



Australian Government

Australian Fisheries Management Authority

South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC) Meeting No 38

Meeting minutes

Date: 6-7 November 2019

Venue: AFMA Offices, Canberra

Attendees

Name	Member type
<i>David McGlennon</i>	<i>Chair</i>
<i>Anissa Lawrence</i>	<i>Environment member</i>
<i>Gerry Geen</i>	<i>Industry member</i>
<i>Michael Steer</i>	<i>Scientific member</i>
<i>Daniel Corrie</i>	<i>Interim AFMA member</i>
<i>Shane Dugins</i>	<i>Apologies</i>
<i>Simon Boag</i>	<i>Industry member</i>
<i>Sarah Jennings</i>	<i>Economics member</i>
<i>Toni Clarke</i>	<i>Industry invited participant</i>
<i>Will Mure</i>	<i>Industry member</i>
<i>John Harrison</i>	<i>Recreational sector invited participant</i>
<i>Debbie Wisby</i>	<i>Industry invited participant- phone</i>
<i>Veronica Silberschneider</i>	<i>State invited Participant</i>
<i>Fiona Hill</i>	<i>AFMA invited participant</i>
<i>Nat Riverio</i>	<i>AFMA presenter</i>
<i>Mike Gerner</i>	<i>AFMA presenter</i>
<i>James Van Meurs</i>	<i>AFMA presenter</i>
<i>Brodie Macdonald</i>	<i>AFMA presenter</i>
<i>Sally Weekes</i>	<i>AFMA presenter</i>
<i>Erik Poole</i>	<i>Observer (Sydney Fish Markets)</i>
<i>Max Bayley</i>	<i>Observer (AFMA)</i>
<i>Belinda Norris</i>	<i>Executive officer</i>

Meeting Minutes

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Introduction and apologies

The Chair opened the meeting at 11:00 am and welcomed participants. The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners (Ngunnawal people) past and present on whose land we are meeting and recorded apologies.

Mr Dugins was an apology, the details of which were outlined in letter sent to the SEMAC Chair. Ms Wisby dialled in for the meeting however as the connection was poor, was only able to participate up until agenda item 3.1.

AFMA Manager Research, Yvonne Zunic, discussed *Fisheries Management Paper 1* (FMP 1) with SEMAC members to provide an outline of the roles and responsibilities of the members.

The MAC had a number of questions relating to the specifics of the confidentiality of the papers and agenda and noted that:

- Information discussed at MAC meetings is not publically available until the minutes are finalised and made public.
- If MAC members wish to share papers and information with their constituents, a request must be made to the Chair on a case by case basis.

Action item 38.1. AFMA to confirm confidentiality requirements of the MAC agenda and papers.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda

The MAC adopted the agenda (**Attachment A**), noting minor amendments including a response to Industry member Mr Dugins letter to SEMAC as part of the industry update and two additional other business items. The MAC noted that industry member Mr Boag did not agree with the amount of time allocated to the industry updates. The Chair noted that industry updates are taken as read and additional time was added to the agenda item to address Industry member Mr Dugins letter and concerns.

1.3 Declaration of interests

The MAC reviewed the table of members, invited participants and observers standing declarations. The Chair asked participants to declare any specific conflicts of interest with items on the agenda and any that were not already recorded in the provided table, consistent with requirements in FMP 1.

An updated table of declared conflicts of interest is provided at **Attachment B**.

Conservation member Ms Lawrence noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

Chair Dr McGlennon noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

Industry member Mr Geen noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

Industry member Mr Mure advised a potential conflict of interest with agenda items 3.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6. Mr Mure left the room while the MAC discussed the potential conflict. The MAC noted Mr Mure's knowledge and valuable contribution and agreed that Mr Mure should participate in the discussion on each of the items however, he should not contribute to forming the recommendations for agenda items 3.2, 4.4 and 4.5.

Industry member Mr Boag advised a potential conflict of interest with agenda items, 3.2, 3.3, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8. Mr Boag left the room while the MAC discussed the potential conflict. The MAC noted Mr Boag's knowledge and valuable contribution and agreed that Mr Boag should participate in the discussion on each of the items however, he should not contribute to forming the recommendations for agenda items 3.2, 4.4 and 4.5.

Mr Boag noted that industry members not participating in the recommendation was a change to previous SEMAC practice and was concerned about declining participation of industry in MAC decisions. The Chair noted that the decision included non-pecuniary interests to be considered and members would not be excluded from the discussion only recommendations on key areas.

Industry invited participant Ms Clarke advised a potential conflict of interest with agenda items 3.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. Ms Clarke left the room while the MAC discussed the potential conflict. The MAC noted Ms Clarke's knowledge and valuable contribution and agreed that Ms Clarke should participate in the discussion on each of the items however, she should not contribute to the recommendations for agenda items 3.2, 4.4 and 4.5.

Economics member Dr Jennings noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

Scientific member Dr Steer noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

Industry invited participant Ms Wisby advised a potential conflict of interest with agenda items 3.1, 4.3 and 4.4. Ms Wisby was muted from the discussion while the MAC considered the potential conflict. The MAC noted Ms Wisby's knowledge and valuable contribution and agreed that Ms Wisby should participate in the discussion on each of the items however, she should not contribute to the recommendation for agenda item 3.1.

NSW state invited participant Dr Veronica Silberschneider noted no conflicts of interest with respect to the agenda items.

1.4 Status of actions arising from previous meetings

A consolidated list of outstanding action items from previous SEMAC meetings (**Attachment C**) was circulated to the MAC prior to this meeting. The MAC discussed the items and no issues were raised.

2. Updates

2.1 Managers Update

The interim AFMA member Mr Corrie provided an update to the MAC on the relevant management matters arising since the May 2019 MAC meeting. The MAC noted that the agenda paper was taken as read, and further noted the following during the discussion:

- Industry member Mr Boag expressed his support for the work AFMA has undertaken regarding NSW and school whiting catches and was pleased with the constructive engagement on the issues.
- Conservation member Ms Lawrence noted the excellent work on seabirds undertaken by the industry, and raised the question on when/ if Electronic Monitoring (EM) would be introduced to the trawl sector.
- AFMA interim member Mr Corrie provided the following update on the trawl sector EM trial:
 - The EM trawl trial was finalised in October 2019. While the final report is pending, the trial has shown that EM is likely effective for monitoring interactions with large Threatened, Endangered and Protected (TEP) species in the trawl fishery, however is unlikely to provide useful information on catch and effort.
 - EM as a data collection tool has been considered amongst a suite of tools to meet the data needs and objectives for the trawl sector.
 - The owner of one of the vessels involved in the trial has requested to keep the cameras operational following the completion of the trial.
 - SESSFRAG has recommended that the Fisheries Independent Survey (FIS) as a priority for this financial year (2020) and integrating EM into the fishery in following financial year (2021). A suite of advice will be presented to the AFMA Commission next month for decision.

- Mr Boag advised the MAC that the Seine and Trawl Advisory Group (STAG) will now also include Auto longline (STAAG) and the MAC will receive minutes from the meetings, which will also be made publicly available.
- TEP reporting is made publicly available as part of the quarterly TEP reports.
- A proposal to split the Statutory Fishing Rights (SFRs) for species which exhibit east/west stock structuring was consulted on earlier this year.
 - The feedback provided highlighted that information to support stock delineation was outdated and data that are more recent should be used to update the analysis.
 - There are serious concerns about economic impacts on particular operators if splitting the SFR's occurs.
 - A desktop study is proposed to update the stock structure advice.
- Mr Geen noted that there will be substantial economic impacts with regionalisation and potential redistribution of wealth and suggested that an independent panel should be considered for the allocations.
- Mr Corrie advised the MAC that the updated trawl sector Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) is complete and should be available within approximately a week and the Gillnet ERA is currently in draft form. The manual and auto longline ERA's are yet to be completed.
- An independent industry-funded review of the school shark assessment has been undertaken. CSIRO is currently preparing a response to the review report. The review report is not currently publicly available.
- Conservation member Ms Lawrence provided an update that Humane Society International (HSI) is recommending three new species of sharks and rays (Australian longnose skate, grey skate and whitefin swellshark) for listing and questioned what, if any advice AFMA have provided to the Threatened Species Scientific Committee on these species.

Action item 38.2. An ERA update to be included in the agenda for SEMAC 39, including an assessment of the shark species highlighted by Ms Lawrence.

Action item 38.3 AFMA to determine if advice was provided to the TSSC on the proposed shark listing of three species; Australian longnose skate, grey skate and whitefin swellshark.

2.2 Industry update

The Chair asked the Industry members of the MAC to provide an update on any items arising since the last MAC meeting 6 May 2019. The MAC noted that:

- The Small Pelagic Fishery (SPF) has achieved MSC certification.

- Mures fishing is working with CSIRO on a project to quantify and account for Orca depredation in hook CPUE standardisations. The project is in the data and information-gathering phase.
- A project is being developed to put cameras on nets in the SPF to identify factors involved in dolphin interactions.

2.1.1 Letter to SEMAC from Industry Member Mr Dugins

MAC members noted that Industry member Mr Dugins had written to the Chair raising a number of issues, and advising that he would not attend the MAC meeting.

Key issues raised by Mr Dugins letter were:

- the ongoing issues of management of school shark as a rebuilding species including;
 - the inequity of the application of Electronic Monitoring (EM) across AFMA-managed fisheries;
 - inequality between fisheries in the SESSF regarding management responses and escalating measures in relation to protected species interactions, and
 - the function of SEMAC and its responses to address ongoing management issues.

AFMA provided a brief response to the letter, outlining that a number of the issues have been discussed extensively at both the MAC and Resource Assessment Groups (RAG). The MAC noted AFMA's response and discussed the concerns, noting:

- The AFMA Commission decision to remove net length restrictions was made in 2016 and implemented in 2017 contingent on fishery wide dolphin management arrangements.
 - The rationale for the removal of net length restrictions was to reduce regulatory burden and allow fishers to choose the best combination of gear to suit their operations.
- AFMA noted that there was a period of time when biological data was not collected in the GHAT (observers were removed from vessels when EM was implemented). However, data collection has been undertaken for the last 12 months as part of the industry data collection project.
- SharkRAG will review the school shark rebuilding strategy at their next meeting as part of the annual review process.
- SEMAC noted that the school shark 20 per cent rule is applied at the quota holder level not the boat level.
 - SEMAC noted that as the 20 per cent rule is effective at the fishery (not the boat) level there is concern that Shark RAG may not consider it an issue when reviewing the rebuilding strategy.
 - Mr Mure and Ms Lawrence, with agreement from majority of members of the MAC, noted that there is a potential loophole in the enforcement and implementation of the 20 per cent rule and that targeting of school shark at the boat level may be occurring, which is contrary to the intent of the rule.

Action item 38.4 SEMAC request that SharkRAG consider the 20 per cent school shark retention rule and other additional management options as part of the annual review of the rebuilding strategy and to provide formal advice to SEMAC on the management of school shark.

Mr Corrie noted EM is part of a suite of monitoring tools available for managing the fishery. Its utility should be driven by the data needs and management objectives for each sector, and EM is being considered in other fisheries, including the trawl fishery.

- Mr Boag noted that the trawl fishery was open to utilisation of EM however questioned why it is not being introduced for all Commonwealth fisheries.
- Ms Lawrence reiterated the point that the use of EM should be consistently applied across all fisheries.
- Industry noted concerns about equity across fisheries as related to the use of EM, and a perceived lack of clarity from AFMA about whether it is being considered for other fisheries.
- Ms Wisby raised the lack of cost equality between sectors of the fishery noting that the gillnet sector is required to pay for the ongoing costs of EM when other fisheries do not bear these costs.

The MAC recognised that, while the overall objectives remain the same, AFMA has different approaches to data collection for each sector, including how TEP interactions are monitored and managed. While a consistent approach is preferred, the economic and logistical implications mean implementation will vary between fisheries.

- Mr Boag noted that there should be data collection principles (much like the by-catch principles) that apply evenly to all sectors of the fishery.
- Dr Jennings noted that there is a need to achieve equitable standard of performance in each fishery.
- AFMA recognised that the SESSF data plan and the revised plan needs more information and clarity about the data needs and monitoring options for TEP and bycatch species. The Fisheries Management Strategy is where that information is currently being detailed.

The MAC noted that Mr Dugins had lodged a formal complaint raising serious issues, and suggested AFMA and the SEMAC Chair should respond in an appropriate manner.

Additionally:

- Mr Boag noted that he and some of the fishers he represents could relate to the mental health issues raised and agreed with the seriousness of the issues and how decisions made by AFMA can impact operators.
- Mr Geen noted that the decision to remove net length restrictions was highly contested and suggested when such decisions are made, a review of outcomes should be undertaken at a later date.

Action item 38.5 SEMAC Chair and AFMA to respond to Mr Dugins correspondence regarding SEMAC 38.

3.1 Squid total allowable effort

AFMA introduced the agenda item and asked the MAC to approve the recommendation from SquidRAG to the AFMA Commission that the 2020 Total Allowable Effort (TAE) for the Southern Squid Jig Fishery (SSJF) be set at 550 standard squid jig machines.

Mr Corrie provided an overview of management arrangements and catch and effort for the 2019 season to date:

- Prior to the start of the fishing season (1 January each year), the AFMA Commission determines the TAE as the number of jig machines that can operate in the fishery. In setting the TAE, the Commission considers advice from SquidRAG and SEMAC. SquidRAG considered the TAE on 2 October 2019.
- The SSJF Harvest Strategy implements a system of within-season catch triggers for the SSJF, SESSF South East Trawl (SET) and Great Australian Bight (GAB) sectors. It includes catch and effort triggers that signal the need for assessment and review of management arrangements.
- As of August 2019:
 - The SSJF has caught 245 t (5000 t trigger)
 - Trawl catch was approximately 402 tonnes (2000 t trawl trigger)
 - Combined jig and trawl catch is around 647 t (6000 t combined trigger)
 - Nine SSJF vessels were active in 2019 (30 vessel limit).
- There are 4900 gear SFRs currently held in the fishery. SquidRAG recommended that the 2020 TAE remains at 550 standard squid jigging machines which means 8.7 SFRs are required for each machine. This is consistent with the 2019 TAE and SquidRAG reiterated that this is considered a sustainable level of effort and if fully utilised would not pose a risk to the stock.

The MAC considered the information presented and no questions arose.

Industry invited participant Ms Wisby was put on hold and was not present during the recommendation.

SEMAC Recommendation: support SquidRAG recommendation to the AFMA Commission that the 2020 TAE for the SSJF be maintained at 550 standard squid jigging machines.

3.2 Pink ling closures

AFMA introduced the agenda item:

The Maria Island, Seiner's Horseshoe and Everard Horseshoe closures were first implemented in 2014 via a closure direction to limit the catch of eastern pink ling. Until recently, the only operators allowed in the closures were those who had written approval from AFMA to limit their catches of eastern pink ling to no more than 25 per cent of their total quota holdings (known as ratio vessels).

Over time, various management arrangements, including trip limits, have been implemented to further reduce catches of eastern pink ling. Over the past three seasons, as an alternative to trip

limits and under a co-management agreement, the South East Trawl Fishing Industry Association (SETFIA) have coordinated an arrangement whereby individual operators commit to catching a limited amount of pink ling over the season (known as SETFIA vessels). The SETFIA arrangement has been successful, and the total commitment 'allocated' to SETFIA has not been exceeded. For the 2019/20 season, AFMA amended the closure direction to allow commitment vessels access to the closures.

For the 2019/20 season, operators who are not 'SETFIA or 'ratio' vessels are subject to a 200 kg trip limit and are not allowed in the closures.

Following advice from the Senate Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances, AFMA repealed the amendment on 16 September 2019 on advice that the amendment involved an invalid sub-delegation to SETFIA of AFMA's legislative power under subsection 41A(2) of the *Fisheries Management Act 1991*. This means that operators under the SETFIA arrangements are no longer exempt from the closures, and only 'ratio' vessels are currently permitted (noting no vessels are currently under this arrangement).

AFMA asked the MAC to provide advice on whether the Maria Island, Seiner's Horseshoe and Everard Horseshoe closures should be repealed, or remain in place with limited exemptions, noting the decision to maintain or remove them should be based on their current utility as a means of restricting catch.

The MAC discussed the paper and the following arose from the discussion:

- Prior to the closures being implemented, trawl effort was very low inside the closures, with a total of 136 shots over a four year period, none of which were inside the Maria island closure. Since 1 May 2019, when trawlers were allowed access under the SETFIA arrangement, there has only been one shot in the Everard's closure.
- While the average catch rates inside the closures are not particularly informative because of low effort, there is very little difference historically in the average catch rates for trawlers inside and outside the closures.
- Industry members Mr Boag and Mr Mure noted that the closures were originally voluntarily put into place to restrict catches of pink ling and not due to being localised spawning aggregations.
- Auto longline fishers have always had access to the closures under the 25 per cent rule so catch rates for this sector should not increase.
- Scientific Member Dr Steer noted that spatial closures are not effective for a species that spawn over a large spatial area.
- Previous advice from SERAG has not considered the closures as a means of protecting temporal spawning aggregations for pink ling and that minimising total mortality was the rationale for the closures.

Industry members Mr Boag and Mr Mure and industry invited participant Ms Clark stepped out of the room for the recommendation.

SEMAC recommendation: Support repealing the Maria Island, Seiner's Horseshoe and Everard Horseshoe closures subject to an AFMA desktop review and confirmation that

repealing the closures represents a low risk to the rebuilding of pink ling stocks. This will then be finalised out of session once the review has been undertaken

3.3 South Australian snapper

Mr Dietman, Mr McPhail and Mr Presser from the Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) dialled into the meeting. AFMA introduced the agenda item and provided an overview of the paper.

In order to protect snapper stocks in South Australian (SA) waters that have recently been assessed as depleted, the South Australian Government recently implemented a total ban on snapper fishing for the Spencer Gulf, West Coast and Gulf St Vincent until 31 January 2023. Limited snapper fishing will be permitted in the South East region during the no-spawning period between February and October each year.

The Commonwealth have been asked to implement complementary management arrangements.

In October 2018, AFMA agreed to implement a snapper closure in SA waters from 13 November to 16 December 2018 to complement management arrangements introduced by PIRSA to protect snapper during the spawning period. The closures that AFMA put in place were for this period only and longer term arrangements were contingent on resolving a number of outstanding issues relating to the OCS between the Commonwealth and South Australia, specifically:

- agreement on the quantum of a revised trip limit and bycatch allocation for snapper taken by the Commonwealth;
- ensuring SA management arrangements are effective to prevent, detect and respond to targeting of Commonwealth-managed shark species to ensure catches remain within its allocation under the MOU;
- correcting the OCS to give the Commonwealth the responsibility of managing Bight redfish (*Centroberyx gerrardi*); and
- AFMA and PIRSA considering a data sharing arrangement, including compliance reporting, to ensure timely exchange of catch and monitoring information.

The MAC noted that the current trip limit is 50 kg for snapper for Commonwealth boats and that AFMA and PIRSA are in discussion regarding complementary arrangements alongside the OCS issues above.

PIRSA representatives provided an update to the MAC:

- The main issue is depleted snapper stocks in Spencer Gulf and west coast, and in order to rebuild the stock, strong management is required.
- In the past, PISRA has been able to manage this through closing snapper areas during spawning seasons.
- The southeast zone is now closed until end of January 2020, opening on 1 February 2020 under catch restrictions.

- The closures that have been put in place make it an offence to take and possess snapper in South Australian waters.

The MAC discussed the background and information provided by PIRSA, and noted the following:

- The possession rule highlighted by PIRSA, and how it might apply to Commonwealth operators, is a matter that needs to be discussed between AFMA and PIRSA, and solutions sought.
- The risk that the ban on snapper is likely to shift effort by SA operators to fishing for Commonwealth-managed shark species.
- Mr Boag noted that Commonwealth boats should not be subject to South Australian fisheries laws, however, that Commonwealth trawlers wanted to support PIRSA in sustainable fishing and that the expectation is that South Australia will continue to recognise their current commitments about Commonwealth stocks including shark arrangements under the existing OCS MOU.
- PIRSA representatives noted the SA marine scalefish fishery is also undergoing reform and that reducing the bycatch of shark is part of the review. Catch quotas is one of the options being explored.
- Dr Steer noted there are issues with public perception regarding Commonwealth operators landing snapper in South Australia, and suggested there is potential as part of the research program to acquire biological samples from Commonwealth operators if they were allowed to land snapper.

SEMAC recommendation: SEMAC recognises the need to address snapper issues in SA, but suggested the outstanding OCS issues need to be addressed before implementing complementary snapper arrangement for Commonwealth fishers.

3.4 Data capture project

AFMA staff member Ms Rivero gave a presentation on the data capture project.

In February 2019, AFMA began the Agency Data Capture (ADC) project to deliver a platform that can be used to better collect and share data externally where required. The project to date has successfully completed the technical work required to create an improved IT process for data coming in and out of AFMA, specifically, by implementing an Application Programming Interface (API) gateway.

Key points from the presentation were:

- The project is currently underway and has arisen from a need for a 'digital first' approach to fisheries data capture on an improved and future proof platform.
- AFMA is developing an Application Programmable Interface (API) gateway for the digital exchange of information between clients and AFMA.

- The new platform will allow for improvements on the current e-log system, for example: rolling out changes such as adding/updating data fields captured through e-log software will be easier.
- Fishers will be able to retrieve their submitted data and correct errors when required.
- Third party software providers will be able to connect their products to AFMA's systems far easier than they are able to now.
- Data can be validated against 'Reference lists' held by AFMA. For example, when entering 'Life Status' of a species, the response can be validated against a reference list of allowed responses (e.g. Dead, Alive etc.).
- The ability to reject data that is clearly wrong (for example when a haul is reported to be before the setting of gear).

To date, a number of items in the project have been completed:

- An API for line fishing methods is currently been tested by vendors with intention to release once testing is complete. The line fishing method API includes functionality for the digital submission of Catch Disposal Records (CDRs), which AFMA intends to trial prior to extending to other fishing methods.
- A fish receiver reporting user interface has been created and will be made available to fish receivers to test the digital CDR workflow for line fishers.
- Development of further logbook APIs for all fishing methods with current e-log schemas is currently underway.

The MAC discussed the agenda item and key points raised were:

- Mr Boag noted that eCDRs should be prioritised, the time delays and data entry processes around paper based CDRs need significant improvement going forward. Would like to see crew collected data to be considered under this project.
- The MAC agreed that there is a need to make sure the program is easy to use and noted that usability of software currently on the market has been an ongoing issue. Catchlog intend to release a new software version that is intended to have an improved interface.
- Going forward, fisheries should look to review what is currently being collected through e-logs and consider whether it is the correct information.

4.2 Hagfish

AFMA introduced the agenda item and asked that the MAC note and provide advice on the proposed approach for granting access to operators seeking to fish for Hagfish.

There are currently two trap permits in the SESSF that were historically used for targeting pink ling on the seamount chains off eastern Australia. However, in March 2015, one of the operators' trap permit was surrendered and AFMA issued an amended trap permit (under the *Fisheries Management Act 1991*, Division 5, 32 (8)) to allow the use of specialised trap fishing gear designed to target Hagfish (*Eptatretus cirrhatus*) in the fishery.

Fishing under this permit commenced in May 2015 and this remains the only permit that allows the use of hagfish traps. However, there has been recent interest from at least three other operators to participate in the fishery.

AFMA sought advice from SlopeRAG in December 2014 on how to assess the sustainability of Hagfish. The RAG was unable to provide specific recommendations, however supported the proposal to allow limited fishing, providing a monitoring program was in place and was regularly reviewed. This included compulsory observer coverage initially to allow the collection of length frequency data, catch composition and bycatch information with a view to reassess the fishery once adequate data had been collected.

AFMA then consulted with SEMAC during February 2015 on permitting the use of up to 300 hagfish traps in the area of waters proposed. SEMAC provided support for the fishing operations providing catch and effort data is reviewed by SlopeRAG three and six months after fishing commenced. MAC members also noted that the targeting of hagfish is a temporary arrangement and as such, expected the fishery be subject to further consideration once the level of catch is determined.

In light of recent additional interest in the fishery, there is a need for a more a more formal and structured approach to providing access to the fishery and collecting data. AFMA proposed the following:

- Pending finalisation of the AFMA Exploratory Fisheries Policy (the Policy), develop a Hagfish Research Plan (the Plan) and monitoring framework to enable fishing under scientific permits. The Plan will provide guidance on sampling design, catch limits and how interested operators can apply for permits. The Plan will be considered at SERAG in December 2019.
- Once the Plan is finalised, remove the hagfish endorsement from the current operators trap permit, and invite interested operators (including the current operator) to apply for scientific permits which will allow fishing consistent with the Plan.
- Once the Policy is finalised, issue exploratory fishing permits consistent with the Policy and the Plan. This is preferred to the 'scientific permit' approach because it allows AFMA to collect data, and allocate levies that reflect management demands.

The MAC discussed the proposal and the following arose from discussion:

- All interested operators will need to qualify for scientific permits to be able to fish for hagfish under the Plan.
- Dr Silberschneider noted that there were a number of issues in relation to the hagfish fishery when it first commenced in southern NSW including: lack of communication with NSW regarding the management of the fishery, on-water conflict between trap operators and NSW fishers, and issues around lost gear. She was concerned that the proposal had the potential to cause further issues. AFMA advised that these issues would be addressed under the Plan.
- AFMA need to consider issues around bycatch, fish welfare and handling practices when sampling, gear loss, the spatial distribution of fishing effort and the need for observer coverage when developing the Plan.

SEMAC recommendation: The MAC supported the proposal, noting the Plan will be considered by SERAG in December 2019 and presented to SEMAC at its 2020 meeting.

4.3 Review of EM requirements for the GHAT fishery

AFMA introduced the agenda item and provided an overview of the issues:

There is currently an appropriate level of coverage in the gillnet and auto-longline sectors, with 45 of the 48 active boats (93 per cent) having EM coverage, whereas EM coverage for manual longline and dropline boats are 50 per cent and 26 per cent, respectively.

Concerns have been raised in relation to fishery risks and data needs, particularly about fishing practices on boats without EM. For example, while there is sufficient EM coverage across the fishery to meet reporting requirements under the seabird Threat Abatement Plan (TAP), concerns exist about representativeness of this monitoring and non-compliance with school shark handling requirements (landing live school shark).

AFMA sought feedback on a proposal to amend the Electronic Monitoring Direction (the Direction) to define any boat fishing for more than 100 days, regardless of the method used, and therefore should be required to have EM installed and operational.

The MAC noted that amending the definition would only have minor cost implications, recognising the change will affect one operator that fishes using two different methods for more than 100 days combined, who will be required to install EM.

SEMAC recommendation: Any boat meeting the definition of full time (100 days in line sector) regardless of method or combination of methods is required to have an operational EM system.

The MAC discussed the need for any additional levels of monitoring for the manual longline and dropline sectors of the GHAT, which would involve lowering the days threshold for when EM is required. The MAC noted the following:

- EM is currently installed on four hook vessels that fish in Tasmania and South Australia. While these vessels represent 50 per cent of fishing effort across the sector (as a proportion of hooks set), they are four of forty active vessels, and the EM coverage may not be representative of fishing effort across the fishery.
- While AFMA can meet the current monitoring requirements under seabird TAP without amending the day thresholds for requiring EM, there were concerns about how representative the current coverage is of the entire fleet.

The EM Direction needs to be amended to define monitoring requirements, required by the Seabird TAP, for the dropline method.

- When EM was first introduced, the number of fishing days was used as a threshold to determine requirements for EM. The thresholds were based upon effort in the fishery at the time, and provided a benchmark by which industry could make decisions on how many days they fish in a year. This translated into business decisions for the fishery, and lowering the threshold would likely result in some operators choosing to fish less, or leave the fishery.

- There are significant costs associated with increasing the coverage of EM in the fishery - approximately \$12,000- \$25,000 per boat for EM installations, plus ongoing costs associated with the monitoring program.
- It is unclear if amending the EM threshold will improve any of the issues relating to the potential targeting of school shark, and it is not expected to solve any of the issues related to the 20 per cent school shark to gummy shark retention rules.
- Increased EM coverage would likely improve fishery-wide discard estimates, and would be a potential driver for the change to EM thresholds.

SEMAC recommendation: After significant discussion, and considering the presented information, SEMAC does not support amending the current requirement for EM in the manual longline sector subject to AFMA determining whether current EM coverage is representative of overall hook fishing effort in the GHAT for meeting the requirements of the seabird Threat Abatement Plan.

Action item 38.6 AFMA to consider cost effective approaches to determine whether current EM coverage is representative of overall hook fishing effort in the GHAT for the purpose of reporting requirements under the seabird Threat Abatement Plan.

4.4 GHAT Simplification project

AFMA introduced the agenda item and provided the MAC with an update on the simplification project. The MAC noted that:

AFMA Management intends on distributing a draft implementation plan for the simplification project to the Simplification Working Group and SEMAC in mid-November 2019. The implementation plan outlines the potential steps for simplifying access arrangements in the Gillnet Hook and Trap (GHAT) sector of the Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery (SESSF), including proposals that may be possible to implement this season, two of which were presented for SEMAC consideration.

A key objective of the simplification project is to give fishers the flexibility to access different gear types to catch their quota in the most efficient/economic way and to respond to different market demands. The preferred means of granting this flexibility is to issue a single GHAT SFR that would allow the use of all gear types approved in the fishery. As a step prior to this, AFMA is contemplating options for granting this flexibility on a shorter term basis to assess the interest/ability of fishers to switch between gear types.

To this end, AFMA has developed criteria to provide for the granting of temporary gear permits (similar to the gillnet to hook permits in South Australia), to allow operators to trial different gear types. Applications for permits would be subject to the following criteria:

- applicant must hold an existing SFR in the GHAT (Gillnet, Shark Hook or Scalefish Hook);
- application must be for an already approved gear type;
- the key target species are managed through a total allowable catch limit;

- the boat nominated to the permit must have an operational EM system; and
- the concession holder must adhere to all management measures in place for that method (e.g. spatial closures and mitigation requirements).

AFMA Management proposed these permits could be granted initially on a trial basis only (up to twelve months duration) and would not be transferable.

The MAC discussed the proposal to support the criteria and granting of temporary gear permits in the GHAT and the following arose from the discussion

- The trial of different gear types is part of the stepped process for simplification to determine the level of interest in switching gear use in the fishery.
- No new access rights will be granted through allowing trial of different gear types in the GHAT and it is only allowing people to fish under the existing management arrangements. The delineation is within the GHAT sector and there will be no cross over between fishing sectors.
- There are potential risks to school shark and protected species, however this risk is mitigated through the requirement that to participate in the trial, EM is a requirement and upper limit of catch is quota management system.
- The gummy shark stock assessment is complicated by changing gear types, but there are ways of accounting for this when standardising CPUE.

SEMAC recommendation: Support the criteria and granting temporary gear permits in the GHAT to allow operators to trial different gear types for up to twelve months.

Action item 38.7 AFMA to notify SharkRAG of the potential for changing gear types as part of the 12 month trial and its possible implications for stocks assessments.

The MAC noted the proposal to remove the 100 kilogram trip limit for shark for boats who hold both Scalefish Hook SFRs and a concession to target sharks using hooks (permit or SFR).

The MAC noted:

- The measures were intended to prevent holders of scalefish hook concession holders from targeting gummy shark.
- This was considered at SEMAC 37 and the MAC advised that it should only be considered amongst other broader changes to the fishery through the simplification project because of concerns about potential increases in catch of School shark.
- The proposal was refined to apply only to holders who are 'dual endorsed'. i.e. those that hold concessions to fish for both shark and scalefish.
- Previously, the primary concern surrounding removing the 100 kg trip limit was related to the potential for increase in effort and the impact on school shark.
- This proposal will deliver significant economic efficiencies for operators who are dual endorsed and is consistent with the broader GHAT simplification project objectives
- Effort is not expected to increase by removing the 100 kg trip limit for dual endorsed boats.

SEMAC recommendation: Support the removal of the 100 kg trip limit on boats who hold both Scalefish Hook SFRs and a concession to target sharks using hooks (permit or SFR).

Action item 38.8 AFMA to investigate the introduction of a shark 'trigger' for all Scalefish Hook SFRs, similar to that applicable to Auto longline permits.

4.5 Upper slope dogfish management review

AFMA outlined that it is starting the five year review of the Upper Slope Dogfish Management Strategy (the Strategy) which aims to recover four species of dogfish: Harrison's Dogfish (*Centrophorus harrissoni*), Southern Dogfish (*C.zeehani*) (both listed as conservation dependent under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*), Endeavour Dogfish (*C. moluccensis*) and Greeneye Spurdog (*Squalus chloroculus*).

To inform the five year review of the Strategy, AFMA will be consulting CSIRO, the Department of Environment and the public between October 2019 and January 2020 with any changes implemented at the start of the new fishing season, 1 May 2020.

SEMAC noted/discussed the following points:

- Given the extensive work supporting the development of the Strategy and no new information, AFMA is not intending to make significant changes.
- A project scope has been submitted to COMRAC for consideration for funding in 2020-21. The project is intended to execute the preferred option for collecting baseline data to support a monitor program for the recovery of upper-slope dogfish.
- AFMA has received a number of proposals from industry requesting changes to some aspects of the Strategy, which are being considered as a part of the review.
 - Preliminary advice from SEMAC is being sought on AFMA's proposed response to these proposals prior to broader consultation. Final SEMAC advice would be sought at the February meeting following the broader consultation.
 - GABMAC will be considering the proposal from the Great Australian Bight Industry Association regarding the Kangaroo Hill and Racetrack/Hamburger closures. SEMAC noted AFMA's intention was to keep closures in place in waters shallower than 700 m.
- Regarding the industry proposal to allow dropline fishing in all dogfish closures within the area of the GHAT:
 - Industry are of the view that they can minimise the risk of catching them by only fishing during the day and not setting hooks on the bottom. Dogfish move into shallow water at night to feed and tend to occur on the bottom so these two operational changes in their view, reduce the likelihood of interactions.
- Regarding the industry proposal to retain *Squalus* species other than *S. chloroculus*:
 - In the western part of the GHAT a large number of *squalus* species, not *S. chloroculus*, are encountered at times and if the broader group of species are not of concern, industry would like to flexibility to retain them. Industry is confident in their ability to distinguish between the listed species Harrison's dogfish, southern dogfish, endeavour dogfish and *S. chloroculus* from the broader *squalidae* family of dogfish, which are not listed.

- Regarding the concession conditions that outline prescriptive handling practices for dogfish caught by hook methods:
 - A new bycatch handling rule applies across Commonwealth fisheries for all bycatch, which mandates principles of bycatch handling conditions, removing the need for the prescriptive dogfish conditions.
 - Despite this, some concern was raised regarding the removal of the explicit condition that does not permit dogfish to pass through the dehooker.

SEMAC recommendation:

SEMAC supported AFMA's proposed response to the industry proposals regarding dropline fishing in dogfish closures, the retention of species not at risk and handling practices for dogfish caught by auto longlines:

If dropline fishing in dogfish closures is to be considered, a project to demonstrate that this method can be used in a manner that has little impact on dogfish is required and if successful, a high level of on-going monitoring would be required with the costs borne by industry.

If the retention of *Squalus* species other than *Squalus chloroculus* is to be considered, industry need to demonstrate and have it verified by a dogfish expert that they can correctly identify species of concern (i.e. the four covered by the strategy) from those that are not of concern.

Handling practices should be simplified so long as the requirement to not allow bycatch species to go through the de-hooker can still be enforced.

SEMAC noted that AFMA intends to consult on its approach as part of the review and come back to SEMAC in February with its final position that will be presented to the AFMA Commission.

Implementation and transition to a new harvest strategy

AFMA introduced the agenda item.

The SESSF has undergone a period of substantial change. Starting in 2006 with a structural adjustment program that reduced the number of boats in the fishery by around a half, this has included:

- greater focus on ecological risk assessment, protected species monitoring and bycatch management
- fishers targeting a smaller number of key economic species
- the Total Allowable Catches (TACs) for secondary quota species becoming increasingly under-caught
- some stocks continuing to decline, or not recovering, despite reduced fishing effort
- climate driven changes in species productivity

- implementation of the recently revised Commonwealth Fisheries Harvest Strategy Policy and Commonwealth Bycatch Policy.

These changes have led to important research, supported by Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC), in relation to monitoring and assessment, including:

- The Strategic Review of SESSF Monitoring and Assessment (SMARP) (FRDC 2014-203) which considered a suite of monitoring and assessment tools available to find the most effective and cost effective approach under the current harvest strategy.
- Understanding factors influencing under-caught TACs, declining catch rates and failure to recover for many quota species in the SESSF (Declining Indicators) (FRDC 2016-146) which considered potential reasons for under caught quota species and declining CPUE. In the face of climate change and effort-creep, the project recognised that CPUE is not as effective as fishery independent indexes of abundance.

An implementation workshop was held in February 2019 to draw together, evaluate and develop a prioritised list of recommendations and actions from the SMARP and Declining Indicators projects.

Priority recommendations from the SMARP and Declining Indicators project identified by workshop participants will be included in an implementation plan which is due to be finalised shortly.

A workshop of the Multi Species Harvest Strategy Project team was held in August 2019 to bring together a wide range of people familiar with the fishery to pitch harvest strategy ideas based on a number of agreed design criteria and requirements. Teams have been assembled to develop the strategies with the aim of having them as close as possible to being implemented in a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) within six months. The MSHSP is scheduled for completion in October 2020.

Action item 38.9 AFMA to send FRDC multispecies harvest strategy and workshop outcomes to SEMAC members when finalised

4.7 EM direction in SPF

AFMA introduced the agenda item seeking MAC support to implement the *Fisheries Management Act (E-Monitoring Small Pelagic Fishery) Direction 2019* to largely continue the rules already outlined in Statutory Fishing Right (SFR) conditions for electronic monitoring (EM).

A direction under section 40A of the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* is AFMA's preferred method of implementing requirements regarding the installation, maintenance, function tests and provision of information to AFMA for EM.

SEMAC noted that implementing these rules via a direction is consistent with what is done in the Tuna and GHAT fisheries.

Action item 38.10 AFMA to define fishing event in the SPF EM direction

Action item 38.11 AFMA review what is meant by 'catch handling' in view of the cameras in the SPF EM direction and whether that wording is correct given camera angles are not intended to monitor commercial catches in this fishery.

SEMAC recommendation: Support the implementation of the *Fisheries Management Act (E-Monitoring Small Pelagic Fishery) Direction 2019* subject to the term 'fishing event' being defined and wording regarding catch handling being reviewed.

5.0 Other business

Shark Report Card

Environment member Ms Lawrence provided background to the MAC on the recently published Shark futures: A report card for Australia's sharks and rays by Colin Simpfendorfer et al 2019, which provides an assessment on the status of sharks in Australian waters (FRDC Project No **2013/009**).

The MAC noted:

- There is potential overlap between species of concern (white finned swell shark, eastern angel shark, and saddled swellshark) in this report and distribution of Commonwealth fishing effort.
- AFMA should consider potential risk to species identified in the report, and in doing so, consider the outcomes of recently completed ERAs and management approaches to be specified in the Fisheries Management Strategy.

Action item 38.12 AFMA to ensure that all issues relating to species highlighted in the shark report card are being considered as part of the Environmental Risk Assessments (ERA) and any potential risk is identified and managed

EM Piece counts in GHAT Fishery

Industry member Mr Boag raised the issue of understanding the value of piece counts in the GHAT fishery. Mr Boag noted that assessments required data in kgs and that catches are debited to quota in kgs. Also, that the recording of piece counts was very time consuming. Mr Boag, Ms Clarke and Mr Mure noted that the requirement for Skippers to continually look away from the hauling room (on auto longliners) was a potential health and safety concern.

The MAC noted that:

- Electronic Monitoring provides a means of independent verification of logbook data, including piece counts.
- There is a significant cost to reviewing piece counts using EM.
- Historical discard estimates from the Integrated Scientific Monitoring Program are currently used for stock assessments. EM-derived discards estimates using piece counts will be used in future assessments.

Action item 38.13 AFMA and Industry member Mr Boag to report back at SEMAC 39 on the history, rationale and cost of obtaining piece counts using EM in the GHAT Fishery

5.1 Review of Actions and close

AFMA presented the agreed action items; there were no comments from the MAC

Attachments

- A) Final Agenda
- B) SEMAC 38 Declared conflicts of Interest
- C) Action items

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AMG' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Signed (Chairperson)

Date 17 December 2019

Attachment A

South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC) 38 – Agenda

Meeting Date Wednesday 6 and Thursday 7 November 2019

Time Day 1: 11:00am – 5pm (AEST)
Day 2 : 9:00am – 2:30pm

Location Canberra AFMA Offices, Majura Park

Chair David McGlennon

Attendees

Members	Anissa Lawrence	Environment member
	Dan Corrie	Interim AFMA member
	Gerry Geen	Industry member
	Michael Steer	Scientific member
	Shane Dugins	Apologies
	Simon Boag	Industry member
	Will Mure	Industry member
	Sarah Jennings	Economics member
Invited Participants	Debbie Wisby	Apologies
	Veronica Silberschneider	NSW State Invited participant
	Toni Clark	Auto longline sector
	John Harrison	Recreational Sector
	Fiona Hill	AFMA
Executive Officer	Belinda Norris	AFMA
Presenters	Brodie Macdonald	AFMA
	Nat Riverio	AFMA
	Sally Weekes	AFMA
	Mike Gerner	AFMA
	Yvonne Zunic	AFMA
	James Van Meurs	AFMA
Observers	Max Bayly	AFMA
	Erik Poole	Sydney Fish Market

Apologies: Debbie Wisby (calling in for relevant discussions)

Day one 10:30 am – 5:00 pm Marlin and Mackerel Rooms

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Duration and Paper Action</i>
Arrival tea and coffee		30 minutes 10:30am- 11:00am
1. Preliminaries		60 minutes 11:00am – 12:00pm
1.1 Introduction, apologies and brief overview of responsibilities for new members	Chair / Yvonne Zunic	For Noting
1.2 Acceptance of agenda	Chair	For Noting
1.3 Declarations of interest	All	For Noting
1.4 Action items	Chair	For Noting
2. Updates		
2.1 Managers update, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seabirds and mitigation trials, blue eye trevalla, regionalisation, STAG terms of reference, School shark research priority from SESSFRAG, SPF, end of review period dolphin update, ERA and bycatch and discard workplans, Shark and EPBC listing 	Dan Corrie	45 minutes 12:00pm -12:45pm For Noting and Questions
Lunch		45 minutes 12:45pm- 1:30pm
2.2 Industry update 2.3 Response to industry member Shane Dugins letter	All	55 minutes 1:30pm -2:25pm For Noting and Questions
3. Business		
3.1 Squid Total Allowable Effort	Dan Corrie	2:25pm-2:50pm 20 Minutes For Advice
3.2 Pink ling closures	Dan Corrie	35 minutes 2:50pm -3:25pm For Advice
Afternoon tea		20 minutes 3:25pm- 3:45pm
3.3 SA Snapper (call in SA snapper participants)	Dan Corrie	45 minutes 3:45pm-4:30pm For Noting
4.2 Hagfish	Brodie Macdonald	30 minutes 4:30pm – 5:00pm

		For noting and questions
4.0 Meeting close		5:00pm

6:45 pm SEMAC Dinner – Blu Ginger

Day two- 9:00 am – 2:30 pm Marlin and Mackerel Rooms

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Duration and Paper Action</i>
4. Business cont.		9:00am
4.1 Welcome and recommence	Chair	10 minutes 9:00am -9:10 am
3.4 Data capture project	Nat Riverio	35 minutes 9:10 am- 9:40am For Noting
4.5 Upper slope Dogfish Management Review	Sally Weekes	40 minutes 9:40 am- 10:20am For Noting
Morning tea		20 minutes 10:20am-10:40am
4.7 EM direction SPF	Sally Weekes	20 minutes 10:40am -11:00am For Advice
4.6 Implementation and transition to new harvest strategy	Dan Corrie	20 minutes 11:00am -11:20am For Advice
4.3 Review of EM requirements for the GHAT fishery and EM piece counts for GHAT	Brodie Macdonald and Mike Gerner	60 minutes 11:20am - 12:15am For Advice
Lunch		45 minutes 12:15pm- 1:00pm
4.4 GHAT Simplification Project	Brodie Macdonald	60 minutes 1:00pm - 2:00pm For Noting and Advice
4.8 Additional business Shark report card and relevance to SESSF	Chair- David McGlennon	15 minutes 2:00pm - 2:15 pm
5.1 Review of action items	Chair- David McGlennon	10 minutes 2:15pm -2:25pm

Attachment B

South East Management Advisory Committee SEMAC 38

Agenda item 1.3 Declarations of interest

Declared Interest - Last updated: 6 November 2019	
Members	
Ms Anissa Lawrence	<p>Independent consultant. Director of TierraMar Consulting.</p> <p>Undertakes contracts for a number of Conservation NGOs, government departments, non-government agencies and the private sector on a range of fishery related matters.</p> <p>No pecuniary interest.</p> <p>President of the SEA LIFE Trust (ANZ).</p> <p>Director of FISHI International.</p>
Mr David McGlennon	SEMAC Chair- No interest pecuniary or otherwise
Mr Gerry Geen	<p>A partner in Seafish Tasmania Pty Ltd that holds approximately 60 per cent of the SPF Jack Mackerel SFRs, 70 per cent of the Redbait (east) SFRs, 30 per cent of Blue Mackerel (east) SFRs and significant quota holdings in the western zone.</p> <p>Seafish Tasmania Pty Ltd owns a Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Trawl Boat SFR.</p>
Will Mure	<p>Sole Director of Mures Fishing P/L</p> <p>Commonwealth fish receiver permit</p> <p>Tasmania Fish Processing licence</p> <p>Scalefish hook boat SFR</p> <p>SEQ Quota Holding Permits</p> <p>Auto longline Fishing Permit</p> <p>High Seas permit</p> <p>Blue eye trevalla SFR;s</p> <p>Ling SFR's</p> <p>Ribaldo ITP</p> <p>Mixed species ITQ's and SFR's</p> <p>Member of various fishing related associations including SIA, SETFIA, SSIA, TSIC</p>
Dr Michael Steer	<p>Principal scientist at SARDI Aquatic Sciences (Finfish Fisheries)</p> <p>Chair of SERAG</p> <p>Member of SESSFRAG</p> <p>Member of Commercial Marine Scalefish Reform Advisory Committee (SA)</p> <p>Member of Marine Scalefish fishery Management Advisory Group</p> <p>Member of Charter Boat Management Plan Advisory Group (SA)</p> <p>No pecuniary interest in the SESSF</p> <p>Scientific member for South Australian Snapper Management Advisory Committee.</p>
Dr Sarah Jennings	<p>Economics member on SERAG.</p> <p>Economics coordinator, FRDC Human Dimensions Research Subprogram</p>

	<p>Member of AFMA Economics Working Group. Economics member SESSFRAG Independent economics consultant. No pecuniary or other interest.</p>
Mr Shane Dugins	<p>Chair of the Sustainable Shark Fishery Association. Shareholder and Director of a Fishing Company that holds: Commonwealth SFRs including Shark and Scalefish SFRs, leases quota, Victorian and Tasmanian licenses and Victorian Crayfish quota. Representative of the Sustainable Shark Fishing Association. Consultation services provided to AFMA for specialist fishery knowledge</p>
Mr Simon Boag	<p>Non-beneficiary Director of two fishing companies in the SESSF. Industry member on SERAG. SETFIA receives funding from various bodies to complete projects. Involved in the delivery of industry training courses through East Gippsland TAFE. Undertakes contracts as an independent consultant.</p>
Invited participant	
Ms Toni Clark	<p>Employed by Petuna Sealord Deepwater fishing P/L and Australian resident company which holds various fishing rights in,, and operates vessels in the SESSF, GHAT, East Coast Deepwater Fishery, Coral Sea and International fisheries operating a vessel under an Australian flag: Employed by Petuna Fisheries who hold various fishing rights in the SESSF, GHAT, Commonwealth and state (Tasmania) Scallop fishery, East Coast Tuna Fishery, Offshore Fisheries and Tasmania State Fisheries. My pecuniary interest is limited to the extent of an employee of the company.</p>
Ms Debbie Wisby	<p>CEO of a fishing company based in Tasmania. Company/Director holds Commonwealth squid jig SFRs and various Tasmanian licences. Commonwealth Fish Receiver. Member of Squid RAG, invited participant SEMAC, industry representative of Tasmanian Scallop FAC. Local Government Councillor. Consultant for private enterprises on a range of fishery related matters. Advisor to Fishwell Consulting for Squid project 2016/2017 Local government councillor and mayor Consultant for private enterprise on a range fi fishery related matters Company owns vessels active in the Gillnet, Scallop and Squid industries.</p>
Dr Veronica Silberschneider	<p>Acting Senior Fisheries Manager, NSW Department Primary Industry Cross jurisdictional management and research interests for NSW DPI, no pecuniary interest</p>
Mr John Harrison	<p>Executive Chair- Seafood Industry Safety initiative (FRDC) Member- North West marine Park Advisory Committee (Parks Australia) Consultant to the NT Coastal line Fishery fishers (Western Zone\no pecuniary interest)</p>
Mr Brodie Macdonald	<p>AFMA Gillnet Hook and Trap Fishery Manager- No Interest pecuniary or otherwise</p>
Mr Dan Corrie	<p>AFMA Trawl and Scallops Manager- No interest pecuniary or otherwise</p>
Ms Sally Weekes	<p>AFMA Small Pelagic Fishery Manager- No interest pecuniary or otherwise</p>
Ms Fiona Hill	<p>AFMA Demersal and Midwater Manager- No interest pecuniary or otherwise</p>
Executive Officer	

Ms Belinda Norris	AFMA – Senior Management Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest whether pecuniary or otherwise.
Observers	
Mr Max Bayly	AFMA – Fisheries Management Officer- No interest pecuniary or otherwise
Mr Erik Poole	An employee of Sydney Fish market which owns SET quota

Attachment C

Action Item		Member to action	Agenda Item in which the matter was raised	Date to be completed by
38.1	AFMA to confirm confidentiality requirements of the MAC agenda and papers	AFMA	1.1	SEMAC 39
38.2	ERA update to be included in agenda for SEMAC 39	AFMA	2.1	SEMAC 39
38.3	AFMA to determine if advice was provided to the TSSSC on the shark listing of three species.	AFMA	2.1	SEMAC 39
38.4	SEMAC request that SharkRAG look at the 20% school shark retention rule and other additional management options as part of the annual review and to provide formal advice to SEMAC on management of school shark	Brodie Macdonald	2.11	Next SharkRAG meeting
38.5	SEMAC Chair and AFMA to response to Mr Dugins regarding his letter to SEMAC	AFMA and David McGlennon	2.11	
38.6	AFMA to look at cost effective options to determine the representativeness of the current four vessels with EM for the Threat Abatement Plan	Brodie Macdonald	4.3	SEMAC 39
38.7	AFMA to notify SharkRAG the potential for changing gear types a part of the 12 month trial and its possible assessment implication	Brodie Macdonald	4.4	Next SharkRAG meeting
38.8	AFMA investigate the options for changing the trip limit for scalefish hook permits to be in line with the auto longline sector as part of simplification	Brodie Macdonald	4.4	SEMAC 39
38.9	AFMA to send FRDC multispecies harvest strategy and workshop outcomes to SEMAC members when finalised	Dan Corrie	4.5	

Action Item		Member to action	Agenda Item in which the matter was raised	Date to be completed by
38.10	AFMA to discuss with legal department about specifying what is meant by fishing event in the SPF EM direction	Sally Weekes	4.7	ASAP
38.11	AFMA to look at the wording regarding catch handling in the SPF EM direction and clarify wording and meaning	Sally Weekes	4.7	ASAP
38.12	AFMA to ensure that all issues relating to species highlighted in the shark report card are being considered as part of the Environmental Risk Assessments (ERA) and any potential risk is identified and managed	AFMA	4.8	SEMAC 39
38.13	AFMA and Industry member Mr Boag to report back at SEMAC 39 on the history, rationale and cost of piece counts in the GHAT Fishery	Mr Boag and Brodie Macdonald	4.8	SEMAC 39