

---

## National Meeting of Recreational Fishing Forums

### Meeting Notes

---

---

#### Welcoming address

---

Peter Schroder, Manager Inshore Fisheries, opened the meeting and welcomed all the representatives. Peter reflected back on the sector during his six years with the Ministry. He noted that only 10 of the 30 staff now in the inshore team were with the Ministry of Fisheries 6 years ago and noted the importance of forum representatives for the knowledge and experience they bring to the table.

Peter acknowledged that over the last ten years the Ministry's focus has primarily been on commercial fishing rights and deed of settlement priorities which has taken up a lot of resources. However, over the last three years the Ministry has been able to put more resources towards improving its relationship with the recreational sector. Peter admitted reluctance to establishing the regional forums but in hindsight can now see the value that the recreational forums bring to the Ministry. Peter also acknowledged that there is still progress to be made with regional forums but that the conference was in part about this future direction.

Looking forward, Peter noted the uncertain economic future and the resource pressure that would be felt across government agencies. He noted that this would require a 'how do we do more for less' attitude. Peter then outlined the agenda and thanked the representatives for their attendance at the meeting.

---

#### Regional Forums

---

Alan Moore, Senior Fisheries Advisor, lead a session on regional forums which included updates and progress reports to draw out similarities and differences between the forums. The session also included discussion on the successes or need for improvement of regional forums and provided the opportunity for local and national fisheries management issues to be raised.

Alan outlined the role of the forums, drawing attention to the objectives of the forums. He noted that the forums were about positive relationship building. Forum representatives expressed interest in obtaining the contact details of other attendees.

Forum representatives then presented a progress report from their regional forums:

#### Northern

- The Northern forum prefer to use the term amateur rather than recreational
- The forum has 12-13 representatives covering a large area.
- Important issues in the region include water quality in the Bay of Islands and sewerage dumping in the Whangarei Harbour
- Expressed discontent with issues of transport cost as the rates for reimbursement have not altered with the rise in petrol costs

- Have enjoyed the presentations including one from Mark Morrison linking juvenile fish nurseries in estuaries to coastal adult populations
- Western stock of blue fin tuna an issue of concern
- Noted that some fear exists in the region on the implications of rohe moana gazetting. Suggest that education on customary tools would be useful
- The forum has regular compliance updates which are helpful
- The forum has a close relationship with tangata whenua
- Kaipara harbour and tidal turbines are an issue of concern
- Stress the need for a customary contact list
- Suggest the need for more science on depleted stocks.

### **Hauraki Gulf Bay of Plenty**

- A number of forum members have departed and others taken their place
- The forum supported a submission on the proposed Great Barrier Island Marine reserve but have not had any involvement with the mātaītai at Mt Maunganui nor the Umupuia and Cackle Bay shellfish closures
- Anthony Olsen's (Tuwharetoa) involvement has been positive for relationship building between the forum and Tuwharetoa
- Expressed discontent at the lack of success the forum has had. At the moment they exist as interested parties who meet to discuss issues.
- A level of frustration at the lack of 'teeth' the forums have
- Suggest a review of the terms of reference for the forums
- Stress the need for true consultation and clear mandates for the forum
- Would like to see the forums become outcome and results driven and have improved interaction between the forums
- Argue that the forums do not help the general public to get involved in fisheries management
- Issues of representation – forum members can't possibly represent the large number of people in their regions
- Now chair their own meeting
- Forum hasn't achieved anything

### **West Coast (North Island Central West)**

- Numbers of attendees and consistency of attendance is an issue
- Ministry has been asked to re-run the original advertisement to recruit more members
- The same representatives are on a number of different Ministry stakeholder groups e.g. Fish Plan Advisory Groups
- Dolphins and set net bans are a big issue in the region
- The Kaipara is a large body which needs separate management
- Argue that spatial areas need to be managed differently e.g. harbours compared with offshore.
- Support the compliance updates the forum receives
- Identify consultation as a major issue
- MFish was criticised for the way in which the region boundaries were chosen. Sarah Omundsen, Inshore Fisheries Manager, noted that the original forum regions were chosen based on where applicants lived, not on any other division.
- Suggest that forums share notes across regions.

- West Coast North Island finfish plan in progress.
- No iwi representative on the forum
- Toheroa
- Linkage between fish plans and harbour plans
- Review of trevally fishery.

### **North Island South East**

- Have a good working relationship with MFish and have gained a better understanding of fisheries management processes.
- Have good group discussions and the forum is working well
- Currently have 7 members as 2 have recently resigned
- Haven't had much engagement with iwi until the CRA4 issue arose.
- CRA3 and CRA4 are major issues in the region. CRA3 has become very contentious and is, from the current perspective, practically irresolvable.
- There is a voluntary restriction on bag limits in CRA4. The recreational sector has voluntarily shelved 2 crays from their bag limits, the commercial sector has shelved 65% of their TACC, and kaitiaki will ensure that customary permits do not exceed the customary allocation.
- Note that there are not any avenues for information dissemination to the general public.
- Argue that although MFish claims to be a world leader in fisheries management, they are well behind in terms of mandating and resourcing the recreational sector.
- Note that similar issues of representation mandate and resources were occurring 20 years ago.
- A small number of people doing a lot of work
- Have paua stickers for commercial divers to identify them as legitimate operators
- Forum representatives report back to clubs
- Hāpuka/bass an issue (no knowledge of recreational take and TACC not caught most years)
- Area (FMA2) is too large
- Frustrations at length of time that MFish processes take.

### **North Island South West**

- Meetings have been very positive
- Hector and Maui dolphin set net bans have been an issue in the region, many are sceptical of the statistics used to justify set net bans and express frustration over whose role it is to verify such information
- Difficulty in getting information out to the general public
- Marine reserves and issues of spatial displacement are an issue of concern
- Stress the need to become a partner in fisheries management
- Stress that they are not mere stakeholders
- Consultation is an area of frustration
- Voiced frustration that tangata whenua groups may be privileged above other processes e.g. mātaītai applications vs. marine reserve applications
- There are issues of mandate and advocacy in the recreational sector but the forums are a step in the right direction
- Support having compliance input to the forums

## **Top of South**

- The forum is running well.
- There has been some success for the forum including advancing the Blue Cod IPP
- Notes the apathy of the general public
- 'The Fishing Paper' circulates in the region and is an avenue for MFish and the forum to share information
- Are keen for consultation to move in to genuine discussion
- Are very interested in local area management as the region includes a number of unique fisheries areas including the Marlborough Sounds
- Getting information out to others is an issue as there are a large number of itinerant fishers.

## **Southern**

- The forum is not working well, forum members walked out of the last meeting
- There is a lot of frustration at asking the same questions and addressing issues which have been present for many years
- Have contributed enough time and have not seen any outcomes
- Lack of mandate is a point of frustration
- Forum members do not receive feedback on where their information goes
- Argue that MFish responds to management issues in emotional and political manner e.g. dolphin set nets
- Much distrust and scepticism of management processes.

## **General Discussion**

- QMS not meeting expectations
- Need for MFish to better take in to account forums' perspectives
- Forum representatives should be cautious of their language use and refer to the forums as 'our forums' compared to 'their [MFish] forums'
- Was noted that minutes of forum meetings are available on the MFish website and this could be one way in which forums can better interact with one another.

*Action: Circulate list of attendees contact details (see presentation booklet)*

---

## Consultation

---

Peter Schroder, Manager Inshore Fisheries and Sarah Omundsen, Inshore Fisheries Manager, led a session on consultation. In the first part of this session, the forum broke up in to three groups, two comprised of forum and AFMAC representatives and the other group of MFish staff. The groups discussed 'what consultation means to them' and identified issues with current consultation processes and ideas for improvement.

Issues which arose included:

- the need for processes to be transparent
- time frames (not enough time to take proposals to clubs)
- distrust in process and MFish
- need for plain English documents
- need for independent analysis
- no input into IPP (e.g. what questions are going to be asked)
- lack of interest from general public
- lack of resources
- frustration that anecdotal information is not accepted
- No opportunity to present options for consideration – limited to submitting on options proposed in IPPs
- Not operating in a 'level playing field' as the sector feels customary and commercial interests are better represented
- Shorter versions of IPPs (e.g. one page summary versions)
- Need for other forums to share information
- Issues of how consultation is defined. MFish staff noted that in terms of the Act, consultation includes Section 12 obligations. However, it is clear from discussion and MFish experiences, that consultation needs to extend beyond this process.
- Feeling that submissions are not listened to e.g. set net prohibitions for dolphins.

Suggestions to improve current consultation process:

- Pre-consultation
- Resources
- Understanding of goals and objectives of fish plans
- Better tailored and accessible
- Feedback and rationale for decisions
- Role that Fish Plan Advisory Groups can play
- It was also noted that having an increased role in decision making makes those contributing to these decisions, responsible for them.

In the second part of the session, Sarah Omundsen gave a brief presentation (see presentation booklet) from a regional perspective on how forums contribute to fisheries management. She stressed that MFish staff do listen to their forums and that forums provide an important avenue of communication for MFish with recreational fishers. She noted that the forums provide valuable information on patterns of catch and that compliance operations can be based on issues raised at regional forum meetings. Sarah then stated that forums have had influence on some management issues (e.g. input in to the scallop and dredge oyster pamphlet) She also noted the importance of keeping realistic expectations (e.g. it is not realistic to expect all processes to be speedy).

Sarah noted the role that Fisheries Plans will play in terms of consultation. She stressed the significance that recreational fishing forums will feed into recreational representation on the Fisheries Plan Advisory Groups. Sarah then led a discussion on the submission process. General comments included:

- Quicker and responsive vs. longer and more transparent
- More time to prepare and share ideas with clubs etc
- Pre consultation – would have had some input in to the process prior to the submission stage
- Could better align with forum and club meetings, or special meetings could be convened
- Avoid holiday periods for submissions
- Information needs to be easily accessible
- Submission guidelines may be helpful
- Opportunity to make comments on draft IPPs and FAPs
- Questions about whether the Minister needs to be the decision maker for all issues
- If submission deadlines need to be extended, forum representatives should ask for extensions.

---

## **Local Area Management**

---

John Taunton-Clark (TC), Inshore Fisheries Manager, facilitated discussion on local area management. He gave a presentation (see presentation booklet) on current examples of local area management and detailed customary tools. TC noted that he was not proposing that mātaimai or taiapure be seen as general local area management tools but interest was expressed from the forums that they wished to hear more detail on the tools available to tangata whenua.

In addressing the question 'What issues can local area management address?' forum members raised the following issues:

- Spatial conflict between commercial and recreational fishing
- Itinerant fishers – locals could manage their areas to protect against the effects of large holiday populations
- Could separate the management of coastal and harbour areas
- Could promote interest of the general public in sustainability issues
- MFish don't know what's occurring at a local level
- Could address issues of localised depletion
- Could be responsive to biological processes – e.g. juvenile fisheries areas and their habitat
- Would better address recreational anecdotal information – a governance structure where recreational voices are heard
- Compliance issues – local pride and ownership would reduce infringements
- Where TACC can be taken from – concerns were raised that the commercial catch for an area can be taken from a very small area of the fisheries management area rather than the effort being more widely dispersed throughout the area

- Fisheries management areas are too large. Management decisions need to be made on a harbour by harbour basis. It was also noted that this style of management would be resource intensive.

The following issues were raised in discussion on local area management:

- Use of customary tools was seen as something positive and pro-active that tangata whenua can use. In contrast, recreational fishers respond to issues or problems, so focus on negative issues because they don't have similar tools.
- There was a perception by some forum members that Maori would implement by-laws in mātaihai reserves to allow Maori owned commercial fishing vessels to fish within the mātaihai area. Jonathan Rudge, Policy Manager, explained that this could not occur under the Act. Although tangata whenua are able to apply for commercial fishers to be allowed to fish in a mātaihai, there is no mechanism to specify that only Maori-owned vessels fish there.
- There was confusion about whether the public had an opportunity to comment on by-law introductions in mātaihai reserves. Forum members were informed that they did have this opportunity.
- Much concern was expressed that there was no opportunity for involvement in mātaihai and taiapure applications.
- Others commented that Mātaihai regions are not extensive and that tangata whenua are rightfully entitled to these tools.
- Concerns were raised about a 'race for space'
- Concern was expressed on issues of access that mātaihai might have for inshore fisheries.
- Some argued that mātaihai reserves are likely to be a positive for recreational fishers, as they may allow for more involvement in management and as they exclude commercial fishing vessels
- It was suggested that there needs to be full time liaison team for recreational fishers. Was noted that fisheries analysts have time allocated to work with the recreational sector and that recreational forums are funded at the similar level as customary forums
- Local area management would achieve local buy-in – local pride, local ownership
- Some suggested that port liaison committees provided for local area management and that discussions of this kind were reverting back to past governance structures
- Was noted that special legislation has been used to provide local area management e.g. Guardian's of Fiordland. Shouldn't need to rely on this type of legislative change to facilitate local area management
- Others noted the value of special legislation as it provides for a 'whole package' approach i.e. all management tools are implemented simultaneously not in a 'piecemeal manner' through different agencies.
- Community groups which have been established around the country indicate discontent with current fisheries management processes and structure
- It was suggested that local area management is not about taking over management but rather about guiding management style
- It was noted that the complexity of community groups in places like Auckland would make local area management a real challenge
- Issues of scale were raised. It was noted that commercial fishers operate at large scales so if local areas were defined in too small an area, then they may not get valid interaction with large commercial companies
- Fish plans could enable smaller scale management

*Action: Provide information to forums on mātaimai application process*

## **Presentation by Kim Walshe, Tripartite Group**

Kim Walshe reported back on research findings and his personal thoughts on local area management (see presentation booklet). His presentation included comment on the following:

- What is local area management?
- Issues of recreational fishers' representation in local area management. He noted that only 10 per cent of all recreational fishers have ever been a member of a boat or fishing club. The implications of this are that clubs are not representative of the community in age, ethnicity or gender.
- He also raised issues of how negotiations on fisheries management decisions would occur between parties and how parties would be bound to agree with management decisions.
- He also raised issues of self management, drawing on research which highlights public apathy to participate in fisheries management. For example over 50 per cent of a survey of 612 people stated that they would not keep a diary.
- Kim highlighted that recreational fishers involved in management processes do not represent the 'typical' fisher. However, that the more interested in fisheries management one is, the more likely they will be interested in environmental impact and be willing to teach others.

---

## **Monitoring of Recreational Catch**

---

Bruce Hartill of NIWA gave a presentation (see presentation booklet) on past monitoring programs, aerial over-flight surveys, web cams and boat ramp monitoring of recreational catch.

Bruce noted that information does exist on recreational catch. It is fairly robust, and thought to be more reliable than anything we've had in the past. He outlined different approaches which have been used to estimate recreational catch including tagging programme, telephone/diary surveys (both regional and national) and aerial/ramp surveys.

He identified some of the problems with estimating recreational catch including:

- Telephone interviewees often politely deny being fishers, when
- In fact they are, to get out of being interviewed. This is called soft refusal behaviour, and leads to unreliable estimates of harvest and fisher participation.
- Diarists report far fewer zero bag catches than are independently observed at boat ramps. There are many explanations for this.
- Diarists often report not just their own catch, but also that of others they fished with on a trip. Evidence for this is reported catches which are multiples of the legal bag limit.

- Recall bias - tend to unintentionally exaggerate things in the past (human nature)

Despite these biases, there is relative consistency across surveys. So it is likely that the patterns are broadly representative but at an exaggerated scale.

Bruce outlined his aerial surveying work including the methods of data collection and issues with aerial surveying - not all fishing effort can be assessed from the air. In some instances have to rely on observations at boat ramps to account for methods such as trolling, and for shore based fishers, diarist data are required

In the future we may use aerial over flight surveys (which can be used to potentially provide reliable harvest estimates for some fisheries) to calibrate telephone/diary surveys (which give a synoptic but exaggerated picture of all recreational fisheries). Web cameras overlooking boat ramps will be used to continuously monitor levels of fishing effort over the long term.

Bruce was questioned about the use of club data. Bruce noted that club fishers do not represent the 'average fisher' so using club data is not likely to identify average trends in recreational catch. Long term broad trends can be inferred to a limited degree, but to do this it is necessary to collect data in a consistent and reliable manner over periods exceeding a decade.

There was some discussion on where charter boat operators fit in fishing sector groups as they were seen to be part of both the recreational and commercial sector. Bruce noted that a charter boat logbook scheme was potentially very useful because it acts as a benchmark for which the estimated figures of recreational catch could be compared to. It would be highly desirable if all charter boats were required to report their catch.

---

## Opening of Day Two

---

Jonathan Peacy, National Manager Fisheries Operations, opened the second day of the meeting. He apologised for the absence of Wayne McNee, Chief Executive who was unable to attend the meeting as he was briefing the new Minister of Fisheries.

Jonathan noted the importance of recreational forums for understanding how to get the best value for the recreational sector.

He noted that we are limited by legislation (which is to be reviewed in the next few years) and it's a matter of doing the best we can with the resources and legislation that we've got.

---

## Fisheries 2030: A vision and strategy for fisheries

---

Jonathan Rudge, Policy Manager, outlined progress on Fisheries 2030.  
(See presentation booklet)

Jonathan informed the forum that the Ministry contracted Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) earlier in the year to facilitate the development of a long term vision and high level strategy for management of New Zealand's fisheries. PWC have been meeting with sector interests individually and facilitating cross sector meetings to obtain views on New Zealand's fisheries management with the objective of achieving a consensus on a vision for fisheries in 2030 and the high level strategy for achieving this. Jonathan notes that high level shared visions e.g. healthy fishery are relatively easy to gain agreement on but tensions do exist at lower level details.

Jonathan noted the need to gain support of the new Minister and government for the initiative but noted Wayne McNee's commitment to the process. He also noted that there would likely be a need for legislative reform to deliver the new Vision and strategy, but that again this would need to be supported by the new government.

Issues which were raised during this session included:

- Some forum members voiced their support for devolution of responsibility and the need for the Minister to be less involved with day to day management.
- Geoff Rowling, a member of AFMAC who has been involved in Fisheries 2030, expressed the sentiment that as the process is run by MFish, it was difficult to affect the outcome. However, he noted that if one doesn't participate then the recreational sector's vision will not be reflected in 2030. Geoff also acknowledged that MFish as the government agency had a valid role and responsibility for this, and the value of the independence and transparency brought into the process by PWC.
- Forum members stressed the need not to make the same mistakes as in the past.
- In response to the assertion that the present act has means of addressing abundance and environmental concerns which are not currently used, Jonathan noted that the legislative review would not necessarily result in the drafting of a whole new act, but rather provide a legislative framework which would best enable the delivery of the vision and strategy. He also noted that such a legislative review and reform process would take time and implementation of the vision and strategy would need to work with the current legislation whatever the outcome of the review.

- There was some discussion over the role of MFish vision. The scallop industry was used as an example of a fishery that is healthy but ‘facilitated by and not run by’ MFish.
- A forum member noted the similarity in discussion to that which occurred in the Guardians of Fiordland. He used the example of an egg to represent a desirable management model – the stakeholders inside with the agency around the outside.
- Forum members expressed the desire to achieve positive and trusting Crown and Recreational sector partnerships, stressing the change from being a stakeholder to being a partner, and to have quality international relationships and high levels of compliance.

---

## **Amateur Advocacy and Representation in New Zealand**

---

Geoff Rowling, President of NZ Recreational Fishing Council, Richard Baker, President of NZBGFC, and Bob Rosemergy, President of Spearfishing NZ, facilitated a session on amateur advocacy and representation in New Zealand. Six main themes emerged from this session. These were: structure, agreed process, communication, objectives, funding and succession.

Key points raised were:

- Amateur sector is reliant on volunteers who have limited time
- No large time commitment has previously been made to address issues of structure. Now the sector needs to take time to focus on structure
- The need to fight the notion that ‘an organised recreational sector is an oxymoron’
- The Ministry has played an important role in adding structure to the sector by establishing the forums
- Communication is key to interaction with grassroots
- Concerns with funding issues – should government money be accepted and/or will such funding be prescriptive in its use?
- Discussion about whether there is a need for any more representative groups; it was suggested that current structures are not adequate as not all interest groups are represented e.g. shellfish gatherers
- Tangata whenua need to be involved
- Need to move from voluntary to professional realm with a professional agency that can engage with MFish processes.
- Conflicts between recreational fishing bodies were recognised. Was suggested that a good process will overcome personal conflict.
- Need for education of general public to increase awareness of recreational forums and clubs
- Despite apathy of general public, there needs to be more opportunity for them to participate in fisheries management processes
- MFish supports the concept of developing a national representative body of recreational fishers.
- MFish noted that they are open to new structures to organise the recreational fishing sector but that it is easier to support forums in terms of funding
- Assertion that the recreational sector can look at other bodies for effective structures, regional councils, school boards, Fish and Game, etc

- There needs to be incentives to be involved – the body must have visible outcomes e.g. the Guardians of Fiordland replaced the s12 consultation process.
- Need to mandate the forums (e.g. through voting, internet). Mandate is also important from the government's perspective as they need to work with groups that have a recognised mandate. Other issues which arose with regard to mandate were: who would forum members be mandated to represent - the general public or recreational fishers? Who can select those that have mandate? What are representatives mandated to do?
- It was suggested that structure and objectives need to precede mandate
- Some forum members believed that their involvement of over 20 years working with government agencies on fisheries management gave them mandate.

*Action: Agreed that a steering committee would be established with 3-4 representatives to advance the idea of a representation in the recreational sector.  
Proposed members: Kim Walshe, Derrick Paull, Richard Baker and Laurel Teirney.*

*Action: Forums to look at ways to increase awareness of recreational forums and clubs*

---

## **Report of Australian RecFish Conference**

---

Derrick Paull, NZ attendee at the Australian RecFish Conference, reported on the conference to the forum (see presentation booklet). He noted that all the attendees had a common interest – more big fish. He identified five key points from the conference:

1. Access: a significant issue in Australia, particularly access to freshwater areas. Also concern about 'locking out' of MPAs which may have implications for accessing salt water fisheries.
2. RecFish Research Incorporated: highlights the difference between the treatment of scientific and anecdotal information. Suggests that a similar research body in New Zealand would be useful.
3. Funding: a big issue in Australia. The invisible economy of recreational fishing in Australia is estimated at \$4billion. Tax income on recreational spending could be feed back in to the recreational sector. Differences in funding structures between states, some are directly funded by government and don't seem to be affected by the implications of this source of funding.
4. Leadership: the succession plans, a generational gap has been identified in leadership. In Western Australia they have established the Future Young Leaders – a training course for 15 keen fishers under 35 years old who spend two weeks learning about fisheries management.
5. Socio-economic value of fishing: value is more than the fish you take home, people feel better if they're involved in the management, although recognise that there are issues of apathy in the general public which may preclude their involvement in management processes. Derrick asserted that a lack of funding in the NZ recreational sector limited the ability of the sector to engage in research for recreational interests and suggested the need for a funding body and research organisations on par with FRDC and 'Recfishing Research' in Australia. Derrick suggested that research carried out by NIWA is often perceived to lack independence.

Bruce Hartill of NIWA said that NIWA is dedicated to research providing benefits to New Zealand. Although owned by the Crown, it provides independent research and advice and operates as a standalone company with its own Board of Directors and Executive Team.

MFish notes that NIWA is a Crown Research Institute (CRI) that undertakes work for a variety of local and international organisations, following best practice, in terms of ethics and science. In addition, all stakeholders are welcome to be involved in the peer review of research carried out under contract to the Ministry of Fisheries.

---

## Report from Spearfishing NZ

---

Bob Rosemergy, President of Spearfishing NZ gave a presentation raising spearfishers' concerns

- Spearfishers provide a unique perspective – underwater instead of on above the water
- Spearfishers have noticed the diminishing numbers of kahawai and the virtual disappearance of blue fish
- There has been a big shift in spearfishing culture – number of shops has declined as more people sell via internet and from home
- People used to rely on clubs for the use of boats but now more people have their own boats
- Census data – highlights that even where population numbers have declined, the number on fishing effort has increased. Census data also highlights the role of itinerant fishers
- Funding should be provided by the government
- Voluntary restriction on bag limits highlights the need for better management systems.

General comments:

- Spearfishing as the most selective of fishing methods
- Demographic statistics are important because with an increasing population there will be more controls on our system and the recreational sector needs to be involved in these decisions.

---

## General discussion on funding

---

- Discussion about whether the recreational sector should accept government funding – concerns about the 'tags' that this may put on the use of this money.
- Most felt that it was acceptable to be funded by government
- It was suggested that accepting government finance would only have implications if recreational sector was trying to buy out ACE quota
- Interested in finding out the economic value that the recreational sector contributes to the New Zealand economy.
- One member suggested that funding needs to be consistent and that licensing was a way in which this consistency could be achieved as this would also help to quantify the level of recreational fishing
- The issue of licensing was identified as an emotive term for recreational fishers and it was decided that this as not an appropriate time to advance this

idea as the positives of any scheme are overrun by a focus on licensing if this was included in the proposed scheme

- Advocacy is seen as a way in which funding may be raised – if the public sees value in the recreational fishing 'cause' then they will gain support, akin to Forest and Bird fundraising efforts
- Need to be mindful of government priorities to other sectors such as healthcare
- Need to manage expectations, need to build up to a well funded body
- Do not want a representative body to be focused on fundraising
- Councils – revenue from cruise ships
- Revenue from fuel tax on vessels
- Need a business model and budget.

---

## Regulations

---

Andy Warmbrunn asked forum members to bring forward regulations that their forums were keen to have reviewed. The issues raised were:

Top of South:

- Raise the Marlborough Sounds SNA limit from 3 to 6
- Blue Cod daily limit
- Kahawai MLS
- Reduce scallop safety bag limit (50p/p)
- Set net mesh size
- Telson clipping

NISW:

- Set nets, mandatory attendance
- No set nets where other users are present
- No set nets on offshore reefs

NISE:

- Standard size limit of finfish at 33cm
- Accumulation of bag limits – paua should be maximum of 3 days allocation in freezer
- Charter boat should have a separate allocation of TACC

Western:

- Reinstatement of special permit for disabled persons
- Telson clipping

Northern:

- Disabled special permit provision

This session included discussion on:

- Special permit process – agreed to put forward to forums for consideration about whether a reinstatement of this special permit is necessary.

- ToS, NISE and NISW will liaise with one another to discuss the blue cod issue.
- Issues with set nets to be progressed by MFish including mesh size, soakage time, attendance, reef setting, night setting, upper mesh size limit.
- Discussion on telson clipping. It was decided that if forums are interested they can discuss with the National Rock Lobster Working Group.
- MLS can be discussed in each region if deemed necessary. Otherwise it is too difficult to address
- MFish to report back to forums and representatives on the current status of the Paua accumulation limit which was discussed by the forums early in 2008.

*Actions: MFish to progress regulation review of set nets and to report back progress to regional forums.*

*MFish will discuss with recreational fishing forums, whether the special permit is an issue which needs to be reviewed.*

*TOS, NISW and NISE to discuss blue cod regulation review*

---

## **Monitoring of Recreational Effort and Value**

---

Ralph Townsend, Chief Economist discussed indices of recreational fishing activity and choice modelling (see presentation booklet).

Ralph simulated a website choice modelling exercise, explaining the rationale behind the questions and the information that can be obtained from choice modelling exercises.

He outlined the benefits of choice modelling including the likelihood of getting more information than face to face interviews, and being able to include photographs.

Notes the high participation rate of fisherpeople – often around 60% which is abnormal compared to the 12-13% that most researchers would target for survey work.

Forum members asked Ralph about estimates for recreational fishers economic input in to the economy. Ralph suggested that while monetary value can be helpful, the more significant issue was discovering the value in fishing experience.