

***Crustacean Fisheries Advisory Committee (CFAC)***

*29 June 2022*

Lands Building, Hobart

***CFAC Meeting No 89 Minutes.***

**Members present:**

Ian Cartwright	Chair
Rene Hidding	CEO TRLFA
Karl Krause	TRLFA representative
Troy Rainbird	TRLFA representative
Dawn Jordan	Rock Lobster industry representative
Clive Perryman	Rock lobster industry representative
Dave Ponsford	Giant crab industry representative
Michael Blake	Processor representative
Ian Heathorn	Processor representative
Craig Crawford	Marine Police representative
Klaas Hartman	IMAS Scientific Representative
Julian Harrington	TSIC representative
Rachel McKay	Marine Police representative
Jonathan Hammond	TRLFA representative

**DPIPWE Advisers:**

Sonja Hempel	NRE Fishery Manager
James Parkinson	CFAC Executive Officer
Mark Gibson	VMS Officer

**Apologies:**

Brian Adkins	Rock Lobster industry representative
Mal Budd	NRE compliance & licensing

<b>Item</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Discussion Points</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Timing</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, noting the last meeting was in October.</li> <li>• The Chair noted the passing of Louise Hart, the FAC held a few moments of silence to reflect on the contribution she made to the CFAC. The Chair suggested he write to the Hart family on behalf of the FAC, the FAC supported this action.</li> <li>• The Chair welcomed Sonja Hempel to the FAC replacing Hilary Revill as the NRE Tas fishery member on the FAC.</li> <li>• The Chair welcomed Clive Perryman to the FAC noting not a new Face.</li> <li>• The Chair suggested he write to Hilary thanking her for her many years of service on the FAC and as rock lobster manager. The FAC supported this action, noting that she was one of the most productive and approachable managers in Australia, along with being honest and frank.</li> </ul>	<p>Chair to write to the Harts expressing sorrow for their loss noting the great contribution she made.</p> <p>The Chair will also write to Hilary Revill thanking her for her service on the FAC.</p>	-	-
	<b>Apologies</b>	Mal Budd and Brian Adkins	-	-	-
	<b>Declaration of pecuniary interests</b>	Ian Heathorn prior to the meeting advised that he no longer holds a Fishing (Licence) Rock Lobster. The pecuniary interest register was amended to reflect this.	-	-	-
	<b>Adoption of agenda</b>	The agenda as sent to members was adopted with no additional changes.	-	-	-
	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting 88</b>	The FAC was informed a second set of minutes were sent to members from meeting 88 that incorporated comments received from members. The FAC accepted the minutes as a true and accurate record.	-	-	-

		An industry member raised the status of form and peak body submissions as discussed in the minutes from last meeting, it was noted that such submissions would be treated on their merits.			
<b>Actions arising</b>					
	<b>Meeting 88 Item 1:</b> Permanent transfer of caught units. Presently not allowed. Investigate if there is a need to allow	Noted that the issue was about the permanent transfer of units after they has been caught or partially caught. Brokers consider it is not an issue as quota can only be caught once. Perception that a unit should be able to be sold with or without quota. Issue to be progressed with the NRE Tas licensing section.	To follow up with NRE Tas.	Mal Budd	Before next meeting.
	<b>Meeting 88 Item2:</b> Workshop to investigate a new market strategy and supply chains	Not progressed, FAC agreed workshop no longer needed.	Completed		
	<b>Meeting 88 Item 2:</b> Police officer poor lobster handling techniques	The TRLFA CEO was satisfied this issue had been resolved	Completed		
	<b>Meeting 88 Item 4:</b> Investigate splitting access to the NE catch cap area winter and summer	Proposal floated at port meetings and at the TRLFA forum. Some interest, but greater sense of agreement within the commercial sector needed to progress further.	Completed		

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
2.	Brief updates	<p><b>Research</b>  The IMAS member provided the FAC with a brief research update, points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research pots have been rolled out, with 70 permits issued, 90 have expressed interest.</li> <li>• Some concern about research pot catch rates. The FAC was informed that IMAS does not look at research pot catch rates, only size frequency. It was suggested that the stick pots are starting to catch after early concerns that they were not performing well.</li> <li>• The new research pot rulers are very close to being released.</li> <li>• Aust lobster model is being progressed, model will be able to be aligned with new size limits and boundaries</li> </ul> <p>Kylie Cahill at IMAS acknowledged for her efforts in reviving the research pot program.  Concerns that some fishers are not using research pots correctly and taking advantage of the two extra pots. NRE suggested that data contained in catch and effort records can be cross referenced with data returns.</p>	NRE Tas to cross reference catch and effort with research pot data	NRE Tas	
		<p><b>TRLFA</b>  The TRLFA CEO noted there was not a lot to report, with fishing having slowed for winter. Been mostly concentrating on submission and politics of that particularly over 60 pots.</p>			
		<p><b>Processors</b>  The Processor member noted the following points:</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beach price has improved in the \$55-70 range, benefiting from Victoria and SA shutting.</li> <li>• In the South price is more like \$50-55.</li> <li>• \$75 all in on KI due to size.</li> <li>• Price being driven by domestic market.</li> <li>• Overseas, Taiwan has two supply routes through grey market into China, two groups are fighting making difficult to get lobster through.</li> <li>• Singapore market is good, with demand back to pre-covid and price matching Aust.</li> <li>• Aust gov has supported a Hong Kong trade show, along with a NZ trade show to promote Aus lobsters.</li> <li>• Investigating a cooked frozen NZ domestic market, where NZ price too high for the local market at \$120+/kg.</li> </ul>			
		<p><b>Compliance</b></p> <p>An NRE Tas representative provided the FAC with an update on the VMS rollout, points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80 fishers had signed up to have VMS voluntarily fitted.</li> <li>• Waiting final approval to commence rollout when a letter will be sent to fishers.</li> <li>• The completion date for the rollout is still planned for 1 NOV,</li> <li>• 5 marine electrical contractors have been approved.</li> <li>• Web page being updated with rollout information and how data is treated.</li> </ul> <p>Noted rollout is a bit behind, waiting on Minister to give final approval. Industry member questioned if it was still possible to complete the process by 1 November. The FAC was informed that there was an opportunity have units fitted after November and that fishers will be</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>able to fish post 15 November should VMS not be installed by the opening, alternative arrangements will be made to keep people fishing. One industry member raised concerns over battery drain, other members thought this was not an issue with modern units. A process to turn units off in port will be considered.</p> <p>The Marine Police members provided an overview on marine offences comprising of 1103 marine offenders, 180 lobster, 3 processors, 52 commercial offenders 690 rec, including cautions. Noted commercial offences 50% down on last year.</p>			
		<p><b>Management</b> The NRE Tas fisheries manager provided the management update covering:</p> <p>Centrostephanus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent study has shown RL has a low prey preference for centro over other species. Notwithstanding, managing for a higher lobster biomass which will have overall benefits for ecosystem function.</li> <li>• Commercial catch continues to decrease centro numbers</li> <li>• Last year of AIRF and current subsidy, which will be reviewed for start of season in December.</li> <li>• At a national level progressing a centro strategy.</li> <li>• The CSIRO centro strategy is still imminent. Noted process started 2 years ago, the FAC is very keen to see the new strategy</li> </ul> <p>LMRA Submissions has been received, currently being reviewed, aiming to have report out by the end of the year.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>FDTP</p> <p>A team is being put together to progress, it was thought electronic logbooks would come into the rock lobster fishery after 2023.</p> <p>catch update: Noted 13t ahead for east coast catch, asked if was due to more effort.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
3.	Rock Lobster VMS Rollout	This item was presented in the compliance update			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
4	Rock Lobster Stock Status	<p>a) Current year fishing update</p> <p>The NRE Tas member presented a catch update, points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statewide catch is around 23t behind the point to the end of June 2021.</li> <li>• East coast catch cap is around 13t ahead of the same point in 2021</li> <li>• The North East catch cap is around 4t ahead of the same point in 2021.</li> </ul> <p>It was thought the East Coast Catch Cap Area would close by the end of August.</p> <p>b) Stock status update</p> <p>The IMAS member presented a rock lobster stock status update, points from the presentation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPUE is up statewide, standardised ahead of nominal</li> <li>• Statewide CPUE is at 1.4kg/pot lift, the highest since 1984.</li> <li>• Eastern standardised catch rates are up across all eastern assessment areas, including area 2.</li> <li>• Western standardised catch rates are up all western assessment areas, though not as pronounced as in the east.</li> </ul> <p>Industry members were asked how the current season was going, most fishers thought catch rates have continued to improve.</p> <p>Possibility of a TAC increase raised, given the strong catch rates. It was suggested the TAC will be on the agenda later this year. The NRE Tas</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>member suggested all metrics will be looked at, however more concerned about meeting rebuild targets.</p> <p>The Chair asked FAC members their thoughts regarding a TAC increase. The IMAS member reminded the FAC that the stock has been at a low level for a long time, even in 1984. It was suggested there was interest and discussion at SRL in pursuing MSC certification which provide guidance on stock levels and rebuild rates, noting that could be important with gaining access to the EU market and other markets including China may require it going forward. The FAC was encouraged by increase in CPUE but is taking a cautious approach noting the benefits of increased biomass and benefits of increased catch rates especially with fuel prices going up. The IMAS member noted generally lower levels of recruitment down about 30% across all SRL jurisdictions compared to pre 2000's. The Chair noted a robust stock with greater CPUE was now considered a better approach rather than chasing MEY, and more about PGY ("pretty good yield")</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
5	<b>Rock Lobster Management Plan Review-</b>	<p><b>Consideration of Submissions and Recommendations to the Minister</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member provided an overview of the process to date, noting the consultation included rock lobster rules and east coast policy, however today would be concentrating on providing recommendations regarding the rock lobster rules and that the east coast responses will be considered when developing the harvest strategy.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The Chair remarked on the quality of the summary document that was very helpful and noted the FAC had received the large submissions spreadsheet. The Chair confirmed this was the last opportunity for FAC to provide comment on the new management plan before rules come in on 1 Nov.</p> <p>An industry member noted the number of submissions in the spreadsheet did not add up to tallies in the analysis. The NRE Tas member explained around 20 submissions had requested their entire submission be made confidential and these were removed from the spreadsheet of submissions provided to FAC members. The Chair suggested all submissions should be released to the FAC given the FAC is not a public forum and are able to consider submissions on the basis of committee-in-confidence.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>Aligning size limits with growth rates and sexual maturity</b>	<p>General support for the concept of aligning size limits with growth rates and sexual maturity with nearly <math>\frac{3}{4}</math> of commercial and recreational submissions supporting the concept.</p> <p><b>Northern Zone</b></p> <p><b>Size Limits:</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was strong support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>TRLFA did not support increasing male size limit as it will impact the size availability for processors.</p> <p>The IMAS members suggested there was a small impact on yield, with the proposal being biologically neutral.</p> <p>Industry members on the FAC supported increasing the female size limit to 120mm as proposed however supported leaving the male size limit at 110mm.</p> <p><b>Boundaries :</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was little support for the commercial sector for the proposed Red Rock (RR) line, with strong support for the current St Helens Point line based on operational constraints for the commercial fishery.</p> <p>Following discussion, it was noted the need for a line at RR will depend on the final size limit proposal, noting that the CFAC is putting forward two options to the Minister for the Eastern Zone.</p> <p>For the 120F/110M Eastern Zone CFAC proposal, which would match the CFAC's advised Northern Zone size limits, there would be one "north eastern Zone" for size limits and the East Coast Catch Cap would remain at St Helens.</p> <p>For the 120F/115M Eastern Zone CFAC proposal, the CFAC advises that the Eastern Zone northern boundary should be at RR, as initially proposed by NRE Tas, while noting that there will be some operational disadvantage for the commercial sector.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The NRE member noted that should the Eastern line be needed the department supports the line at RR.</p> <p>An industry member noted that should the catch cap line be moved to RR there will need to be a shift of catch from NE to ECCA of about 7t which will need to be calculated and that should ECCA be reduced the extra 7t will be eroded.</p> <p>Under the 110M/120F size limit proposal industry members supported maintaining St Helens Pt for the catch cap.</p> <p><b>Eastern Zone</b></p> <p><b>Size Limit:</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was strong support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions.</p> <p>It was noted that from submission comments there was strong support for increasing the female size limit in the east to 120mm. It was noted that there were benefits of standardising the female SL of 120 across the north and east being less complex for recreational and easier to police.</p> <p>The IMAS member provided a biological overview of impacts, negligible decrease in biomass, a significant gain in egg production. Noted uncertain how recreational catches will be impacted. He believed 120/115 had good outcomes reduced race to fish and recreational catch. 5-10% reduction in catch rate compared to current proposal, though a substantial catch rate reduction overall.</p> <p>There was unanimous support from the FAC to increase the eastern zone female size limit to 120mm.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The FAC considered the eastern zone male size limit.</p> <p>The IMAS member suggested there were limited gains from shifting catch to males and reduces the number of larger male lobsters that can predate on centro, will reduce race to fish reduce recreational catch. Biologically neutral between males 110 and 115.</p> <p>Industry members on the FAC generally supported maintaining males at 110mm. Some industry members supported the 115mm proposal noting this was also the TRLFA position. The strong support from submissions for increasing males and females to 115 was noted. The TRLFA EO emphasized the increased size limit will provide extra protection for the two depleted zones on the east coast where a higher male size limit would contribute to rebuilding and would reduce the high recreational effort in these zones. He also noted an increased size limit will provide extra protection for translocated lobsters and will improve the gain per translocated lobster. Size limit will provide greater protection should catch limits fail.</p> <p>A two step process was suggested with increasing females to 120mm and maintain males at 110 and increase males to 115 down the track once the females had grown through. There was concern that increasing male and females was a too great a hit, particularly in the lower part of the zone. Other industry members supported this proposal.</p> <p>The FAC noted the benefits of having the northern and eastern zone size limits aligned.</p> <p><b>Boundaries:</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>comments, noting there was support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions.</p> <p>The TRLFA CEO informed the FAC that on balance TRLFA supported the Cape Pillar line and noted the implications for rec transiting which are complex.</p> <p>It was noted some commercial submissions supported a line at Marion Bay out through the sand, noting there were operational benefits for both commercial and recreational.</p> <p>A majority of the FAC supported the proposed line at Cape Pillar.</p> <p><b>Southern Zone</b></p> <p><b>Size limit:</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was strong support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions</p> <p>The majority of FAC members supported maintain the current size limits of 105F and 110M.</p> <p><b>Boundaries:</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		The majority of FAC members supported the proposed boundaries for the southern zone size limits.			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>Recreational measures to support the proposed size limit zones</b>	<p><b>Tail marking of recreational rock lobster</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the level of support for the proposal.</p> <p>FAC members noted two size limit zones will reduce the complexity of tail marking requirements. A FAC member suggested that tail clipping increased mortality and caused tail necrosis in lobsters that end up being released, noting this is an issue in some parts of NZ.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Recreational transiting reports</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the level of support for the proposal.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Between size zones</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the level of support for the proposal.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Through closed waters with pots with a gear transiting report</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the level of support for the proposal.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<p><b>Commercial measures to support the proposed size limit zones</b></p>	<p><b>Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting there was support for the proposal from both recreational and commercial submissions.</p> <p>The FAC noted greater than 50% support amongst commercials for the proposal.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal noting the concerns raised in earlier discussion.</p> <p><b>Commercial transit report until automated VMS tools are operational</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the mixed support from commercial submissions, however this was a provisional measure while VMS is being rolled out, will be removed once VMS is fully rolled out.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal</p> <p><b>Changes to definition of commercial transiting</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the mixed support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>A FAC member noted that one of the proposed transiting provisions, the requirement to transit with unbaited pots, is a significant impost on fishing operations (baiting in calmer water before going out into rougher waters is preferred). Some FAC members agreed.</p> <p><b>The FAC supported the proposal, but wanted the requirement to transit without baited pots looked at.</b></p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p><b>Changing a previously nominated fishing area while at sea</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>Other Recreational changes</b>	<p><b>Sharing rock lobster when fishing in a group</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from recreational submissions.</p> <p>The FAC noted this was currently happening and supported the rule change.</p> <p><b>Holding rock lobster on an unattended recreational vessel</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the minimal level of support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>There was Some confusion about length of time a boat can be left on morning at home port vs away camping and going ashore for activities or camping.</p> <p>The majority of the FAC supported the proposal, one member reserved their position suggesting the rule could be exploited.</p> <p><b>Lost or irretrievable gear reporting service</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from recreational submissions.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p><b>Recreational catch reporting</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the mixed level of support from recreational submissions. The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Discontinuing the special recreational rock lobster licence</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the mixed level of support from recreational submissions. The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Presumption of take and possession</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the level of support from recreational submissions. The FAC supported the proposal.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<i>Expanding the 60 pots area</i>	<p><b>Expanding the 60 pots area</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial and recreational respondents including key themes from comments, noting the proposal was highly polarising from a commercial perspective and not supported in recreation submissions.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The NRE Tas member provided the rationale for the original proposal noting the proposal was about increasing efficiency during the China market disruption which is ongoing.</p> <p>The FAC was reminded that it was TRLFA policy as determined at the 2017 meeting to expand the 60 pot area around the state. The TRLFA EO provided some background to the TRLFA position, suggesting that smaller boats have benefited from separation of pots and units along with removal of the length tonnage schedule allowing a boat with 1.5t of quota to use 50 pots, which was driving up the price of quota through efficient singlehanded operators having received a 50% pot upgrade overtime.</p> <p>The IMAS member provided an overview on increasing pot numbers highlighting :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will increase the race to fish in the NE Catch cap.</li> <li>• More effort will be driven to area 5 where lobsters are bigger, and while the price is stronger resulting in more catch coming from the area.</li> <li>• Makes fishing more efficient and reduce number of vessels in fishery.</li> </ul> <p>A majority of industry members on the FAC supported the proposal to extend the 60 pot area. Those who did not support the proposal did so on the grounds that it would increase catch and effort in area 5 were biomass is well below acceptable levels and will drive up the price of quota.</p> <p>The TRLFA provided an alternate proposal with the eastern 60 pot line going through Banks Strait rather than Red Rocks, noting east coast</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>fishers will not see a 60 pot vessel. It was pointed out this alternate proposal would not address the area 5 stock concerns and improved efficiency driving up the price of quota. However, the proposal was supported by the majority of industry members.</p> <p>An industry member put forward another alternate proposal where a boat with crew could go to 60 pots and a single handed boat only use a maximum of 50 pots, generally members supported the proposal, noted small boats are over loaded and can't take the extra pots. TRLFA suggested the proposal would have to be modelled and tested, however supported the development of future skippers in the industry.</p> <p>The TSIC member suggested the concern is wider than just the east coast, with concerns coming out of the NW and King Island, with significant objections amongst industry who contacted the TSIC office, noting the low biomass issues in the NW being of particular concern.</p> <p>The TRLFA CEO suggested the area 5 biological issues were not the same as those observed in area 3. The IMAS member explained that there was less certainty about unfished biomass in area 5, less recreational issues, greater growth rates.</p> <p>It was noted that the FAC could not reach a consensus on the proposal with a majority of FAC members supporting the proposal.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>Commercial changes to improve</b>	<p><b>Loading tank report required when moving lobsters to a holding tank</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the very strong level of support from commercial submissions.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>quota monitoring</b>	<p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Processors to separate and mark catches by size limit zone</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from commercial submissions. However, it was suggested this would be an excessive and significant burden on processors. It was suggested that keeping separated is likely to require lids on bins. In principle processor members supported the proposal.</p> <p>It was noted, the processors group is having discussion with NRE Tas compliance to progress the matter outside of the FAC</p> <p>The FAC supported the principle of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Direct sale lobster weight and coloured regional tags</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial respondents including key themes from comments, noting the level of support for the proposal from commercial submissions.</p> <p>The question was asked will processor making domestic sales be required to use different coloured tags denoting size zone, it was uncertain whether processors would need to use the different coloured tags.</p> <p>FAC Supported however FAC requested clarification on the process for domestic sales.</p> <p>Some FAC members thought that it was difficult at times to record to two decimal places outside in windy conditions.</p> <p><b>Restrictions on setting pots at night</b></p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial respondents including key themes from comments, noting the mixed support for the proposal from commercial submissions</p> <p>An industry member provided additional background to the multiple night shot issues.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal to standardise the time for setting pots at night.</p> <p>A strong majority of FAC members supported removing the prohibition on multiple night shots. One member did not support removing the prohibition, noting more effort in the inshore fishery, having pots set around others in the night.</p> <p><b>Marking of commercial fish cauf buoys</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from commercial submissions</p> <p>It was noted that currently the rules don't allow the moving of a fish cauf from its registered location such as for unloading where they are often towed into shore or a boat ramp. The FAC supported including in the rule amendment allowing the transport of a cauf to shore for the purpose of unloading.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Ports of landing and possession</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the mixed level of support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>There was a level of misunderstanding regarding the proposal and CFAC required further clarification.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		FAC Supported with clarification.			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
	<b>Other commercial management changes</b>	<p><b>Changes to personal possession provisions</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial respondents including key themes from comments, noting the mixed support for the proposal from commercial submissions.</p> <p>An industry member questioned why the full limit could not be taken at one time if desired, the marine police member confirmed the trip limit of 5 aligned with the western recreational daily bag limit.</p> <p>It was pointed out that the average annual number of take home lobsters was around 11, significantly more than the proposal, but the reduction was a good will concession to the recreational sector.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Exclusion of supervisors from the 200 quota unit threshold in certain circumstances</b></p> <p>The NRE Tas took the FAC through a breakdown of submissions for commercial respondents including key themes from comments, noting the low support for the proposal from commercial submissions.</p> <p>It was clear there was a lot of confusion and misunderstanding regarding the proposal</p> <p>The NRE Tas member suggested the proposal would be amended to assess on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>The Chair asked the FAC what they wanted from the rule, the TRLFA wanted to see the circumstances where a supervisor would be exempt</b></p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p><b>from the rule so they could move from vessel to vessel without being caught up by the 200 unit rule.</b> Another industry member thought a licence owner should have the same restrictions as supervisors, equity between the supervisors and licence holders and maintain equity of the 200 unit rule.</p> <p>Noted the NRE Tac compliance member was not present to provide clarity around the proposal and way forward.</p> <p><b>The FAC requested to see the drafting of the final rule</b></p> <p><b>Authorising an alternative pot design</b></p> <p>The FAC noted a mixed level of support from commercial submissions</p> <p>The NRE Tas member emphasised that any changes to pot design will need to go through a rigorous testing process before being approved.</p> <p>The IMAS member noted that a change in pot design would cause issue for the assessment, an implication for CPUE figures.</p> <p>It was noted that any change in pot design would need to meet current escape gap requirements</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>TACC carry-over under exceptional circumstances</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>The FAC noted the TARFish submission on this issue</p> <p>The FAC noted an enabling provision within the rules, for cataclysmic circumstances.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Flexibility to return lobsters to the sea under exceptional circumstances</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the strong level of support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>The FAC supported the proposal.</p> <p><b>Removing giant crab bycatch provisions</b></p> <p>The FAC noted the general support from commercial submissions.</p> <p>It was noted that giant crab fishery was started by rock lobster fishers and was continuation of current circumstances with the take of giant crab bycatch prohibited by rock lobster fishers. The intention is that rock lobster bycatch provisions will be reinstated when the giant crab fishery is in a healthier state.</p> <p>Noted that the FAC was split on the issues with some suggesting that the status quo be maintained by closing the take of giant crab by public notice.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
6	<b>Rock Lobster 2022/23 seasons Dates</b>	<p>The NRE Tas member took the FAC through the proposed season dates noting a roll-over of the current dates.</p> <p>Some industry members suggestion that the NE catch cap should not be open in September, given the poor quality of the fish in the area at that time. The FAC generally supported the NE catch cap closing in September, however suggested consultation on the NE closure date with wider industry.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		Noted ECCA will not likely open in December as it is likely to be caught by August.			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
7	<b>Rock Lobster Harvest Strategy Development Path Forward</b>	<p>The NRE member took the FAC through the background noting a harvest strategy (HS) provides more certainty for the sector.</p> <p>The NRE member suggested the formation of a HS working groups to consider east coast submission and develop the draft HS. With membership open to a wider range of stake holders including Rec, indigenous , comm, gov and science and will cover all sectors and removals from the fishery, including management actions for all sectors.</p> <p>The Chair suggested the process needs to provide advice back to the FAC with the working group to produce the draft harvest strategy.</p> <p>The Chair noted the rock lobster fishery is multi-sector, but the bulk of catch is taken by the commercial sector, and the commercial sector needed to be front and centre and form basis of the working group. He advised to look at other harvest strategies around the country.</p> <p>TRLFA suggested they expected to be represented and suggested a younger fisher be appointed to the committee.</p> <p>An industry member suggested that an independent Chair be appointed and suggested that the CFAC Chair would be a good choice.</p> <p>The FAC supported the process for the development of the harvest stagey.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
8	<b>Giant Crab Management Plan Remake</b>	<p>NRE Tas provided an overview of the process for development of a new giant crab management plan noting the current plan expires on 28 February 2023 noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend the expiry of the current management plan until 28 February 2024</li> <li>• Hold a giant crab industry forum later in the year.</li> <li>• With the theme of the remake from an NRE Tas perspective being centred on compliance issues that have come out of recent investigations.</li> </ul> <p>The FAC supported the proposal in principle, and agreed that it should be discussed further at the next meeting.</p>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
8.	<b>Other business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Otway Basin Seismic Survey</b></li> <li>• The TSIC member provided an overview of a proposed seismic surveys off the WC noting 3<sup>rd</sup> survey in 5 years. At the very early stages of planning.</li> </ul>			

Item	Title	Discussion Points	Action	Who	Timing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="629 244 1496 507">• The TSIC member also drew the FAC's attention to the UK sentient species legislation that has been recently passed suggesting may have implications for the treatment of lobsters including boiling of lobsters alive as commonly happens.</li> </ul>			
9.	Next meeting				

**Consolidated action list**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Progress/ action/ notes</b>
Meeting 88	1	Permanent transfer of caught units. Presently not allowed. Investigate if there is a need to allow	Mal Budd	By next meeting	
89	1	Chair to write to the Harts expressing sorrow for their loss noting the great contribution she made.	Chair	By next meeting	
89	2	The Chair will also write to Hilary Revill thanking her for her service on the FAC.	Chair	By next meeting	
89	3	NRE Tas to cross reference catch and effort with research pot data	NRE Tas	By next meeting	