



Commonwealth Fisheries Marine Mammal Working Group (CFMMWG) Meeting No 5

Meeting Minutes

Date: 30 October 2018

Venue: Melbourne Airport

Attendees

Name	Member Type
Mr Bill Talbot	Independent Chair
Dr Karen Evans	Scientific/Mitigation Member
Mr Tony Harman	Member for the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
Mr Phil Ravello	AFMA Member
Dr Julian Pepperall	Recreational/Charter Fishing scientific Member
Mr Richard Wells	Overseas Expert Member
Mr Gerry Geen	Industry Member
Ms Lucy Crawford	Executive Officer, AFMA
Ms Sally Weekes	AFMA Invited observer, Manager, Small Pelagic, Squid and Scallop fisheries

Attendees (via teleconference)

Name	Member Type
Dr Mike Double	Member for the Department of the Environment and Energy
Ms Alexia Wellbelove	Conservation Member

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Welcome and apologies

1. The Chair Opened the Meeting at 10:31am and Members noted apologies from Mr Rhys Arangio (Industry member), Dr Simon Goldsworthy (Scientific/Mitigation Member), Dr John Wakeford (Scientific/Mitigation Member) and Ms Claire Wallis (AFMA EO).
2. The group welcomed new Members Mr Richard Wells and Mr Gerry Geen, Ms Sally Weekes (AFMA) as an observer and Ms Lucy Crawford as the acting EO.

1.2 Declaration of interests

3. Members, invited participants and observers provided declarations of interest as prescribed in Fisheries Administration Paper 12 and incorporated updates from the previous meeting where required.
4. Mr Geen declared he is a partner in a Small Pelagic Fishing company, therefore may have a conflict of interest in Agenda Item 6 and Agenda Item 7. The Chair recommended and the group agreed, that Mr Geen participate in the discussion

but if it became apparent that a conflict of interest did exist that Mr Geen be excluded from further discussion of that item.

1.3 Ratification of CFMMWG 4 Minutes

5. The working group ratified the minutes from Meeting 4. No further issues raised.

1.4 Adoption of Agenda

6. No additional items were added to the agenda for Meeting 5.
7. It was highlighted that attachment items E and F mentioned in Agenda Item 6 were not circulated. Mr Talbot confirmed they had been received previously. These documents were recirculated for new members during the meeting.

2 Action Items from previous meetings (attached)

8. The working group reviewed and noted the status of each action arising from previous meetings and noted the progress that had been made against each item since the last meeting.

Action Items 1 - 6

9. The group noted that action items 1 – 6 would be considered under Agenda Item 6, Dolphin Mitigation Strategy.
10. It was highlighted that action item 2 had previously been updated during meeting 3 where the group agreed that AFMA would progress the task and follow up with CSIRO if necessary.
11. The group queried if the action item was still needed, and if so, does it need a dedicated project developed in order to achieve it? It was decided that this was something that should be considered in more detail at MMWG Meeting 6.
12. It was noted that action item 4, exploring if fishery-based funding for a short, multi day high level review of Dolphin Bycatch data is useful, had also previously

Action Item #1 – Working Group to consider developing a dedicated project plan for Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination - Review and limitations of AFMA data; or choose to leave the action item closed.

been addressed. More raw data can be presented if need be, if not, open to advice. It may require a project around it, and to be adequately funded.

Action Item 7

13. Action item 7 was not discussed.

Action Item #2 – Fur Seal bycatch frequency & Factor determination. Originally Action Item #7 at CFMMWG 4

Action Items 8 & 9

14. The Chair asked if action item 9 had any confirmed action. The AFMA member gave an update in Dr Rayns' absence. 'No action taken as yet, the workshop looked at putting together project proposals for potential funding'.
15. The Chair acknowledges that the change in Marine Mammal Working Group members superseded the priority of action item 9 and agreed to mark these action items as complete.

Action Item 10

16. Action item 10 was marked as complete.

Action Items 11 & 12

17. Action Items 11 and 12 were not addressed.

Action Item # 3 – Confirm whether logbook reported data is updated after Electronic monitoring review is undertaken to confirm TEP species ID for each interaction. Originally action item #11 at CFMMWG 4

Action Item # 4 – AFMA to assess the feasibility of long-term retention of EM footage capturing TEP interactions. Originally action item #12 at CFMMWG 4

3 AFMA Update by the AFMA Member

18. The group noted upcoming AFMA leadership changes as follows: Dr Nick Rayns is finishing 30 November. Dr James Findlay's contract as CEO is also coming to an end and he won't be seeking reappointment.
19. AFMA offices are moving out to Majura Park, ready for the New Year.
20. Some updates on trials for Electronic Monitoring (EM) in some Trawl fisheries. Trials had commenced on three vessels, 2 trawlers and 1 Danish seine vessel. There is some work to be done to fine tune camera angles etc. but in initial viewing of the footage collected it was confirmed that the cameras will be able to detect presence / absence of seabird mitigation devices, and large TEP species being landed on deck. A further update on these trials will be made at the next CFMMWG meeting.

Action Item # 5 – AFMA to provide an update on Electronic Monitoring in the Trawl Fisheries it has been installed in.

21. The group sought clarification as to if it would be possible to see some of the footage produced from the EM systems. The AFMA Member advised that AFMA may be able to provide some footage and details of the systems for the next meeting and would take this as an action item.

Action Item # 6 – AFMA to provide detailed EM briefing to MMWG so they can better understand the capability of the systems and data captured.

22. The bycatch program has had some initial meetings with South East Trawl Fishery Industry Association (SETFIA) to trial seal excluder devices in the otter trawl fishery. A boat has been lined up for trials, a metal fabricator has been approached about building the SED device for trial and a project plan has been written up. The trial has been put on hold pending the Lakes Entrance Bycatch officer position being filled, in order to have a staff member on the ground to assist with at-sea trials.
23. A member of the Southern Shark Industry Association has been informally trialling a device known as a “pinger” for its effectiveness in deterring dolphins from nets. The operator identified problems with the short battery life of the device and as a result may trial a different model.
24. The industry member stated that the skipper trialling the device said having to replace batteries on units placed 200m apart while hauling was adding three hours to hauling time. There were further issues with the model such as flooding of the battery.
25. It was noted that the word “pinger” may not be the most accurate term for the device. A deterrent or dissuasion device may be a more accurate term and the group was asked to be clear in their language around terms as pinger and deterrent are not interchangeable.
26. The Conservation member asked whether there are any similar bycatch strategies to the Seabird Bycatch Strategy in development. The AFMA member highlighted that there is both a dolphin and seal strategy in draft and that the CFMMWG would be included in the consultation process for these documents.
27. The AFMA member identified that some other bycatch project work was being conducted by AFMA such as Bycatch Reduction Device (BRD) trials in the Northern Prawn Fishery (NPF) and the reconfiguring of tori lines in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF), but noted they were outside the scope of the CFMMWG.

4 US Marine Mammal Rule update/Agriculture Update

28. Mr Harman gave an update from the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources. Senator the Hon Anne Ruston is no longer the Assistant Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources with Senator the Hon Richard Colbeck being appointed to the role as of late August 2018.
29. October 22 – 28 was National Bird Week, which coincided with the release of Australia's *National Plan of Action for Minimising Incidental Catch of Seabirds in Australian Capture Fisheries* (NPOA–Seabirds).

30. The US Marine Mammal Rule came into operation on 1 January 2017 with actions to take effect from 1 January 2022. Countries that export seafood to the United States will have their fisheries assessed to determine the extent of their interactions with marine mammals and be classified as either 'export' or 'exempt'. Almost 4,000 fisheries have been assessed by the US to date, with around 900 fisheries identified as 'exempt', that is either having or likely to have little interaction with marine mammals. Those that are identified as 'export' must have marine mammal protections equivalent to those in place in the US. The Department of Agriculture and Water Resources is working on gaining further clarity around what this means for Australia. A draft list of fisheries classifications is available at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/foreign/international-affairs/list-foreign-fisheries>
31. The recreational / charter fishing member asked if any recreational fisheries are involved. Mr Harman stated none that he was aware of, due to the trade aspect of the Marine Mammal Rule, however cumulative impacts on marine mammals will need to be assessed
32. The AFMA member enquired as to a time line for the Commonwealth fisheries that are labelled 'export' to be reconsidered as 'exempt', in particular if there are any key dates? Mr Harman replied that the decision is still sitting with the US and Australia is awaiting greater clarity. The initial classification for fisheries was done in 2017 with a further assessment to be made in 2021. Dr Evans asked if the US has provided a deadline for the implementation of protections, given the time it may take for fisheries to implement any changes required to meet the rule requirements. Mr Harman replied that the US is aware of the potential impact of the rule on the US retail seafood industry, but that there is no deadline.
33. Ms Weekes asked if the Department of Agriculture has been coordinating State fisheries as well as Commonwealth. Mr Harman said they have been liaising with them via Fish Ministers and the Australian Fisheries Management Forum...
34. Dr Evans asked Mr Harman what he sees as the next steps, given the uncertainty. Mr Harman said seeking clarity on what constitutes equivalency, possibly putting together some contingency plans, should some fisheries be identified as 'export' and therefore impacted by the Rule. Fisheries jurisdictions will also be asked to contribute to a stocktake of available data.

5 False Killer Whale Depredation in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish fishery

35. The AFMA member identified that some fishers in the ETBF had flagged that they were having significant issues with false killer whale (FKW) depredation, resulting in significant economic loss. AFMA are seeking to facilitate a solution that may mitigate FKW depredation and in doing so, identified some products on the market that anecdotally appear to prevent depredation. To avoid

commercially benefiting a single product AFMA is seeking some broad advice on what types of mitigation devices that may be effective, to pass on to fishers to conduct field trials led by the fishers themselves.

36. Dr Evans asked if there has been any formal assessment of the extent of the problem. Mr Phil Ravanella identified that the information provided was anecdotal and that a formal assessment of the problem is yet to be undertaken.
37. Dr Evans stated that first thing to do would be get some formal information, as anecdotal information can be open to criticism. Potentially using EM a number of factors required for assessing the extent of the problem could be explored, such as how often does depredation occur and how does this vary temporally or spatially? It would also be essential to establish if it is definitely FKW, another cetacean species or a mix of species? Given that sharks also depredate lines establishing whether or not sharks are involved would also be useful. Using teeth impression you may be able to discern the different marine animals involved.
38. The group noted that Dr Geoff McPherson did some FRDC funded work on depredation by pilot whales in the northern part of the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery and those reports would be available to provide a historical perspective on marine mammal depredation, the species involved and any mitigation measures that might have been trialled.
39. It was also suggested that the logbooks be looked at, although there may be some species identification issues, with potential identification of pilot whales as FKW.
40. It was highlighted that this is an issue in the Pacific and in Hawaiian fisheries as well, where they have done some work with non-acoustic mitigation deterrents and that it would be worthwhile for some time be spent learning from those experiences rather than moving too quickly.
41. In addition it was noted that depredation also occurs in fisheries in Uruguay, South Georgia and New Zealand. Companies suffering losses are working to come up with solutions. Mr Wells advised that there are a number of devices available; some of these may work while others may not. Many fisheries have tried pingers/dissuasive devices, but have yet to see reported and proven tests.
42. Dr Evans brought up an example of seasonal occurrences of depredation on Japanese longlines in Australian waters by killer whales. The Japanese fishers responded by avoiding certain fishing spots at certain times of year.
43. The AFMA member suggested that the problem with depredation may have come to a head this year because all of these tactics have been tried but depredation continues to occur. The anecdotal information provided by fishers appears to suggest that the spatial range of the species has expanded this year. Dr Pepperall said there have been instances reported where vessels will steam as fast as they can and pods of various mammals would just follow behind.

44. Dr Evans stated that the whole fishery would need to be part of the research, not broken down by vessel.
45. Mr Ravello stated that it does not seem to be an issue in the more southern part of the fishery; to date there have been no reports of depredation from areas of Ulladulla and Bermagui.
46. Dr Evans stated that the best course of action would be to take due diligence in gathering the appropriate data, and then take steps to trial acoustic deterrents or alternative methods.

Action Item # 7 – AFMA to review existing data to determine details of the extent of depredation occurring in the fishery and present to a future meeting of the group.

6 GHAT & SPF Dolphin Mitigation Strategy Review update

47. Ms Weekes provided the group with an update on the Small Pelagic Fishery and Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation strategies. The group was asked to note the performance of the strategies. For background, the GHAT and SPF dolphin strategies were implemented at the start of the fishing season (May) in 2017. The SPF has had essentially 100% observer coverage across a 5 year period. The GHAT has had 100% observer coverage within the South Australian area while the rest of the fishery has had 3-10% observer coverage, from both observers and Electronic Monitoring (EM).
48. An effort has been made to make the strategies consistent across the fisheries but noting that there are differences between the fisheries and consequently there are some differences between the strategies.
49. The strategies are based on individual responsibility where the fisher is penalised when prescribed limits have been breached, rather than the whole fishery. Penalties are increased if prescribed limits have been breached in consecutive periods; where limits have been breached in three consecutive review periods, fishers are excluded from the fishery for six months. The rates and numbers apply to all species of dolphin, but to date only common and bottlenose dolphins are known to interact with both fisheries.
50. Ms Weekes provided a description of the short, intermediate and long term outcomes of the Small Pelagic Fishery and Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation strategies. Key points are:
 - The target of EM in the GHAT is 10% coverage for all areas excluding South Australian, and that is being achieved. Off South Australia the target is 100 % coverage which is also being achieved.
 - Not all boats had Dolphin Mitigation Plans (DMP) in place from May 2017 as there was an implementation phase; the mandatory date for DMP was in December. This meant that some vessels had interactions between May 1 and December 1 with no DMP in place.

- AFMA considers the number of dolphin interactions being reported to be reliable given the level of monitoring in the fishery. While 10 % of the EM footage is reviewed, the cameras are on 100 % of the time and the level of footage reviewed provides adequate incentive for fishery to report accurately in their logbooks.
- The industry member suggested that the strategy needs to find a more appropriate balance between incentivising the motivation to improve the behaviours of individuals and penalties. It is difficult for fishers to innovate without a risk of potentially catching more dolphins and exceeding the current settings in the strategy.
- The industry member added that related to incentives and penalties is that punishment should be for non-compliance with dolphin mitigation plans rather than reaching triggers if the operator that reached the trigger was doing everything possible to avoid interactions compared to someone who is not compliant with their DMP.
- It was also suggested by Mr Geen that the penalty of being excluded from the fishery after two consecutive review period breaches is draconian and potentially counterproductive as no new information on the causes of interactions or trial of new approaches can be gathered by that operator. An alternative approach could be that an operator would be required to take an observer or by-catch officer on board for every trip for (for example) 3 months after having breached the review period limits twice at their cost. This would represent a heavy financial penalty, thus maintaining the incentive for operators to avoid dolphin interactions, while potentially providing useful information on the nature and causes of any such interactions.
- The conservation member noted concerns about the ongoing scale of the dolphin mortalities and that the apparent failure of the strategies to reduce numbers killed.
- AFMA indicated that the expectation was that dolphin numbers would be reduced given that at least one operator was on track to be excluded at the end of the third review period.

51. Ms Weekes also provided a summary of information collected from Dolphin Interaction Evaluation reports. Ms Weekes directed attention to the provided dolphin interaction data that had been circulated at the beginning of the meeting, as it may be of more use and interest. The group was asked if the information in the attachment is relevant and useful.

52. Dr Pepperall asked about the relevance of identifying dolphins with sea lice damage. Ms Weekes said that it was included as an indication of how long the dolphin had been in the nets.

53. Dr Evans stated that all the data collected in association with individual interactions is important, and having greater context provided by those data could help in better understanding the drivers of interactions. She also

suggested that the data be separated by species to provide greater species specific context to investigating potential drivers for interactions.

54. Ms Weekes referred to Table 1 in Attachment B, which compares species identification provided by EM and that provided in logbooks. Clarification was provided to the group on what the 'Fate' column referred to; this referred to what was done with the dolphin, not whether it was alive or deceased.
55. Ms Weekes referred to Attachment C, a map of interactions across 2017. As noted earlier, the data included on this map only represents the 12 month period.
56. Dr Evans suggested that the map include more detail, in order to provide more context to the interactions such as including CPUE data, separating species, identifying interactions by day/night fishing, or season.
57. It was noted to the group that AFMA records shot data by length of net where one shot is equivalent to 4200m of net.
58. Ms Weekes referred to confidential data that was circulated to the group in hard copy earlier in the meeting that documented interactions recorded across the 12 month review period. Mr Wells asked what happened to the quota owned by anyone who stands down from fishing. It was noted that they can do what they like, other fishers can lease in that quota and catch fish. This lead to the point that there may be little incentive for other fishers to advise a skipper on mitigation techniques.
59. In summary, the MMWG:
 - generally supported the overall approach of the strategy of using individual accountability and having scalable management responses
 - Recognised that improving the understanding of interactions between dolphins and the fisheries, being able to potentially identify mitigation or practices that reduce interactions and ultimately assess the appropriateness of the caps and triggers, will be an iterative process.
 - Considered the data currently being collected through the dolphin interaction reports is valuable and its collection should continue. Encouraging fishers to complete the comments section of the forms was viewed as valuable in that it may render important information not currently captured. Of equal importance in improving the understanding of interactions and subsequent identification of mitigation options is the collection of data when interactions are not occurring.
 - considered that outlining what constitutes an 'acceptable' DMP is important as it is seen as a way to check 'best practice' is being implemented, noting that what is considered best practice is still evolving and that innovation still needs to be encouraged..

- Considered monitoring compliance with DMP important as non-compliance should be penalised more harshly than ‘accidental’ interactions that arose despite the best efforts of a fisher who is complying with their DMP (this point is also relevant to the topic of balance between incentives and penalties).
- Considered that measuring the number of changes an individual has made through time is important as it is one way of measuring ‘innovation’ and whether the settings in the strategies are appropriate. As the number of changes being made over time reduces, the point at which interactions are minimised as far as possible may be being approached and any interactions that continue to occur likely to be unavoidable.

60. With the exception of the conservation member who continues to hold concerns regarding dolphin mortalities, the MMWG recommended:

- That the data currently being collected on dolphin interaction forms continue and that fishers be encouraged to complete the comments section of these reports as this may provide a means of identifying potentially useful information.
- That AFMA review the data being collected when interactions are not occurring as this information is important in understanding dolphin interactions and potential mitigation options.
- That the approval process for DMP should be structured, repeatable and simple.
- That what constitutes an ‘acceptable’ DMP be clearly documented and maintained so as to provide a reference for best practice approaches.
- That compliance with DMPs be monitored and appropriate action be taken for non-compliance with DMP.
- That AFMA consider the balance between incentives and disincentives and whether these can be revised to better support innovation and learning while at the same time still reducing dolphin interactions.
- That AFMA consider how changes to mitigation devices or behaviour made by operators through time can be measured as this will be important for assessing when the level of dolphin interactions becomes unavoidable.

Action Item #8: AFMA to circulate to the MMWG for comment, the current checklist that AFMA undertakes to approve a Dolphin Mitigation Plan.

Action item #9: AFMA to consider the recommendations made during the discussion regarding the Dolphin Mitigation Strategy and report back on progress made.

7 SPF – Seal Excluder Device design history

61. AFMA introduced the item which was seeking advice from the group regarding Seal Excluder Devices (SEDs, in particular if the current specifications for these devices is still current.
62. It was noted by Ms Weekes that the term ‘interaction’ is used across AFMA and includes alive and dead animals. Whether an interaction results in a mortality or not is captured via the field ‘life status’. It was noted by the group that it would be better to distinguish the type of interaction in order to accurately determine if the SEDs are working.
63. It was noted by Mr Wells that SED’s should be tailored to the likely captured mammal. This may need to be ascertained via a trial and error method. Most likely it will need to be designed around adult seals, rather than juvenile seals in a midwater trawl fishery.
64. Mr Geen also noted that a soft SED may also be useful in some circumstances.
65. The MMWG:
- Acknowledged that in some instances the hood may in fact contribute to some mortalities but did not consider this to be high relative to the numbers that escaped.
 - Noted that any work done regarding measuring the effectiveness of any device needs to be specific to that particular device.
66. The MMWG recommended that the current specifications of the SED are still current to the best of their knowledge but that the spacing of the grid bars and escape hole should be reviewed to ensure they are appropriate for the size of animal typically being caught. One way of doing this would be to collect circumference measurements of seal bycatch.

8 Meeting Close

67. No further items were raised for discussion.
68. The chair closed the meeting at approximately 4:30pm.

Appendices

- 1 Status of previous action items
- 2 New action items as at end of CFMMWG [45](#)

DRAFT

Australian Fisheries Management Authority Commonwealth Fisheries Marine Mammal Working Group	MEETING NUMBER: 5
	LOCATION: Melbourne Airport Holiday Inn
	DATE: 30 OCTOBER 2018
FOR NOTING	AGENDA ITEM: 2

ACTION ITEMS

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the working group:
 - a) **Notes** the updates against each action item from previous Commonwealth Fisheries Marine Mammal Working Group meetings (Table 1)

PURPOSE

2. To inform the working group of the progress made against each of the action items from the previous meeting, and to provide any updates. The following colours indicate the level of progress of each item.

Complete	Underway / Not yet complete	Not a priority / Redundant / On hold
----------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------

Status of previous Action Items

Complete

Underway / Not yet complete

Not a priority / Redundant / On hold

Action Item Number	Original (Agenda Item) / Meeting #	Description	Responsibility	Update as of October 2018	Update as of May 2018
1	(6) Update on GHAT & SPF Dolphin Mitigation Strategies / CFMMWG 2	AFMA to produce list of mitigation devices used in the GHAT, including current relative uptake of these techniques, collate data on levels of implementation on various dolphin mitigation devices vs interaction rates vs effort and provide to the CFMMWG for consideration/ranking where possible.	AFMA	This information will be included as part of the first review of the Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation Strategy scheduled for May 2018.	This action item is currently included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies.
2	(7) Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination – Review & limitations of AFMA data / CFMMWG 2	AFMA and Karen Evans to investigate sourcing cleaned SESSF effort data used for stock assessments, and AFMA to explore provision of: a) clean catch and effort data, b) all observer data c) all EM events and d) logbook reported interaction data Above data sets to be used to support desk top study of cetacean interactions in the GHAT (marine mammal CPUE, changes in effort, and regional variation in interaction rates) and high level review of CTS data prior to exploration of marine mammal CPUE and base interaction rates between seals and CTS vessels.	AFMA	If appropriate the tasks will be pursued through reviews of Strategies e.g. Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation Strategy.	This action item is currently included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies.
3	(7) Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination –	AFMA to provide the ERA for the GHAT to the CFMMWG for determination of data availability prior to initiating a high level data review.	AFMA	All fisheries are currently going through new and updated Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) processes. AFMA	The otter board trawl ERA report is currently in draft.

Action Item Number	Original (Agenda Item) / Meeting #	Description	Responsibility	Update as of October 2018	Update as of May 2018
	Bycatch estimation study / CFMMWG 2			recommends awaiting the results of these new ERAs to determine next steps.	AFMA to circulate the ERA reports once they are publicly available.
4	(7) Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination / CFMMWG 2	AFMA to explore fishery-based funding for a short, multi-day high level review of the data to explore whether it can do what we need, and if not, where the holes are and how they could be fixed for the GHAT and the wet boat sector of the CTS.	AFMA	If appropriate the tasks will be pursued through reviews of Strategies e.g. Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation Strategy.	This action item is currently included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies, not including the wet boat sector of the CTS.

DRAFT

Action Item Number	Original (Agenda Item) / Meeting #	Description	Responsibility	Update as of October 2018	Update as of May 2018
5	(7) Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination – Bycatch estimation study / CFMMWG 2	<p>AFMA to provide for the GHAT and CTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a timeline of management measures in the fishery (e.g. roll out of EM) and likely impacts on logbook data - a summary of observer/monitoring coverage (including an indication of how observer coverage has been distributed across the fishery, and how observer reporting requirements or training have varied through time) and variation in effort for the previous 10 years for the fishery in question; and - A summary of how many of the AFMA logbook reports are from a trip where an observer was present. 	AFMA	If appropriate the tasks will be pursued through reviews of Strategies e.g. Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation Strategy.	Elements of this action item are included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies.
6	(7) Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination – Species ID & Dropouts / CFMMWG 2	AFMA to review costings for development of ability to provide clips related to marine mammal interactions, and longer storage of these clips or photos, and advise the CFMMWG on Archipelago's species ID process if possible, and what proportion of dolphins are identified to species.	AFMA	If appropriate the tasks will be pursued through reviews of Strategies e.g. Gillnet Dolphin Mitigation Strategy.	<p>Elements of this action item are included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies.</p> <p>AFMA will consider this option as part of future structure of the EM program.</p>

Action Item Number	Original (Agenda Item) / Meeting #	Description	Responsibility	Update as of October 2018	Update as of May 2018
7	(8) Fur seal bycatch: frequency & factor determination / CFMMWG 2	Pending review of the data, the group recommended that AFMA needs to review the potential compliance issue associated with the discrepancy between observer and logbook data, noting the requirements of fishers to report all TEPS interactions.	AFMA	This action item was added to the CFMMWG 2 list during CFMMWG 3	Elements of this action item are included as part of the proposed approach to review the GHAT and SPF dolphin mitigation strategies.
8	(2) Setting the Scene / CFMMWG 3	AFMA to report the outcomes of the Top Marine Predator Workshop back to the CFMMWG at its next face to face meeting in May.	AFMA		Presented at CFMMWG 4
9	2 / CFMMWG 4	AFMA to circulate the one page document about the outcomes of the Year of the Marine Top Predator (YoMTP) workshop to the broader membership of the CFMMWG.	AFMA		Circulated to CFMMWG members on 24/8/2018 Verbal update to be provided by N Rayns under Agenda Item 3 at CFMMWG 5.
10	3 / CFMMWG 4	AFMA to report back to the CFMMWG on the status and progress of the electronic monitoring trial in the Commonwealth Trawl Sector.	AFMA		Cameras have been installed on two vessels with a third to be installed shortly. No data has been reviewed as yet.
11	3 / CFMMWG 4	Confirm whether logbook reported data is updated after electronic monitoring review is undertaken to confirm TEP species identification for each interaction.	AFMA		Logbook data is not updated based on EM footage at this time. This reflects prior approaches to logbook data which is treated as independent of observer data and has not historically been "corrected".
12	3 / CFMMWG 4	AFMA to assess the feasibility of long-term retention of EM footage capturing TEP interactions.	AFMA		Covered under Action Item 6, recommend combining

New action items as of end of CFMMWG 5

Action Item Number	Original (Agenda Item) / Meeting #	Description	Responsibility
1	2 / CFMMWG 5	Working Group to consider developing a dedicated project plan for Dolphin Bycatch; frequency and factor determination - Review and limitations of AFMA data; or choose to leave the action item closed.	CFMMWG
2	7 / CFMMWG 5	Fur Seal bycatch frequency & Factor determination. Originally Action Item #7 at CFMMWG 4	AFMA
3	11 / CFMMWG 5	Confirm whether logbook reported data is updated after Electronic monitoring review is undertaken to confirm TEP species ID for each interaction. Originally action item #11 at CFMMWG 4	AFMA
4	12 / CFMMWG 5	AFMA to assess the feasibility of long-term retention of EM footage capturing TEP interactions. Originally action item #12 at CFMMWG 4.	AFMA
5	5 / CFMMWG 6	AFMA to provide an update on Electronic Monitoring in the Trawl Fisheries it has been installed in.	AFMA
6	6 / CFMMWG 6	AFMA to provide detailed EM briefing to MMWG so they can better understand the capability of the systems and data captured	AFMA
7	6 / CFMMWG 6	AFMA to circulate to the MMWG for comment, the current checklist that AFMA undertakes to approve a Dolphin Mitigation Plan.	

DRAFT