

Stakeholder Comments and Ministry Response on Research Projects

Issue no.	Subject	Page no.
41	Fisheries research - General comments	3
42	Observer coverage	8
	ECO ranking of research projects	11

Project no.	Research project title	Page no.
OEO2004/01	Abundance of black oreo and smooth oreo	19
ORH2004/01	Abundance of orange roughy	21
ORH2004/02	Orange roughy stock assessment	22
OBS2004/01	Research observer days – deepwater fisheries	23
HOK2004/03	Estimation of spawning hoki biomass	24
HOK2004/04	Estimation of mortality of juvenile hoki	26
HOK2004/05	Stock discrimination of hoki	28
MDT2004/01	Estimation of hoki and middle depths fish abundance	29
OBS2004/03	Research observer days – hoki and middle depths fisheries	30
BUT2004/01	Characterisation of the Cook Strait butterfish fishery	31
EEL2004/01	Recruitment of freshwater eels	32
EEL2004/02	Monitoring commercial eel fisheries	33
EEL2004/03	Wairewa customary eel fishery	34
EEL2004/04	Longfin eel population modelling	35
INS2004/01	Validating bluenose and rubyfish ageing	36
SNA2004/01	Snapper population modelling	37
SNA2004/02	Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA1	38
SNA2004/04	Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA2	39
SNA2004/05	Biomass estimation for snapper in SNA1	40
SNA2004/06	Measurement of abundance of 0+ snapper in SNA8	42
STA2004/01	Stock assessment of stargazer in STA7	44
STA2004/03	Validation of growth zones in stargazer otoliths	45
COC2004/01	Stock assessment of Snake Bank cockles	46
COC2004/02	Stock assessment of Cockles in Papanui and Waitati inlets	47
COC2004/03	Stock assessment of Cockles in COC7A	48
CRA2004/01	Main larval sources that support the red rock lobster fishery	49
CRA2004/02	Rock lobster recruitment	50
GEN2004/01	Determination of shellfish age, growth rates and spawning events	51
OCT2004/01	Characterisation of octopus catches	52
PAU2004/01	Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU7	53
PPI2004/01	Stock assessment of Mair Bank pipis	54
SCA2004/01	Stock assessment of Coromandel scallops	55
SCA2004/02	Stock assessment of Northland scallops	56

SCI2004/01	Measuring the abundance of scampi	57
SUR2004/01	Characterising kina fisheries in Tory Channel	58
AKI2004/01	Intertidal shellfish monitoring	59
PAU2004/03	Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU2	60
REC2004/01	Estimation of recreational harvest of priority fish stocks	62
REC2004/02	Survey of marine recreational fishing in selected areas	62
REC2004/06	Estimation of NZ sealion incidental captures	62
REC2004/07	Catch and effort in marine recreational fisheries	62
REC2004/08	Indices of recreational fishing effort	62
ENV2004/02	Estimation of NZ sealion incidental captures	64
ENV2004/04	Characterisation of seabird captures in NZ fisheries	66
ENV2004/05	Impacts of fishing related mortality on NZ seabirds	68
ENV2004/06	Assessment of Maui's dolphin – fisheries interactions	70
ENV2004/07	Investigation the effects of fishing on seamounts	73
OBS2004/04	Research observer days – SQU6T and SQU1T	75
EMA2004/01	Stock monitoring of blue mackerel	76
JMA2004/02	Stock assessment of JMA1	77
KAH2004/01	Characterisation of the kahawai fishery	78
KIN2004/01	Developing kingfish stock monitoring and assessment	80
STN2004/01	Movements of southern bluefin tuna	81
SMA2004/03	Catchability of trawl surveys	86
SAM2004/02	Medium term research plan	87

FISHERIES RESEARCH

Issue 41 - General comments

SeaFIC/Hoki

We begin by making some generic comments. The remainder of the submission addresses specific research proposals.

Consultation

SeaFIC expressed concern throughout 2003 that consultation on research services was inadequate and remained driven largely by research providers rather than by management needs. We additionally expressed concern at the lack of value in the RCC, which seems to exist with no clear purpose. We will not reproduce here the comments we made in our submission following the RCC¹ or verbally thereafter.

Perhaps partly in response to the expression of such concerns, MFish informed many stakeholders by letter on 29 January 2004 that the SOI discussions on 4 February 2004 would involve a project by project consideration of the proposed research services. Unfortunately, SeaFIC Science was not sent a copy of that letter and only learned of the intention on 2 February 2004. Many commercial stakeholders were totally unaware of the intention.

At the meeting on 4 February 2004, MFish staff mostly left the room for the project by project discussion, with no relevant staff left to consider cost recovery or administrative issues. The two MFish Science staff that remained were, like many stakeholders, not fully prepared.

Overall, the consultation on Research Services proposed for 2004/05 has not been adequate. The areas of inadequacy are many and varied, and the issues are well rehearsed if so far not dealt with.

The foregoing is a very negative comment, but SeaFIC is pleased to note that while the 2004/05 planning has again in our view been inadequate, MFish is making serious attempts to correct matters for future rounds. We look forward in 2004 to a more robust research planning round, led by the Senior Fishery Management Advisors and with appropriate roles played by research providers and affected levy payers.

Appropriate structure to allow fair and equitable application of cost recovery rules

It is perhaps symptomatic of the poor planning processes within MFish, and across agencies, that many projects, most notably in the Aquatic Environment portfolio, are not structured in a manner that would result in a fair and equitable application of the cost recovery rules. Projects ENV 2004/04 and ENV 2004/05 are examples of this. The projects are wide in scope and are not well focused. They do not permit clear and unambiguous application of the rules with costs falling appropriately. As proposed and explained in the meeting on 4 February 2004, the costs of unspecified modeling work on unspecified species of birds would

¹ SeaFIC submission on the Proposed Fisheries Services 24 October 2003

fall, for instance, primarily on HOK quota holders. Yet it is far from clear that the hoki fishery is the main risk exacerbator.

While it is laudable that MFish is trying to pick up the reins in an uncoordinated (between government agencies) area of work, SeaFIC cannot support projects which are poorly focused and leave open the possibility of unfair attribution of costs.

Undermining of incentives

Inappropriate cost attribution due to poorly defined and focused projects may not necessarily be illegal – though it assuredly contravenes the principles of natural justice. SeaFIC notes that such an unjust application of the rules detracts from the purpose of the rules and, most importantly, undermines confidence amongst quota holders and creates wrong incentives. That distortion of incentives potentially undermines the QMS itself. As a matter of principle, SeaFIC is firmly of the view that projects should at all times be constructed so as to ensure fair and reasonable cost attribution to ensure proper incentives are created. We cannot support projects which fail in this respect.

Costs and cost estimates

This year, for the first time, MFish has provided cost estimates at the discussion stage of the SOI. This is a step forward. MFish may have prepared explicit and detailed cost estimates, but what is provided in the draft SOI is very crude and at times unhelpful. Project costs given as “\$0-\$50,000” or “\$50,000 - \$100,000” do not inspire confidence – either in the cost estimation procedures themselves (if they do actually exist), or in the likelihood of value for money being attained when the majority of projects (see paragraph 59 above) are subject to a single bid and are also mostly undertaken by a single research provider. Nor is confidence inspired by many of the costs being very high, possibly unreasonably so.

SeaFIC acknowledges that cost estimates have been provided and sees this as a very small step towards doing the job properly and in a useful manner. As provided this year, although well-intentioned, it is unfortunate that the cost estimates in fact further undermine confidence in many cases.

The seafood industry has seen revenues tumble dramatically in the last three years and the economic forecasts for 2004/05 are poor. At the same time, management, research and administration costs have been rising. Given the current economic state of the industry, great care is needed in the commissioning of research to ensure only essential and cost-effective projects are undertaken.

The Northern Inshore Fisheries Co Ltd. (TNIFCL)

TNIFCL endorses the comments in the SeaFIC submission relating to the consultation process on research services. In addition TNIFCL wish to make a general statement regarding its overall dissatisfaction and concerns with the consultation process regarding research services. This relates to direct observation of the process in the inshore finfish, snapper, recreational, and aquatic environment research planning groups and subsequent attendance at the RCC and Plenary.

The current process appears to pay little if no lip service to the medium term research plans and is, with the exception of parts of the aquatic environment area, entirely driven by voluminous research ideas of varying degrees of relevance provided by research providers in the absence of clear priorities from MFish. In many working groups these ideas are presented for the first time at research planning meetings and are not circulated in advance of meetings. This has resulted in chaotic and highly unsatisfactory engagement with the consultation process. It is unclear how this process results in the optimum outcome for responsible fisheries management. TNIFCL submits that MFish need to be taking a more proactive role as responsible fisheries managers. Fishery Managers should:

- Clearly identify the problem definitions for responsible fishery management
- Prioritise those management needs
- Determine what questions are required to solve the problems
- Present the questions to the science working groups and explore how research could be designed to meet them
- Consider the range of options and the cost benefits of each option
- Determine how the data or research outcomes are to be used

The aquatic environment research planning group demonstrated this approach for seamount and seabird research by providing the analysis of the management needs and the research priorities derived from that analysis. It should be a model for future research planning group processes and/or determination of research requirements for MFish stock strategies.

TNIFCL and other members of the industry continue to be frustrated at the lack of clear boundary definition between MFish and DoC for research related to protected species and the poor progress between DoC and MFish to provide clarity on this matter. It is apparent that there had been no consultation with the Department of Conservation on their observer requirements for protected species at the time of release of the consultation document. The draft NPOA for seabirds proposed a joint DOC/MFish management approach to the interaction of protected species with fisheries and a single working group approach. This was generally supported by all stakeholders as providing clarity and efficiency in prioritising Crown research needs in this area. TNIFCL would like to see this transformation before the next planning round.

TNIFCL support the inclusion of the cost recovery interpretation and indicative cost of the project. We suggest that it would be helpful for multiyear projects if the costs for each year were indicated. The research proposals as presented are inadequate in the view of TNIFCL in most cases in terms of the management issue to be addressed and the research required to meet the management issue and any discussions as to why the proposed research approach is the preferred option. The content for project description is often weak and badly articulated. There are instances of objectives for significant projects in excess of \$1.5 million dollars been covered in four sentences! This poses significant problems under the Agreement if future discussions with scientists result in significant changes of scope to projects.

TNIFCL believe that given the financial issues faced by the industry as a consequence of the high New Zealand dollar that it should consider the effect to the industry of the current proposed levy for the 04/05 year and the future viability of a fishing industry in New Zealand. Where there are significant projects that could be deferred for one year e.g SNA 1 tagging project then TNIFCL believe that these should be deferred and the fishery monitored through existing lower cost sampling projects.

Sanford

Sanford are supportive of the Research Services process that the Ministry of Fisheries undertake annually, which includes the annual Fisheries Assessment Working Groups and RCC to discuss the research projects in more detail.

However, in a change of process this year, the Research Services were again discussed at the SOI plenary in an almost identical form to the RCC.

Ironically, we are commenting on what is perceived to Sanford to be an unnecessary duplicated process with the RCC and the SOI plenary. We would ask that the Ministry of Fisheries define clearly the purposes of both consultation processes, and outline the difference's between the two meetings if they are to both be continued in the future.

Fisheries Audit Services

FAS believes the overlaps between the Ministry proposed environmental projects under Aquatic Environment research, and the Department of Conservation (DOC) work carried out under the Conservation Services Program (CSP) must be revisited. Industry is now well aware of what costs are recovered from where, and why, so any attempt to levy twice for the same or similar services is unlikely to go unscathed.

It is essential DOC and MinFish get together and sort out their responsibilities and boundaries for issues relating to threatened species, services and research.

Area 2 Inshore Finfish Management Co Ltd, comment

Area 2 notes that there are significant overlaps between the environmental projects being levied across many fisheries by the Ministry under the umbrella of Aquatic environment research, and the Department of Conservation (DOC) work carried out under the Conservation Services Program (CSP). Responsibilities and boundaries for sustainability issues relating to threatened species must be clearly spelled out. It is a waste of time and money to have two government departments researching and providing services for the same thing. Start talking to each other on this one!

Area2 would like to see a rationalisation of interests between DOC and the Ministry of Fisheries.

ECO comment

The research services proposed for 2004/05 are supported but we are concerned at the narrow range of projects, poor range of aquatic environment projects, and the failure of the Ministry to implement the results of many projects. The Ministry should promote:

- The need for more aquatic environment research: The Ministry is still not responding to the report of the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment on "Setting Course" and Section Five of the Fifth Report to Parliament for 1999 of the Controller and Auditor General. Both reports stressed the need for more research on the aquatic

environment and the adverse effects of fishing on it, as well as on the matters in the Environmental Principles, section 9.

- Of the 10 Aquatic Environment projects that produced 1 pages only 5 projects were accepted by the managers and proceeded to the Research Co-ordinating Committee and into the proposed fisheries research projects for 2004/05. Other projects rejected included impacts of mobile bottom fishing gear (three projects including one shellfish project), framework for ecosystem modelling, and impact of fishing on demersal fish populations. The Ministry has yet to adequately fund or give high priority to the impacts of fishing on the aquatic environment.
- More research on new species recently added or to be added to the quota management system.
- Greater assessment of non-fish by-catch in fisheries: We are opposed to a change to biannual assessments of fur seals.
- If research is not carried out into a fish stock then a management response consistent with precautionary management should be to reduce catch limits.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of stakeholders;
- (b) recalls that the research services for 2004/05 were derived over a series of meetings including those of the Fishery Assessment Working Groups, Research Planning Groups and the Research Coordinating Committee, before being put out for 'official ' consultation in the SOI;
- (c) notes that cost recovery rules were applied according to the *Fisheries (Cost Recovery) Rules 2001* document;
- (d) notes that DoC and MFish are working closely to avoid duplication of research; and
- (e) notes that most of the issues raised by stakeholders are currently being addressed.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder comments and Ministry responses.

Issue 42 – Observer coverage

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	26 – Observer services provided
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	
Research project code and title	All observer projects
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	The Northern Inshore Fisheries Co Ltd. (TNIFCL) Page 3 Sanford Page 3; paras 21 - 26 Solander Page 5, paras 28 – 31 ECO Page 12 point 3 and research rankings pages 13 - 19

Submission details

The Northern Inshore Fisheries Co Ltd. (TNIFCL)

Observer coverage is a significant component of the proposed research services. It is of deep concern and criticism that the discussions of required observer days, the coverage and data collection requirements (from a research perspective) are not covered at the research planning groups and were presented for the first time at the RCC. The consultation documents do not generally include the basis or rationale behind the derivation of the number of days. What is demonstrably absent is a clear definition of the research question posed and how the observer coverage has been designed to provide data (and what type of data) to address the question. It is simply not adequate to present a number of days in the absence of supporting data as to how those days have been derived.

The current process does not allow for industry to present its proposed coverage through industry observer and log book programmes to allow for rationalisation of observer days or any discussion of options e.g. shed sampling and log book programmes or to allow stakeholders to confirm that the observer coverage is designed to provide optimal outcomes for the collection of biological stock data. TNIFCL would like clarity that MFish are confident that the Observer Programme has the ability to deliver all the required observer days and what the strategy is for prioritisation of observer coverage if they do not have the capacity to deliver. We do not wish to be levied for a service that cannot be delivered.

Sanford comment

Sanford support the use of observer coverage to provide statically robust data to ensure good fisheries management decisions can be made using this information. We believe observer coverage should be for the purposes of obtaining biological information or for various information gathering for better fisheries management, including compliance.

We are concerned about projects using observer coverage proposed for the purposes of defining whether a 'risk' or 'interaction' occurs with marine mammals or seabirds (protected species) and the fishing industry when there are other tools which currently provide some of this information.

There is significant duplication of process which leads to the inefficient costs and increased time. Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act 1978 and the Wildlife Act 1953 fishers are required to complete and return notification of any interactions with protected species. Currently Sanford are completing "Non Fish-Incidental Catch reporting Forms" and return them to the Ministry of Fisheries (Fax 04-470-2686, Attention Bob Johnson).

Sanford information provided on these forms is accurate and correct.

This is a legal requirement and all our vessels undertake this process.

Sanford submit that this information provides a very clear picture of when interactions occur, with what species, and in which fishery. We are concerned that this information is not being used as an appropriate tool, and because of this, costly, unnecessary research projects are being proposed.

We submit that the Ministry of Fisheries, in co-operation with the Department of Conservation review the "non fish-incidental catch reporting form", and in doing so consider how this information can be best used to ensure we are not proposing unnecessary research, nor duplicating research and observer coverage between departments.

Solander comment

28 The placing of Observers on Vessels appears to relate more to convenience and "getting numbers up" rather than following the research project for which coverage was intended.

29 By way of example we refer you to the table provided on Page 212. Whilst 127 Observer days are attributed to the domestic Tuna Industry only 32 of these were spent in the Northern in-shore Fishery. The remaining 95 being spent on the *Daniel Solander* in the Southern Fishery. Thus the impression being given that there has been an improvement in Observer coverage in the Northern area is incorrect.

30 Likewise the same Vessel in the Ling Fishery last season spent 217 days at sea with observed days being 360 (the apparent anomaly in numbers being as a result of two observers being carried on most of the voyages).

31 Whilst we welcome good Observer coverage on our Vessels (domestic and joint venture) we question the correlation between the Observer placement and research programmes they are intended to support.

ECO comment

We supported moves 2 years ago to increase observer coverage to assessed sea bird captures in fisheries. We are disappointed that this increased observer coverage is not included in this year's business plan nor is it commented on in this research plan.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (f) notes the stakeholder views;
- (g) notes that project descriptions were provided for the first time in 2003 for Research Observer Days. These included Objectives and Rationale for observer services for Deepwater Fisheries (OBS2004-01), Antarctic Fisheries (OBS2004-02) Hoki and Middle Depths Fisheries (OBS2004-03) Aquatic Environment (OBS2000-04) and Pelagic Fisheries (OBS2004-05); and
- (h) is working on improving the correlation between observer placement and the research programmes they support. The Ministry welcomes industry cooperation in achieving better placement of observers. The coverage in the ling fishery was intended to be as close to 100% as possible, so, the observation in paragraph 30 suggests this was a success rather than a problem. The tuna example in paragraph 29 is known and the Ministry is actively trying to improve this situation.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder comments and Ministry responses.

ECO ranking of research projects

Our priority ranking system is based on 5 points:

4-5 - high priority

3 - medium priority

2- low priority - could be deferred to a future year.

0-1 - Of doubtful scientific merit

We have also included a commentary on some of the projects.

DEEPWATER FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
ANT2004/01	Characterisation of the toothfish fishery	High	5
ANT2004/02	Aspects of the biology of fishes in the Ross Sea toothfish fishery	High	5
ANT2004/03	Seabird and marine mammal interactions with the Ross Sea toothfish fishery	High	5
ANT2004/04	Stock Assessment of toothfish	High	5
ANT2004/05	<p>Modelling of the ecosystem effects of fishing in the Ross Sea</p> <p><i>Internationally the Ross Sea has been recognised as a special area (see report of the Worlds Parks Congress IUCN 2003). If fishing continues in the Ross Sea then it is critical that the impacts of fishing on the marine environment is well considered.</i></p> <p><i>These projects should be cost recovered from Antarctic fishers.</i></p>	High	5
OEO2004/01	Estimation of the abundance of black oreo and smooth oreo in selected areas	High	5
OEO2004/02	Oreo stock assessment	High	5
ORH2004/01	Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas	High	5
ORH2004/02	Orange roughy stock assessment	High	5
ORH2004/03	Stock assessment of orange roughy fisheries outside the New Zealand EEZ	High	5
OBS 2004/01	<p>Research Observer Days – Deepwater fisheries</p> <p><i>This project is support but additional observer coverage should be considered.</i></p>	High	5
OBS 2004/02	<p>Research Observer Days - Antarctic</p> <p><i>This project is a requirement of CCAMLR conservation measures.</i></p>	High	5

HOKI AND MIDDLE DEPTHS FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
HOK2004/01	Hoki population modelling and stock assessment <i>We welcomed the inclusion on objective 2 – the investigation of prediction of year class strength from environmental variables. This is a crucial aspect for future management of this fishery.</i>	High	5
HOK2004/02	Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Chatham Rise using trawl surveys	High	5
HOK2004/03	Estimation of spawning hoki biomass using acoustic surveys	High	5
HOK2004/04	Estimation of mortality of juvenile hoki <i>This project should continue. We do not support MFish projects being replaced by industry controlled research.</i>	High	5
HOK2004/05	Stock discrimination of hoki <i>Note: Four hoki projects were not included in the RCC assessments.</i>	High	5
HAK2004/01	Stock assessment of hake	High	5
LDO2004/01	Age and growth of lookdown dory	High	5
LIN2004/01	Stock assessment of ling	High	5
MDT2004/01	Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Southern Plateau using trawl surveys	High	5
MID2004/01	Determination of catch at age in hoki, hake and ling fisheries	High	5
MID2004/02	Catch sampling and ageing of hoki and ling in the Cook Strait fishery	High	5
SBW2004/01	Stock assessment of southern blue whiting	High	5
SBW2004/02	Biomass estimation of southern blue whiting using acoustic surveys <i>Assessment of SBW management strategies was not included in this year's proposals. Further work on management strategies should be included in research projects.</i>	High	5
OBS 2004/03	Research Observer Days – Hoki and middle depth fisheries <i>We support this project but increased observer coverage is necessary so that non-fish bycatch can be more accurately assessed.</i>	High	5

INSHORE FINFISH FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
BUT2004/01	Characterisation of the Cook Strait butterfish fishery	High	5
EEL2004/01	Recruitment of freshwater eels	High	5
EEL2004/02	Monitoring commercial eel fisheries	High	5
EEL2004/03	Wairewa customary eel fishery	High	5
EEL2004/04	Longfin eel population modelling <i>We strongly support research into the threatened longfin eels. We are concerned that the proposals to look at sustainability of eels in lakes and wetlands was not deferred.</i>	High	5
INS2004/01	Validating bluenose and rubyfish ageing using radiocarbon dating	High	5
INT2004/01	Estimation of inshore fish abundance off the west coast South Island using trawl surveys <i>We look forward to the development of future trawl surveys in other areas. This includes the reinstatement of the Southland trawl survey.</i>	High	5
SNA2004/01	Snapper population modelling and stock assessment	High	5
SNA2004/02	Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA 1	High	5
SNA2004/03	Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA 8	High	5
SNA2004/04	Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA 2	High	5
SNA2004/05	Biomass estimation for snapper in SNA 1	High	5
SNA2004/05	Measurement of abundance of 0+ snapper in SNA8 <i>We support the development of this assessment method.</i>	High	5
STA2004/01	Stock assessment of stargazer in STA 7	High	5
STA2004/02	Relative abundance of stargazer in STA5	High	5
STA2004/03	Verification of growth zones in stargazer otoliths	High	5
TAR2004/01	Stock assessment of tarakihi in TAR 7	High	5
TAR2004/02	Relative abundance of tarakihi in TAR 1	High	5
	<i>1. We look forward to future proposals for observer in inshore fisheries. 2. We are opposed to the dropping of the spiny dogfish project. This is inconsistent with obligations under the NPOA on sharks.</i>		

SHELLFISH FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
COC2004/01	Stock assessment of Snake Bank cockles	High	5
COC2004/02	Stock assessment of cockles in Papanui and Waitati Inlets, Otago	High	5
COC2004/03	Stock assessment of cockles in Tapu Bay, Ferry Point and Pakawau <i>We support the cockle projects continuing on an annual basis.</i>	High	5
CRA2004/01	Main larval sources that support the red rock lobster fishery	High	5
CRA2004/02	Rock lobster recruitment <i>We strongly support this project and strongly urge this information be used more as an input into stock assessments. Currently this information is rarely used, in particular in forward projections.</i> <i>The rock lobster proposals are supported.</i>	High	5
GEN2004/01	Determination of age, growth rates and spawning events in shellfish using stable isotopes	High	5
OCT2004/01	Characterisation of octopus catches	High	5
OYS2004/01	Foveaux Strait oyster stock assessment <i>The proposal to look at factors affecting Bonamiosis in Foveaux Strait oysters should have been continued. This is a key issue in the management of the oyster stock. The assessment of closed areas must be part of any assessment process.</i>	High	5
PAU2004/01	Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU7	High	5
PPI2004/01	Stock assessment of Mair Bank pipis	High	5
SCA2004/01	Stock assessment of Coromandel scallops	High	5
SCA2004/02	Stock assessment of Northland scallops	High	5
SCI2004/01	Measuring the abundance of scampi	High	5
SUR2004/01	Characterising kina fisheries in Tory Channel, Marlborough	High	5
	<p><i>We note that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The project to assess horse mussels was axed despite it being a new species in the QMS;</i> <i>2. The impacts of shellfish dredging in two projects were not continued. The project to assess surf clams was axed despite it being new species added into the QMS.</i> 		

NON-COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
AKI2004/01	Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the Auckland Fisheries Management Area	High	5
BCO2004/01	Abundance of blue cod around the Banks Peninsula	High	5
BCO2004/02	Abundance of blue cod off North Canterbury (BCO3)	High	5
PAU2004/02	Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU2, between Tirua Point and Patea River, Taranaki	High	5
REC2004/01	Estimation of recreational harvest of priority fish stocks	High	5
REC2004/02	Survey of marine recreational fishing in selected areas	High	5
	<i>We note that three projects have been removed from consideration. Two of these relate to assessing recreational activity in particular areas.</i>		
REC2004/06	Analysis of marine recreational diary data	High	5
REC2004/07	Catch and effort in marine recreational fisheries	High	5
REC2004/08	Indices of recreational fishing effort	High	5
	<i>We support the early development of standards and specifications for recreational fishing surveys which is supposed to be carried out via a workshop.</i>		

AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
ENV2004/02	Estimation of New Zealand sea lion incidental captures in New Zealand fisheries	High	5
ENV 2004/03	<i>Estimation of NZ fur seal incidental captures in New Zealand fisheries.</i> <i>We are strongly opposed to the removal of the project to assess fur captures in New Zealand fisheries.</i>	High	5
ENV2004/04	Characterisation of seabird captures in New Zealand fisheries	High	5
ENV2004/05	Modelling of impacts of fishing-related mortality on New Zealand seabird populations	High	5
ENV2004/06	Assessment of Maui's dolphin – fisheries interaction	High	5
ENV2004/07	Investigating the effect of fishing on seamounts	High	5
OBS2004/04	Research Observer Days – SQU6T and SQU 1T	High	5
	<i>We strongly support this project.</i>		
	<i>19 further projects did not continue to this stage – this includes six which were axed just prior to the RCC. This does not show a strong commitment to aquatic environmental research projects. At the very least the projects deferred at the RPG stage should be reconsidered.</i>		

PELAGIC FISHERIES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
EMA2004/01	Stock monitoring of blue mackerel	High	5
JMA2004/01	Stock monitoring of jack mackerels	High	5
JMA2004/02	Stock assessment of JMA1	High	5
KAH2004/01	Characterisation of the kahawai fisheries	High	5
KIN2004/01	Developing kingfish stock monitoring and assessment	High	5
STN2004/01	Movements of southern bluefin tuna	High	5
SWO2004/01	Stock Assessment of swordfish	High	5
TRE2004/01	Stock assessment of TRE 1	High	5
TRE2004/02	Stock assessment of TRE 7	High	5
TUN2004/01	Estimation of non-target fish catches in the tuna longline fishery	High	5
OBS2004/04	Research Observer Days – Pelagic fisheries	High	5
	<i>We strongly support this project.</i>		
	<i>We note that three projects did not continue beyond RCC stage.</i>		

STOCK ASSESSMENT METHODS

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
SAM2004/01	Process based CPUE models	High	5
SAM2004/02	Optimal design in catch at age sampling	High	5
SAM2004/03	Catchability of trawl surveys <i>This project should continue.</i>	High	5
SAM2004/04	Medium-term research plan <i>We strongly support the development of a medium term plan for SAMs</i>	High	5

OTHER SERVICES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
MOF2004/01	Stock assessment process	High	5
MOF2004/02	Scientific support for international obligations related to fishing	High	5
MOF2004/03	Technical input to policy advice	High	5
MOF2004/04	Socio-economic research	High	5
MOF2004/05	Estimation of customary Maori harvest	High	5

RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT

<u>Code</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Our Priority</u>
DAT2004/02	Research Data Management	High	5

DEEPWATER FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no.	22
Research project code and title	OEO2004/01 Estimation of the abundance of black oreo and smooth oreo in selected areas
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 18, paras 90 – 91 TOKM Page 5, para27 and 28

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

90 Acoustic surveys to estimate biomass are expensive when carried out on dedicated vessels. In many cases, the costs of such surveys approach or even exceed the revenues from the fishery. In recent years, however, industry-based acoustic surveys conducted in deepwater, middle depth and hoki fisheries have started to yield high quality biomass estimates that have been accepted by stock assessment working groups. The development of techniques for industry-based surveys has been carried out by various commercial stakeholder organizations in conjunction with national and international research providers. When acoustic surveys are integrated with fishing operations, the costs reduce dramatically. As a matter of principle, SeaFIC considers that when industry-based approaches are available, MFish should not be commissioning expensive, dedicated surveys without the explicit support of the affected quota holders.

91 We suggest this project be withdrawn.

TOKM comment

27. While Te Ohu Kai Moana agrees that an update acoustic survey of black and smooth oreo stocks in FMA4 is warranted, the estimated cost of \$1-1.5 million cannot be justified. The latest port price survey, as used in the April 2004 cost recovery levy Order calculations, gives a port price for OEO of \$1300/mt. Inclusion of this survey raises the levy cost to \$214/mt or 17% of port price.

28. This project should be withdrawn from Required Services and discussions entered into with the ORMC for the survey to be conducted by (collaborated) Simrad ES60 – equipped commercial vessels during the processing phase of normal fishing activities.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of stakeholders;
- b) notes that the final determination whether this project will be conducted will not be made until the results of ongoing research are reviewed;
- c) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of further consultation and the tender evaluation process; and

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that, if approved, the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following further consultation and the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	27
Research project code and title	ORH2004/01 Estimation of the abundance of orange roughy in selected areas
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 19, para 92

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

92 Industry-based acoustic surveys (see paragraph 90 above) have produced high quality biomass estimates for a range of orange roughy stocks in the past two years. The Deepwater stock assessment WG has accepted these estimates for use in stock assessments. Given the economic situation of the industry (paragraph 85) and the clear intention of the Orange Roughy Management Company to continue producing industry-based acoustic biomass estimates, SeaFIC considers that this project should be withdrawn.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the stakeholder views;
- b) notes that the final determination whether this project will be conducted will not be made until the results of ongoing research are reviewed; and
- c) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of further consultation and the tender evaluation process.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following further consultation and the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	29
Research project code and title	ORH2004/02 Orange roughy stock assessment
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 5, paras 29 - 30

Submission Details

TOKM comment

29. There have been major differences in recent years between acoustic survey – derived assessments and those derived from standardised (or unstandardised) CPUE – the latter usually yielding substantially lower stock level results. The differences have recently been explored by Alan Hicks of UOW and corrective factors suggested. Unless these factors are to be applied in future CPUE based work, we would recommend deletion of objective 1 from this project.

30. Objective 2 is also problematic in the Observer Programme coverage of ORH fisheries is patchy, both seasonally and geographically. It would make more sense to delete entirely the OP work and concentrate solely on industry-sources observer data.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TOKM;
- b) notes that the application of the CPUE correction factor will be determined by the Deepwater Fishery Assessment Working Group;
- c) notes that the collection of observer data by the industry has been very limited during the last two fishing years; and
- d) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	34
Research project code and title	OBS2004/01 Research Observer Days – Deepwater Fisheries
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 5, para 31

Submission Details

TOKM comment

31 See comments above for project ORH2004/02 about the appropriateness of OP work in ORH (and OEO) fisheries. We contend much more comprehension data will result from industry at-sea sampling work, provided this is extended to also recovering otoliths as required.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TOKM;
- b) notes that the collection of observer data by the industry has been very limited during the last two fishing years; and
- c) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

HOKI AND MIDDLE DEPTHS FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	46
Research project code and title	HOK2004/03 Estimation of spawning hoki biomass using acoustic surveys
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 19, paras 94 – 96 Hoki Page 6, paras 26 - 28 TOKM Page 5, para 32

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

94 The Hoki Fishery Management Company has been working for two years with NIWA to produce high quality industry-based acoustic biomass estimates. The Hoki stock assessment WG has accepted these estimates for use in stock assessment.

95 The hoki quota has fallen in recent years from 250,000 tonnes to 200,000 tones and then to 180,000 tonnes. In 2004/05 it is expected that a further reduction in quota will take place. Revenues from hoki have fallen approximately 40% from 2002 to 2004 (estimated) and will decline further in 2004/05.

96 Reiterating our comments at paragraphs 85 and 90, and noting the work already being undertaken by the hoki industry, SeaFIC/Hoki considers that this project should be withdrawn.

TOKM comment

32 The successful industry vessel acoustic surveys conducted in 2003 in Pegasus Bay, Conway Trench and Hokitika Canyon suggest that part at least of the proposed Cook Strait survey should be conducted by an industry commercial vessel equipped with a (calibrated) Simrad ES60 sounder. Such a participation would offer scope for

- Reducing survey costs
- Extending the survey period
- Increasing the snapshot coverage

Ministry of Fisheries analysis:

The Ministry:

- a) notes the stakeholder views;
- b) notes that the feasibility of an industry based acoustic survey has not yet been proven and there is need to survey the eastern spawning grounds in 2005 as there is no survey planned for 2004.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	48
Research project code and title	HOK2004/04 Estimation of mortality of juvenile hoki
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 20, paras 97 – 98 Hoki Page 6, paras 29 - 30

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

97 This work was first suggested by industry during an industry meeting held in late 2003, to which some NIWA scientists were invited. The work is now underway, funded through the Hoki Fishery Management Company and being done in conjunction with NIWA. The project should therefore be withdrawn.

98 SeaFIC is concerned that this project was fed into the research planning process by a research provider after the industry intention to do the work was already made clear. This is an example of the poor planning processes and wrong drivers that are currently in play. The potential to undermine industry research is clear.

Hoki comment

29 This work was first suggested by industry during an industry meeting held in late 2003, to which some NIWA scientists were invited. The work is now underway, funded through the HFMC and being done in conjunction with NIWA.

30 FMC and SFMC recommend that this project should therefore be withdrawn.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the stakeholder views;
- b) notes that this proposal will only proceed if the work has not already been satisfactorily completed.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	50
Research project code and title	HOK2004/05 Stock discrimination of hoki
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 20, paras 99 – 100 Hoki Page 6, paras 31 - 33

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

99 It is not clear from the rationale why this proposed research is important. What are the fishery management implications? If a stock discrimination technique is found that works, what then will follow?

10 Considerable effort has already been expended in this area, with no success. On behalf of the Hoki Fishery Management Company, NIWA produced a report in 2003 which suggested it was unlikely such work would be successful. SeaFIC firmly believes that Industry should not be forced to pay for scientific experiments that have a low chance of success at any time, but especially at a time when the industry is facing financial difficulties. The project should be withdrawn.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the stakeholder views;
- b) notes that although the work is important it is not urgent and could be delayed from 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses; and
- b) delete this project as a required service for 2004/05.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	58
Research project code and title	MDT2004/01 Estimation of hoki and middle depth fish abundance on the Southern Plateau using trawl surveys
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 5, paras 33 - 34

Submission Details

TOKM comment

33. Te Ohu Kai Moana is concerned that the Western-Substock stock assessment results for Hoki in recent times have been substantially more optimistic than the reality being found on the water. The assessment draws heavily on the southern trench survey results for input data which inevitably casts doubt on the value of the trawl survey itself.

34. The question really is – “Does the survey provide value for money?” We are unable to answer but suggest the value of the survey needs close consultation by MFish before this project proceeds.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that this trawl survey is the only project currently monitoring the abundance of the western hoki stock as acoustic surveys of the WCSI have been discontinued. The continuation of this trawl survey series is regarded as absolutely essential for stock assessment and management of the hoki stocks.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process;
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential;

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	69
Research project code and title	OBS2004/03 Research observer days – Hoki and Middle Depths fisheries
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 5, para 35

Submission Details

TOKM comment

35. While there is a substantial increase in industry-sourced data collection, we would question the need for the number of Observer Programme – sourced observer days proposed for HOK and middle depths fisheries. Certainly there is a problem with otolith numbers from industry sources, but that could easily and simply be addressed by discussion with the Hoki Fishery Management Co. and vessel operators.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that the Observer Programme is the only guaranteed source of data collection at-sea for the hoki and middle depth fisheries. It is also the only source of otoliths required for catch-at-age information required for stock assessment purposes.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

INSHORE FINFISH & FRESHWATER EEL FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	73
Research project code and title	BUT2004/01 Characterisation of the Cook Strait butterfish fishery
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 20, para 101

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

101 We suggest that this project is of “Low Priority” and should be withdrawn – the case is not made in the rationale for this research in a small fishery to be afforded a high priority. Local depletion is caused by recreational fishing; we see no concerns for the sustainability of the fish stock.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC but would point out that although supporting only moderate commercial fisheries, butterfish are of substantial customary and recreational interest and that the Ministry currently has no means of monitoring the abundance of this QMS species.
- b) notes that, although the work is important, it is not urgent and could be deferred.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) agree to delete this project from the list of research projects to be provided in 2004/05.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	75
Research project code and title	EEL2004/01 Recruitment of freshwater eels
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 5, paras 36 - 37

Submission Details

TOKM comment

36. The cost for this project should be funded by both Industry and the Crown to reflect the text appearing in the project notes, *“This project can be attributed to the requirement for the assessment of recruitment for the sustainable utilisation of both customary and commercial eel fisheries.”*

37 We also note that the South Island Eel working group requested a West Coast site be included in this project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the views of TOKM and advises that:

- (a) under the cost recovery rules there is a Crown contribution to this project that covers the non-commercial proportion of the fishery
- (b) A West Coast South Island site will be included if a suitable site can be found.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder comments and the Ministry responses;
- b) note that, in terms of the Fisheries (Cost Recovery) Rules 2001, there is a Crown contribution to this project;
- c) note that a West Coast South Island site for elver monitoring will be included if a satisfactory site can be found;
- d) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- e) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	78
Research project code and title	EEL2004/02 Monitoring commercial eel fisheries
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 6, para 38

Submission Details

TOKM comment

38 Our understanding of the Research Co-ordinating Committee decisions on this project is it would be put on hold pending evaluation of project 2002/04.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the views of TOKM and advises that:

(a) the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the review of the current project EEL2002/04

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submission and Ministry response;
- b) note that this project is subject to review of the current project EEL2002/04 and will proceed only after the Eel Fishery Assessment Working Group has discussed the current project;
- c) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- d) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	80
Research project code and title	EEL2004/03 Wairewa customary eel fishery
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 6, para 39

Submission Details

TOKM comment

39 We express our concern that science providers are driving this customary research projects, not Iwi. We also express our concern that no evidence has been provided to demonstrate this project is supported by the Wairewa Runanga.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the views of TOKM and advises that:

- (a) although the Wairewa Runanga has provided verbal support for this project, it will only proceed with written agreement of the Runanga.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder comment and the Ministry response;
- b) note that this project will only proceed with written confirmation from the Wairewa Runanga
- c) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- d) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	82
Research project code and title	EEL2004/04 Longfin eel population modelling
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 21, para 102 TOKM Page 6, para 40

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

102 This is an experimental project which should be ForST funded. No eel fishery in the world has a population model that can be used for stock assessment and management. The eel quota holders in New Zealand should not be required to fund this feasibility study.

TOKM comment

40 While the South Island Working Group agreed to the project being undertaken, that agreement was on the understanding it was a small first step and the cost for the project would be low. We note that nowhere in the world is there a stock assessment model.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry of Fisheries notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM and advises that;

- (a) the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder comments and the Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	84
Research project code and title	INS2004/01 Validating bluenose and rubyfish ageing using radiocarbon
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 21, para 103 TOKM Page 6, para 41

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

103 SeaFIC suggests that method development is a public good and that funding should be sought elsewhere. While we support the investigation of a validation method for ageing long lived deep water teleosts, we oppose the cost recovery being limited to the two fish stocks (BNS and RBY).

TOKM comment

41 This is a method development study and is not specific to BNS/RBY. If the project does proceed the cost should be spread more widely.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM but would point out that this project is an extension of a previous study on BNS and RBY and is designed to meet important objectives of the earlier study.
- b) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process; and
- c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	88
Research project code and title	SNA2004/01 Snapper population modelling and stock assessment
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 21, para 104

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

104 SeaFIC is concerned at the cost of snapper assessment work, especially in comparison to other species for which complex assessments are undertaken (e.g. hoki). We suggest that a review of the increasingly complex snapper assessment modelling is overdue, with a focus not on “how good is the work?” but rather on “what is needed to provide sufficient information to allow good decision-making?”

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry of Fisheries:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC;
- (b) agrees that the stock assessment of snapper should be reviewed before this proposal proceeds.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	88
Research project code and title	SNA2004/02 Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA 1
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TNIFCL Page 4

Submission Details

TNIFCL comment

We believe that some of the costs of this project could be offset by using the observers covering the SNA 1 longline fishery for seabird interactions through CSP. This would optimise the use of the observers and allow for cost reductions in other areas. This needs to be evaluated when costing this project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TNIFCL;
- b) notes that the use of observers will be considered for the purpose of cost savings in this project.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	94
Research project code and title	SNA2004/04 Estimation of snapper year class strength in SNA 2
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	Area 2 Inshore Finfish Management Co Ltd. Page 2, paras 5 and 6

Submission Details

Area 2 comment

5 Area 2 wishes to see funding for the project SNA2004/04 (Estimation of SNA2 year class strength) include a contribution from the Crown on behalf of customary rights and recreational fishers who have access to 30% of the TAC. As is typical for many inshore species, the commercial sector is levied to provide stock assessment research and sustainability information and other users obtain significant benefit of this research.

Area 2 believes that associated with customary and recreational rights are responsibilities to contribute to information about sustainability. A financial contribution must be made by all users if this project goes ahead.

Area 2 notes that the cost of SNA2004/04:Estimation of SNA2 year class strength is estimated to be \$50,000 - \$100,000. This is a straightforward shed sampling project, nothing new involved, and should be able to be carried out at a cost much less than \$50,000.

Area 2 believes the estimated cost, \$50,000 - \$100,000 is excessive.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of Area 2 IFMC;
- b) notes that the Crown does contribute a share of the project cost in accordance with the cost recovery rules.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	96
Research project code and title	SNA2004/05 Biomass estimation for snapper in SNA 1
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 21, para 105 Hoki Page 5, para 25 TNIFCL Page 4

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

105 SeaFIC endorses the views expressed by The Northern Inshore Fisheries Company Ltd that this project should be deferred until the results of the major SNA8 tagging programme are finalized and effectively utilised in the assessment work. We note paragraph 85 above and see no reason so urgently to undertake such expensive work.

TNIFCL comment

We believe this project should be deferred for at least one year. This is a significant cost to the industry and we believe that until the analysis has been completed on the outcomes of the SNA 8 tagging project and the lessons learnt on the suitability of this approach for snapper and lessons learnt in project design and implementation that this project should not be initiated. TNIFCL have some concerns over the capacity of the research provider to accommodate the range of projects currently being proposed. We also specifically ask for it to be deferred to provide relief to industry in the current financial environment.

Hoki comment

Hoki endorses the SeaFIC comments.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TNIFCL ;
- b) notes that this project has been deferred already for a number of years and is now ready to proceed.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	98
Research project code and title	SNA2004/06 Measurement of abundance of 0+ snapper in SNA 8
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 22, paras 106 – 107 TNIFCL Page 4 TOKM Page 6, para 42

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

106 After the RCC SeaFIC noted that the rationale does not make it clear how the measurement of abundance of 0+ snapper in SNA 8 will flow on into the recruitment of age 3 snapper into the fishery. A ‘good year’ for 0+ snapper will not necessarily lead to good recruitment into the snapper fishery 3 years later due to a number of possible mortality events in the intervening years. This project should be deferred until more analytical work has been completed on the precision of the forecasts i.e., how useful the predictive power of the data is to determine good years for recruitment.

107 We endorse the comments of The Northern Inshore Fisheries Company Ltd and reiterate that the project should be withdrawn.

TNIFCL comment

This approach to evaluating the 0+ abundance of fishstocks for biomass estimates is new for MFish. The value of the approach needs discussion in the technical working groups across a range of inshore fish species and discussion as to how 0+ age class has been used for stock assessment purposes in other parts of the world and a clear understanding gained of the merits or otherwise of such an approach for single and multiple species before this project should even be considered. TNIFCL would like to see it withdrawn from the 04/05 research plan.

TOKM comment

42 Survey design is only the first step. There will be an ongoing survey cost thereafter. We question if the predictive power warrants the ongoing cost?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC, TNIFCL and TOKM;
- b) notes that the proposed objective is not to carry out the survey but to determine whether the approach is feasible for predicting future recruitment as recommended by SeaFIC and TNIFCL.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	100
Research project code and title	STA2004/01 Stock assessment of stargazer in STA 7
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 22, para 108 TNIFCL Page 4

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

108 STA7 is currently the subject of an AMP. As part of that AMP, a commitment has been made by the stakeholders to carry out a stock assessment. SeaFIC considers that the inclusion of this project – again not put forward by managers – undermines the integrity of the STA7 AMP and, more generally, the confidence of industry in the research planning and potentially fishery planning processes. The project should be withdrawn.

TNIFCL comment

TNIFCL support the concerns over the proposed overlap between AMP requirements and required fisheries services. It is an indication that MFish will require to develop policy that establishes the priorities between services for fish plans, stock strategies and AMPs for the future.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TNIFCL and agrees that objective 3 will be withdrawn if a stock assessment is completed by the Industry.
- (b) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	103
Research project code and title	STA2004/03 Validation of growth zones in stargazer otoliths
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 22, para 109 Hoki Page 5, para 25

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

109 This is a risky research project where the chances of success are unknown. Marking and releasing stargazer runs the risk of being a significant cost to quota holders and of having a zero scientific (information) return. As such, and especially in the current economic climate, the project should be withdrawn.

Hoki comment

Hoki endorses the SeaFIC comment.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC but wishes to point out that keeping some specimens in captivity will ensure a result from this low cost project;
- (b) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended as a result of the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

SHELLFISH FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	110
Research project code and title	COC2004/01 Stock assessment of Snake Bank cockles
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 6, paras 43 - 46

Submission Details

TOKM comment

43 We question whether operating under a CAY strategy requiring “annual” surveys can be justified. The COC fishery has low economic value, only 25% of the TACC was caught in the 2002-03 fishing year and export markets are saturated.

44 An alternative MCY strategy would do away with the need to conduct very expensive annual surveys.

45 We also note that some of the information covered under the heading “General” is inaccurate. The last sentence in paragraph 1 is no longer appropriate and recent catches have not ranged between 400 and 450t, certainly not the TACC. The second paragraph makes reference to a TAC of 400t.

46 We also raise the question of how useful the growth data will be if they are based upon a declining biomass. This trend would suggest there is little if any growth at all. We are mindful that since 1995/96 commercial harvesting, at very low levels, has only occurred in the most recent 2 fishing years.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TOKM
- b) notes that the proposed research meets the management requirements for COC 1A.
- c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	112
Research project code and title	COC2004/02 Stock assessment of Cockles in Papanui and Waitati inlets, Otago
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 6, para 47

Submission Details

TOKM comment

47 Again we question the rationale of operating this fishery under a CAY strategy requiring “annual” surveys, opposed to MCY. We also note our surprise that in COC3, CAY surveys are done on a 2 to 3 yearly basis rather than annually.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that the proposed research meets the management requirements for COC 3;
- (c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	114
Research project code and title	COC2004/03 Stock assessment of Cockles in Tapu Bay, Ferry Point and Pakawau (COC7A)
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 6, paras 48 - 49

Submission Details

TOKM comment

43. All share holders in this fishery have agreed to this project proceeding. However, we still express the same comments as for other COC fisheries regarding CAY and MCY strategies.

44. We also note that the estimated costs for the survey are excessive and well above “actual” survey costs in previous years. Industry is currently paying in the order of \$15,000 to undertake this survey work, significantly lower than the estimated \$50,000 - \$100,000.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that the proposed research meets the management requirements for COC 7A;
- (c) regards this project as absolutely essential for 2004/05.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	116
Research project code and title	CRA2004/01 Main larval sources that support the red rock lobster fishery
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 23, para 110 TOKM Page 7, para 50

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

110 This project was presented to the Rock Lobster Research Planning Group and the National Rock Lobster Management Group. It received qualified support. As presented at those meetings, however, the expectation was that the project would build from existing work and would be a relatively small desktop study, perhaps involving one scientist for a few weeks. It is hard therefore to understand the cost estimate of \$100,000 - \$150,000. In line with stakeholder wishes, SeaFIC would support this project but only at a reasonable cost. At the current cost estimate, we would suggest the project be withdrawn.

TOKM comment

50 This is a desk top project and does not justify the estimated \$100,000 - \$150,000 cost. Unless these costs can be significantly reduced we object to this project going forward.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM;
- b) agrees that the cost of the proposal will be an important consideration if the tender is to proceed.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	118
Research project code and title	CRA2004/02 Rock lobster recruitment
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 7, paras 51 - 52

Submission Details

TOKM comment

51 We are yet to be convinced of the value in proceeding with this project. The advice received to date suggests the data collected over the past several years has contributed nothing to assessing CRA stocks in New Zealand. This is despite the success of similar methods in other countries.

52 If the project is to succeed we feel it would be a more effective programme if suitably trained locals did the work. We also note the need to significantly reduce the cost of the project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TOKM;
- b) notes that trained locals are currently used in the project where possible and the cost and extent of this project has been halved in recent years.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	121
Research project code and title	GEN2004/01 Determination of age, growth rates and spawning events in shellfish using stable isotopes
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 23, para 112 TOKM Page 7, para 53

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

112 As noted for other such projects, SeaFIC does not think it reasonable that affected quota holders should have to fund a proposal which has only a moderate chance of success. This technique is unproven and may not be successful. We suggest that public good funding be sought for such work.

TOKM comment

53 Based upon the information contained in the proposal the project appears to be worth while. If there is a good likelihood of the project being successful we would support the project receiving a higher ranking.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM
- b) notes that this research has the potential to provide a valuable tool for determination of age and growth information for a wide range of shellfish species.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) **note** that this project is classified as essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	123
Research project code and title	OCT2004/01 Characterisation of octopus catches
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 23, para 113 TOKM Page 7, para 54

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

113 There is no urgency for this project. We suggest it be withdrawn.

TOKM comment

54 Based upon the information contained in the proposal the project appears to be worthwhile. If there is a good likelihood of the project being successful we would support the project receiving a higher ranking.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM
- (b) notes that this research has a medium priority and could be deferred.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) agree to delete this project from the list of research projects to be provided in 2004/05.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	127
Research project code and title	PAU2004/01 Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU 7
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 24, para 115 TOKM Page 7, paras 55 - 56

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

115 Note that the start and completion dates are incorrect (2002 and 2003).

TOKM comment

55 We support the project proceeding but urge science providers to work closely with the PAU7 stakeholders.

56 We also express concern at the estimated \$150,000-\$200,000 cost involved in doing the project. We find no justification for these costs. We also note the reservations we expressed about the model in the last stock assessment of PAU7 and PAU5D.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	129
Research project code and title	PPI2004/01 Stock assessment of Mair Bank pipis
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 7, paras 57 - 59

Submission Details

TOKM comment

57 We are somewhat surprised by the statement “There is no available information that establishes whether or not there are sustainability concerns about this fishery at present”. Surely, consultation with stakeholders would provide at least anecdotal evidence on the sustainability of stocks.

58 We also note the references to there being no available information on the quantities of fish taken by customary harvesters. Why have Iwi not been approached for this information?

59 Given the small size of the commercial fishery we have to ask whether the cost of the project can be sustained.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that this research has a medium priority and will proceed on this basis.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	131
Research project code and title	SCA2004/01 Stock assessment of Coromandel scallops
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 24, para 116 TOKM Page 7, para 60

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

116 We support the final nature and extent of the project being determined in conjunction with stakeholders.

TOKM comment

60 Te Ohu Kai Moana is supportive of the project but questions the upper end of the estimated cost of \$50,000. There is not a lot of time and effort required to collect data, a model already exists, data entry is not huge, and reports contain much information from previous years.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	134
Research project code and title	SCA2004/02 Stock assessment of Northland scallops
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 24, para 117

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

117 We support the final nature and extent of the project being determined in conjunction with stakeholders.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	136
Research project code and title	SCI2004/01 Measuring the abundance of scampi
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 24, para 118 TOKM Page 7, para 61

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

118 Like many deepwater and middle depth projects, this is essentially a placeholder, with the nature and extent, and affected parties, still to be determined. SeaFIC does not support placeholder projects as a matter of principle and considers they should only be included with clearer focus and the explicit agreement of affected stakeholders.

TOKM comment

61 In view of the variable results achieved to date, can further photographic survey work be justified?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM;
- (b) notes that the objectives of this project are well specified;
- (c) notes that the use of photographic techniques is supported by the Shellfish Fishery Assessment Working Group.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	139
Research project code and title	SUR2004/01 Characterising kina fisheries in Tory Channel, Marlborough
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 7, paras 62 - 63

Submission Details

TOKM comment

62 Given the importance of Tory Channel to Iwi and the large proportion of commercial catch taken from this area since the early 1980s, we support the project being given a higher priority.

63 We also note discussions at the RCC that this project may sit better with customary projects.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM;
- (b) notes that this research has a medium priority and will proceed on this basis;
- (c) believes that the project will be successful within the Shellfish Fisheries area.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as essential.

NON-COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	142
Research project code and title	AKI2004/01 Intertidal shellfish monitoring in the Auckland fisheries management area
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 8, para 64

Submission Details

TOKM comment

64 We register our concern that this project is being advocated from within the Ministry with no clear evidence of stakeholder support. We also note the ad-hoc way in which the proposal has been progressed. In the future we would like to see all relevant information made available to the shellfish working group, particularly that held by the Hauraki Gulf Forum.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry;

- (a) notes the views of TOKM
- (b) notes that this project is a high priority for fisheries management in the Auckland area
- (c) notes that this project has been undertaken each year since 1995/96, and involves extensive consultation with local stakeholders.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	150
Research project code and title	PAU2004/03 Fishery independent survey of paua in PAU 2, between Tirau Point and Patea River, Taranaki
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 25, para 119 TNIFCL Page 5 TOKM Page 8, paras 65 - 66

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

119 SeaFIC objects to the inclusion of this project which did not come through the research planning process. It should be withdrawn.

TNIFCL comment

TNIFCL does not generally comment on areas under the remit of other CSOs. However it raises a point of principle regarding this project (and certain others) in that given MFish is fully aware that it has an annual planning process and the timing does not vary from year to year. In the spirit of good consultation we should not be seeing these and other projects introduced outside the research planning group process. TNIFCL would also like an explanation as to what policy drives the allocation of a recreational fishery only, given the Minister has to give consideration of allowing for the utilisation of fisheries for the social and beneficial benefits of all, which would include commercial and customary interests.

TOKM comment

65 Te Ohu Kai Moana is concerned that this project has been able to bypass the Shellfish Research Working Group and RCC. We are equally concerned that MFish are proposing to set a lower MLS between Tirua Point and Patea River, Taranaki, and intend to prohibit commercial fishing in this area.

66 Te Ohu Kai Moana is of the view industry need to be consulted in relation to any spatial and allocation issues arising from this project. We also note the lack of any reference to Iwi/customary support for the project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC, TNIFCL, and TOKM;
- (b) acknowledges that this research project was developed late in the research planning round and was not tabled at the Research Coordinating Committee meeting. The project was developed in response to a management proposal by fisheries managers that was promulgated after the RCC;
- (c) notes that the relevance of the project has not been questioned; and the project was included in the SOI consultation.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	152 - 161
Research project code and title	<p>REC2004/01 Estimation of recreational harvest of priority fish stocks</p> <p>REC2004/02 Survey of marine recreational fishing in selected areas</p> <p>REC2004/06 Estimation of New Zealand sea lion incidental captures in New Zealand Fisheries</p> <p>REC2004/07 Catch and effort in marine recreational fisheries</p> <p>REC2004/08 Indices of recreational fishing effort</p>
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	<p>TNIFCL Pages 4 and 5</p> <p>Sanford Page 4, paras 33 – 35</p> <p>SeaFIC Page 25, para 120 (for REC2004/06 only)</p> <p>TOKM Page 8, para 67 (REC2004/07) Page 8, para 68 (REC2004/08)</p>

TNIFCL comment

There is an urgent and compelling need for the medium term research strategy for this working group to be fully and rigorously assessed. MFish and stakeholders have lost the way with regard to recreational diary surveys. The current ensemble of five proposed projects in addition to existing projects to address estimates of recreational catch shows a clear lack of focus and objectives in this area that range from spider hunting to straw grasping. It is an important issue for the management of fisheries and therefore the research needs to be placed in some form of strategic context rather than the current ad hoc approach. It would be worthwhile suspending these projects and focusing on the development of a clearer framework (including evaluation of options) to remove stakeholder frustration and set the working group back on a more even keel.

Sanford comment

33 Sanford have commented on the absence of recreational policy above. The research projects proposed in the research plan are reflective of the absence of recreational strategy or policy, with projects lacking strategic focus because of the absence of a strategy driving research needs.

34 We have particular concern with the Recreational Harvest Surveys, and the process for ensuring historical research is robust. We understand that there are difficulties with the results of both the 1996 and 2000 harvest surveys. We believe that lessons learnt from these surveys should be utilised and used for planning for future research, not revisiting, and reanalysing these surveys.

35 Finally we note that Ministry are averaging the two recreational harvest surveys in the absence of robust reliable results, we strongly oppose this practice as it is statistically unacceptable and procedurally incorrect.

SeaFIC comment

120 Project REC2004/01 is estimated to cost up to \$1 million to look at alternative methods to diary systems. SeaFIC supports that project but sees little value in project REC2004/06 which is backward looking.

TOKM comment

67 We note with some interest that the current recreational reform of recreational fishing policy includes the concept of a “reasonable daily bag limit”. It will almost certainly become necessary to define “reasonable”.

68 May be a little early to extend the REC2002/02 work into another area. Might it not be better to wait until that project is completed and analysed results are available?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry notes the views of TNIFCL, Sanford SeaFic and TOKM and advises that:

(a) the Ministry will discuss a revised recreational medium term research plan at the next Recreational Research Planning meeting. The revised plan will take into account an information strategy for recreational fishing that is being developed by the Ministry. In addition the revised plan will need to incorporate the outcome of a new initiative bid for additional funding to undertake research into recreational fishing. Estimating the recreational harvest for all fishstocks will remain a principal objective for recreational research.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder comments and the Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	163
Research project code and title	ENV2004/02 Estimation of New Zealand sea lion incidental captures in New Zealand Fisheries.
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 25, paras 121 – 123 Hoki Page 7, paras 34 - 36

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

121 The cost estimate for this project (0 - \$50,000) is risible. The work involved is nothing more than checking simple calculations already undertaken by SeaFIC. We are not aware that in the many years of checking, any errors have been found.

122 The project is not really a research project at all. There is no technical need for it. Rather, it exists to meet a political need – that someone other than industry does the simple sums that are used for management purposes.

123 If the project is maintained at all, the cost estimate should be better reflected by the use of more credible bandings (we suggest 0 - \$100) and the costs should be borne by the Crown.

Hoki comment

Hoki endorses the SeaFIC comments

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the stakeholder views;
- b) notes that the cost intervals for 2004/2005 projects are set at \$50,000 (eg \$0-\$50,000, \$50,000 to \$100,000) and that the above project will fall within the \$0 to \$50,000 category.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	165
Research project code and title	ENV2004/04 Characterisation of seabird captures in New Zealand fisheries.
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 26, paras 124 – 126 TNIFCL Page 5 TOKM Page 8, para 69 Hoki Page 7, paras 37 - 39

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

124 Please see the comments at paragraphs 80-82 and 83-85. Although SeaFIC is genuinely impressed at MFish attempts to take finally a more strategic approach in this area, we cannot support the projects in their current form and believe they should be withdrawn. Work should not be undertaken at any cost and should not be proposed in such unfocused and unspecified terms.

125 It is unclear how this project relates to the National Plan of Action for Seabirds (NPOA), which is the intended overarching framework for seabird research.

126 We note that specific objective 5 duplicates a research project already levied 4 years ago under the Department of Conservation CSL Programme: \$107,000 levied from Industry in 2000 to design a protected species observer programme (CSL OBS 2000/2).

TNIFCL comment

We wish to refer to our earlier comments on the lack of resolution on boundary definition between DoC and MFish on protected species research. A similar programme of work is proposed under the Conservation Services Programme. Whilst it may differ slightly in some areas of source data surely it would be better to have a single integrated project than two overlapping projects. TNIFCL believe that caution should be used when using historical data to map future risk scenarios. The industry has made significant commitment to seabird bycatch in the very recent past which has resulted in significant decrease in bycatch in certain fisheries e.g. ling, and mid-water trawl. The cost recovery information does not state which protected species are to be examined and analysis of the risk from New Zealand fishing to

those species. We assume that the default allocation of 50% cost for protected species research applies to all MFish projects which relate to protected species.

TOKM comment

69 It's about time an "ad hoc" approach to collecting data was abandoned in this area but practicality and conflict with DOC is a concern.

Hoki comment

Hoki endorses the SeaFIC comment.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the stakeholder views;
- (b) notes that the proposed research is designed to enable MFish to meet its obligations with respect to the effects of fishing on seabirds. These obligations are derived from the National Plan of Action for Seabirds;
- (c) notes that DoC and MFish are working closely to meet the obligations under the National Plan of Action for Seabirds, and avoid duplication of research.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	169
Research project code and title	ENV2004/05 Modelling of impacts of fishing-related mortality on New Zealand seabird populations
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 26, paras 127 – 128 TNIFCL Page 5 TOKM Page 8, para 70 Hoki Page 7, paras 40 - 41

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

127 Please see the comments at paragraphs 80-82, 83-85 and 124. We note that this research project is so vast (7 specific objectives) and yet so poorly specified that it dooms itself to failure and duplicates the responsibilities of the Department of Conservation to produce Population Management Plans for protected species.

128 The project should be withdrawn.

TNIFCL comment

We have previously expressed concern over the lack of clarity on this project and uncertainty of the value of the outcomes. We submit that this project should be significantly reduced in scope to a pilot study of three seabirds only. On evaluation of the outcomes and lessons learnt from the pilot study through the working group progress we believe it should be possible to assess the appropriateness of this approach for management of the interaction of seabirds with commercial fisheries. We have requested that these species be identified but this information has not been forthcoming. It is unclear how the cost recovery rules can be applied in the absence of this information. This project should be withdrawn for more serious consideration.

TOKM comment

70 This is a complete repetition of the CSP projects for seabirds since 1994. We strongly oppose this project. We also note that MFish is charging ahead without being able to take account of the NPOA, as it is (still) not available.

Hoki comment

Hoki endorses the SeaFIC comment.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the stakeholder views;
- (b) notes that the proposed research is designed to enable MFish to meet its obligations with respect to the effects of fishing on seabirds. These obligations are derived from the National Plan of Action for Seabirds;
- (c) notes that the modelling will focus on three species in year one and work on other species will be contingent on the results of this work;
- (d) notes that DoC and MFish are working closely to meet the obligations under the National Plan of Action for Seabirds, and avoid duplication of research.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	173
Research project code and title	ENV2004/06 Assessment of Maui’s Dolphin - fisheries interactions
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 26, paras 129 – 133 TNIFCL Page 5 Sanford Page 4, paras 27 – 32 TOKM Page 8, para 71

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

129 Currently there is no risk posed to Maui’s dolphin from fishing as set net fishing has been banned within four nautical miles off the coastline. There are no documented cases of trawl caught Maui’s dolphin (vessels are required to complete a Non-fish Incidental Mortality Form if an interaction occurs).

130 We note that in the ‘Fisheries Research Services for 2004/05 for discussion at the Research Coordinating Committee meeting of 21 October 2003,’ dated 13 October 2003, this project was 100% Crown funded – why has this changed?

131 The project duplicates the research being undertaken in the Auckland DOC region as documented in the ten year DOC ‘Maui’s Dolphin Research Programme 2003-2013’. It is therefore unnecessary.

132 Why is there mention of a survey being designed to achieve objective 1? There is no rationale for this.

133 This project should be withdrawn.

TNIFCL comment

We dispute the requirement for this project and the associated industry levy and again refer back to concern over boundary definition of the role between DoC and MFish on protected species research. The Minister when setting the levy order is required to consider the extent to which fisheries services are wholly purchased or provided by other persons. This proposal duplicates work specified under an existing DOC plan for Maui’s dolphin research (which suffers from poor consultation) and current work underway on surveying. Whilst we can

sympathise with the dilemma faced by MFish in ensuring good information principles are followed for Maui dolphin-fisheries interactions we see the current situation as a failing of the Crown to develop a clear working position in relation to this sub-species. This project should be withdrawn.

Sanford comment

27 There are several projects proposed to be undertaken where an assessment of the interaction or risk with the fishing industry and protected species still to be determined. Several examples are in the proposed research services for the 2004/05, which include Assessment of Maui's Dolphin (ENV2004/06), Research Observer Days for deepwater, hoki and middle depths.

28 A specific example is the Maui's Dolphin Assessment – Fisheries Interactions, ENV2004/06. This project is proposed to determine the “risk” to dolphins posed by fishing. Quite clearly the set net ban has removed this risk, and the trawl fleet do not interact with the dolphins. This can be confirmed by the non-fish incidental catch reporting forms recording nil dolphin kills or captures over the last four decades.

29 At the RCC Susan Waugh (MFish) clearly outlined that this project would be 100% crown funded because of its nature and extent, yet we find industry are funding it in the SOI.

30 Sanford submit that if MFish wish to undertake risk and interaction observations over and above current reporting requirements they do so at their own cost.

31 Finally, the Department of Conservation are undertaking research on protected species both using the Conservation Services Programme and Crown initiated work. Again we request that the two departments talk to each other to ensure a centralised programme occurs. We use Maui's dolphin again as an example where DoC have a Maui's Dolphin Research Programme 2003-2013 which duplicates project ENV2004/06.

32 We submit that project ENV2004/06 should be withdrawn.

TOKM comment

71 As virtually all waters where interactions might occur have been closed to set netting and there are substantive closures to trawling, this project should be Crown funded. Interactions are primarily with non commercial fishers.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC, TNIFCL, Sanford and TOKM;
- (b) considers that fishery independent techniques are required to assess the risk posed to Maui's dolphins from fishing;
- (c) notes that the estimated costs of this research have been attributed according to the Fisheries (Cost Recovery) Rules 2001;

- (d) notes that DoC and MFish are working closely to meet their respective obligations for protected species and avoid duplication of research.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	175
Research project code and title	ENV2004/07 Investigating the effects of fishing on seamounts
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 27, paras 134 – 139 TOKM Page 8, para 72

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

134 Much of the work proposed has already been done by Malcolm Clark of NIWA – it is unclear what is proposed here, what extra value it might add, and how the cost estimates are derived for work already completed.

135 The statement “The nature and extent of the work will be determined in conjunction with the AEWG” is perhaps the giveaway that the project is really no more than a poorly costed placeholder. As such it should be withdrawn.

136 A commitment was made to determine the nature and extent of this project following a review of projects ENV2001/15 and ENV2002/05. These projects are yet to be tendered – thought should be given to reviewing all three projects to ensure a coordinated and relevant programme. This needs to take place in the context of the still-to-be-completed/agreed MFish Seamount Strategy to ensure that any research fits into the policy framework.

137 We note that a similarity analysis is a simple grouping/mapping exercise and will serve little purpose particularly when each individual seamount is supposedly different.

138 The rationale and description of objectives is poorly written – this is not surprising given the lack of policy/management context.

139 This project should be withdrawn – it duplicates work that has already been undertaken, poorly estimates costs and has no policy/management basis.

TOKM comment

72 This project is not acceptable until such time as the international definition of a seamount, i.e. 1000m above surrounding seafloor, is adopted.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TOKM;
- (b) notes that the project description identifies the work undertaken on seamounts by New Zealand researchers to-date. The proposed research expects to draw heavily on this and avoid duplication;
- (c) notes that the proposed research is designed to enable MFish to meet its obligations with respect to the effects of fishing on seamounts;
- (d) notes that 'seamount' is clearly defined in the project proposal;
- (e) notes that this project should be deferred until the seamounts policy and the Marine Protected Areas strategy have been completed.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) agree to delete this project from the list of research projects to be provided in 2004/05.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	178
Research project code and title	OBS2004/04 Research observer days – SQU6T and SQUIT
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 8, para 73

Submission Details

TOKM comment

73 Until SLEDS are recognised, the Breen model is applied and MALFIRMS dropped, we do not support this project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views TOKM.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

PELAGIC FISHERIES

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	182
Research project code and title	EMA2004/01 Stock monitoring of blue mackerel
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 8, para 74

Submission Details

TOKM comment

74 Blue Mackerel are a low economic value fishery. This will need to be carefully considered when evaluating tenders for the project.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TOKM; and
- (b) notes that EMA is a low economic value per unit fishery, but that the fishery for blue mackerel takes a relatively high volume of catch annually.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	191
Research project code and title	JMA2004/02 Stock assessment of JMA1
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TOKM Page 8, para 75

Submission Details

TOKM comment

75 How can this be limited to the 2 New Zealand species when *T.s.murphyi* is known to also occur in JMA1 area?

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- a) notes the views of TOKM; and
- b) agrees that *T. s. murphyi* occurs in JMA1 along with *T. declivis* and *T. novaezelandiae*, but notes that as catch sampling data are available describing the proportions of each of the three species taken in the catch, an assessment of any individual JMA species present in JMA1 is possible.

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	193
Research project code and title	KAH2004/01 Characterisation of the kahawai fisheries
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 28, paras 140 – 142 TNIFCL Page 6

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

140 SeaFIC opposes this project. We note it has been given a “medium” priority by MFish – we suggest it is ‘low’ priority based on the following statement in the Rationale:

“Whilst there is unlikely to be any significant risk if this particular research project is not undertaken, without a clear assessment of our current knowledge of the fishery, there will be no way of reasonably assessing the risks to sustainability for this fish stock”

141 We note the statement “The total New Zealand annual recreational harvest based on an average of the 1996 and 2000 survey estimates is ~3,000 t”. We oppose this averaging unequivocally and are surprised that MFish persists in such statistical nonsense.

142 SeaFIC endorses the comments made by The Northern Inshore Company Ltd.

TNIFCL comment

TNIFCL recognize the importance of this fishstock. However we remain concerned about the value of any information from this project to inform management decision making in the complete absence of biological data. We strongly believe that this project should be dropped and consideration be given over the next year to a pragmatic and rational approach kahawai fishery assessment.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry of Fisheries:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC and TNIFCL;
- (b) notes that this project is still considered a medium priority as the catches from the fishery are substantial and Fisheries Managers require information with which to more accurately assess risk in this fishery;

- (c) notes that subsequent to the project outline being developed, a recreational harvest estimate for 1999-2000 has become available and is 3303 t for kahawai excluding KAH2 for which the estimate is highly uncertain (2937 tonnes, c.v. 74%);
- (d) notes that biological data are already being collected to describe a part of the kahawai catch through other research projects; and
- (e) notes that this project intends to collate available information in such a way that a more informed approach to kahawai fishery assessment can be undertaken in future.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that the project description will be updated to include the recently available recreational catch estimate for kahawai;
- (c) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (d) note that this project is classified as essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	195
Research project code and title	KIN2004/01 Developing Kingfish stock monitoring and assessment
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	TNIFCL Page 6 SeaFIC Page 28, para 143

Submission Details

TNIFCL comment

TNIFCL believe that this study should also include cost/benefit analysis of the various approaches and an indication of the required frequency of any such approach for large scale stock management. It further contends that with good preparedness, organisation and communication from MFish that this project could be replaced by a TWG workshop to explore and evaluate the options. This project should be withdrawn.

SeaFIC comment

143 SeaFIC endorses the comments made by The Northern Inshore Company Ltd.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of TNIFCL and SeaFIC;
- (b) notes that it is intended that a cost benefit analysis which incorporates temporal scales of the various approaches is a part of this project; and
- (c) agrees that technical working group input will be required to successfully complete this research project, but notes that considerable additional research will need to be undertaken both before and after such input.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	197
Research project code and title	STN2004/01 Movements of southern bluefin tuna
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 28 – 30, paras 144 – 154 Sanford Page 5, paras 36 – 38 Solander Page 3, paras 11 – 27 TOKM Page 9, para 76

Submission Details

SeaFIC comment

144 On 11 November 2003 SeaFIC received documentation pertaining to an additional pelagic project – Movements of southern bluefin tuna (STN2004/01) asking for comments by the 18th of November. The explanation was that there had been a planning oversight and that, while the formal consultation on project 2003/01 was on the basis of three years, a research project for the remaining two years of the program (beyond STN2003/01) was not included in the Research Coordinating Committee (RCC) document.

145 MFish agrees that this project was not consulted at the RCC “due to an oversight” but it seems to believe that since it allowed additional time for comment on this project, that this somehow equates to formal consultation. We disagree – the “additional time” was 3 days and the project has never been formally consulted.

146 We are not at all sure what, within the sustainability and utilisation framework of the Fisheries Act 1996, is the purpose of this research. A statement that it is part of the southern bluefin tuna medium research plan and part of the pelagic fisheries medium research plan does not shed any light on the reason why this particular project is proposed in this particular form. Being then told that it is “consistent with the Fisheries Resources section of the Ministry of Fisheries Strategic Research Directions document” does not provide any illumination either.

147 An additional point of confusion arises from examining CCSBT documents where the draft budget for 2004 refers to a SRP tagging program costed at \$561,325. That project is funded by contributions from members and New Zealand’s contribution is projected at \$38,000. So where does the Ministry’s project fit within the CCSBT tagging program?

148 We are uncertain about the proposed logistics of the project. The Rationale states that there may be an opportunity for tagging studies to be conducted in cooperation with tuna fishers possibly at either end of the STN season. How is this intended to work in practice? Will the fishers who participate in a tagging project at the start of the season (while the rest fish against the national allocation) be compensated for loss of opportunity? Conversely, if the fishing for tagging purposes occurs at the end of the season, will the fishers be indemnified against the possibility of catching fish that may exceed the national allocation tonnage?

149 Objective One states that it is expected that the mortality of large STN will be about 50% and that “there is potential for these fish to be used to offset the costs of this research”. We fail to see how that proposition would be put into practice. It appears that this sale of fish concept has been taken from the CCSBT budget, where the 2004 expenditure of the SRP tagging program will be offset by transferring a surplus of \$85,000 (representing the net proceeds from selling dead fish from an Australian east coast pilot tagging program).

150 Such offsetting of costs is a simple proposition when the agency which funds research uses any revenue generated to offset its costs. Since the Ministry is planning to levy the commercial fishing industry for the costs of this project, how does then the Ministry plan to implement this offsetting in practice? Setting the levies at the beginning of the year based on the full costs of the project would then constitute an over recovery at the end of the year once the revenue gained from the dead fish was factored in. Or, since the Ministry has levied on the pelagic stock assessment formula, would the revenue be applied solely to offset the Crown’s 5% contribution?

151 Industry has previously objected to both the cost (\$300,000 -\$400,000) of this project and its allocation (STN stocks), especially when MFish insisted that it must carry out this project in support of New Zealand’s international obligations. The approach taken to this project appears to be inconsistent with the ANT projects carried out “in support of New Zealand’s international obligations”, which are 100% Crown funded.

152 MFish’s response to a question from SeaFIC on this inconsistency makes a distinction (that we haven’t yet managed to fathom) between ANT projects as “for the benefit of NZ fishers and the international community” and the STN projects as “for the benefit of NZ fishers with flow on benefits for the international community.”

153 That is sheer sophistry. It has nothing to do with flowing benefits versus straight benefits; MFish is unable to impose and collect levies on fisheries outside the EEZ, such as the Ross Sea toothfish fishery.

154 SeaFIC objects to the inclusion of this project as it has never gone through the research planning process. It should be withdrawn or, if it proceeds it should be 100% Crown funded.

Sanford comment

36 Sanford have previously commented on our concerns regarding this project. The SeaFIC submission addresses our concerns in detail. In summary, Sanford do not support this project being undertaken in its current form as there are many unconsidered concerns regarding the tagging project which will have an economic effect on fishers. We believe that

if this project was undertaken it should be 100% crown funded, but even if this was to occur we have concerns. Such as, would all fishers participate in the tagging, what consideration is given of fishers that don't participate, and the implications under a Total Allowable Commercial Catch. And finally, under the Quota Management System (QMS) the discarding of QMS species is unwarranted – how will this be addressed.

37 Our concerns regarding the absence of consultation are well documented, are still of concern and will not be repeated, but should be noted.

38 Sanford submit that this project should be withdrawn.

Solander comment

11 This project is one year of a three-year programme. STN2003/01 is due to commence April this year.

12 No Company would be more interested in the outcome of this project than Solander. Nevertheless we categorise it as “nice to have” rather than essential. We contend that the project is part of New Zealand’s contribution to CCSBT and therefore should be Government funded.

13 At no time has the commercial sector ever requested that this research be undertaken.

Cost

14 There is some confusion as to the cost of this project. In the current year STN2003/1 is being charged to Industry at \$226,244.

15 It is being suggested in a Ministry response that STN2004/1 will cost the industry \$180,000 per annum.

16 The Consultation Document suggests that the cost will be in the order of \$300,000 - \$400,000 per annum for both STN2004/1 and STN2005/1.

Which is it?

17 FSL/CSL levies in the current year represent 9% of the port price for STN and depending upon the final cost of STN2004/1 will likely rise to 11% in 2005.

Consultation

18 STN 2003/1 and STN 2004/1 appear to originate from a previous attempt to levy the Industry at \$800,000 per annum for five years (total \$4 million). This was proposed in the IPP for the MFish business plan for the three year period 1st July 2002 – 1st June 2005. Clearly an impost of this level (\$2,000 per tonne) was totally beyond the capability of Industry to pay. When the project was withdrawn it was agreed that consultation would take place with the Industry to discuss appropriate tagging projects. This consultation did not occur.

19 On the 11th November 2003 we received advice from MFish that through an error STN2004/1 was not included in the Research Co-ordinating Committee (RCC) document. We were given to the 18th November 2003 to respond. STN 2004/1 we believe mirrors STN2003/1 in content and design. STN2003/1 was rejected at the RCC and STN2004/1 did not even make it to the RCC! The only paper of substance on STN2003/1 was the excellent one prepared by Dr Talbot Murray. This was made available on the 19th December 2003 a month after the new closure date for submissions.

20 Correspondence from SeaFIC and Industry to the Ministry complaining about the lack of consultation on this project and the presumption that it is an Industry Cost are legion. Despite this there has been no meaningful discussion on the role of Industry and Government in respect to scientific research programmes administered or reported to CCSBT (*SeaFIC submission 24/2/2003 attached as appendix*).

Relationship With CCSBT

21 We are not familiar with the discussions New Zealand Government has within CCSBT regarding the scientific research programme (SRP). At one time there appeared to be two tagging programmes of concern to New Zealand and we do not know whether New Zealand contributes directly to CCSBT's research fund.

22 It is stated that Australia is spending some AUD\$2 million on a tagging programme. Japan spent ¥180 million in 2002. The Japanese Government funded totally their tagging programme and it was reported under CCSBT-ESC/0309/35.

23 The Australian tagging programme is in two parts and almost entirely Government funded. The Australian Industry is levied 0.25% of GVP (Gross Value Production) through the Fisheries Research Development Corporation (FRDC). In the case of STN (SBT) this computes to an industry contribution of AUD\$162,500 per annum. The FRDC provides AUD\$2 from Government sources for every dollar subscribed from Industry giving a total project cost AUD\$487,500. **The choice on how FRDC funding is spent is determined by Industry** and they chose to support an archival tagging programme. Thus the Australian Industry contributes **AUD\$31 per tonne²** against a New Zealand Industry contribution of **NZD\$539 per tonne** in the current year.

24 The previous figures emphasise the total impracticability of the New Zealand Industry to compete with the resources of the Central Governments of Japan, Australia and ultimately those of Korea and Taiwan. This dilemma has to be addressed where New Zealand is part of an international agreement and feels the moral need to match the endeavours of the other parties.

25 Whilst contributions from Australia and Japan seem impressive, if all CCSBT members contributed in the same proportion as New Zealand the total expenditure on tagging would exceed NZD\$8,000,000 this year! Do we really need to be this generous?

²CCSBT Allocations;

Japan	6065 tonnes	Australia	5265	Taiwan	1140	Korea	1140
Co-operating non members	900	New Zealand	420	Total	14,930 tonnes		

26 New Zealand's national allocation under CCSBT is only 2.81% of the total. If New Zealand fails to gain an increase at CCSBT 11 (Busan 19-22nd October) then the whole approach to funding the Commission needs to be re assessed.

THE SOLUTION?

27 The alternatives are

- i. Agree that this project is Crown funded and represents New Zealand's contribution to CCSBT research; and / or
- ii. To shelve the project until economic conditions improve; or
- iii. To limit the total FSL/CSL contribution from STN to 5% of the port price and set this as a standard; and
- iv. To secure an increase in national allocation.

TOKM comment

76 The project is opposed on the basis that it: (1) has not been subject to proper discussion in the working group process; (2) is required by CCSBT ie. is part of NZ International obligations. (3) is of no benefit to New Zealand; and (4) is not warranted – cost vs. benefit.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of SeaFIC, Sanford, Solander and TOKM;
- (b) notes that considerable work has been undertaken, and is ongoing, to further consult with STN stakeholders to address the questions raised in submissions about the logistics of the tagging programme, legal considerations and compensation of fishers participating in the programme;
- (c) notes that this is a New Zealand based research programme distinct from the CCSBT Scientific Research Programme (SRP);
- (d) notes that the STN fishery occurs within the New Zealand EEZ where cost recovery rules apply to fishers, and that this research is primarily being conducted for the benefit of New Zealand fishers;
- (e) notes that a commercial sector request is not a pre-requisite for undertaking research; and
- (f) notes that the research cost for this programme indicated in the SOI are for 2004-05 and for 2005-06 combined (\$150,000-\$200,000 per annum).

Recommendation

The Ministry of Fisheries recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry responses;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

STOCK ASSESSMENT METHODS

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand's fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	219
Research project code and title	SAM2004/03 Catchability of trawl surveys
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 30, para 155 Hoki Page 8, para 42

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

155 The Orange Roughy Management Company recently invited tenders to undertake a project on the feasibility of estimating trawl survey catchability. The results of that work are planned be presented to the Deepwater stock assessment WG during 2004. Given that the work is already being carried out and will be presented soon, this project should be withdrawn.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the views of the stakeholders; and
- (b) notes that the nature and extent of this proposal will not overlap with the work commissioned but supplement that work in fisheries not already covered.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential.

Output Class	Fisheries information and monitoring
Output	21 – Utilisation and sustainability of New Zealand’s fisheries resources measured
Draft SOI fisheries research section page no	220
Research project code and title	SAM2004/02 Medium –term research plan
Page and paragraph number from stakeholder submission	SeaFIC Page 30, para 156 Hoki Page 8, para 43

Submission Details

SeaFIC/Hoki comment

156 As agreed at the SOI consultation meeting on 4th February 2004, this work should be Crown funded. SeaFIC is concerned that MFish would consider commissioning the preparation of a medium term research plan, potentially from a research provider with vested interest in the business opportunities that would be created. Medium term research plans need to be determined in consultation with stakeholders and, in general, driven by management needs. An exception might be made for SAM projects where the needs are better determined by scientists directly, but still the task must fall to MFish and not be outsourced.

Ministry of Fisheries analysis

The Ministry:

- (a) notes the stakeholder views;
- (b) agrees that the final responsibility for the medium term research plan rests with MFish but considers that completion of the initial draft should be outsourced.

Recommendation

The Ministry recommends that you:

- (a) note the stakeholder submissions and Ministry response;
- (b) note that if approved the nature and extent of this proposal may be amended following the tender evaluation process; and
- (c) note that this project is classified as absolutely essential;