd (DSG) and thank you for your invitation to provide a further submission on benthic research projects in the New Zealand EEZ in recognition of the industry's Benthic Protection Area (BPA) proposal. While the Accord entered into by the Minister of Fisheries and the DSG has yet to be ratified, based on the understanding reached between the Minister and industry leaders on this matter in the interim, we submit it would be inappropriate for the Ministry to initiate any new research into the effects of fishing on EEZ benthic environments until the Ministry's environmental research strategy has been reviewed to take into account the existence of the proposed BPAs.

2. We have identified the following research projects in the Proposed Fisheries Research Services for 2006-07 that we believe fit the nature of projects that should be re-considered. We understand that, while they are in the 2006/07 approved work plan, the Ministry has yet to complete contracts for any of these projects.

BEN 2006/01	Mapping the spatial and temporal extent of fishing in the EEZ
BEN 2006/02	Assessing the Effects of Fishing on Soft Sediment Habitat, Fauna and Processes.
BEN 2006/03	Effects of fishing on seamounts, hills and knolls.
BEN 2006/04	Identification of Archived Bycatch
BEN 2006/05	Risk Assessment Framework for assessing fishing and other anthropogenic effects on coastal fisheries
BEN 2006/06	Productivity of deepwater invertebrates

3. In addition to the need to review these projects by taking into account the BPA proposal, which the Minister of Fisheries has accepted since these proposed research projects were first contemplated, we have taken the opportunity to provide wider comments on some of these projects. While these points should have been made more appropriately in the general critique that closed on 28 February 2006, a closer examination of the projects has revealed additional issues that need to be brought to the attention of the Ministry in respect of those projects.

In summary, the DSG welcomes the opportunity to make this additional submission on the Ministry's proposed research services for 2006/07 on the basis that all such research in the EEZ must take into account the likely impact of the new Benthic Protection Areas. These BPAs weren't in existence when the research planning was undertaken to consider these research proposals. We submit that the Ministry should review all its research programmes into benthic environments to take into account this new development, albeit that the proposed accord has yet to be ratified. However, as outlined above, we submit that there are also fundamental scientific and strategic faults with several of these proposed projects and that these should be cancelled, or at the very least deferred until they can be reconsidered in the light of the new BPA initiative. As regards the cost recovery allocations, we believe that several of these projects are not eligible under Section 262 of the Fisheries Act 1996 for cost recovery in the event that they are considered as Required Services.

Ministry of Fisheries Analysis

DSG argues that several of the projects mentioned in their late submission describe research that is “not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of adverse effects from fishing on the aquatic environment” and that costs cannot, therefore, be recovered under section 262 (Cost recovery principles) of the Fisheries Act (1996).

The most relevant subsection of section 262 of the Act, s. 262 (d), states that “Costs of conservation services or fisheries services provided to avoid, remedy, or mitigate a risk to, or an adverse effect on, the aquatic environment or the biological diversity of the aquatic environment must, so far as practicable, be attributed to the persons who caused the risk or adverse effect.” Subsection 262 (c) may or may not be relevant (e.g., to the description of fishing activity) and states that “Costs of conservation services or fisheries services provided to manage or administer the harvesting or farming of fisheries resources must, so far as practicable, be attributed to the persons who benefit from harvesting or farming the resources:”.

DSG’s interpretation of s. 262(d) is very narrow because they infer it to preclude cost recovery for the description of fishing activity that leads to risk (BEN2006/01), for experiments to assess the nature and extent of impacts (BEN2006/02), for time series of surveys of benthic habitats at risk from or recovering from trawl impacts (BEN2006/03), and for investigations of the productivity of species that the Ministry believes are at risk as a means to assessing the level of that risk (BEN2006/06). These are all components of a programme designed to understand the nature of trawl impacts and to identify the species and habitats most at risk. The Ministry believes this to be an integral part of avoiding, remedying, or mitigating risk and/or adverse effects as required by the Fisheries Act.

DSG suggests that one of the projects contains what they describe as “an inappropriate bundling of research tasks”. In fact, these components were first presented to research planning meetings, at which DSG’s precursor entities were represented, as separate projects. Industry representatives at those meetings argued strongly for the projects to be amalgamated and applauded that action at the Research Coordinating Committee.

DSG makes specific comments on several of the projects but summarises them in a statement that there are “fundamental scientific and strategic faults with several of these proposed projects”. The Ministry does not accept that there are any such fundamental or strategic flaws and has developed these proposals through a rigorous research planning process involving stakeholders and detailed consultation.

DSG further posits that “*The BPA proposal now requires the Ministry to re-consider its strategy for benthic research before initiating any new research into such environments.*” The BPA proposal has not been implemented but, if it is implemented in its current or a revised form, the Ministry will, of course, take into account the details of that implementation in its research planning and prioritisation processes. Whether or not the BPA proposal is implemented, there will be a need, at least in the short to medium term, to better understand the nature and extent of fishing impacts to support management of those impacts and to set and refine the minimum amount of each habitat requiring protection from the effects of fishing. These projects are designed to meet those information needs. The Ministry frequently reviews the relevance of its research portfolio and will not tender or contract research that it does not consider to be relevant to the management of fisheries or fishing impacts.

Issue 108 - BEN2006/01 Mapping the spatial and temporal effect of fishing in the EEZ

Proposed research services page no.	229 - 231
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	Te Ohu; page 10 para 78 – 79 DSG; page 2 para 4 -8

Submission Details

Te Ohu comment

78 In view of the data problems inherent in CELR forms – see notes under Objective 4, p.230 – what action is being taken to scrap those forms and replace them with something useful? For this proposal though, how will the lack of data from CELR forms be overcome?

79 We note it is proposed to recover costs of this project from all species involved in bottom-impacting target fishing activities, but the setnet species are omitted from the list, some pelagic species are included but not others and even some species classed as HMS. A rethink of the stocks involved is required.

DSG comment

4. The DSG submits that this project should be reviewed in the light of the BPA proposal promoted by the fishing industry and accepted by the Minister of Fisheries.

5. The BPA proposal will set aside 30% of the EEZ from bottom trawling. These areas have been selected as being representative of the range of benthic environments within the EEZ.

6. During the development process of BPAs, the industry contracted GNS Science to map and to estimate the spatial extent of bottom trawling in NZ waters from TCEPR records. The initial calculation estimated that only 6.9% the waters from 200 m to the 200 NM EEZ Boundary had been touched by bottom trawls or by mid water trawls contacting the bottom. We have since contracted GNS to reassess this for the entire EEZ - as there are areas of the EEZ that are shallower than 200 m - and for all species caught by trawl, as well as consider comments made by the Ministry that the method used may underestimate the aerial extent of the footprint. This reassessment has been completed and estimates that only 8.5% of the NZ EEZ has been trawled. On this basis, more than 90% of the NZ EEZ has never been trawled. Such further details of the spatial extent of the spatial extent of trawling in the EEZ as may be required, could be expeditiously obtained by additional queries of this existing database, and without the need for a new project at this time.

7. On this basis, we submit it is no longer necessary to again map the spatial and temporal distribution of bottom trawling in the EEZ as the prerequisite to understanding fishery performance, identifying potential environmental risks or the defining of representative benthic environments for research or assessment. The BPA proposal now requires the Ministry to re-consider its strategy for benthic research before initiating any new research into such environments.

8. The DSG also believes that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of the adverse effects of fishing on the aquatic environment. What is proposed is a mapping of fishing activities, the costs of which cannot be recovered under section 262 of the Fisheries Act 1996.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the suggestion by Te Ohu that work on benthic impacts should be put on hold until decisions have been made on industry's proposals for benthic closures. Whether or not these proposals are adopted, there will still be a need for information to assess the risk to benthic communities posed by fishing in line with Government's SMEEF. This project will provide an understanding of the distribution of mobile bottom fishing relative to putative habitats and any existing or new closures and, therefore, neither pre-empts nor undermines decisions on BPAs.

The Ministry notes Te Ohu's question on CELR forms. The Ministry agrees that the analysis of fishing effort reported on CELR forms can be problematic. However, several methods of dealing with these lower quality data have been developed and used by research providers in the past, and the Ministry is confident that the information will be used to the fullest extent possible.

The Ministry notes Te Ohu's question on cost recovery. Fishstocks were selected for cost recovery on this project on the basis of a substantive amount of reported bottom trawling activity. Setnet fisheries were not included because it is the Ministry's belief that mobile bottom fishing gear causes the greatest impact.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of the adverse effects of fishing on the aquatic environment and that costs cannot, therefore be recovered. The Ministry does not accept this proposition and believes that understanding the distribution of fishing is an integral component of understanding and managing the risks posed by fishing.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 109 - BEN2006/02 Assessing the adverse effects of fishing on soft sediment habitats and fauna

Proposed research services page no.	232 - 234
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 249 - 250 Te Ohu; page 10 para 80 DSG; page 2 para 9 - 13

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

249 This expensive three year project (up to \$2 million) is not warranted in the current economic environment.

250 We believe that a definition of adverse effect must be established before experiments are undertaken and that a smaller feasibility project should establish whether the effects of bottom trawling can be discerned in various soft sediment habitats over different time scales in New Zealand. Many soft sediment habitats are subject to rapid environmental change and turnover due to strong currents and storms, the impacts of infrequent disturbance from bottom trawling in some areas will be insignificant.

Te Ohu comment

80 Exactly the same cost recovery questions apply as for BEN2006/01.

DSG comment

9. The DSG submits that this project should be cancelled in light of the BPA initiative.

10. The project is a three year project with, we submit, an inappropriate bundling of research tasks of differing natures. Objective 1 contains two sub-projects, the first of which relates to the establishment of a research methodology including sampling strategies, identification of key data variables, and analytical procedures and the second of which is to develop improved techniques and methods of defining and mapping benthic habitats, including a better integration of acoustic and photographic imagery. Objective 2 relates to the development of experimental, observational and analytical protocols for the undertaking of benthic surveys.

11. The DSG considers that this project is clearly inappropriate for the Ministry to promote since the prime output of the project is to provide NIWA, or any other chosen service provider, with a new functional capability rather than advancing the stock of scientific knowledge of New Zealand's benthic environment. If NIWA, or any other service provider, wishes to improve its capability, it should fund that development from its own resources rather than use Fisheries Required Services research monies. Furthermore, the project is poorly specified and lacks a clear focus. There are effectively three research programmes contained in the one proposal with the third programme conditional on the success of the first two programmes and the first programme dependent on the technical feasibility of the processes in the second stage. The nature of all the programmes is experimental and innovative and not aligned to fisheries management objectives of the Ministry. Industry

funding should not be used to develop experimental techniques and add capability to NIWA/others. The industry has well-founded fears that projects of this nature are subject to significant delivery and financial risks and should not be undertaken in the context of “fisheries research” under Required services.

12. The DSG also believes that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of adverse effects from fishing on the aquatic environment. What is proposed is the development of functional capability and research technologies, the costs of which cannot be recovered under section 262 of the Fisheries Act 1996.

13. The DSG does not support this proposal for the reasons outlined above.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry has already noted the suggestion by Te Ohu that work on benthic impacts should be put on hold until decisions have been made on industry’s proposals for benthic closures. Whether or not such closures are made, there will still be a need for information to assess the risk to benthic communities posed by fishing in line with Government’s SMEEF.

The Ministry has already noted Te Ohu’s question on cost recovery. Fishstocks were selected for cost recovery on this project on the basis of a substantive amount of reported bottom trawling activity. Setnet fisheries were not included because it is the Ministry’s belief that mobile bottom fishing gear causes the greatest impact.

The Ministry notes the suggestion by SeaFIC that this study is not warranted in the current economic environment. However, information is required to support Government’s SMEEF and, in particular, to identify the species and habitats most at risk from fishing. The Ministry believes that prioritisation of research on the basis of risk to sustainability is at least as important as shorter term judgements on affordability.

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s suggestion that a definition of “adverse effect” must be established before experiments are undertaken. The Ministry knows of no requirement for a definition of “adverse effect” to precede such research.

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s suggestion that a smaller feasibility study should first establish whether the effects of bottom trawling can be discerned in various soft sediment habitats over different time scales in New Zealand. This proposition is inconsistent with a large body of New Zealand and international, peer-reviewed scientific literature. There is no need for a feasibility study and the scientific literature is clear that it is entirely feasible, using appropriately designed studies, to discern the effects of bottom trawling in soft sediment habitats over different space and time scales.

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s suggestion that many soft sediment habitats are subject to rapid environmental change and turnover due to strong currents and storms, and that the impacts of infrequent disturbance from bottom trawling in some areas will be insignificant. In fact, the great majority of soft sediments, especially in waters deeper than about 100 m, are affected by strong currents and storms very rarely, if at all. Localised areas may be subjected to currents or sedimentation, and the effects of trawling in these areas may be of lesser

importance. However, other areas will be much more susceptible to the effects of bottom trawling, and assessing this contrast will be one focus of the study. Soft sediments support our most important fisheries and many are extensively trawled. Despite this crucial importance, our knowledge of the consequences and reversibility of the impacts of bottom trawling remains sketchy.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this project should be cancelled in the light of the BPA proposal. The BPA proposal has not been implemented but, if it is implemented in its current or a revised form, the Ministry will, of course, take into account the details of that implementation in its research planning and prioritisation processes. Whether or not the BPA proposal is implemented, however, there will be a need to understand the nature and extent of fishing impacts to support management of those impacts and to set and refine standards as specified in the SMEEF. The Ministry frequently reviews the relevance of its research portfolio and will not tender or contract research that it does not consider to be relevant to the management of fisheries or fishing impacts.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this project has an inappropriate bundling of tasks. In fact, these tasks were bundled at the request of industry participants in the research planning round; it is difficult to balance all such conflicting requests.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this project merely funds capability development in one or more research providers. The project was designed to provide the Ministry with a research product to enable it to understand and manage the risks associated with trawling and dredging. It does not simply fund capability development in research providers, and any capital expenditure to develop or purchase new equipment is the responsibility of the provider.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of the adverse effects of fishing on the aquatic environment and that costs cannot, therefore be recovered. The Ministry does not accept this proposition and believes that understanding the nature and extent of benthic impacts is an integral component of understanding and managing the risks to benthic systems posed by fishing.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 110 - BEN2006/03 Effects of fishing on seamounts, hills and knolls

Proposed research services page no.	235 - 236
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 39 para 251 - 252 Te Ohu: page 10 para 80 DSG page 3 para14 - 19

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

251 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and medium urgency.

252 We note the synergies with NIWA's Foundation for Research, Science and Technology study and if this proposal were to go ahead we would expect the researchers to work closely together to avoid duplication. The interaction would need to be carefully monitored in consideration of any tenders.

Te Ohu comment

80 Exactly the same cost recovery questions apply as for BEN2006/01.

DSG comment

14. The DSG does not support this project.

15. This project is seen as an extension of existing research objectives currently being undertaken by NIWA under Project ENV2005/16. That project has a planned completion date of June 2008. Among its objectives were to undertake baseline surveys for a range of deep-sea environments. Data on the macro-invertebrate fauna and ichthyofauna available from previous FRST and Biodiversity funded studies was to be incorporated in that project.

16. Given the scope and the expected outcomes of Project ENV2005/16, it would be premature to initiate a further project that has in part matching objectives before the outcomes of ENV2005/16 have been fully reported and assessed.

17. As with our comments for Project BEN 2006/02, we believe the objectives and research strategy underpinning this project need to be re-considered in the light of the BPA initiative.

18. The DSG also believes that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of adverse effects from fishing on the aquatic environment. What is proposed is a survey of the benthic environment, the costs of which cannot be recovered under section 262 of the Fisheries Act 1996.

19. We do not support this project and believe it should be cancelled, or at the very least deferred and any future options considered only after existing work is completed and assessed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project being classified as Tier 2 and of medium urgency. The Ministry considers this work to be an important generalisation of an existing study of a small number of seamounts and its urgency will increase as that study progresses.

The Ministry notes the potential synergies with NIWA's modest FRST-funded study. As with all Ministry projects, researchers are required to confirm that they are not otherwise funded to do the work they propose, and the interaction is always carefully monitored in consideration of any tenders and research reports. The Ministry will work closely with research providers to avoid duplication.

The Ministry has already noted Te Ohu's question on cost recovery. Fishstocks were selected for cost recovery on this project on the basis of a substantive amount of reported bottom trawling activity. Setnet fisheries were not included because it is the Ministry's belief that mobile bottom fishing gear causes the greatest impact.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestions that this project be cancelled because it extends and generalises a project currently underway. The Ministry has classified this project as of medium urgency for this reason but nonetheless believes that additional work should be undertaken to monitor recovery (if any) of seamount systems impacted by fishing.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this project should be reconsidered in the light of the BPA proposal. The BPA proposal has not been implemented but, if it is implemented in its current or a revised form, the Ministry will, of course, take into account the details of that implementation in its research planning and prioritisation processes. Whether or not the BPA proposal is implemented, however, there will be a need to understand the nature and extent of fishing impacts to support management of those impacts and to set and refine standards as specified in the SMEEF. The Ministry frequently reviews the relevance of its research portfolio and will not tender or contract research that it does not consider to be relevant to the management of fisheries or fishing impacts.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of the adverse effects of fishing on the aquatic environment and that costs cannot, therefore be recovered. The Ministry does not accept this proposition and believes that understanding the nature and extent of impacts on seamounts is an integral component of understanding and managing the risks to such systems posed by fishing.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 111 - BEN2006/04 Identification of archived bycatch

Proposed research services page no.	237 - 238
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 253 DSG page 4 para 20

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

253 SeaFIC supports this proposal

DSG comment

20. The DSG supports this proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support of SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	239 - 240
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 254 Te Ohu: page 10 para 81 – 82 DSG page 4 para 21 - 22

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

254 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and medium urgency. We consider that the priority should also be medium.

Te Ohu comment

81 Past experience by Te Ohu with the use by MFish of risk assessment methodologies, for example, in the assessment of species for QMS introduction, gives us absolutely no confidence that any results which might flow from this project would be fairly and reasonably applied.

82 Te Ohu accordingly rejects this project, even with Crown funding. The longer-term risks from it are just too high.

DSG comment

21. The DSG supports the classification of this project as a Tier 2 medium priority project but does not support it being undertaken in 2006/07.

22. The DSG does not support the concept of Tier 2 contingency projects for the reasons put forward by the Seafood Industry Council in its submission and considers this project to a prime example of where medium priority projects would impact on the availability of funding to undertake high priority research in future years.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the lack of support for this project from both SeaFIC, DSG, and, especially, Te Ohu. Risk assessment is a broad term and the focus of this project is to develop a framework under which information on a wide variety of stressors in the coastal environment can be drawn together and their relative importance assessed. The Ministry would expect research providers to recognise the strengths and any deficiencies of previous risk assessment approaches in developing a model for coastal fisheries, should the project proceed.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 113 - BEN2006/06 Productivity of deepwater invertebrates

Proposed research services page no.	241 - 242
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 255 Te Ohu; page 10 para 83 DSG page 4 para 23 - 26

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

255 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and medium priority and medium urgency

Te Ohu comment

83 This is purely a Public Good project in the “nice to know” category. If it is to proceed, it should be Crown funded

DSG comment

23. The DSG does not support this project.

24. As with our comments for Project BEN 2006/02, we believe the objectives and research strategy underpinning this project need to be re-considered in the light of the BPA initiative.

25. The DSG also believes that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of adverse effects from fishing on the aquatic environment. What is proposed is a survey of three invertebrate taxa of the benthic environment, the costs of which cannot be recovered under section 262 of the Fisheries Act 1996.

26. We do not support this project and believe it should be cancelled.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and Te Ohu’s suggestion that this is “nice to know” research. The Ministry accepts that there may be more pressing information needs defined in other projects, but information on the productivity of deepwater invertebrates is required to assess, in line with Government’s SMEEF, the level of risk to these species posed by fishing. In the absence of fishing, the Ministry would agree that this would be academic research under some sort of Crown funding.

The Ministry notes DSG’s suggestion that this project should be reconsidered in the light of the BPA proposal. The BPA proposal has not been implemented but, if it is implemented in its current or a revised form, the Ministry will, of course, take into account the details of that implementation in its research planning and prioritisation processes. Whether or not the BPA proposal is implemented, however, there will be a need to understand the nature and extent of

fishing impacts to support management of those impacts and to set and refine standards as specified in the SMEEF. The Ministry frequently reviews the relevance of its research portfolio and will not tender or contract research that it does not consider to be relevant to the management of fisheries or fishing impacts.

The Ministry notes DSG's suggestion that this research project is not of itself related to the avoidance, remedying or mitigation of the adverse effects of fishing on the aquatic environment and that costs cannot, therefore be recovered. The Ministry does not accept this proposition and believes that understanding the productivity of deepwater invertebrates is an integral component of understanding and managing the risks to these species posed by fishing.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 114 - ENV2006/04 Ecosystem indicators for New Zealand fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	243 - 246
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 256 Te Ohu: page 10 para 84

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

256 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2. However we question why tenders have already been sought for this project

Te Ohu comment

84 Surely this proposal falls into the Public Good category. There is no recognized methodology, so experimentation is required. There is no surety of success or that any results which might be achieved will be applicable to fisheries management in this country, yet all fishstocks are being called on to pay.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and Te Ohu's suggestion that this is "public good" research. By its very nature, research can never provide the surety that Te Ohu requests. However, in line with management agencies in almost all developed nations, the Ministry is moving slowly towards a more holistic, ecosystem approach to fisheries management. Key to such an approach is a suite of suitable indicators at the ecosystem level, to complement those already in use at a fishstock level. If it proceeds, this project will use existing data to assess the suitability for New Zealand conditions of some of the indicators found to be practical overseas.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 115 - ENV2006/05 Climate and oceanographic trends relevant to New Zealand fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	247 - 248
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 257

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

257 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 116 - ENV2006/06 Trends in relative mesopelagic biomass using time series of acoustic backscatter data from trawl surveys

Proposed research services page no.	249 - 250
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 258

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

258 SeaFIC SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 117 - ENV2006/07 Cumulative and historical effects of fishing and other relevant factors on New Zealand ecosystems

Proposed research services page no.	251 - 252
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 259 Te Ohu; page 10 para 84

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

259 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and medium priority

Te Ohu comment

84 Surely this proposal falls into the Public Good category. There is no recognized methodology, so experimentation is required. There is no surety of success or that any results which might be achieved will be applicable to fisheries management in this country, yet all fishstocks are being called on to pay.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and Te Ohu’s suggestion that this is “public good” research. By its very nature, research can never provide the surety that Te Ohu requests. However, suitable methodology has been developed and published by overseas researchers and could be applied in New Zealand. The Ministry is moving slowly towards a more holistic, ecosystem approach to fisheries management and the long-term context of present-day conditions is an important consideration.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 118 - GBD2006/01 DNA database for commercial marine fish and invertebrates

Proposed research services page no.	253 - 254
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 260 Te Ohu; page 10 para 85

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

260 SeaFIC maintains that because this proposal will contribute to New Zealand's commitment to local and international management and enforcement of finfish and invertebrate fisheries it should be 100% Crown funded

Te Ohu comment

85 Once again, this is a Public Good project whose results, if any, are unlikely ever to apply to industry or to the management of the commercial fisheries. If it is to proceed, it should be 100% Crown funded

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC's and Te Ohu's suggestion that this research should be Crown funded. As more fishstocks are introduced to the QMS, there will be an increasing need to understand the differences between stocks and between species. There may be both stock management and compliance implications of this work, but cost recovery is provided for under both circumstances. The Ministry believes there is a very high chance that the results will be applied to the management of New Zealand fisheries.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 119 - HAB2006/01 Biogenic habitats as areas of special significance for fisheries management

Proposed research services page no.	255 - 256
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 40 para 261 Te Ohu; page 10 para 85

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

261 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2. . However we disagree that the costs of the project should be cost recovered from the industry. This is in essence a review of information on the existence and developments in a number of biogenic habitats of special interest to fisheries management. The content is akin to a population study and not active research into the effects of fishing or the mitigation of fishing impact. The project should be Crown funded as the Fisheries Act does not provide for cost recovery for research by the Ministry of a population study nature.

262 Furthermore, we question why tenders have already been sought for this project

Te Ohu comment

85 Once again, this is a Public Good project whose results, if any, are unlikely ever to apply to industry or to the management of the commercial fisheries. If it is to proceed, it should be 100% Crown funded

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and Te Ohu’s suggestion that this is “public good” research. The Ministry does not agree that the work should be Crown funded, however, and the cost recovery rules allow for costs of research to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the risk to, or adverse effect on, the aquatic environment or biological diversity caused by commercial fishing to be recovered. Biogenic structures have been identified as providing key environments and ecosystem services that are likely to be modified by fishing methods that disturb the seabed, and this project will, therefore, assist with the identification of the species or habitats most at risk from fishing as mandated by Government’s SMEEF. Further, the Ministry believes there is a very high likelihood that the results will be applied to the management of New Zealand fisheries.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issues 120 - HAB2006/02 Rhodolith beds as habitats of significance for fisheries management

Proposed research services page no.	257 - 258
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 41 para 263 - 264 Te Ohu; page 10 para 85

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

263 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and medium priority and medium urgency.

264 We disagree with the inclusion of the word ‘may’ in the note in the cost recovery section and submit that there should be a Crown component in recognition of non-commercial dredging for scallops and oysters that occurs in some areas. Further, we submit that the project should be Crown funded, because the research is by nature a population study and not tied to the effect of fishing.

Te Ohu comment

85 Once again, this is a Public Good project whose results, if any, are unlikely ever to apply to industry or to the management of the commercial fisheries. If it is to proceed, it should be 100% Crown funded

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes SeaFIC’s support for this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and Te Ohu’s suggestion that this is “public good” research. The Ministry does not agree that the work should be Crown funded, however, and the cost recovery rules allow for costs of research to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the risk to, or adverse effect on, the aquatic environment or biological diversity caused by commercial fishing to be recovered.

Rhodolith beds are biogenic structures that have been identified as providing key environments and ecosystem services that are likely to be modified by fishing methods that disturb the seabed. This project will, therefore, assist with the delineation of one of the habitats probably most at risk from fishing as mandated by Government’s SMEEF. As such, the Ministry believes there is a very high likelihood that the results will be applied to the management of New Zealand fisheries.

This project is considered to be of medium priority only because a wider project summarizing the international literature and identifying information needs is thought to be of higher priority in this area.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

PELAGIC FISHERIES PROJECTS

Issue 121 - EMA2006/01 Commercial catch monitoring of blue mackerel

Proposed research services page no.	260 - 263
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 41 para 265 Te Ohu; page 10 para 86 - 87

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

265 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Te Ohu comment

86 Te Ohu questions why this work needs to be undertaken yet again. There are already several years of consecutive data, and as it is trends that are being sought, more useful results are likely if the work is done every 2 or 3 years. We do not consider objectives 1 and 3 necessary for the 2006/07 year. Objectives 2 and 4 also would be better delayed for a year or so.

87 Reject proposal.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The collection of time series data are critical for assessment of stock status and the current time series will be an important input to the stock assessment currently under development. In the absence of a stock assessment, time series of catch-at-age data can be analysed to examine trends in mortality. The current stock assessment will consider the frequency of future sampling, but until this is complete, history has shown that it is very important to collect these data as often as possible.

Due to the length of the current time series, this project was classified as Tier 2, but if it is possible to go ahead with Objectives 2 and 4 this would be very useful as the work under these objectives are expected to inform the frequency of any future catch monitoring.

Finally, despite substantial annual catches, we have no other monitoring in place for these stocks at this time.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;

- (c) **note** that within the project the additional catch sampling (Specific Objectives 1 and 3) remains the priority, however, if funds allow their completion the undertaking of Specific Objectives 2 and 4 is important to inform future blue mackerel research and stock assessment;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 122 - JMA2006/01 Multi-year monitoring of the species composition of the commercial catch of jack mackerel

Proposed research services page no.	264 - 267
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 41 para 266

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

266 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

This project is supported by SeaFIC and no other submissions about it have been received.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 123 - JMA2006/02 Stock structure of the native jack mackerel species

Proposed research services page no.	268 - 270
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 41 para 267 Te Ohu; page 11 para 88 - 90

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

267 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2. We consider that rather than 'medium' this project is of low priority and can be deferred

Te Ohu comment

88 While these (JMA2006/02 and KHA2006/01) may be desirable projects, what will be the position if the results indicate the present stock boundaries are unsatisfactory, as is the likely outcome?

89 In Te Ohu's experience, changing stock boundaries for species established in the QMS is a fraught and costly process. MFish might as well accept that, even if these projects are successfully undertaken, it is highly unlikely quota holders for the various stocks will permit any boundary changes, so why undertake the projects?

90 Reject proposals.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Regardless of the management areas used for a given species, knowledge of the stock structure of a species is fundamental to the accurate assessment of the status of a fish stock and estimation of its sustainable yields. Such knowledge also informs future research needs such as stock monitoring.

The stock assessment currently under development for jack mackerel will examine, in a modelling context, the sensitivity of important model outputs to uncertainty in stock structure. For this reason, this project is classified as Tier 2 and of medium rather than low priority.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that this project remains a medium priority;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 124 - KAH2006/01 Stock structure of kahawai

Proposed research services page no.	271 - 274
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 41 para 268 - 270 Te Ohu; page 11 para 88 - 90

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

268 SeaFIC has a number of difficulties with this proposal in its present form and recommends that it be deferred for one year until after the nature and extent of the work and areas to sample are determined in the review of the stock assessment that is being developed in 2005/06 and 2006/07 (KAH2005/01).

269 The proposal at present lacks focus. For example, the following statement is imprecise:

“The approach proposed involves a broad spectrum low cost investigation now, with a review during the stock assessment of how critical detailed information would be in future, then, if needed to go ahead with a larger scale method.”

270 Research providers have to construct tenders on the basis that only after a review of Specific Objectives 1 and 2 in early 2007 will they know whether Specific Objective 3 is required, and the timing and scope of it.

Te Ohu comment

88 While these (JMA2006/02 and KHA2006/01) may be desirable projects, what will be the position if the results indicate the present stock boundaries are unsatisfactory, as is the likely outcome?

89 In Te Ohu’s experience, changing stock boundaries for species established in the QMS is a fraught and costly process. MFish might as well accept that, even if these projects are successfully undertaken, it is highly unlikely quota holders for the various stocks will permit any boundary changes, so why undertake the projects?

90 Reject proposals.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry agrees with SeaFIC that it is more pragmatic to undertake Specific Objectives 1 and 2 at this time and defer Specific Objective 3 until after the completion of this project and the concurrent research assessing the status of the kahawai stocks. The research detailed in Specific Objectives 1 and 2 is required now, is considered technically feasible, and will directly inform future management of the kahawai fisheries.

Regardless of the management areas used for a given species, knowledge of the stock structure of a species is fundamental to the accurate assessment of the status of a fish stock

and estimation of its sustainable yields. Such knowledge also informs future research needs such as stock monitoring.

The stock assessment currently under development for kahawai will examine, in a modelling context, the sensitivity of important model outputs to uncertainty in stock structure and therefore the need for detailed additional information on stock structure in the future (e.g. Specific Objective 3).

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that Specific Objectives 1 and 2 should go ahead in 2006/07;
- (d) **agree** that Specific Objective 3 be deleted in 2006/07, and that the cost estimate will be revised accordingly;
- (e) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (f) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 125 - KAH2006/02 Stock monitoring of kahawai – using recreational catches

Proposed research services page no.	275 - 278
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 271 Te Ohu; page 11 para 91

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

271 SeaFIC supports this proposal but considers the cost recovery estimate is excessive

Te Ohu comment

91 There are significant non-commercial components in the KAH and KIN fisheries, which is acknowledged in the texts of these proposals but not in the cost allocation sections. The Rules proportions should be applied

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Numerous studies have recommended the use of recreational catches instead of commercial catches to best monitor the age and size structure of the kahawai stocks. As recreational catches consist of large numbers of small landings, landed across numerous landing points, the cost of monitoring the recreational catch will be higher than the cost of monitoring commercial catches.

The cost recovery rule applied to this project (Rule 9(1)a) incorporates the split of the TAC among commercial and other interests (according to item 5 in the Schedule to the Rules). This recognises the significant non-commercial component in this fishery (e.g. the commercial cost recovery is approximately 32% of the cost; the Crown contributes the other 68% on behalf of recreational and customary fishing interest).

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the cost recovery rules have been applied correctly;
- (d) **note** that this research is expensive due to the logistical complexity of the work;
- (e) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (f) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 126 - KIN2006/01 Stock monitoring of kingfish

Proposed research services page no.	279 - 282
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 272 Te Ohu; page 11 para 91

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

272 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2. The cost recovery estimate, however, appears to be excessive

Te Ohu comment

91 There are significant non-commercial components in the KAH and KIN fisheries, which is acknowledged in the texts of these proposals but not in the cost allocation sections. The Rules proportions should be applied

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As for kahawai, for stocks where it is necessary to monitor recreational catches, the cost of monitoring these catches is typically more expensive than monitoring commercial catches.

The cost recovery rule applied to this project (Rule 9(2)) incorporates the split of the TAC among commercial and other interests (according to item 5 in the Schedule to the Rules). This recognises the significant non-commercial component in this fishery (e.g. the commercial cost recovery is approximately 21% of the cost; the Crown contributes the other 79% on behalf of recreational and customary fishing interest).

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the cost recovery rules have been applied correctly;
- (d) **note** that this research is expensive due to the logistical complexity of the work;
- (e) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (f) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 127 - KIN2006/02 Commercial handling mortality of kingfish

Proposed research services page no.	282 - 286
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 273 NZBGFC; page 1 para 6 - 7

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

273 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

NZBGFC comment

6 NZBGFC submit that project KIN2006/02 “Commercial handling mortality of kingfish” must be moved into the first tier projects. In the 2004/05 fishing year the kingfish TACC in KIN7 was exceeded by 168 % (TACC 7t and landings 18.76t) and the TACC in KIN8 was exceeded by 48% (TACC 36t and landings of 53.2t). This is not a good outcome for commercial fishers, nor for non-commercial interests.

7 On 1 October 2005 kingfish were added to the Sixth Schedule of the Fisheries Act 1996 to allow the release of kingfish taken commercially, subject to conditions. Only kingfish with a high likelihood of survival may be released under this provision (reducing the mortality on the stock as a whole). The released fish do not count against ACE. It is our view that KIN2006/02 is required to monitor the effectiveness of this management measure and to help improve where possible the code of conduct that is being developed.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As a first step in evaluating the effectiveness of recent regulatory changes, the Ministry of Fisheries have increased observer coverage in fisheries that catch KIN and have instructed observers to pay particular attention to the fate of kingfish. The results of this work will inform research in this area. This project has been classified as Tier 2 and will only go forward in 2006/07 if sufficient funds exist.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the concerns raised by NZBGFC are to some extent mitigated by increases in observer coverage;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	287 - 289
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 274

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

274 SeaFIC does not support this proposal. We question the feasibility of the proposed work and whether it is even possible to determine species and the quantum of a school from a small aircraft. If any work is to be tendered, it should be for a minimal feasibility study, the results of which will need to be considered by the Pelagic RPG before a decision is made to undertake a full survey.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

Based on feedback from SeaFIC during the Research Planning Process, the scope of this project has already been reduced to a feasibility study. It is clear that small aircraft, already used by commercial fishing companies, can readily identify species and approximate sizes of schools of pelagic fish species from the air.

The Pelagic Fisheries Stock Assessment Working and Research Planning Groups will review the results of the feasibility study before any decision is made to undertake a full survey.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** the research is feasible, the project is constrained to design based on existing knowledge, and that the results will be subject to open technical review prior to any full survey;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 129 - PEL2006/02 **Bycatch of pelagic fish from other fisheries**

Proposed research services page no.	290 - 291
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 275 - 276 Te Ohu; page 11 para 92 - 93

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

275 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2 and we consider that rather than 'medium' it is of low priority and can be deferred.

276 This is seen as an unnecessary project as bycatch of commercial fish species is reported in the appropriate stock assessments and catch reports. There is also very limited data in that only the top 5 species are reported by law

Te Ohu comment

92. Why is this project necessary now? Surely this work formed part of the catch data used in establishing TAC/TACC levels when the various species and their stocks were introduced into the QMS? If not, the levels set were defective and should be revisited.

93 Is this in fact the real purpose of the proposal, despite the nominated objectives?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes that differences between actual landed catch and the catch taken at sea necessitate this research. We note that bycatch of pelagic fish species, which in the context of other fisheries are often relatively small and of low value, is usually outside the scope of research into other fisheries and is generally not incorporated in other stock assessment and catch reports.

As pelagic fish bycatch occurs across a range of fisheries, a gap exists in the records of pelagic fish catch (as opposed to landings). This research intends to fill that gap. By utilising observer records this research should also be able to address the data gap identified by SeaFIC.

Knowing the total catch by species with some degree of precision is very important for stock assessment purposes irrespective of the catch histories utilised for the introduction of species into the QMS. It is not a case of the introductory levels being defective, rather, we are seeking additional information to improve and update the earlier work.

Although the Ministry considers this research necessary, it is not believed to be urgent.

For these reasons, this project is classified as Tier 2 and of medium rather than low priority.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that this project remains a medium priority;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 130 - SHK2006/01 Characterisation of pelagic shark fisheries

Proposed research services page no.	292 - 294
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 277 Te Ohu; page 11 para 94

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

277 SeaFIC supports this project. However, it is uncertain how much information is available to characterise the fisheries. Hopefully the project will identify data deficiencies and make recommendations for the collection of the appropriate data.

Te Ohu comment

94 Surely objective 2 forms part of New Zealand's international obligations and should be funded by the Crown?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

As noted in the project description, recent research has shown that porbeagle sharks are likely to be highly vulnerable to overexploitation and New Zealand is probably the coastal state with the greatest impact on this stock. Further, it is not known if current catches or the current TAC are sustainable. Based on these three factors, compilation of all available data to allow an assessment of stock status is clearly required to assess the sustainability of the current TAC.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that this research relates directly to the New Zealand fishery for cost recovery purposes;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 131 - STM2006/01 Multi-year stock monitoring of striped marlin including logbook programme implementation

Proposed research services page no.	295 - 298
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 278

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

278 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

This project is supported by SeaFIC and no other submissions about it have been received.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 132 - STN2006/01 Catch-at age of southern bluefin tuna

Proposed research services page no.	299 - 301
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 279 Te Ohu; page 11 para 95

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

279 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Te Ohu comment

95 As for SHK2006/01 above.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support from SeaFIC for this project.

Estimation of the age composition of southern bluefin tuna catches is currently the only monitoring undertaken of the portion of the wider southern bluefin tuna population that is caught in New Zealand waters. This monitoring programme provides information on the status of the stock that is very useful for management purposes.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that this research relates directly to the New Zealand fishery for cost recovery purposes; and
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 133 - TAG2006/01 Management of data from the gamefish tag recapture programme

Proposed research services page no.	302 - 304
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 42 para 280 Te Ohu page 11 para 95

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

280 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Te Ohu comment

95 As for SHK2006/01 above.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support from SeaFIC.

The comment from Te Ohu is not relevant to this programme as this project is 100% Crown funded and refers to the management of data from a New Zealand programme.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that this research is 100% Crown funded;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 134 - TAG2006/02 Determination of habitat preference using electronic tags

Proposed research services page no.	305 - 307
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 43 para 281

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

281 SeaFIC supports this proposal

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support from SeaFIC for this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 135 - TAG2006/03 Management of the archival tag recapture program

Proposed research services page no.	308 - 310
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 43 para 282

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

282 SeaFIC supports this proposal being classified as Tier 2

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the support from SeaFIC fro this project

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 2 project; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 136 - TRE2006/01 Monitoring the length and age structure of commercial landings of trevally in TRE 1 and TRE 7

Proposed research services page no.	311 - 313
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 43 para 283

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

283 SeaFIC supports this proposal but considers that the cost recovery estimate is excessive.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes that an industry research provider has been involved in providing this research in the past and is likely to be involved in future. In part, the higher cost is related to the seasonality of trevally landings and the two stocks sampled in this programme. However, the major component of cost in this programme is the ageing of trevally. Trevally are moderately difficult to age and therefore require additional time and care in their processing than for some other species (e.g. snapper). This is reflected in the higher estimated cost for this research project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that this research is expensive due to the technical complexity of the work;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Issue 137 - TUN2006/01 Commercial catch sampling programme for highly migratory fish species

Proposed research services page no.	314 - 316
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 43 para 284 - 285

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

284 This is expensive considering a lot of the data will be collected by other programs (e.g. Fishery returns and observers).

285 The Ministry notes that it is difficult to estimate the cost of a new project such as this. Further, the pilot programme has not yet been completed. We refer to the Note for this project “The results of TUN2005/02 and the review of that project by the Pelagic Fisheries Stock Assessment Working Group will be used to fully determine the scope of TUN2006/01.”

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The goal of this project is to utilise data on individual fish collected by fish processors and will only go ahead if it is shown that it is both feasible and cost-effective.

The Ministry notes that an industry research provider has been involved in providing this research in the past and is likely to be involved in future. In part the higher cost is related to the seasonality of trevally landings and the two stocks sampled in this programme. However, the major component of cost in this programme is the ageing of trevally. Trevally are moderately difficult to age and therefore require additional time and care in their processing than for some other species (e.g. snapper). This is reflected in the higher cost for this research project.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that this research will only go ahead if feasible and cost effective;
- (d) **agree** that the project remains a Tier 1 project; and
- (e) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.

Proposed research services page no.	320 - 321
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC: page 43 para 286

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

286 SeaFIC supports this proposal subject to the following change:

- Delete the seventh objective (“To optimise the design of observer coverage in scampi fisheries”) – Research Observer services relate to the placing of observers on vessels and the tasks they are to undertake. Design of the observer coverage is a scientific research task to be undertaken by the Science group. It should not be included as an objective for Observer Services projects nor funded from this output.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes that this specific objective will not be funded from the Observer Services output. Optimisation research is funded within the Research Services output and will continue to be funded in this manner in future. The specific objective has been included in the project outline for completeness and to meet earlier requests from industry to ensure that observer coverage is reviewed on a regular basis. Appropriate wording will be incorporated into future observer project outlines to ensure this confusion is addressed.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) **note** the comments from the submitters along with those made in previous submissions;
- (b) **note** the Ministry responses;
- (c) **note** that the Specific Objective 7 will not be funded from the Observer Services budget; and
- (d) **approve** this project as a required fisheries service.