
Crustacean Fisheries Advisory Committee (CFAC)

26 February 2021. Lands Building – Remarkable Cave Room

CFAC 86 Minutes.

Present:

Ian Cartwright	Chair	Hilary Revill	DPIPWE Wild Fisheries Management
Karl Krause	TRLFA representative	Klaas Hartman	IMAS Scientific Representative
Rene Hidding	CEO TRLFA	Craig Crawford	Marine Police representative
Dawn Jordan	Rock Lobster industry representative	Malcolm Budd	DPIPWE compliance & licensing
Louise Hart	Rock lobster industry representative		
Darrell Grey	TRLFA representative (via Teams)	Observers:	
Dave Ponsford	Giant crab industry representative	Ian Dutton	Director Marine Resources
Michael Blake	Processor representative	James Parkinson	CFAC Executive Officer
Julian Harrington	TSIC representative	Nick Boucher	DPIWE Wild Fisheries Management
Ian Heathorn	Processor representative		

Apologies:

Jon Bryan	Community/conservation representative
Rachel McKay	Marine Police representative

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
1	Welcome, apologies, declarations of interest and agenda	Apologies noted: No declarations of interest; no change to pecuniary interests register. Agenda accepted as circulated.	-	-	-

	Minutes of the previous meeting	Draft Minutes from Meeting 85: Accepted, subject to minor amendments suggested prior and during the meeting	Post final minutes	JP	15 March
	Actions arising				
	Meeting 83 Item 1: Department to develop guidelines for all FAC's on the management plan amendment process including how submissions are treated	Draft policy being developed within wild fisheries group, will distribute to CFAC when finalised.	Policy guidelines to be distributed to CFAC	HR	31 May
	Meeting 85 Item 1: Processor representatives to discuss compliance issues with manager compliance	Meeting was attempted to address concerns, but not held due to busy time over Christmas. Concerns remain and meeting required	Arrange meeting; report back to CFAC	MB	31 May
	Meeting 85 Item 2: CFAC members to provide feedback to IMAS regarding stock assessment web site	DPIPWE, IMAS, TRLFA and processor reps to discuss issues around the future inclusion of real time data	Arrange meeting; report back to CFAC	HR	31 May
	Meeting 85 Item 4: IMAS to look at impact of translocation on recruitment and quantify impact on catch rates.	Translocation analysis in progress no results yet, will be completed by end of May before the TRLFA general meeting.	IMAS to complete report	KH	31 May

	Meeting 85 Item 5: Chair to write letter to AFMA re trawl interactions	Chair has written to AFMA executive officer, no response yet.	Chair will follow up	Chair	31 March
	Meeting 85 Item 6: FAC members interested in trialling app to contact Daniel Gledhill.	Opportunity provided at lunch break	Complete	-	-
	Meeting 85 Item 7: TRLFA to provide advice to DPIPWE on any rules they believe urgently require review by 1 Dec.	A FAC member has provided DPIPWE with suggestions.	Complete	-	-
2.	Updates /actions re response to impacts of current China trade access issues	<p>The TRLFA CEO noted that: a State of confusion persists, the prognosis for new quota year is uncertain; fishermen will need to reduce costs; and the TRLFA is interacting with all levels of government regarding assistance.</p> <p>A processor member: noted: the significance of the China market; the search for new markets/increased prices; that the indirect supply routes into China were allegedly opening up but such supply routes were being discouraged by both the Chinese and Australian governments.</p> <p>It was also noted the high NZ \$100-160 beach prices relative to the current beach price \$25-35 (25 a small brindle, large red 35); that the current processing factories are geared up for live export not cooking and freezing; the limitations of the local Xmas market c. 500t, and that it will be difficult to compete with WA lobster with 7800t available and a beach price of \$15.</p> <p>DPIPWE members noted: that the fishery is in uncharted waters; numerous requests for assistance are being received with licencing staff on the front line; DEFAT briefings indicated that it would be 1-3 years before the China market was likely to back on line and industry were urged not to engage with China grey/ black market; LMRMA not fit for purpose under the current circumstances, looking to free up process in Act to make fisheries more resilient and free up time and resources and speed up</p>			

		change to management plans; 210 rock lobster licence renewed, 2/3rds, 70 elected for a delayed payment; and DPIPWE will not be charging tag fees,			
		Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The FAC: Noted the significance and importance of continuing the <i>Rural Live and Well</i> counselling service. Given funding terminates in August, further funding is needed to keep the service going. TSIC has written to Minister Rockliff, and asked the FAC to reiterate support for the programme. TRLFA acknowledged DPIWE handling of the COVID situation and assistance to industry.</p> <p>[The TSIC member informed post meeting that the <i>Rural Live and Well</i> counselling service has been provided \$360,000 over three years to fund the program]</p>	Letter of FAC support to Minister Barnett	Chair	31 March

3.	Brief Updates	<p>The Research member noted that: the rock lobster assessment now online at www.tasfisheries.org , IMAS will welcome any feedback before a more formal release; app is being developed for rec catch reporting; and 'lessons learned' from Victorian and other tagging programs, are being reviewed.</p> <p>The compliance member noted: that from 91 offenders (31 last year) had resulted from marine inspections, including 295 at sea vessel inspections across all commercial fishing; a total of 667 recreational marine offences reported. The FAC's attention was drawn to: the significant weight issues being detected in the commercial catch i.e. discrepancies between, weights received and weights shipped out, of processing facilities: concerns that a number of fishers don't hold a FLP, fishers not fishing where they report and that there appears to be issues surrounding the general regulation of spatial management in the fishery. The FAC generally agreed that VMS will assist with compliance with spatial management and other compliance issues.</p> <p>The fishery manager noted that: the east coast catch cap has been set with no changes to rec sector for upcoming season in November, the 2022/23 cap will be informed by commercial and rec catch; the east coast working group has no utility going forward after the first meeting late last year; the Department is working on a wider strategy across the fishery, including east coast management; and the cadmium survey received good support from fishers, the full report and results are expected in late March.</p>			
		Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>An industry member raised concerns regarding a new licence condition requiring a supervisor to oversee all activity from the commencement of a fishing trip until the end of the fishing trip and all rock lobster have been unloaded. The FAC was informed that the supervisor who catches the fish must sign the catch record and part A when the fish are unloaded, this has always been the case as stipulated in the quota docket instructions.</p>	<p>TRLFA EO to discuss the issue with the DPIPW Manager of Compliance and Licencing and report back to the next FAC meeting.</p>	<p>TRLFA DPIPWE</p>	<p>30 April</p>

4.	Joint CFAC RecFAC presentation of the size limit and pot numbers proposals	DPIPWE and IMAS members presented overviews of the size and pot limit proposal as outlined in agenda papers and IMAS background documents. It was noted that CFAC and RECFAC will further consider the proposals separately.		
5.	Proposed Management Plan Changes	Changes for the commercial sector will be in place for 1 March 2022 and recreational for 1 November 2022, subject to statutory management planning process including consultation.		
	a) Size limit proposal	<p><u>i) CFAC supported the proposal to extend the minimum female size limit of 120mm across the northern part of the fishery (see map attached to minutes) and increase the male size limit to 115mm.</u></p> <p>Industry members did not support the removal of the NE catch cap due to effort shift concerns as CPUE improves, which it was suggested could have stock implications and prevent reaching biomass rebuild targets.</p> <p>Following discussion <u>ii) CFAC supported retention of the NE catch cap</u> as a tool to reduce the impact of increased effort flowing in from other regions.</p> <p><u>iii) CFAC supported the increase in the minimum size limit to 115mm in the eastern area.</u></p> <p><u>iv) Industry members of CFAC did not support the maximum size limit (MSL) proposal for the east coast,</u> remained unconvinced of the benefits and raised concerns regarding recreational divers taking large rock lobster damaging them, and having to return them if under the MSL.</p> <p><u>v) CFAC supported maintaining the current size limits for the remainder of state waters.</u></p> <p>The FAC considered the proposal for lower size limits for parts of the far south, most likely for a limited period to take advantage of market demand, noting IMAS have previously suggested that this action would yield productivity gains.</p> <p>After some discussion <u>vi) CFAC supported placing and enabling legislative mechanism in the rules to reduce the size limit should a future need be identified.</u> It was noted that such a reduction would provide diversity in product that can be supplied.</p>		
		Discussion Points	Action	Who Timing

		There is a need to review the level of the NE cap, taking into account the increase in minimum size limit	IMAS to review NE cap level and provide recommendation to CFAC	KH	November
	b) Boundaries	<p>CFAC considered three options for the western boundary of the northern and southern size limit areas; Bluff hill Pt (current 60 pot boundary), Sandy Cape (September open area boundary), and Henty River (current female size limit boundary). <u>The FAC supported establishing the western boundary of the northern size limit area at the Henty River,</u> allowing the line to be placed on sand and did not cross any reef. It was noted the line at the Henty would be conservative biologically and result in, a slight reduction in productivity for a trade-off in more efficient commercial operation. Industry members were strong in their opinion that fish taken north of the Henty at the larger minimum size limit needed to be able to be unloaded in Strahan. Compliance was of the view that fish needs to be unloaded in the zone that the fish were caught, this was not supported by industry members, who noted that fishers are now unloading in ports outside of the catch cap and size limit regions and that it should be possible to find ways and means of achieving this important requirement for efficient commercial operation and sustainability.</p> <p>CFAC considered two options for the northeast boundary: Eddystone Point or St Helens Point. <u>Industry members of CFAC supported the NE Boundary being at St Helens Point.</u></p> <p>The CFAC considered two options for the southern boundary of the eastern and southern size limit areas: Cape Pillar (biological sweet spot) and Adventure Bay (catch cap boundary). <u>Industry members of CFAC expressed general support the southern boundary of the eastern and southern size limit areas at Cape Pillar</u> subject to TRLFA seeking local fisher views.</p>			
		Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		Need to seek further industry views on the position of the southern boundary of the eastern and southern size limit	TRLFA to consult with fishers who work in this area	RH	15 April

	<p>c) Compliance considerations (boundaries)</p>	<p>Compliance members (Dept and Police) supported the proposed changes, noting that there were enforcement issues to consider. While the proposed smaller size limit in area 8 is problematic. The remainder of the size limit proposal is supported, with the following compliance measures in place: strict single zone fishing, all unloads and conclusion of trip in size limit area; use of VMS across fishery (noting need for telephone reports can be reviewed; pre-fishing and unloading telephone reports; sensible line placement and handling of lobsters from multiple size limit zones)</p> <p>CFAC supported the compliance rationale that the only way to effectively manage size limit areas will be for all commercial vessels to have VMS and to retain pre fishing and unloading telephone reports, as well as single zone fishing trips.</p> <p>Industry members of CFAC did not support the concept of single zone ports of unloading if VMS was mandatory for the whole fleet. CFAC accepted the need to develop rules to provide some compliance capacity to track size limit on land back to a fisher. This may include future amendments to the Processor and Handling Rules as well as the Rock Lobster rules. Compliance members (Dept and Police) conceded that unloading could occur outside a relevant size limit area in conjunction with transit reports.</p>
	<p>d) Pot limits</p>	<p>CFAC supported the proposed 60 pot zone, noting the Bluff Hill Point line will be removed which will be an operational benefit (see attached map, noting the capacity to use 60 pots in the far SE with VMS)</p> <p>Industry members of CFAC supported maintaining the status quo of 50 pots in the east coast area given the remainder of the state would move to 60 pots. The FAC noted that a vessel moving to a higher pot level will be considered as transitioning and will need a stability booklet under AMSA regulations.</p> <p>[Advice from the TSIC member following the meeting is that 10 additional pots are unlikely to trigger transitioning– unlike a fixed piece of equipment such as a net reel]</p>
	<p>e) Other draft plan arrangements</p>	<p>The DPIPWE member took the FAC through other amendments being considered as outlined in the background paper. Additional suggestions were made by CFAC members including: the ability to transport partly completed pots above vessel pot limits; revision of the over catch rule and associated</p>

		administrative penalty; further consideration of carry over, given that SA and VIC allow 20% and 10% respectively; and provision for innovation in pot design to increase efficiency.			
6.	Season opening dates for Nov 2021/22	CFAC supported the DPIPWE season dates proposal for November 2021 – October 2022.			
7.	Update fisheries digital transition project	The CFAC was provided an update of the FDTP project including the new combined catch and effort quota docket.			
8	Other business	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		A member queried the permanent transfer of a caught unit and the ability for the transfer to occur during the season rather than many applications for transfer accumulating to be transferred at the start of the new quota year.	Further consideration by DPIPWE	MB	15 May
9.	Future meeting dates	Likely meeting late August to consider submissions.			

Consolidated action list

Meeting	Item	Action	Who	Timing	Progress/ action/ notes
83	1	Department to develop guidelines for all FAC's on the management plan amendment process including how submissions are treated	HR	31 May	In progress
85	1	Arrange meeting between processors and DPIPWE on compliance issues	MB IH	31 May	Outstanding
85	2	Arrange meeting between DPIPWE, IMAS, TRLFA and processor reps to discuss issues around the future inclusion of real time data in online assessment.	HR	31 May	Outstanding
85	4	Report on impact of translocation on recruitment and catch rates	KH	31 May	Outstanding
85	5	Follow-up letter to AFMA re trawl interactions	Chair	31 March	
86	2	Letter of support for continuation of <i>Rural Live and Well</i> counselling service.	Chair	31 March	Completed
86	3	Arrange meeting between DPIPWE and TRLFA regarding supervisors	MB RH	30 April	
86	5	Review level of NE cap, taking into account the increase in minimum size limit	KH	November	
86	5	Seek further industry views on the position of the southern boundary of the eastern and southern size limit	RH	15 April	Completed
86	8	Consideration of the ability for permanent transfer of units to occur during the season.	MB	15 May	

