



Australian Government

Australian Fisheries Management Authority

South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC) Meeting 32

Meeting Minutes

Date: 6 to 8 February 2018

Location: Melbourne

Day 1: 11:00am to 5:00pm (AEST)

Day 2: 9:00am to 5:00pm (AEST)

Day 3: 9:00am to 12:00pm (AEST)

Attendees

Name	Membership
Chair	
Diane Tarte	Chair
Members	
George Day	AFMA member
Simon Boag	Industry member
Sandy Morison	Scientific member
Les Scott	Industry member
Gerry Geen	Industry member
Anissa Lawrence	Environment conservation member
Shane Dugins	Industry member (via teleconference for agenda items 3.7 and 3.8)
Invited participants	
Mark Nikolai	Recreational invited participant
Frances Seaborn	State invited participant
Debbie Wisby	Industry invited participant (via teleconference for agenda item 3.4 and day 3)
Sarah Jennings	Economics invited participant
Executive Officer	
Cadie Artuso	Executive Officer
Observers	
Helen Kroger	Chair of AFMA Commission (day 2 only for agenda items 3.1 and 3.2)
Max Kitchell	Chair of Small Pelagic Fishery Scientific Panel (for agenda items 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5)
Presenters	
Brodie MacDonald	AFMA GHAT Manager (for day 1 and 2 only)
Daniel Corrie	AFMA Trawl Manager (for day 1 and 2 only)
Sally Weekes	AFMA Small Pelagic and Squid Manager (for day 2 and 3 only)
Nate Meulenberg	AFMA Compliance (for agenda item 3.12)
Apologies	
N/A	N/A

Day 1: Tuesday 6 February 2018

Agenda Item 1.1 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting at 11:00 am and welcomed participants. The Chair acknowledged the traditional owners past and present on whose land we are meeting. Partial apologies were recorded from Debbie Wisby and Shane Dugins (who could not be present at the meeting but were available via teleconference for some agenda items). Members were advised the meeting was being recorded to assist with the preparation of the minutes and no objections were raised.

Agenda Item 1.2 Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted noting some small changes. The final agenda is at [Attachment A](#).

Agenda Item 1.3 Declaration of interests

The MAC reviewed the table of members', invited participants' and observers' standing declarations as outlined in the revised *Fisheries Management Paper 1* (FMP 1). The Chair asked participants to declare any specific conflicts of interest with items on the agenda or to declare conflicts of interest that were not recorded in the provided table. Following declarations of any specific conflicts of interest, the Chair requested that each member leave the meeting while the

MAC discussed whether the conflict should preclude them from participating in the agenda item. The following conflicts were declared:

- Mr Geen confirmed a conflict of interest with agenda items 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8. The MAC discussed the conflicts, noting that Mr Geen is a quota holder in the Small Pelagic Fishery (SPF) and has a direct conflict with agenda items 3.3 and 3.5. The MAC discussed the conflicts, recognising Mr Geen's knowledge and valuable contribution, the MAC agreed Mr Geen should participate in the discussion and recommendations for agenda item 3.8 and the discussion for agenda items 3.3 and 3.5. Mr Geen excused himself from participating in the recommendations for these items.
- Mr Boag confirmed a conflict of interest with agenda items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8. The MAC noted that Mr Boag is a representative of the Small Pelagic Fishery Industry Association (SPFIA), the South East Trawl Fishing Industry Association (SETFIA) and the Southern Shark Industry Alliance (SSIA) and does not have a direct financial interest in the agenda items. The MAC discussed the conflicts, recognising Mr Boag's knowledge and valuable contribution, the MAC agreed that Mr Boag should participate in the discussion and recommendations.
- Mr Scott confirmed a conflict of interest with agenda items 3.1 and 3.7. Noting Mr Scott represents a company which holds a large proportion of quota for four species in the Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery (SESSF), being pink ling, ribaldo, blue grenadier and blue eye trevalla. The MAC discussed the conflict, recognising Mr Scott's knowledge and valuable contribution, the MAC agreed Mr Scott should participate in the discussion and recommendations for all species except for pink ling, ribaldo, blue grenadier and blue eye trevalla, where Mr Scott excused himself from participating in the recommendations.
- Mr Nikolai, as a new participant of the MAC, noted his conflicts of interest, but was not aware of any specific conflicts of interests with the agenda.
- Ms Wisby who was available via teleconference for agenda item 3.4 and day three, confirmed a conflict of interest with agenda items 3.4 and 3.9. The MAC discussed the conflict, recognising Ms Wisby's knowledge and valuable contribution, the MAC agreed Ms Wisby should participate in the discussion and recommendations.
- Mr Dugins who was available via teleconference for agenda items 3.6 and 3.7, confirmed a conflict of interest for these items. The MAC discussed the conflict, recognising Mr Dugin's knowledge and valuable contribution, the MAC agreed Mr Dugins should participate in the discussion and recommendations.

An updated table of declared conflicts of interest is at [Attachment B](#).

Agenda Item 1.4 Actions arising from previous meetings

A consolidated list of outstanding action items from previous SEMAC meetings was circulated to the MAC ([Attachment C](#)). The MAC discussed the items and the following was raised:

- The expected implementation date for the quota regionalisation project is 1 May 2020.
- The Western Gemfish Genetic Research Report (titled: Research to underpin better understanding and management of western Gemfish stocks in the Great Australian Bight - FRDC 2014/014) confirmed that there appears to be two reproductively isolated populations

of gemfish, east and west of western Tasmania. AFMA will hold a workshop in March 2018 to discuss western gemfish including improving the assessment.

- The formal establishment of the Southern Trawl Advisory Group (STAG) is underway, with advice being sort from AFMA's legal team regarding broader co-management arrangements.
- The MAC requested an update on protected species interactions.

Action item 32.1 AFMA – AFMA to circulate the next quarterly protected species report, when available.

- The next Marine Mammal Working Group (MMWG) meeting is expected in March 2018.
- The review of the western gemfish trigger limits within the Great Australian Bight Trawl Fishery (GABTF) is still outstanding, noting the expected timeframe for review is 2017-18.

Agenda Item 2.1 Managers updates

The AFMA member provided an update to the MAC on the key manager's items arising since the last MAC meeting on 1-2 November 2017. The MAC noted that:

- AFMA are opening a new office in Lakes Entrance, which is expected to be fully functional by July 2018. The office is expected to have eight employees in total, which will include two compliance officers, one bycatch officer and five officers with responsibility for trawl, squid, scallop and GHAT matters.
- Work is ongoing in regard to co-management arrangements with SETFIA.
- AFMA are currently reviewing the use of Govdex as the platform to disseminate information to the MACs and are seeking the MACs view on its use. The MAC noted that the biggest benefit of Govdex is allowing members to easily access information from previous meetings.

Agenda item 2.2 Industry updates

The Chair asked the industry members of the MAC to provide an update on any items arising since the last MAC meeting on 1-2 November 2017. The MAC noted that:

- The GHAT industry member highlighted their ongoing interest with the gulper shark review.

Agenda item 3.1 SESSF Total Allowable Catch (TAC) recommendations for the 2018-19 fishing season

The Chair introduced the agenda item. The MACs discussion, recommendations and any dissenting views for the SESSF 2018-19 TACs have been provided at [Table 1](#). In forming their views, the MAC noted that:

- the TAC recommendations for elephant fish and school shark will be discussed out-of-session on 21 February 2018
- bight redfish, orange roughy (GAB Albany and Esperance) and deepwater flathead will not be discussed by SEMAC as they have been considered by Great Australian Bight Management Advisory Committee (GABMAC)
- Mr Scott was present for the discussion on this agenda item, but did not participate in the recommendations for pink ling, ribaldo, blue grenadier and blue eye trevalla.

Table 1. MAC discussion, recommendations and any dissenting views for the SESSF 2018-19 TACs.

Species	Discussion	MAC recommendation and any dissenting views
<i>Alfonsino</i>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catches are low because there is limited fishing effort. • There is some fishing effort occurring on the high seas, however changes in the management arrangements between the SESSF and the high seas make harvesting difficult. • Further extension of the TAC should be considered by the RAG with the Strategic Monitoring and Assessment Review Project (SMARP). 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension of the 3 year MYTAC to a 5th year • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 1017 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
<i>Blue eye trevalla</i>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG recommended a single year TAC due to an upcoming stock structure workshop, planned for March 2018. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the single year AFMA TAC recommendation of 462 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2017-18 the MAC recommended a step-up approach (of 50 per cent of the AFMA recommended TAC) in order to improve stability in the fishery. • The industry member noted preference for a tier 1 assessment with a view to Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification in the future. 	
<i>Blue grenadier</i>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catches of blue grenadier remain well below the TAC. The RAG noted this was for commercial reasons (no factory freezer boats fishing the winter spawning fishery) rather than concerns with the stock status. • A stock assessment is planned for 2018. • The MAC noted discards of blue grenadier have been continuously increasing. Consequently, the RAG asked the MAC to consider gear restrictions, with the aim of reducing discards. In their consideration of this, the MAC noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the increase in discards isn't a sustainability issue but a wastage issue b) the increase is likely due to strong recruitment and a lack of factory freezer vessels, which retains all grenadier landed c) there is an EOI going to the FRDC to trial square mesh codends in the Commonwealth Trawl Sector (CTS) for wet boats, which may provide opportunities to reduce discards. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extension of the 3 year MYTAC to a 5th year • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 8810 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • noting the MACs support of fishing technologies that reduce discards and increase gear optimisation and economic profitability (noting the EOI underway may help facilitate this). While discarding is an issue in the wet boat fleet for economic profitability, the economic impact of discarding is not as severe as the economic impact of underutilising the TAC.
<i>Blue warehou</i>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catches of blue warehou in 2016-17 were low. • The RAG advised there is no indication that operators are targeting blue warehou. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA recommendation of a 118 tonne incidental catch TAC.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A survey of recreational fishers in Tasmania is currently underway, the results of which can be considered in the context of the rebuilding strategy. • The MAC queried whether the current take is affecting rebuilding of the stock. The AFMA member noted that there is a project underway looking at undercaught TACs and stock rebuilding, which may address this question. 	
Deepwater shark (eastern)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated tier 4 assessment resulted in a RBC of 9 tonnes. • To provide more stability for industry, the large change limiting rule was applied to the decreased TAC. • The RAG noted a large proportion of the stock is protected by deepwater closures. This, along with changes to commercial fishing practices meant that the RAG was uncertain as to whether the catch per unit effort (CPUE) was reflective of the whole stock. • The industry members noted their concern around the accuracy of the stock assessment, given the deepwater closures. The MAC noted that there is a need for a more robust assessment and that an assessment will be done in 2018, pending an investigation into the level of protection afforded by the deepwater closures. • The MAC agreed that until more information is available regarding the impact of closures on the stock, the best approach is to follow the Harvest Strategy. Noting that catches in the 2016-17 season are close to the recommended TAC for 2018-19, and the trend indicates the TAC will continue to decline. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA single year TAC recommendation of 23 tonnes • the RAG to update the assessment in 2018 and closely examine catch trends, inside and outside the closures • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
Deepwater shark (western)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p>	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an industry proposed step-up approach (at 50 per cent of the proposed TAC increase) noting the low level of catch and to promote

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG accepted the tier 4 assessment, noting that catch rates have increased. • There is more information available for the western stock of deepwater shark than the eastern, however the RAG has similar concerns in that, given the deepwater closures, it is uncertain if the CPUE is reflective of the whole stock. • The RAG noted in their recommendation, that as part of the next assessment, they will examine catch rates in areas inside and outside of the deepwater closures. • Given that the deepwater closures apply a higher level of precaution, a discount factor does not apply. • The industry member noted that catches are low compared to the AFMA recommended TAC, which is significantly higher than the 2016-17 TAC. • The industry members recommended a step-up approach, to provide more stability in the TACs for industry. The MAC supported the staged increase in the TAC. 	<p>stability in TACs, rather than the AFMA TAC recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noting that this is not explicitly provided for in the Harvest Strategy • a single year TAC of 264 tonnes • SERAG will update the eastern and western tier 4 assessments in 2018 to assess the impact of closures on the CPUE index • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
<p><i>Flathead</i></p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2016, the RAG adopted an updated assessment for flathead. The assessment estimated a current spawning stock biomass at 43 per cent of the unexploited stock biomass, which is above the target of 40 per cent. • In setting the TAC for the 2017-18 season, industry members raised concerns that changes in the Danish seine net mesh sizes may not have been adequately accounted for in the tier 1 stock assessment. Industry recommended that AFMA consider a step down approach with a view to updating the stock assessment to account for changes in mesh size. • The Danish seine gear survey was undertaken in July 2017. The RAG considered the results from this survey and agreed that the small increase in mesh size would not affect the outcomes of the assessment. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuation of the MYTAC • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 2507 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.

	<p>The RAG therefore recommended an assessment not be undertaken in 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, the RAG recommended using the single year RBC from the 2016 assessment for the remainder of the assessment period. • The MAC noted that an industry initiative to increase the minimum Danish seine codend size across the fleet is being considered. 	
Gemfish (eastern)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No targeting has been permitted since 2002. • The RAG chose not to proceed with an updated stock assessment, noting that there is limited representative data available. • There is no evidence to suggest that the stock is recovering. • Eastern gemfish is a species being examined in the declining and non-recovering stocks project; this will include consideration of alternative approaches to monitor the status of rebuilding stocks. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA recommendation of a 100 tonne incidental catch TAC.
Gemfish (western)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western gemfish caught under the CTS and Gillnet, Hook and Trap (GHAT) concessions must be covered with quota, while the GAB trawl sector is managed under a trigger limit. • The RAG did not have concerns with stock status, but did recommend a targeted and ongoing data collection program before the next assessment. • The MAC noted the recent genetic research, which indicates there is one stock west of Tasmania. The western gemfish tier 4 stock assessment only assesses the CTS component of the stock. The MAC suggested that any future tier 4 assessment should capture the entire stock, including 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuation of the MYTAC • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 200 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • AFMA to consider outcomes of stock structure research when reviewing GAB triggers in the SESSF Harvest Strategy and future assessments for western gemfish.

	<p>the GAB trawl sector (as is the case for the tier 1 assessment) and that allocation issues need to be considered by AFMA. .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFMA will hold a workshop in June to review the current western gemfish triggers in the SESSF Harvest Strategy and consider data requirements for future stock assessments. 	
Gummy shark	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG did not have concerns with the status of the stock. • Under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), South Australia and Victoria are allocated a portion of the TAC. This allocation is deducted from the RBC. • Tasmanian and New South Wales (NSW) catches of gummy shark are not deducted from the RBC (Tasmania under a trip limit arrangement). The MAC noted that, in their view, these figures should also be deducted from the RBC. • Arrangements with NSW will be worked through in the Southern Fish Trawl project. • Accurate figures on recreational take are not available. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuation of the MYTAC • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 1763 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • the soon to be implemented <i>Commonwealth Harvest Strategy Policy</i> states that the Commonwealth are to ensure that all known sources of mortality are taken into account. This needs to be carefully considered in the review of state catches (including NSW and TAS) as relevant to the TAC.
Jackass morwong	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG noted that the CPUE has generally been tracking down, with some indication of an increase in the most recent year. • The RAG noted that port length frequencies do not show any trends in recruitment, although some slightly younger fish are appearing in the data. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuation of the MYTAC • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 505 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.

<p><i>John dory</i></p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG considered an updated tier 3 assessment noting that, despite updates to the methodology to improve accuracy, there are concerns about their broader application. • The South East Resource Assessment Group (SERAG) recommended considering a tier 4 assessment for john dory, noting that unstandardized CPUE has been relatively flat. • The large change limiting rule was applied to the increasing TAC. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 263 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • noting the application of the large change limiting rule in 2018-19 will result in an additional 50 per cent increase in TAC for 2019-20.
<p><i>Mirror dory</i></p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG noted the tier 4 assessment included discards for the eastern stock but not for the western stock, given the lower level of discards • For the eastern and western stocks, recent CPUE is above the limit but below the target reference point. • CPUE and catches across the fishery have been cyclical over time but have recently declined. The RAG did not recommend a MYTAC because of the cyclical nature of mirror dory stock size and catches. • The MAC noted the TAC recommendations go up and down regularly, due to the fluctuations in the stock. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA single year TAC recommendation of 253 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
<p><i>Ocean perch</i></p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean perch is assessed as two stocks (inshore and offshore). The inshore stock is generally a bycatch species (more than 80 per cent discards) while the offshore stock is only occasionally discarded. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 241 tonnes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG noted the high level of discards (estimated from the ISMP) for the inshore stock created uncertainty in the tier 4 assessment. The tier 4 produced an RBC of 248 tonnes, however when discards were deducted, the resulting TAC is 0 tonnes for inshore ocean perch. • The industry member noted discards are high as there is no market for inshore ocean perch in most states. • Inshore ocean perch is a candidate to be removed from the ocean perch basket and examining a catch trigger instead. This will be investigated as part of the stock regionalisation project. • The TAC presented here is based on the offshore stock. • AFMA, in consultation with the RAG, will consider the application of a tier 1 assessment for offshore ocean perch in the context of the SMARP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • noting that AFMA is pursuing the stock regionalisation project to remove inshore ocean perch from the quota basket.
Orange roughy (Cascade Plateau)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were no catches in 2016-17 due to the remoteness of the fishing grounds and unpredictable nature of the aggregations. • No new information was available to the RAG to change its recommendation. • Orange roughy (cascade) is not a rebuilding species and has been assessed as being well above target. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintaining the AFMA TAC recommendation of 500 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
Orange roughy (eastern)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG noted the 2016 acoustic biomass survey had been successfully completed adding to a time series of acoustic surveys which have been incorporated into the updated tier 1 assessment model. The survey demonstrated continued recovery. • The RAG accepted the base case for the tier 1 assessment. The RAG noted an important sensitivity analysis using lower productivity that had 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 698 tonnes

	<p>been determined after an examination of likelihood profiles for key parameters, one of a spectrum of alternative models. This produced a lower spawning biomass than the base case scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG noted that if the lower productivity model was an accurate representation of the stock, catches applied under the base case model could deplete the stock in the long term. However in the short term, noting that another assessment is scheduled for 2020, there is little difference or risk to the stock by applying either of the catch scenarios. • Noting the sensitivities around orange roughy as a recently rebuilt stock, the MAC questioned why the lower productivity model wasn't used, adding that any increase to the TAC needs to be carefully considered. The RAG advice was that either approach doesn't pose an increased risk to the stock in the short term, and that proper consideration of likelihood profiles would be given as part of the next assessment. • The RAG recommended an acoustic survey be carried out in 2019 prior to the 2020 assessment. • The 7 per cent allocation of the RBC to Pedra Branca in the southern zone was applied, and the large change limiting rule applied to the Pedra Branca and eastern zone TACs. The 31 tonne incidental catch TAC was maintained for the rest of the southern zone. • A 100 per cent undercatch provision is in place for eastern orange roughy to prevent operators catching large bags on an aggregated stock and having to discard fish while trying to fill their quota in the current season. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA undercatch recommendation of 100 per cent and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent • noting the RAG advice that the next survey should be conducted in 2019, prior to the 2020 assessment.
<p><i>Orange roughy (southern) including Pedra Branca</i></p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orange roughy (southern) consists of two components: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Pedra Branca area (which is assessed as part of the eastern stock). 2) The remainder of the southern zone. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 53 tonnes for Pedra Branca • the AFMA incidental TAC recommendation of 31 tonnes for the remainder of the southern zone.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An updated assessment was considered for the eastern zone in 2017. Seven per cent of the eastern RBC is allocated to the southern zone. • The large change limiting rule was applied to the increasing TAC. • The MAC noted that a large proportion of the southern area is closed off to marine parks. 	
Orange roughy (western)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new information was available to the RAG to support amending their previous advice. • The RAG noted that the current incidental MYTAC for orange roughy provides adequate flexibility to industry for landing any unavoidable catch and would not impede the recovery of the stock. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA incidental TAC recommendation of 60 tonnes.
Smooth oreodory (Cascade Plateau)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been no catches of smooth oreodory in this area for the last two fishing seasons. Operators typically catch smooth oreodory when targeting orange roughy on the Cascade Plateau and there has been no recent fishing activity. • The RAG has previously advised that current low effort and catches of smooth oreodory on the Cascade Plateau meant that a tier 4 assessment for this stock would not have any new data. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 150 tonnes (until catches reach 10 tonnes at which time the fishery would be reviewed) • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
Smooth oreodory (other)	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This species is under a tier 5 assessment (depletion based stock reduction analysis) which has been recently included in the SESSF Harvest Strategy to assess data poor fisheries. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continuation of the MYTAC • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 90 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industry members noted that this species is often caught as bycatch when targeting orange roughy. Catches have increased due to the opening of the Pedra Branca area to orange roughy fishing. 	
Oreo dory, basket	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The oreodory basket generally consists of spikey oreodory, warty oreodory, black oreodory and rough oreodory. An updated assessment was undertaken in 2017. The assessment included oxeye oreodory on the assumption that the species was being incorrectly identified. AFMA are looking at training, to help operators correctly identify different species of oreodory. The assessment also included discards because recently discard rates had increased. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 the AFMA TAC recommendation of 185 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.

Day 2: Wednesday 7 February 2018

Pink ling	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pink ling is managed under a global TAC. However, it is known that there are two separate stocks of pink ling (eastern and western). The eastern stock, while assessed as above the limit reference point, still requires rebuilding. Based on catch projections in 2015, the RAG noted that constant catches (total mortality) of 500 tonnes posed a low risk to the eastern stock. Therefore, AFMA implemented a notional total mortality catch limit of 500 tonnes in the east. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuation of the MYTAC the AFMA TAC recommendation of 1117 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent, to be applied to the global TAC the AFMA recommended 500 tonne maximum notional catch for eastern pink ling
------------------	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The industry members noted that there are voluntary arrangements in place to ensure that catches stay under the notional maximum mortality target of 500 tonnes for the eastern stock. This includes restricting catches at 25 per cent of total quota holdings, and commitments from operators to restrict catches to a certain level. • The industry members noted that pink ling in the east is often caught incidentally in the GHAT sector when targeting species such as blue eye trevalla, and adhering to the 25 per cent voluntary commitment substantially impeded their ability to catch other species. • The MAC noted that an assessment is planned in 2018, however plans to separate the quota Statutory Fishing Rights (SFRs) would not be in place until 1 May 2020, and so separate management arrangements in the east may still be required. • The industry members noted that this timeframe is unrealistic as while the voluntary arrangements are working now, there is a lot of pressure on industry to restrict catches, and therefore a risk that the arrangement will fail. • As a short-term solution, the industry member proposed applying a 10 per cent undercatch provision to the eastern notional TAC to allow flexibility for industry in restricting their catches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the industry recommended 10 per cent undercatch, to be applied to the eastern notional catch. Noting this provides more flexibility to industry and does not pose a sustainability risk to the eastern stock.
<p>Redfish</p>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The redfish rebuilding strategy was implemented in 2016. • The RAG considered an updated tier 1 assessment in 2017 which estimated the biomass to be lower than that of the 2014 assessment. The MAC noted the main driver for the recovery of the stock is recruitment. • Catches in 2016 were the lowest recorded. The MAC noted that current catches would allow for the rebuilding of the stock, if average recruitment was occurring. 	<p>The MAC requested that CSIRO provide projections under an average recruitment scenario with an annual catch of 100 tonnes to show the impact on expected rebuilding times.</p> <p>Pending this advice, the MAC will consider the incidental TAC of redfish at their 21 February 2018 meeting.</p>

- The RAG presented two stock projections, under both an average and low recruitment scenario:
 - a) Under average recruitment and 0 tonnes catch under standard harvest control rule, the spawning biomass was expected to reach the limit reference point by ~2024.
 - b) Under the low recruitment scenario, with annual catches of 50 tonnes, redfish would take more than 50 years to recover. The MAC noted this is an unlikely worst case scenario.
- The MAC queried as to whether the RAG considered rebuilding timeframes under an average recruitment scenario with catches of 100 tonnes. The AFMA member noted RAG advice that under an average recruitment scenario, catches of either 50 tonnes or 100 tonnes would be unlikely to make a difference, and catches have not reached this level.

Action item 32.2 CSIRO

CSIRO to provide projections under an average recruitment scenario with an annual catch of 100 tonnes to show the impact on expected rebuilding times.

- The MAC noted that although there is an issue with recruitment, maintaining the incidental catch TAC at the current level would not restrict fishing effort (catches of redfish are associated with flathead), would lower the risk of discarding and therefore would facilitate better data collection. The MAC also noted that lowering the TAC would not be likely to reduce total mortality.
- To further reduce mortality of small redfish in particular, management tools such as closures and gear modifications might be considered. But it was also noted that the location of spawning grounds are not known therefore appropriately placed closures aren't an option for protecting the spawning biomass. The MAC also noted the proposed GAB/CTS trial on gear design to optimise selectivity of trawl gear.

Ribaldo	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG accepted an updated tier 4 assessment. • Catches and discards have been consistently low for the last few fishing seasons. • Discards were not included in the CPUE series and therefore AFMA had not deducted them from the RBC. The MAC noted that the rationale for why discards are not factored into the RBC or the CPUE series needs stronger commentary in the future and that these issues were to be discussed at the next SESSFRAG meeting. • No discount factor was applied to the RBC due to the presence of closures. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 430 tonnes • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
Royal red prawn	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG accepted an updated tier 4 assessment. • CPUE has been noisy but effectively flat since 2003. • Currently above the target reference point. • The RAG supported a proposed research project into gulper shark exclusion devices when fishing for royal red prawn. • The RAG recommended not applying the tier 4 discount, noting this should be revisited if gulper shark closures are amended. The MAC noted again, that the rationale for any deductions needs to be explained. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 381 tonnes • the Research Catch Allowance of 40 tonnes, noting the MACs support of the proposed research project • the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
Sawshark	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAG accepted an updated tier 4 assessment using trawl CPUE, not including discards, as the primary indicator of abundance. Noting that 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19

	<p>trawl CPUE is the best indicator available, as the species is not targeted and cannot be avoided by trawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG noted CPUE is above the target reference point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 430 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent.
School whiting	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG accepted an updated tier 1 assessment. State catches of school whiting are high and have been deducted from the RBC. The industry member noted that state catches have been continuously increasing, at the expense of the Commonwealth TAC, and AFMA should pursue a catch sharing arrangement with NSW as a high priority. The AFMA member noted that discussions are underway with NSW in regard to the Southern Fish Trawl project, and catch sharing arrangements will be prioritised on recent catch levels. Noting the uncertainty in regard to stock structure, the RAG supported a research scoping proposal to be submitted to ComRAC in early 2018. Next assessment to be completed in 2020. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 the AFMA TAC recommendation of 820 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent noting the MACs support of appropriate catch sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and NSW, that effectively balance catch-risk-cost.
Silver trevally	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAG accepted an updated tier 4 assessment. The large change limiting rule has been applied to the decreasing TAC. CPUE over the last three years has been stable. Recreational and state catches of silver trevally are high, noting this species is proposed to move to quota in NSW. Catches are well below the TAC. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a three year MYTAC commencing in 2018-19 the AFMA TAC recommendation of 307 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent noting that state and Commonwealth catches, as compared to the TAC, need to be monitored closely.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The industry member noted that there is a concern with moving to a three year MYTAC for a tier 4 stock. The AFMA member noted that any reduction in the length of the MYTAC would result in increased management costs, and it's a low catch fishery. This is because silver trevally is difficult to target and has low market value. 	
<i>Silver warehou</i>	<p>The AFMA member introduced the item and the following arose from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catch rates have been consistently declining and remain well under the TAC. Not an actively targeted species in the trawl fishery. Recent recruitment rates have been lower than expected, noting the assessment assumes average recruitment. The RAG strongly endorsed undertaking an assessment in 2018. The MAC noted this species is being considered for the undercaught TAC and declining stocks project. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuation of the MYTAC the AFMA TAC recommendation of 600 tonnes the AFMA undercatch and overcatch recommendation of 10 per cent noting the MACs concerns around the stock trends.
<i>Non-quota species.</i>	<p>The AFMA member noted that there was no catch of boarfish or orange roughy due to no effort in the East Coast Deep Water area of the fishery.</p>	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> continuation of the non-quota TACs for ECDWT boar fish and orange roughy of 200 tonnes and 50 tonnes, respectively.

Action item 32.3 AFMA – AFMA to ensure that in future MAC papers, the SESSF TAC recommendations are split between non-recovering (incidental catch allowances) and MYTAC species.

Action item 32.4 AFMA – AFMA to investigate the spatial extent of closures, in the consideration of applying a discount factor to tier 4 assessments.

Action item 32.5 AFMA – AFMA to circulate species summaries with all attachments, including RAG advice and assessment results.

Agenda item 3.2 Elephant fish and school shark update

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the following arose from the discussion:

- Advice on a RBC for elephant fish and school shark will be considered by SharkRAG at its meeting on 12 February 2018:
 - a) In regard to elephant fish, the RAG did not accept the tier 4 assessment using gillnet CPUE including discards, and will consider an updated assessment excluding discards.
 - b) In regard to school shark, the RAG is continuing work on a 'simplified assessment' using close-kin data as an index of abundance. Noting that, at the current early stage of data analysis, this information is unlikely to be robust enough to set a TAC, however it may allow the RAG to provide advice on what level of fishing mortality may be acceptable to inform management arrangements that support rebuilding.
- The MAC will consider these outcomes at a teleconference on 21 February 2018.

Agenda item 3.3 Small Pelagic Fishery Total Allowable Catches for the 2018-19 fishing season

In forming its advice regarding the SPF TACs, the MAC considered:

- advice from the SPF Scientific Panel (the Panel) on the RBCs, noting that:
 - all RBCs are consistent with the 2017 SPF Harvest Strategy
 - SPF stakeholders considered the RBCs at the Stakeholder Forum in December 2017 and no specific issues were raised
 - RBCs for six stocks remain unchanged from the 2017-18 RBCs for six of the seven SPF stocks, as there are no new DEPM results for those stocks and no issues identified in the annual assessments
 - the RBC for jack mackerel west increased due to the results of the 2016-17 DEPM becoming available, the first DEPM to be done for this stock
 - regarding jack mackerel west, the Panel also recommended that catches off Kangaroo Island be restricted to 20 per cent of the RBC given the potential for some stock structuring in this area.
- sources of deductions include state catches, SPF discards, recreational catch (where known) and all catches (retained and discarded) from other Commonwealth fisheries
- there are two options for calculating discards to be deducted from the RBCs to get the TAC:
 - Option 1.* Deducting the absolute discard figures from the most recent fishing season, noting this is consistent with the approach taken in previous fishing seasons.
 - Option 2.* Deducting the overall discard rate from the previous three fishing seasons, which is then applied to the RBC. Noting this differs from the approach used in the SESSF which applies a discard rate to the recent catches to calculate the discard deduction.

- AFMA Management prefer *option 1* on the basis it better reflects anticipated discards in the upcoming fishing season, considering the current level of fishing effort and methods being used, which would not result in the full TAC being caught. However, should the TAC be fully caught, all mortality resulting from discards would be accounted for in subsequent years.
- The Panel prefer *option 2* which assumes the TAC is going to be fully caught and if that is the case this option is more precautionary as it reduces the risk of catches exceeding the RBC. AFMA advised that given the current level of fishing effort, the chance of reaching the allocated TAC is highly unlikely. Further, due to the change in gear type and nature of operations in the fishery from when the data used for the discard figures to current, this approach results in an unrealistic estimate of the discards likely to occur in the SPF during 2018-19.
- that while discard *option 2* is more precautionary, it presents a disadvantage to SPF quota holders, in that the historical discards and catch information (from the previous three fishing seasons) is very different to the current level of effort in the fishery and gives an unrealistic estimate of discards likely to occur during 2018-19
- that major changes to the level of fishing effort do not occur quickly, and the SPF TACs (and discards) are reviewed annually so that any significant change would be picked up and addressed.

MAC recommendation:

- **That the SPF TACs, overcatch, undercatch and determined amounts for the 2018-19 fishing season be set at the levels recommended by AFMA Management as outlined in Table 1, using discard *option 1*.**
- **That, consistent with the Panel's advice, the catch of jack mackerel west of Kangaroo Island be restricted to 20 per cent of the TAC until there is a better understanding of stock structure in this area.**
- **Reviewing (before progressing) the research proposal to improve the understanding of the distribution and abundance of SPF species west of Kangaroo Island, identified by the Panel, should catches of jack mackerel west approach 20 per cent of the TAC in this area.**

Action item 32.6 AFMA and the SPF Scientific Panel – AFMA to work further with the Panel to develop an agreed method of calculating discards, to be applied to the SPF RBCs from 2019-20 onwards. Noting the MAC preference for consistency between fisheries and relevant consideration towards the potential variability in fishing effort.

Action item 32.7 SPF Scientific Panel – the Panel to consider if the samples of blue mackerel east collected by the Geelong Star provide adequate information to increase the Tier 1 harvest rate from 15 per cent to 23 per cent for this species. The higher harvest rate was found to be safe by the MSE work done by Smith et al. however the more conservative rate was adopted on the basis that there was some uncertainty around the adult parameters for this species at the time.

Noting the MACs agreed option for calculating discards, the MACs discussion, recommendations and any dissenting views for the 2018-19 TACs are provided below in Table 2. Mr Geen was present for the discussion on this agenda item, but did not participate in the recommendations.

Table 2. The MACs discussion, recommendations and any dissenting views for the SPF 2018-19 TACs.

Species	Discussion	MAC recommendation and any dissenting views
<i>Jack mackerel east</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biomass estimate from the 2014 Daily Egg Production Method (DEPM) survey was used as the basis for the 2018-19 RBC recommendation. The Panel recommended an RBC of 18 937 tonnes. The preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in a slight increase of the TAC compared to the 2017-18 TACs, due to a reduction in discards and state catches. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 18 890 tonnes for jack mackerel east the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.
<i>Jack mackerel west</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biomass estimate from the 2017 DEPM survey was used as the basis for the 2018-19 RBC recommendation. This is the first time a DEPM survey has been undertaken for this stock. The Panel recommended an RBC of 4197 tonnes. Based on previously known fishing effort, the DEPM survey was conducted west of the bass-strait to Kangaroo Island. Given the spatial range of the survey (no areas west of Kangaroo Island were surveyed), the resultant RBC is considered to be highly conservative. The Panel identified two key spawning areas, which may provide evidence of two separate stocks. Considering this, and the limited information on jack mackerel to the west of Kangaroo Island the Panel recommended as an interim measure, until more is known about the stock structure, that catch taken directly off Kangaroo Island be restricted to 20 per cent of the RBC. This percentage is equivalent to the proportion of the spawning area found during the DEPM survey. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 4190 tonnes for jack mackerel west the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms the Panel's recommendation to restrict the catch of jack mackerel to 20 per cent of the RBC (at 840 tonnes) in the two grids (G54 and G55) off Kangaroo Island until there is a better understanding of the stock structure of jack mackerel in this area. The MAC recommended that if catches of jack mackerel begin to reach the 20 per cent limit, that AFMA and SEMAC, in consultation with the Panel,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel also recommended a research priority utilising the information collected from the previous and upcoming South Australian sardine survey as part of the 2019-20 research priorities. The MAC queried as to why the large change limiting rule isn't applied in the SPF Harvest Strategy, consistent with the SESSF. The AFMA member noted that the difference is that the SPF Harvest Strategy is designed to be flexible to fluctuating levels of fishing effort, and small pelagic species follow a boom and bust pattern, whereas the majority of SESSF species do not. 	<p>review (before proceeding) the research proposal to improve the understanding of the distribution and abundance of small pelagic species west of Kangaroo Island.</p>
Blue mackerel east	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biomass estimate from the 2014 DEPM survey was used as the basis for the 2018-19 RBC recommendation. The Panel recommended an RBC of 12 495 tonnes. The preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in an equal TAC compared to the 2017-18 TAC. The Panel noted there were no adult blue mackerel sampled during the survey so the spawning fraction was adopted based on South Australian samples. The Panel still considered that the more precautionary tier 1 exploitation rate within the Harvest Strategy (15 per cent compared to the 23 per cent as recommended by the MSE testing) accounted sufficiently for the uncertainty in the survey result. Noting that the higher harvest rate was found to be safe by the MSE work done by <i>Smith et al.</i> however the more conservative rate was adopted on the basis that there was some uncertainty around the adult parameters for this species at the time. The industry member noted that previous vessels, operating in the east of the SPF, collected a large amount of adult blue mackerel samples and queried whether their inclusion in the survey would result in any change within the DEPM. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 12 090 tonnes for blue mackerel east the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.
Blue mackerel west	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most recent DEPM for blue mackerel west was in 2005. Based on the SPF Harvest Strategy this stock remains at tier 3. The Panel recommended an RBC of 3243 tonnes. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 3230 tonnes for blue mackerel west

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in an equal TAC compared to the 2017-18 TAC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.
<i>Australian sardine</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The biomass estimate from the 2014 DEPM survey was used as the basis for the 2018-19 RBC recommendation. The Panel recommended an RBC of 9915 tonnes. The Panel noted the recent research which provides an indication of a northern and southern stock of south east Australia, with the stock spilt occurring at approximately the NSW and Victorian border. As the eastern sardine area only runs to the NSW border, the Panel confirmed their previous recommendation that only the northern survey biomass estimate should be used when setting the TAC and only the NSW State catches should be taken off the RBC. The MAC noted that the two options for the calculation of discards provide quite different results. Noting this, the MAC preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in a slight decrease in the recommended TAC compared to the 2017-18 TAC, due to an increase in state catch. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 9510 tonnes for Australian sardine the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.
<i>Redbait east</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most recent biomass estimate for redbait east is an average of two DEPMs conducted in 2005 and 2006. The Panel agreed to continue to apply the approach used previously for the average of the two DEPM estimates. A DEPM survey is currently underway for this species, the results of which are expected in 2018-19. The Panel recommended an RBC of 3444 tonnes. The preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in a slight increase of the TAC compared to the 2017-18 TACs, due to a reduction in discards and state catches. The industry member noted that redbait is commonly caught at night, and previous fishing effort in the SPF was restricted to day hours. Therefore, 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AFMA TAC recommendation of 3420 tonnes for redbait east the AFMA recommended undercatch and overcatch at 10 per cent the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.

	<p>there may be a difference in the CPUE for this species now that fishing effort has changed. The AFMA member noted that there have been no discernible trends in CPUE data for the last five fishing seasons and low catches of redbait east.</p>	
<i>Redbait west</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redbait west is the last remaining stock without a DEPM survey. On the basis of the Harvest Strategy, this stock remains at tier 3. • The biomass estimate from Atlantis modelling was used as the basis for the 2018-19 RBC recommendation. • The Panel recommended an RBC of 820 tonnes. • The preferred option for the calculation of discards resulted in an equal TAC compared to the 2017-18 TAC, noting state catches are negligible. 	<p>The MAC endorsed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the AFMA TAC recommendation of 820 tonnes for redbait west • the AFMA recommended undercatch, overcatch at 10 per cent • the determined weight amount of 2000 kilograms.

Agenda item 3.4 Jigging and line methods in the SPF

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the MAC noted that:

- AFMA has received an application to undertake jigging methods for blue mackerel along with enquiries regarding line fishing in the SPF
- under Section 27 of the *Small Pelagic Fishery Management Plan 2009* AFMA, additional methods can be authorised, within the context of AFMA's legislative objectives
- jigging has previously been trialled in the SPF and this method has been demonstrated as a viable method in other small pelagic fisheries globally
- AFMA consulted with the SPF Scientific Panel, key stakeholders via the SPF Stakeholder Forum and the Squid Resource Assessment Group (SquidRAG) regarding the use of jigging and line methods in the SPF. Key points from this advice include:
 - These methods pose no additional ecological risk to key commercial species and any potential risks to bycatch species, such as seabirds, can be effectively managed through mitigation measures.
 - Observer coverage for the first five trips would be adequate to get an indication of any risk to bycatch species.
 - The rig used to jig for mackerel will have a low chance of catching squid and therefore these methods are expected to have minimal squid bycatch.

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

- Jigging and line methods do not pose any risk to the ecological sustainability of the target species, if catches are within the TAC.
- Some concern that these methods may pose a risk to seabirds, noting that this can be managed through appropriate mitigation measures.
- The squid industry invited participant raised concerns that this method may incidentally catch squid. AFMA noted, consistent with the advice from SquidRAG, that the risk of catching squid is relatively low as the gear required to target mackerel is very different to that of squid (i.e. single, small non baited hooks for mackerel, compared to multi-barbed circular hooks with lights for squid).
- The MAC noted the similarities in the methods for squid fishing and mackerel fishing, and whether this would encourage operators to 'switch' fisheries. AFMA noted that if SPF operators were to target squid, or vice-versa, they would need to hold the relevant SFR conditions.

Action item 32.8 AFMA - AFMA to confirm whether jigging or line methods in the SPF, fall under the definition of 'line fishing' as set out in the *Threat Abatement Plan for the incidental catch of seabirds during oceanic longline fishing operations*.

- A large number of mackerel jig vessels fishing on bait grounds in the SPF, has the potential to generate concerns from recreational fishers.

MAC recommendation. The MAC supported the proposal to authorise jigging and line methods in the SPF on an ongoing basis, provided the following is considered:

- a) **Development of a seabird management plan for each boat prior to any fishing activity (for both methods).**
- b) **An appropriate monitoring regime is developed to ensure adequate data is collected to assess risks regarding protected species and the monitoring of bycatch (including squid), including observer coverage for the first 5 trips.**
- c) **Management arrangements should support potential efficiencies that may be gained by operators wishing to fish both the SPF and SSJF, while ensuring the integrity of existing fishing rights are maintained (i.e. quota SFRs if targeting mackerel, or jig SFRs if targeting squid).**

Agenda item 3.5 Spatial management in the SPF

AFMA is seeking the MACs advice on the application of spatial management arrangements in the SPF.

Mr Kitchell, the SPF Scientific Panel Chair provided some background to the spatial management arrangements as they currently stand and outlined the Panel's advice regarding this rule:

- Spatial management arrangements, in the form of regional catch limits, were initially introduced for mid-water trawling in the SPF in 2015 to distribute fishing effort across the fishery and collect representative data on target species.
- Although the risk of localised depletion occurring in the SPF is low, regional catch limits had the added benefit that they may further reduce the risk by restricting catches in localised areas of the fishery over time.
- The regional catch limits in the SPF were via two mechanisms:
 1. 2000 tonne catch limit that applies to one degree grids (G1 to G120) over a 30 day period
 2. 75 per cent limit on a concession holder's combined quota holdings (eastern or western) that applies in a single management zone (zones 1-4 for western and zones 5-7 for eastern) in a single fishing season.
- Considering the information gained since 2015 in relation to these spatial arrangements, the SPF Scientific Panel (the Panel) advised that:
 - a) the benefit of regional catch limits is minimal in terms of spreading effort to support the collection of representative data on target species as this type of data collection is best achieved through research surveys. This means then that any need for regional catch limits should be considered in the context of localised depletion
 - b) the risk of localised depletion continues to be low due to the highly migratory nature of the target species
 - c) the most appropriate way to ensure sustainability of target species is to set conservative catch limits, which is achieved through the SPF Harvest Strategy.
- In light of this, the Panel recommended to:

- a) remove the requirement that only 75 per cent of an individual's quota holdings can be taken in a single sub-area in a fishing year, as any potential risk of localised depletion is best managed on a finer scale
- b) as a precautionary measure, retain but amend the current trigger of 2000 tonnes in a single grid within a 30 day period, to a percentage (2-4 per cent) of the combined fishery TAC, as this provides a more robust system to changes in the TAC. It was the Panel's view that the current 2000 tonnes had not been effective at moving boats on.

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

- The MAC supported the Panel's recommendation to remove the requirement that only 75 per cent of an individual's quota holdings can be taken in a single sub-area in a fishing year, on the basis that it was not effective.
- In regard to the 2000 tonne catch trigger, the MAC noted:
 - a) That any spatial arrangements should apply to all vessels operating in the SPF, not just mid-water trawl vessels.
 - b) That a percentage (instead of a fixed tonnage) would allow for better tracking of the TACs. However, if this were to be applied, they should apply to the eastern and western combined TACs separately, as there is strong evidence of two separate stocks. Noting that the combined TAC is significantly higher in the east and there are fewer grids.
 - c) The scientific member noted that there are no objectives proposed against which to gauge the effectiveness of 'distributing fishing effort' (i.e. number of grids where fishing activity should occur). Consequently, until these have been agreed, any assessment of the effectiveness of the grids is arbitrary.
 - d) In contrast to the Panel's view, an industry member did consider the 2000 tonne rule to be effective as previous vessels operating in the fishery were forced to move on a number of occasions and it also curtailed trips (which would not be evidenced in the data).
 - e) In previous fishing seasons the 2000 tonne catch limit has worked out to be approximately 8 per cent of the combined eastern TAC. Therefore there is little benefit in moving to a 2-4 per cent TAC limit, given that the 8 per cent was operationally successful at distributing effort and during this time there was no significant change observed in the CPUE (a decline in CPUE would be one indicator of localised depletion occurring).
 - f) The Panel monitor for evidence of localised depletion as part of the Annual Fishery Assessment Report and there is nothing to suggest that localised depletion is occurring or has occurred under the 2000 tonne catch limit.
 - g) The MAC discussed the application of social license which is a bigger issue of concern in the east than the west. An industry member also noted that there are voluntary arrangements in place, which effectively act as move on provisions, relating to fishing activities in the east.

MAC recommendation:

- a) **Consistent with the Panel’s advice, remove the requirement that only 75 per cent of an individual’s quota holdings can be taken in a single sub-area in a fishing year, noting these rules were not effective at spreading effort, and that data collection is better achieved through research surveys and move on rules applied at a finer scale.**
- b) **Maintain the 2000 fixed tonnage limit that applies to one degree grids (G1 to G120) over a (rolling) 30 day period, as this has been successful at spreading fishing effort. Noting that there is no evidence of localised depletion occurring under this rule and that the Panel will continue to monitor any changes in CPUE within the fisheries annual assessment.**
- c) **If there are any significant changes to the CPUE, the regional catch limits should be reviewed again.**
- d) **That the regional catch limits be applied to all vessels operating in the SPF.**

Agenda item 3.6 Net length influences on dolphin interactions

The MAC noted the presentation from the GHAT Manager on trends in net length with dolphin interactions, and the following arose from the discussion:

- Interactions in the GHAT over the past 12 months have been at historically high levels.
- An industry member noted that there have been suggestions from industry that dolphin interactions increase when longer nets are used (the hypothesis is that as the net length increases, so do the interactions). However Mr Macdonald noted that this is not supported by data and there is no consistent upwards trend in interactions related to net length.
- The MAC noted most interactions occur with vessels using 4000 – 4999 metres of net set, which is because there are more boats operating in this category.

The MAC endorsed doing a more robust statistical analysis, when more data is available.

Agenda item 3.7 Electronic monitoring in the GHAT

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the MAC noted:

- At their meeting on 1 to 2 November 2018, the MAC were asked to provide comments on the review of the Direction that establishes the electronic monitoring requirements for gillnet, auto-longline, and manual longline vessels in the GHAT. The advice at the time was that:
 - a) The fishing days threshold and review triggers need to be based on fishery risks and support the data needs of the fishery.
 - b) The priority is ensuring that suitable data is being collected and industry aren’t being subjected to unnecessarily onerous costs.
 - c) That AFMA should complete a cost benefit analysis to examine what the cost would be to collect the appropriate data for the fishery with observers, compared to what it would cost with electronic monitoring, including opportunity costs.

- d) That the MAC be provided with the original costings for the implementation of electronic monitoring in the GHAT.

This information was provided to the MAC on 29 January 2018. AFMA are asking the MAC to provide further advice on the level of monitoring, particularly in the manual longline and dropline sectors of the GHAT. The MAC discussed the matter and the following arose from the discussion:

- AFMA are satisfied that the levels of monitoring in the gillnet and auto-longline sectors are sufficient (with 99 per cent and 94 per cent of activity subject to monitoring in the 2016-17 fishing season). The subsequent levels of catch review also largely meet the needs of the respective protected species strategies and support logbook verification of catch and discard reporting for these sectors.
- As noted at SEMAC 31 the monitoring levels for the manual longline sector is low relative to the gillnet and auto-longline sectors. The MAC noted that when electronic monitoring was originally contemplated for vessels in the GHAT the thresholds (where electronic monitoring would be required) were set at 50 days for gillnet and auto-longline and 100 days for manual longline. This was based on previously known fishing effort, which has since shifted.
- The actual costs of implementing electronic monitoring in the GHAT has been a lot higher than that predicted in the original business case.
- With the exception of biological data collection needs, electronic monitoring provides data on catch verification, seabird TAP monitoring, monitoring handling practices, monitoring compliance with bycatch conditions and monitoring seabird mitigation.
- The MAC was presented with several options regarding the future level of electronic monitoring coverage in the manual-longline sector. The options are:

Option 1: Increased catch review of current vessels with electronic monitoring.

Option 2: Status quo and extra observers to meet TAP requirements.

Option 3: Lower the threshold to 50 days and increase electronic monitoring catch review.

Option 4: Lower the threshold to 30 days and increase electronic monitoring catch review.

- The MAC noted that all options present an increased cost to industry (costs increasing from *options 1 to 4*).
- It is expensive to set up electronic monitoring on a vessel. AFMA noted that at present there are limited suppliers of electronic monitoring equipment. There are also ongoing issues with implementing electronic monitoring including; system maintenance and the cost of replacement hard drives.
- All four options would support the data collection needs mandated by the seabird TAP.
- The MAC noted that *Option 1* is not viewed as effective as the data collected would not be representative of the data needs of the fishery (only a few boats operating in the fishery currently have electronic monitoring installed).
- AFMA Management prefer *option 3*, noting that there would be initial costs incurred by individual boats in installing new systems and an ongoing increase in the cost recovered

budget to account for the additional catch review. The industry member noted, that in their view, the increased cost is too high relative to the GVP of the fishery (irrespective of whether it's immediate or long term).

- The industry members strongly opposed all options presenting a large increase in costs, noting the low GVP of the fishery (i.e. *options 2-4*).
- AFMA noted that data needs are being examined in many Commonwealth fisheries, particularly around what can be achieved through electronic monitoring, and that a large focus of this is capturing interactions with protected species. Electronic monitoring is considered a long-term cost saving in this regard compared to continued observer coverage.
- The MAC noted that previously, biological samples were frequently collected by observers. There are opportunities for this to be done by the crew, rather than paying for observers.
- Noting the previous SEMAC advice that level of monitoring should be balanced to ensure that suitable data is being collected and industry are not being subjected to unnecessarily onerous costs, the scientific member suggested to place observers on the boats without electronic monitoring to compare observations.

The MAC recommended:

- **that the level of monitoring needs to be sufficient to meet the TAP**
- **that observers be placed on boats without electronic monitoring to validate the data from vessels that do have electronic monitoring**
- **that AFMA work further with industry to ensure the costs are effectively balanced with the data needs of the fishery**
- **that SEMAC revisit the item at their meeting in June 2018.**

Action item 32.9 AFMA – AFMA to work closely with industry to provide a more detailed cost benefit analysis, to be presented to the MAC at their June 2018 meeting.

Day three: Thursday 8 February 2018

Agenda item 3.8 SPF Scientific Panel and Stakeholder Forum review

AFMA introduced the agenda item regarding the review of the SPF Scientific Panel and Stakeholder Forum model as an alternative to the Small Pelagic Fishery Resource Assessment Group (SPFRAG) to obtain scientific and economic advice relating to the fishery.

The MAC noted:

- It had already provided preliminary advice at its meeting on 1 to 2 November 2017 as part of the review process.
- Further advice was received from the MAC via an online questionnaire, circulated 21 December 2017 and this meeting was an opportunity to discuss the outcomes of that questionnaire and provide any additional advice.

Consistent with its previous advice, the MAC advised/noted that:

- A key issue in the current model is ensuring a degree of transparency for all stakeholders in the science and economics underpinning the fishery, including ensuring the information is provided at a time in the process that maximises the potential for input and interaction in the formation of the scientific and economic advice.
- That any future model ensures that the cost is appropriate to the level of risk posed by the fishery and level of investment in the fishery (risk-catch-cost trade off).
- That any future model provides the appropriate forum for stakeholder input to be considered, for example if the issues being raised by stakeholders are about the management of the fishery then a management forum as opposed to a scientific forum may be more appropriate.
- Some members were of the view that the operating environment in the SPF has changed (such as the fishery now having an agreed harvest strategy and updated science), reducing the pressure that a RAG would be placed under. Others disagreed with that view on the basis that attendance from a range of sectors at the stakeholder forums has been poor as a result of ongoing, polarising views.
- In other fisheries the RAG model works well however membership, expertise and appropriate training are critical. All members must be made aware of the requirements of the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* and the relevant fishery management framework.
- The *Fisheries Legislation Amendment Bill 2017* was recently passed through parliament and requires AFMA to take into account the interests of the recreational and indigenous sectors when making fisheries management decisions. Given the implementation of this bill, the MAC suggested it may be more appropriate to go back to a RAG model. The AFMA member noted that while this bill has been approved, exactly how it will be implemented within AFMA's operational framework is still being worked through.

MAC recommendation:

- AFMA should amend the model to address the key issues raised, with the view of transitioning back to a RAG.**
- That all RAG or MAC members be provided with training to increase expertise on the technical aspects of the fishery, including the Harvest Strategy and the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* and ensure members are aware of their roles and responsibilities.**
- Recognising the interest in the fishery, public forums should still be held to explain the science or discuss management issues, as the need arises.**

Agenda item 3.9 Authorisation of Transshipment in Commonwealth Fisheries

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the MAC noted that:

- Transshipping has occurred in Commonwealth fisheries over many years and currently occurs in the Northern Prawn Fishery.
- There are a number of reasons that transshipping may be considered beneficial, including maintaining product quality for fisheries that operate long distances from port or for product

that needs processing quickly. Transhipment may also improve the efficiency of fishing operations as it can reduce travel time and fuel costs.

- To guide decision making and create more certainty for the fishing industry regarding when transhipment may be authorised, AFMA has developed a transshipping policy and guidelines.
- Preliminary advice was provided by the MAC at its November 2017 meeting, regarding the implications of allowing/ not allowing transshipping in Commonwealth fisheries. This advice has been considered in the development of the policy.
- The policy applies only to Australian vessels landing to an Australian port and does not pose any implications for existing arrangements, such as landing catch to a foreign port.
- The guidelines have been developed for AFMA staff, and have built in flexibility to allow for fishery specific management arrangements and decisions.
- The policy and guidelines will both be reviewed one year after implementation, and every 5 years thereafter.
- Transhipment activities have a poor reputation internationally, and there is a risk that if this activity is undertaken in Australia that there may be some concerns raised by stakeholders.
- The MAC suggested that the policy requires further guidance on the spatial extent of the area in which it applies (i.e. the Australian Fishing Zone or Exclusive Economic Zone) and also requires clarification as to whether there are any implications regarding state waters and / or fisheries.

MAC recommendation: The MAC supported the draft policy and guidelines on the *authorisation of transhipment in Commonwealth fisheries*, noting that the policy requires further clarification as to the area in which it applies and implications for state waters and / or fisheries.

Agenda item 3.10 Best practice framework for addressing ghost gear

The MAC noted the presentation from the environment and conservation member on the best practice framework for fishing gear management, and the following arose from the discussion:

- Ghost gear refers to any fishing equipment that has been abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded.
- Ghost gear can have significant impacts on marine life and the productivity of industry and coastal communities.
- The recently established Global Ghost Gear Initiative (GGGI) aims to find economically viable and sustainable solutions to the problem. Its membership consists of NGOs, the fishing industry, academia and government agencies.
- The GGGI have developed a framework for best practice in the use of fishing gear, which is aimed at all stakeholders from manufacture, through to use and disposal. The framework was consulted on between April and September 2017, and feedback was received from a

variety of stakeholders throughout all levels of the supply chain, including from within Australia.

- 80 per cent of respondents indicated that regulatory approaches would be best suited to mitigate the effects of ghost gear. The MAC disagreed with this on the basis that regulatory arrangements for fisheries are already quite complex, and this is best pursued through voluntary arrangements with industry. The AFMA member noted a recommendation applying to the Department of Environment and Energy's Wildlife Trade Operation (WTO) accreditation for the SESSF was for 'AFMA to consider further promotion of best practice management of unwanted fishing gear within the Commonwealth Trawl Sector.'
- Industry can voluntarily sign onto the Guidelines, for no cost. There is also an opportunity for the Australian Government to issue a statement of support.
- The scientific member noted that the definition of 'ghost gear' used by this initiative combines discarded fishing gear that may continue to fish (the usual meaning of 'ghost' fishing) and general fishery related litter which does not 'ghost' fish. Ghost fishing is a source of unaccounted mortality, but fishing litter is a different type of problem.

The MAC noted their support for the effective management of ghost gear and recognised the importance of appropriate management for the sustainability of the marine environment.

Agenda item 3.11 Update on Seabird Bycatch Strategy for Commonwealth Fisheries

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the MAC noted the following:

- The AFMA Seabird Bycatch Strategy (the seabird strategy) is the first suite of sub strategies being developed under the overarching AFMA bycatch strategy.
- The seabird strategy aims to ensure consistency in the management of interactions between seabirds and Commonwealth fisheries using a risk based approach. This includes:
 - a) improved data collection and monitoring of seabird interactions
 - b) applying appropriate mitigation and management measures
 - c) streamlining consultative arrangements for seabird bycatch management
 - d) improving environmental stewardship by fishers
 - e) understanding cumulative impacts of Commonwealth Fisheries.
- To date, the draft seabird strategy has been distributed for comment internally within AFMA, and externally to other government organisations and environmental non-government organisations.
- The next round of consultation will be circulating the strategy to the relevant RAGs and MACs, which is expected to occur in the coming months.

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

- The industry members noted their preference for AFMA to pursue a sub species strategy for seals, noting that industry have done a lot of work already on seabirds.

- Consideration should be given to different fishing methods, and the ability to detect interactions (i.e. interactions are less visible in the trawl sector).
- The strategy needs to be strongly aligned with the Threat Abatement Plan on seabirds.

Action item 32.10 AFMA – AFMA to present the seabird strategy to the MAC at their June 2018 meeting.

Agenda item 3.12 Compliance update

The MAC noted the Compliance update from Mr Meulenberg, and the following arose from the discussion:

- The 2017-18 Annual National Compliance and Enforcement Program aims to deter illegal fishing in Commonwealth fisheries and the Australian Fishing Zone. The program consists of four major components:
 1. *Communication and education* – the development and delivery of communication and education strategies aimed at key program areas.
 2. *General deterrence* – a series of inspections targeting high risk ports, vessels or fish receivers.
 3. *Targeted risk* – quota evasion, failure to report interactions or retention and protected/prohibited species and bycatch mishandling.
 4. *Maintenance* – previously identified risks, including failure to have an operational VMS/electronic monitoring system, closure monitoring etc.
- The MAC noted that any quota evasion or failure to report interactions could have a risk to the sustainability of the fishery. Any information that AFMA has on this may be useful in stock assessments.
- The MAC queried as to how many compliance events are found or supported by electronic monitoring. AFMA noted that electronic monitoring is an important component of compliance events.
- Co-management may provide opportunities to improve compliance efforts, including circulating relevant information to members, when required.

Action item 32.11 AFMA – AFMA to circulate the presentation ‘*SEMAC 32 Compliance update*’ to the MAC.

Agenda item 3.13 Fisheries Legislation Amendment Bill

AFMA introduced the agenda item and the MAC noted that:

- The *Fisheries Legislation Amendment (Representation) Act 2017* came into effect in November 2017. The legislative changes mean that AFMA must take into consideration the interests of commercial, recreational and Indigenous fishers in fisheries management decisions.

- AFMA Management are seeking the MAC views on what are considered to be the key challenges facing the MAC in taking into account recreational and Indigenous fishing interests.

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

- The 'Terms of Reference for Resource Assessment Groups' highlights that RAGs need to consider recreational and Indigenous interests with respect to the management of Commonwealth commercial fisheries. The MAC noted this may be more relevant to MACs than RAGs and the Terms of Reference should be amended to reflect this.
- Membership will be the critical challenge, noting that it is important for AFMA to manage the expectations of new members and ensure that adequate training is provided.
- The recreational participant noted that a key concern for the sector is to ensure the socio-economic contributions of recreational fishers are being taken into account, particularly in the RAG discussions.
- Finding appropriate members may be difficult, as any member needs to be able to effectively represent their sector (a major challenge faced by many members) and have the relevant expertise. There is a risk that if different members are on the MACs and RAGs that there would be conflicting management advice on similar issues.
- The MAC also noted that there is very little national representation for the recreational and Indigenous sectors (i.e. representation is generally confined to a specific state or jurisdiction) and this may be an issue for fisheries that cover large areas.
- It is not clear what 'taking into account interests' means and there is a lack of knowledge and data on the extent of both recreational and Indigenous fishing. The MAC noted the nation-wide data collection project being pursued by the Indigenous Reference Group, which may help alleviate this issue.
- It is a key objective of AFMA to maximise net economic returns to the Australian community in the management of Commonwealth fisheries, but objectives relating to socio-economic considerations are primarily incorporated into ecologically sustainable development objectives (which will likely be a key issue raised by the recreational and Indigenous sectors). The AFMA member noted that the AFMA Commission will be considering this in 2018.
- The MAC noted the relevance of this discussion in the review of the SPF Scientific Panel and Stakeholder Forum.

The MAC advised that:

- **A key challenge is finding members that are expert based and are able to appropriately represent the entire sector.**
- **Taking into account Indigenous interests will be challenging as their interests are not directly applicable to all fisheries. There is also no national representation.**
- **There needs to be further clarification as to what 'taking into account interests' means, whether this be economic or social. Noting the limitations in AFMA's legislative objectives.**

- Any new members require explicit training, both on the fisheries legislation and the relevant management framework and the roles and responsibilities of MAC and RAG members.
- The Terms of Reference for RAGS as set out in the Fisheries Administration Paper, need to be amended to clarify that management issues are for the purview of the MAC not the RAG.

Action item 32.12 AFMA and SEMAC – AFMA to prepare a formal response, with contribution from the MAC, summarising the key challenges on taking into account recreational and Indigenous fishing interest, from the MACs perspective.

Agenda Item 4.5 Other Business

The next MAC meeting will be held on 21 February 2018, via teleconference.

With no other items of business raised, the Chair thanked all participants and closed the meeting at approximately 12:00 pm.

Signed (Chairperson):



Date: 14 May 2018

Attachments

Attachment A: SEMAC 32 Final agenda

Attachment B: SEMAC 32 Declared conflicts of interest

Attachment C: Action Items from previous SEMAC meetings

SEMAC 32 Final agenda

Day 1: 11:00 am – 5:00 pm

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Duration and Paper Action</i>
1. Preliminaries		60 minutes 11:00 am – 12:00pm
1.1 Welcome and apologies	Chair	For Noting
1.2 Acceptance of agenda	Chair	For Noting
1.3 Declarations of interest	All	For Action
1.4 Action items	Executive Officer	For Noting
2. Updates		20 minutes 12:00 pm – 12:20 pm
2.1 Any managers items arising since the last meeting	(Verbal) George Day	10 minutes For Questions
2.2 Any industry items arising since the last meeting	(Verbal) All	10 minutes For Questions
Lunch		40 minutes 12.20 pm – 1:00 pm
3. Business		
3.1 SESSF TAC recommendations for the 2018-19 fishing season.	George Day	2 hours 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm For Recommendation
Afternoon tea		15 minutes 3:00 pm – 3:15 pm
3.1 SESSF TAC recommendations for the 2018-19 fishing season (cont.)	George Day	1 hour 45 minutes 3:15 pm – 5:00 pm For Recommendation

Day 2: 9:00 am – 5:00 pm

<i>Agenda item</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Duration and Paper Action</i>								
3.1 SESSF TAC recommendations for the 2018-19 fishing season (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including Simon Boags presentation on undercatch provision for eastern pink ling 	George Day	1 hour 15 minutes 9:00 am – 10:30 am For Recommendation								
3.2 Elephant fish and school shark update	George Day	30 minutes 10:30 am – 11:00 am For Noting								
Morning tea		15 minutes 11:00 am – 11:15 am								
3.3 Small Pelagic Fishery (SPF) TAC Recommendations: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">1. Jack mackerel East</td> <td style="width: 50%;">5. Jack mackerel West</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Blue mackerel East</td> <td>6. Blue mackerel West</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Redbait East</td> <td>7. Redbait West</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Australian sardine</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	1. Jack mackerel East	5. Jack mackerel West	2. Blue mackerel East	6. Blue mackerel West	3. Redbait East	7. Redbait West	4. Australian sardine		Sally Weekes	90 minutes 11:15 am – 12:45 pm For Recommendation
1. Jack mackerel East	5. Jack mackerel West									
2. Blue mackerel East	6. Blue mackerel West									
3. Redbait East	7. Redbait West									
4. Australian sardine										
Lunch		45 minutes 12:45 pm – 1:30 pm								
3.4 Jigging and line methods in the SPF	Sally Weekes	45 minutes 1:30 pm – 2:15 pm For Recommendation								
3.5 Spatial management of the SPF	Sally Weekes	60 minutes 2:15 pm – 3:15 pm For Advice								
Afternoon tea		15 Minutes 3:15 pm – 3:30 pm								
3.6 Data on whether net length influences the dolphin interaction rate	(Verbal) Brodie Macdonald	30 minutes 3:30 pm – 4:00 pm For Noting								
3.7 Electronic monitoring direction for the GHAT Update	Brodie Macdonald	60 minutes 4:00 pm – 5:00 pm For Recommendation								

Day 3: 8:30 am – 12:00 pm

Agenda item	Speaker	Duration and Paper Action
Business (cont.)		
3.8 SPF Scientific Panel and Stakeholder Forum Review – update and next steps	Sally Weekes	30 minutes 8:30 am – 9:00 am For Advice
3.9 Authorisation of Transshipment in Commonwealth Fisheries Policy	George Day	45 minutes 9:00 am – 9:45 am For Recommendation
3.10 Best practice framework for addressing ghost gear	(Verbal) Anissa Lawrence	30 minutes 9:45 am – 10:15 am For Noting
3.11 Update on Seabird Bycatch Strategy for Commonwealth Fisheries	George Day	45 minutes 10:15 am – 11:00 am For Noting
Morning tea		15 minutes 11:00 am – 11:15 am
3.12 Compliance update	(Verbal) Nate Meulenberg	30 minutes 11:15 am – 11:45 am For Noting
3.13 Fisheries Legislation Amendment Bill	(Verbal) George Day	15 minutes 11:45 am – 12:00 pm For Advice

SEMAC 32 Declared conflicts of interest

Declared Interest - Last updated: 6 February 2018	
Members	
Ms Anissa Lawrence	<p>Independent consultant. Director of TierraMar Consulting.</p> <p>Conservation member on SharkRAG</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>
Ms Diane Tarte	SEMAC Chair - No interest whether pecuniary or otherwise.
Mr George Day	AFMA - Senior Manager Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest whether 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>
Mr Les Scott	<p>I, Ronald Leicester Scott (Les) in my capacity as a member of the South East Advisory Committee (SEMAC) provide below a disclosure of my interests that conflict or could conflict with the proper performance of my functions as a member of the SEMAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Director: Petuna Sealord Deepwater Fishing P/L an 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; • Consultant to: Australian Longline P/L an Australian resident company which holds various fishing rights in, and operates vessels in the Australian Sub-Antarctic fisheries (Heard Island and McDonald Islands, Macquarie Island Fisheries) and waters under the jurisdiction of CCAMLR; and • Advisor to PG&UM Rockliff – Petuna Fisheries who hold various fishing rights in the SESSF, GHAT, Commonwealth and State (Tasmania) Scallop Fishery, East Coast Tuna Fishery, Off Shore Fisheries and Tasmanian State Fisheries. <p>My pecuniary interest is limited to the extent of: an employee of the company's and partnership disclosed.</p>
Mr Sandy Morison	<p>Director of Morison Aquatic Sciences.</p> <p>Chair of SERAG, SharkRAG, and Tropical Rock Lobster Working Group.</p> <p>Contracted by government departments, non-government agencies and companies for a range of fishery related matters including research and MSC assessments of AFMA managed and other fisheries (by SCS Global Service).</p> <p>No pecuniary or other interest.</p>
Mr Shane Dugins	Chair of the Sustainable Shark Fishery Association. Shareholder and Director of a Fishing Company that holds: Commonwealth SFRs including Shark and

	Scalefish quota SFRs, Victorian and Tasmanian licenses and Victorian Crayfish quota. Representative of the Sustainable Shark Fishing Association.
Mr Simon Boag	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.
Invited participant	
Mr Christian Pyke	Great Australian Bight Industry Association (GABIA) Executive Officer; Industry member on GABRAG (TBC); GABIA receives funding from various bodies to complete projects; Provision of independent consultancy service to Australian seafood industry; Managing Director of Fisheries Asset Brokers; No pecuniary interest.
Ms Debbie Wisby	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
Ms Frances Seaborn	No interest whether pecuniary or otherwise. Employed by the Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (DPIPWE).
Dr Sarah Jennings	Economics member on SERAG. Economics coordinator, FRDC Social Science and Economics Research Program. Member of AFMA Economics Working Group. Independent economics consultant. No pecuniary or other interest.
Mark Nikolai	CEO of the Tasmanian Association for Recreational Fishing Inc. (TARFish). TARFish is the state govt recognised peak body for recreational marine fishers for Tasmania. Board Member of Marine and Safety Tasmania (MAST). MAST is a statutory authority that was established to ensure the safe operation of vessels (recreational and commercial), provide and manage marine facilities and manage environmental issues relating to vessels in Tasmania. Member of the Tasmanian Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee (RecFAC) which provides advice on fishery related matters to state fisheries responsible Minister Jeremy Rockliff. Member of the Tasmanian Recreational Research Advisory Group (RecRAG) which provides annual research priorities for Tasmanian recreational fisheries. Member of the FRDC Tasmanian Research Advisory Committee (TasRAC) which reviews and assesses marine research projects for Tasmania. No pecuniary or other interest.
Executive Officer	
Ms Cadie Artuso	AFMA – Fisheries Management Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest whether pecuniary or otherwise.

Action Items from previous SEMAC meetings

SEMAC 31

Action Item		Member to action	Agenda Item in which the matter was raised	Status
31.1	AFMA to provide the expected timeframe for quota regionalisation project, including consideration of pink ling and ocean perch.	AFMA (Trawl team)	Agenda item 1.4 (action items)	Complete Project implementation date expected on 01 May 2020. A more detailed timetable was provided to the MAC under agenda item 1.4
31.2	AFMA to provide a high-level summary of the key findings from the Western Gemfish Genetic Research Report to the MAC.	AFMA (Trawl team)	Agenda item 1.4 (action items)	Complete. The following summary was provided to GABRAG at its November 2016 meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there appears to be several reproductively isolated populations of gemfish; • Portland/Robe and GAB fisheries should be managed as a single stock. Western Tasmania and the east coast should be managed as another stock; • there is evidence for hybridization between both stocks but not backcrossing with parental lineages; • there appears to be evidence for a small effective population size in the eastern and western Bass Strait.
31.3	AFMA to advise the MAC of the date of the first TAG meeting and include the Terms of Reference and	AFMA and TAG	Agenda item 1.4 (action items)	Underway.

	<p>membership, when established. AFMA to also ensure that the first meeting addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>protected species reporting compared to industry average and observer rates and the consequences of non-reporting and</i> b) <i>Seabird mitigation on large factory freezer vessels, noting the preference for consistency with other fisheries, and ensuring the operators of large factory freezer vessels are present for the discussion.</i> <p><i>Note: This replaces action items 2, 4 and 5 from SEMAC 27.</i></p>			<p>Formal agreements to establish co-management in the South East Trawl sector, including establishment of the TAG (now STAG), are currently being drafted.</p> <p>SEMAC will be advised once complete.</p>
31.4	AFMA and SETFIA to consider a formal consultation process with eNGO's to engage in the TAG process.	AFMA and SETFIA	Agenda item 2.1 (Managers update)	<p>Underway.</p> <p>This will be considered when drafting the terms of reference for the TAG. SEMAC will be advised once complete.</p>
31.5	AFMA to consult with SquidRAG regarding potential issues for the squid fishery in relation to the proposal to use jigging gear for small pelagic species in the SPF.	AFMA (Squid team)	Agenda item 2.1 (Managers update)	<p>Complete</p> <p>Advice from Squid RAG members was sought via email 24 January 2018. An update on their advice will be provided verbally at the meeting as the comment period is still open at time of writing.</p>
31.6	Ms Lawrence to circulate the tabled letter from Mr Boag on " <i>a 90 per cent reduction in interactions between seabirds and Commonwealth trawlers</i> " to the relevant NGOs.	Environment member	Agenda item 2.2 (Industry update)	<p>Complete</p> <p>Circulated on 23 January 2018.</p>
31.7	AFMA to present the data of the school shark assessment (including data on live release) to the MAC at their 6-8 February 2018 meeting, to allow for a more robust discussion.	AFMA	Agenda item 2.2 (Industry update)	<p>Complete.</p> <p>See update on school shark management at Agenda Item 3.2.</p>
31.8	AFMA to request that ABARES double check the figures for the landing price of gummy shark, as this seems inconsistent with industry observations.	AFMA	Agenda item 2.2 (Industry update)	<p>Complete</p> <p>AFMA received advice from ABARES on 27 November 2017. This advice was provided to the MAC under agenda item 1.4.</p>

31.9	AFMA, in consultation with the RAG, to gather data on whether net length influences the dolphin interaction rate and present to the MAC at their February 2017 meeting.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 2.2 (Industry update)	Complete. To be provided at Agenda Item 3.7.
31.10	AFMA to ensure that in the next environment update, due in early 2018, that all protected species are included when providing the number of interactions. AFMA to also include an update on any breaches of the TAP, including information on the species, and the number of breaches that occur.	AFMA (Environment team)	Agenda item 2.3 (Environment update)	Underway Next Environment update due at the May 2018 meeting.
31.11	AFMA to update the MAC on the action taken by industry after the summer TAP was breached.	AFMA	Agenda item 2.3 (Environment update)	Underway Next Environment update due at the May 2018 meeting.
31.12	AFMA to revisit the original business case as developed prior to the rollout of electronic monitoring in the GHAT and determine the variance in actual costs.	AFMA (Service Delivery Section)	Agenda item 3.2 (electronic monitoring in the GHAT)	Complete. See Agenda Item 3.8.
31.13	AFMA to complete a cost-benefit analysis to examine what the cost would be to collect the appropriate data for the fishery with observers, compared to what it would cost with electronic monitoring. The analysis would need to factor in opportunity costs.	AFMA (Service Delivery Section)	Agenda item 3.2 (electronic monitoring in the GHAT)	Complete. See Agenda Item 3.8.
31.14	AFMA to check the confidentiality requirements to determine if the MAC can be informed of the number of compliance events and/or prosecution events that have been based on electronic monitoring evidence.	AFMA (Service Delivery Section)	Agenda item 3.2 (electronic monitoring in the GHAT)	Complete. To be provided at Agenda Item 3.12.
31.15	AFMA to consider the comments made by the MAC and update the MAC on the review at their February 2018 meeting.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 3.2 (electronic monitoring in the GHAT)	Complete Update provided under Agenda item 3.8.
31.16	AFMA to present an update on dolphin interactions to the MAC at the end of the next review period, which is due to end on 30 April 2018.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 3.4 (Update on dolphin mitigation strategies)	Complete. This information will be included in all future managers updates.
31.17	AFMA to request that the MMWG look at potential environmental factors or diseases that may be	AFMA	Agenda item 3.4 (Update on	Underway

	affecting dolphin populations, propose technical solutions to address the increased number of interactions in the Gillnet fishery and cross reference the outputs from the climate change working group.		dolphin mitigation strategies)	Has been added to the agenda for the upcoming MMWG meeting.
31.18	AFMA to set up protocols with the AFMA duty officer to ensure that they are qualified to review a vessels' Dolphin Mitigation Plan and authorise the recommencement of fishing.	AFMA	Agenda item 3.4 (Update on dolphin mitigation strategies)	Underway. Informal guidance provided to Operations Branch. SOP to be developed.
31.19	AFMA to check the wording in the <i>Fisheries Management Regulations 1992</i> and engage to operator to determine the feasibility of the operation, noting this requirement must be met.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 3.5 (processing/ filleting on board SESSF boats)	Not complete
31.20	AFMA to work closely with industry to determine: a) Whether the operation is consistent with the <i>Fisheries Management Regulations 1992</i> ; b) The intended conversion ratio for quota management; and c) The level of monitoring and compliance to cover any additional risk. AFMA to circulate this information to the MAC.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 3.5 (processing/ filleting on board SESSF boats)	Not complete
31.21	AFMA to work on the issue further with the VFA, with the intent to focus more on discards and to seek more information of the level of discards in the fishery by Victorian boats. AFMA to inform the MAC of any progress made.	AFMA (GHAT team)	Agenda item 2.6 (trip limit for school and gummy shark)	Not complete There have been no further discussions with the VFA on this matter since SEMAC 31.
31.22	AFMA Management to seek any additional advice from SEMAC in relation to the SPF Scientific Panel and Forum review out of session.	AFMA (SPF team)	Agenda item 4.1 (SPF Panel and Forum Review)	Complete A questionnaire to gauge the qualitative and quantitative views of SEMAC members was circulated on 21 December 2017.
31.23	AFMA Management to present the outcomes of any advice sought from SEMAC out of session, at its February 2018 meeting to assist SEMAC finalise its input into the SPF Scientific Panel and Forum review.	AFMA (SPF team)	Agenda item 4.1 (SPF Panel and Forum Review)	Complete A summary of the advice received will be covered off under agenda item 3.6.
31.24	AFMA to conduct a risk based analysis of interactions with protected species in the purse seine sector of the	AFMA (SPF team)	Agenda item 4.2 (electronic	Underway.

	SPF, including the level of observer coverage, number of interactions and areas of operation.		monitoring in the SPF)	AFMA has commenced a review of the available data on protected species interactions and level of observer coverage and will consider the use of EM for purse seine vessels as part of the implementation of an EM direction in the SPF.
31.25	AFMA to consider the comments made by the MAC in the drafting of the policy on the 'authorisation of transshipment in Commonwealth Fisheries'. AFMA to circulate the draft policy to the MAC for further advice, when available.	AFMA (PEER and SPF team)	Agenda item 4.3 (Transshipping in Commonwealth fisheries)	Complete The draft policy, incorporating recommendations from SEMAC has been provided under agenda item 3.9.

SEMAC 30

All actions items from SEMAC 30 have been completed. This was noted and endorsed at SEMAC 31.

SEMAC 29

Action Item	Member to action	Agenda Item in which the matter was raised	Status	
29.7	If the results of the Jack Mackerel West survey results in a significant increase in the RBC for this species, that a step up approach is considered in next year's RBC and TAC discussions. The purpose of this would be to minimise the potential impact of increased discarding of Redbait in the Western area due to limited availability of quota or operators being forced to relocate to new fishing grounds.	SEMAC, SPF Scientific Panel and AFMA	Agenda item 3.2	Underway. This item was considered as part of the RBC advice provided by the Scientific Panel and when DEPM surveys are prioritised. The Panel did not recommend any step up as part of the 2018-19 TAC. SEMAC can consider whether a step-up approach is necessary as part of the TAC recommendations under agenda item 3.3.
29.10	AFMA to consider the options to improve incentives for operators to correctly report dolphin interactions. For example, allowing an operator to reduce the review rate if they have a proven record of correctly	AFMA	Agenda item 3.3	Not complete. Being considered as part of long-term discussions around direct billing for e-monitoring catch review.

	reporting interactions. The MAC noted that this would require a change to the EM monitoring costs within the levy base.			
--	---	--	--	--

SEMAM 28

Action Item	Member to action	Agenda Item in which the matter was raised	Status
1	AFMA to contact OLRAC to amend system to comply with terms of reference.	Agenda Item 1.4 (action items)	Underway. AFMA sent an updated schema to OLRAC in May 2016. OLRAC have recently developed a patch and will roll this out in the next software update.
4	AFMA to refer MAC and SharkRAG concerns surrounding accounting for discards back to the RAG, questioning whether the 15% discount factor can be moderated. Note potential relevance of maximum economic returns from the fishery as a whole and the high level of protection given to elephant fish via closures.	Agenda Item 2.1 (Elephant Fish)	Underway. AFMA will relay the MACs concerns to SharkRAG at its 12 February 2018 meeting. <i>Note:</i> This action item was slightly amended at SEMAM 31.
6	AFMA to review western gemfish trigger limits within the GABTF.	Agenda Item 2.1 (Western Gemfish)	Underway. GABRAG to review triggers out-of-session 2017-18.
7	AFMA to provide the expected timeframe to conduct a tier one assessment of ocean perch, and the SFR allocation for inshore and offshore.	Agenda Item 2.1 (Ocean Perch)	Underway. Removal of inshore ocean perch from the quota basket is being considered as part of the SESSF stock regionalisation project. The SESSF data plan details the data requirements for each species based on their current assessment. The most appropriate assessment (Tier) for offshore ocean perch

				will be considered in the context of SMARP implementation throughout 2018.
--	--	--	--	--

SEMAC 27

Three action items regarding the TAG have been amalgamated into action item 31.3, as discussed at SEMAC 31. In addition, the action item for updates on pink ling management arrangements in NSW will now be included in the Managers updates (refer to agenda item 1.4 from SEMAC 31).