

## Digital Monitoring Implementation Advisory Group - Meeting Minutes

14 December 2017

Members	Simon Watt (Bell Gully); Stuart Anderson (on behalf of Dan Bolger, MPI); Matthew Perkins (MPI); Laws Lawson (Te Ohu Kai Moana); Jeremy Helson (Fisheries Inshore NZ Ltd); Rob Domanski (Specialty and Emerging Fisheries); Lesley Campbell (FishServe); Amanda Leathers (World Wildlife Fund); Ian Angus (Dept of Conservation); Keith Ingram (NZ Recreational Fisheries Council); Mark Edwards (Rock Lobster Industry Council); George Clement (Deepwater Group Ltd); Geoff Keey (on behalf of Karen Baird); Joshua Barclay (Blue Water Marine Research).
MPI Officials in attendance	MPI: Jamie Campbell; Elizabeth Cossar; Donna Royal; Samantha Long.
Apologies	Dan Bolger (MPI); Karen Baird (Forest and Bird); Daryl Sykes (Rock Lobster Industry Council); Jeremy Cooper (Paua Industry Council); Rosemary Hurst (NIWA), Dr Michael Looker (The Nature Conservancy).

	Discussion and agreed points
<b>1. Welcome</b> <b>Approve minutes of 9 Nov meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The chair welcomed the members and introduced Jamie Campbell (Digital Monitoring Implementation Manager, MPI) to the group.</li> <li>Matthew Perkins is currently the acting Director IEMRS and recruitment is underway for the new Director Digital Monitoring.</li> <li>The minutes from 9<sup>th</sup> November were approved.</li> <li>Action point 3 Meeting 6 has been re-worded according to Amanda's e-mail update sent to MPI, which was relayed to the group.</li> <li>Questions were raised regarding the status of certain closed action items and whether these should be reopened. MPI to revisit these as part of a fulsome review of historic actions.</li> <li>The group would like to see a generic numbering system added to the current actions log for ease of reference [and closed actions dropped to the bottom of the list].</li> <li>The chair made reference to other ongoing stakeholder engagements outside of the IAG. The Chair informed the IAG that the other stakeholder groups were focussing on the more detailed, operational level discussions, whereas the purpose of the IAG was for strategic level discussions.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Update from MPI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stuart updated the group on the Minister's announcements that MPI will not be split out into separate Ministries. It will remain as one organisation and its name will be retained.</li> <li>Four new portfolio-based branches will be established within MPI – Fisheries New Zealand, Forestry New Zealand, Biosecurity New Zealand and New Zealand Food Safety.</li> </ul>

	Discussion and agreed points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-organisation of MPI's functions will occur in the early part of 2018 and will be in place by April / May.</li> <li>• Key cross-cutting capabilities will remain centralised including: Policy &amp; Strategy, International relationships, compliance services, response services, corporate services and information technology and communications.</li> <li>• There will be some re-organisation within MPI to ensure proper focus and structure.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Update on Circulars</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document summarising <i>Stakeholder feedback and how that has been considered in revising circulars for all vessels (excluding greater than 28m trawl vessels)</i> was discussed.</li> <li>• MPI had meetings with TOKM and the SREs on 14<sup>th</sup> Dec (one day prior to IAG), concerning the ER &amp; GPR circulars and discussed with them where the circulars are likely to land.</li> <li>• The 'key themes' document considers all stakeholder feedback received through discussions and the public consultation process and any substantive feedback from the IAG needed to be provided to MPI by the end of the day (14<sup>th</sup> Dec 2017).</li> <li>• The circulars are expected to be finalised before Christmas noting that they will not be released until the Minister has confirmed timelines for ER &amp; GPR.</li> <li>• Some requirements in the circulars will require regulatory amendments which will involve a public consultation process in the New Year. It was noted that the IAG's feedback is welcomed in this process.</li> <li>• Two issues were highlighted by the group in terms of the content of the circulars: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The landing and discards policy which some members of the group consider should be done in parallel.</li> <li>○ The risk that data continuity may be lost. There have been internal discussions with MPI Scientists relating to this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The group would like to see a structured review process of the Circulars (post approval). MPI committed to coming back to the IAG to discuss the draft review process at an appropriate time.</li> </ul>
<b>4. High Level regional engagement planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An overview of the <i>draft implementation hypothesis ER/GPR</i> document was given by MPI which provides a high level view of the activity that needs to occur in order for implementation of ER and GPR to be as smooth as possible. The document received good feedback from the group noting that it takes into account some of the difficult steps and stages that will be encountered.</li> <li>• The implementation hypothesis used a generic 12 month view, with a hypothetical go live around month 10, in order to show the key activities MPI could look at to support the implementation of Digital Monitoring. The group noted this view was developed 'top down' and that any activity included was still to be informed by detailed planning (to determine what was achievable once timeframes had been confirmed).</li> </ul>

	Discussion and agreed points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group was asked for their feedback relating to the key activities, risks and considerations that could impact the hypothesis and any other considerations.</li> <li>• The group requested they be involved in the planning for trials to ensure protected species are considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The group asked how the new technology would work in terms of recording interactions with protected species.</li> <li>○ There was a suggestion that photos could be used as a back-up means of identification.</li> <li>○ There was also a suggestion around in depth training that could be done on the observer program to identify the different species while out at sea.</li> <li>○ The group noted these items were probably best discussed in the detailed planning of any potential trials.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The group asked if data analysis could be included in the review assess &amp; learn item in the documentation.</li> <li>• MPI agreed to develop a glossary of terms for the implementation hypothesis to ensure there was no misunderstanding regarding terminology used.</li> <li>• There was a query around who would deliver the training noted in the implementation hypothesis, MPI or technology providers. This is yet to be decided and would be informed by detailed planning – however, irrespective of who was to conduct the training it would have to be of a sufficient quality to ensure effective transfer of knowledge.</li> <li>• The group noted training needs were going to be very different to that of &gt;28m roll out given the very broad audience (i.e. rest of fishers) and variability in terms of technological savvy, literacy, etc.</li> <li>• The implementation plan will be shared and feedback sought from other relevant forums including the members of the Technical Working Group and Industry representatives. (Noting that MPI was seeking a consensus on the primary components of the implementation hypothesis from the IAG before discussing more broadly).</li> <li>• The group expressed an interest in seeing the policy and regulatory framework work and how these activities related to the components included in the implementation planning (including any dependencies).</li> <li>• Registration of technology solutions was discussed and how it could reduce the liability of the providers. The risk being that the equipment will be built by somebody interpreting the circulars with potentially no fishing background. Registration can de-risk some aspects for the providers.</li> <li>• MPI indicated that the registration or certification of technology solutions was being considered.</li> <li>• There was also some discussion on costs of devices and transmission of information. MPI provided an update around the changes made to the circulars to allow for ‘home base’ data transmission, reducing potential transmission costs for fishers.</li> <li>• There has been some planning completed on setting up regional roadshows. Current thinking was for six or seven roadshows, commencing in later quarter one of calendar 2018, with the primary objective being to inform and educate. MPI would also use this as</li> </ul>

	Discussion and agreed points
	<p>an opportunity to test guidance material with the end audience. The lessons from these roadshows would then be used to develop/evolve the material to ensure it is fit for purpose. A second set of roadshows would be more instructional and were currently earmarked for later in the year (viability to be determined once timeframes have been confirmed).</p>
<b>5.Update on meeting with the Digital Monitoring TWG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a brief discussion at the Technical Working Group (TWG) on the purpose and role of that group (again, to ensure each stakeholder group had a specific purpose), including the frequency of meetings and whether this needed to change (currently monthly)</li> <li>• The feedback from the TWG was that they found the meetings valuable as an information tool and were keen to see them continue. How MPI would continue to engage the TWG and share content relevant for that working group, was being addressed as part of a broader Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.</li> <li>• It was noted that the TWG would gain value from camera providers attending the group as Electronic Monitoring becomes more of a focus (i.e. to be included at an appropriate time).</li> <li>• The Terms of Reference will be reviewed to get the right balance between information sharing and technical discussion (as part of the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy).</li> <li>• The primary discussion focussed on the timing of circulars and implementation timeframes (i.e. the fact these were still to be confirmed).</li> <li>• An update was given on the roll out of ER and GPR to the deepwater trawl fleet.</li> <li>• The technical working group minutes will be distributed to the IAG once approved by the chair.</li> <li>• The ER &amp; GPR survey of deepwater trawl skippers and vessel managers has been sent out. This seeks feedback around the ER/GPR. Implementation process as a whole. The survey closes in late January and the results will be reported back to the TWG and IAG.</li> </ul>
<b>5.Any other business / wrap up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next meeting will be held on 31st January 2018 from 1-4pm.</li> </ul>

Action No	Date Raised	Action	Action Owner	Status
a	14/12/17	MPI to complete a fulsome review of historic actions, including adding additional commentary for closed items (justifying closure) or re-opening and testing whether the appropriate action has been taken. MPI would also reformat the listing to include reference numbering for ease of use [and drop closed actions to the bottom of the list]. MPI would complete this review in advance of the next IAG (items not able to be resolved before end of Jan 18, would be flagged as work in progress in advance).	MPI	Open
b	14/12/17	MPI to develop a structured process for reviewing circulars on an ongoing basis (as required). A draft process would be provided to the group for review and feedback before iterating and finalising. This will be presented back to the IAG once a draft had been completed (not in time for the next IAG meeting).	MPI	Open
c	14/12/17	MPI to provide a glossary of terms related to the implementation hypothesis for ER & GPR. MPI would also update the hypothesis based on early feedback and resend with the meeting minutes.	MPI	Open