

Digital Monitoring Implementation Advisory Group (IAG) – Meeting Minutes
26 October 2018

Chair	Simon Watt (Bell Gully)
Members	Dan Bolger (Fisheries New Zealand), Kevin McEvoy (Fisheries New Zealand), Bill Chisholm (for Robert Domanski-Speciality and Emerging Fisheries Group), Jeremy Helson (Fisheries Inshore NZ Ltd), George Clement (Deepwater Group Ltd), Karen Baird-via Skype (Forest & Bird), Mark Edwards (Rock Lobster Industry Council), Lesley Campbell (FishServe), Kim Drummond (Te Ohu Kaimoana), Joshua Barclay (Blue Water Marine Research), Rosemary Hurst (NIWA-for part of the meeting)
Fisheries New Zealand	Matt Perkins, Chris Bishop, Marie Fitzpatrick, Maria Hansard
In Attendance	Marysia Vluggen (Fisheries New Zealand), Rhyannon (Rhy) Powell (Blue Water Marine Research)
Apologies	Jeremy Cooper (Paua Industry Council), Keith Ingram-due to communication/technical issues (NZ Recreational Fisheries Council), Amanda Leathers (WWF), Robert Domanski (Speciality and Emerging Fisheries Group); Dr Michael Looker (late apology)
Key discussion points	
1) Welcome	The Chair welcomed all IAG members to the meeting, acknowledged Bill Chisholm standing in for Robert Domanski, Rhyannon Powell in attendance as an observer with Josh Barclay from Blue Water Marine Research and who will be standing in for him from time to time. Also a welcome was extended to Marysia Vluggen presenting information today from New Zealand Fisheries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 13th September 2018 Minutes ii. Outstanding Actions Update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Minutes of the Digital Monitoring Implementation Advisory Group Meeting held on 13th September 2018 were accepted and approved. ii. Following a meeting between Fisheries New Zealand and Jeremy Helson last week, it was noted that many of the previously outstanding actions on the action log had either been progressed to resolution or overtaken by events and were now redundant. Actions that the IAG wanted to remain open were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fisheries New Zealand to publish the Information Release Guidelines b. Information to be provided on business continuity and reporting equipment malfunctions (addressed in this meeting) c. Information on Fisheries New Zealand’s decision regarding not certifying technology (addressed in this meeting) d. Information to be provided by Fisheries New Zealand on its approach to cost recovery for geospatial position reporting (timing to be advised separately) e. Cost of equipment/electronic catch and position reporting (Fisheries New Zealand noted it had shared this information in March 2018 and that there was nothing further to update the IAG on as technology providers are currently finalising their offerings; Fisheries New Zealand noted fishers and SREs could approach technology providers directly for this information). f. Fisheries New Zealand to provide a summary timeline for the rollout of electronic catch and position reporting to IAG members. <p>ACTION: Circulate agreed outstanding actions with IAG - what is settled and what is to be progressed/prioritised.</p>

<p>2) Update from Fisheries New Zealand</p>	<p>Dan Bolger updated the IAG on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incoming Director General Ray Smith starts Thursday next week. ii. Minister Nash announced at the Seafood Industry Conference in August that policy work on changes to landings/discards and more agile decision making would occur before any future consideration of on-board cameras. iii. Detailed regulation amendments – Fisheries New Zealand does not yet have draft regulations to share, but intend to share summary information on the regulations with SREs next week. iv. As previously advised Fisheries New Zealand will not be certifying devices. An update was provided on the means by which industry would be supported which include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Enabling test transmission to FishServe o Providing a technology solutions guide to fishers to enable good purchase decisions o Working with technology suppliers on a declaration form o Developing standard reporting procedure for device failure <p>Regulations are expected to have a defence for failing to report electronically in specific circumstances (primarily device failure through design fault).</p> <p>Fisheries New Zealand noted that no feedback had been received from IAG members on criteria that Fisheries New Zealand could apply to move permit holders to different stages in the electronic catch and position reporting rollout, and that exemptions could not be used as a means to bring people forward regardless.</p> <p>Fisheries Data Working Group would meet shortly to look at options mitigate data continuity risks associated with the electronic catch and position reporting rollout.</p> <p>ACTION: Circulate dates of Fisheries Data Working Group to IAG.</p>

<p>3) Key themes: submissions to proposed changes - electronic catch and position reporting circulars</p>	<p>Following submission closing last week on ER/GPR circulars, 11 submissions were received. Several submissions noted the difficult of providing feedback on circulars when regulations were still being developed. The key points from the submissions related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of reporting • Who will have access to information • Costs <p>Fisheries New Zealand noted that they intend to share summary information on the proposed regulation changes with SREs next week.</p>
<p>4) Technology Providers Update</p>	<p>Matt Perkins presented a technology provider update; tabling a technology vendor summary (as at 23 October 2018) and a draft brochure “Technology solutions guide for electronic catch and position reporting”.</p> <p>Some IAG members raised concerns about the robustness/duration of the testing by some/all of the companies listed especially based on fishing operations in New Zealand. Fisheries New Zealand iterated it was a commercial decision for technical providers, and that operating in the test environment was just one assessment criteria of their equipment being able to be brought to market. Fishers needed to understand which solution would work best with their fishing practice before making a purchase decision.</p>
<p>5) ER/GPR Equipment Failure end to End Process</p>	<p>Marysia Vluggen discussed the process for reporting equipment malfunctions to Fisheries Compliance. Feedback off line would be welcomed, with an intention to bring in SREs for a workshop once initial business and emergency flows are consolidated.</p> <p>IAG members noted the following questions which will be integrated into Fisheries NZ workshops and business considerations when developing the processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the minimum standard of a Business Continuity Plan for catch reporting? • What is the minimum standard of a Business Continuity Plan for position reporting? • What would happen if there were no mobile/email communications available at sea? • What criteria would be applied by MPI when issuing a directive to continue fishing? • If a fisher was based in remote locations (such as the Chatham Islands) how long could a directive last (noting the time to fix the device could be extensive)? • Can the regulations be drafted that automatically allow fishing to continue if there is a BCP in place?

<p>6) Annual review of terms of reference for Implementation Advisory Group</p>	<p>The Chair noted that the terms of reference had been circulated with some amendments suggested by Fisheries New Zealand.</p> <p>Confidentiality Members noted that as representative of their organisation they are expected to report back and a default position of confidentiality makes it difficult.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was agreed that default position is everything can be shared, unless specifically noted as confidential, and acknowledged that members would report high level feedback to their organisations. It was noted that conversations or individual perspectives shared at IAG should remain confidential as per the terms of reference. <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members agreed that actions should be captured in meetings and that items would be confirmed at the following meeting (enabling Fisheries New Zealand to consider resources/prioritisation required to support actions) <p>Other Some members noted that the IAG was not being used as an advisory group but a recipient of Fisheries New Zealand information. It was generally agreed that when issues and actions were brought to IAG it resulted in interesting and useful discussions.</p> <p>Membership Members agreed that Josh Barclay’s role was to represent recreational fishers. It was confirmed that proxy representation is covered in the terms of reference (5.3(b)).</p>
<p>7) Any other business, wrap up – date for next meeting (currently scheduled for 14 November 2018)</p>	<p>The next IAG meeting will be rescheduled for late November. Members to be advised.</p> <p>Fisheries New Zealand noted there was an opportunity to hear from Australian Fisheries Management Authority about the Australian experience of implementing digital monitoring. IAG had mixed interest in this so it was agreed this would be set up by Fisheries New Zealand as an open session for interested parties, not occurring at an IAG meeting. This would also be an opportunity to bring an additional representative from interested organisations.</p> <p>ACTION: Schedule open session with AFMA and extend invite to IAG members and their organisations.</p>

Summary Actions

Action No	Date Raised	Action	Action Owner	Status	Action completed by
1	26/10/18	Circulate remaining outstanding actions in a new document. The action log would include extra column – indicating what Fisheries New Zealand was planning to do in light of that action.	C Bishop	Open	
2	26/10/18	Terms of reference to be circulated with agreed edits.	K McEvoy	Open	
3	26/10/18	Circulate meeting dates of the Fisheries Data Working Group.	M Hansard	Open	
4	26/10/18	Schedule open session with AFMA and extend invite to IAG members and their organisations.	M Hansard	Open	