



**Australian Government**

**Australian Fisheries Management Authority**

## **South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC) Meeting 56**

**Meeting minutes**

**5-6 February 2025**

**Melbourne/MS Teams**

# Contents

1	Preliminaries .....	3
2	Managers Update.....	5
3	Industry Update .....	5
4	SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025-26.....	6
4.1	School Shark .....	7
4.2	Gummy Shark .....	8
4.3	Blue-eye Trevalla.....	10
4.4	Pink Ling .....	10
4.5	Mirror Dory.....	11
4.6	Oreo Basket .....	12
5	Climate Risk Framework .....	13
6	WORDAC Murray Dogfish Closure update .....	14
7	Modified dropline exemption for upper slope dogfish closures .....	14
7.1	Actions and recommendations for agenda item 7 .....	16
8	SPF Harvest Strategy.....	16
8.1	Actions and recommendations for agenda item 8 .....	17
9	SPF TAC recommendations for 2025-26 .....	17
10	SEMAC letter to the Commission .....	19
	Other Business .....	20
	Close of meeting .....	20
	Attachment A - Register of Interests.....	21
	Attachment B – Agenda.....	23
	Attachment C .....	25
	Attachment D .....	26
	Attachment E.....	27

# South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC)

## Meeting 56: 5–6 February 2025

The Chair opened the meeting at 8:30 hr AEDT.

### 1 Preliminaries

#### 1.1 Welcome and apologise

David McGlennon, the Chair of SEMAC, welcomed members to the meeting with an Acknowledgement of Country paying his respects to this country's First People and Traditional Custodians of the land throughout Australia.

The SEMAC members noted the Acknowledgement of Country, that the meeting was being recorded and commenced proceedings.

Participants and apologies:

MEMBERSHIP	Role
<b>Dr David McGlennon</b>	<u>Chair</u>
<b>Dr Sarah Jennings</b>	Economic member
<b>Ms Anissa Lawrence</b>	Conservation member
<b>Dr Paul McShane</b>	Scientific member
<b>Mr Simon Boag</b>	Industry member
<b>Mr Kyri Toumazos</b>	Industry member
<b>Mr Will Mure</b>	Industry member
<b>Mr John Harrison</b>	Recreational member
<b>Ms Sally Weekes</b>	AFMA member
<b>Miss Audrey Kent</b>	Executive officer

AFMA STAFF	INVITED PARTICIPANTS
Anna Willock	Nil
Mark Grubert	<b>OBSERVERS</b>
Lianos Triantafillos	Sally Troy, AFMA Commissioner
Yvette Lamont	Brett McCallum, AFMA Commissioner
Michelle Henriksen	Nicholas Blay, DNRE Tasmania
Alannah Wood	Phil Hough, Petuna Seafoods
Natalie Couchman	Ian Stockton, NSW DPI
Daniel Corrie	<b>APOLOGIES</b>
Anthony Coggan	Mr Gerry Geen, Industry member
Rebecca Jol	

## 1.2 Declarations of interest

SEMAC members noted the conflicts of interest requirements as outlined in [AFMA's Fisheries Management Paper 1](#). Members and participants updated their Declarations of Interest as shown in Table 1 of the Preliminaries paper and discussed specific conflicts of interest with agenda items (see **Table 1**).

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

The Chair sought advice on how SEMAC should manage these conflicts. The MAC decided that conflicted participants would be permitted to contribute to the discussion but would be excused from the meeting for any recommendation made by the MAC (outlined in Table 1).

**Table 1.** Declared conflicts by relevant members in relation to specific agenda items and SEMACs decision regarding participation for those items.

Agenda Item	Potential conflicts of Interest	Discussion Participation	Recommendation Participation
<b>4. SESSF TAC<sup>1</sup></b>	Simon Boag Will Mure Kyri Toumazos	Present	Absent
<b>7. Modified dropline exemption for upper slope dogfish closures</b>	Will Mure	Present	Absent
<b>8. SPF Harvest Strategy</b>	Simon Boag	Present	Absent
<b>9. SPF TAC</b>	Simon Boag	Present	Absent
<b>Commission letter</b>	Simon Boag	Present	Absent

## 1.3 Adoption of agenda

SEMAC adopted the agenda at [Attachment B](#) as final.

## 1.4 Minutes of previous meeting

SEMAC noted that the minutes of the SEMAC 55, held in November 2024 have been completed but are still waiting on final comments from some of the members. The final draft will be available as soon as those comments are received.

## 1.5 Actions arising from previous meetings

SEMAC noted the progress against action items in the update provided by the Executive Officer at [Attachment C](#).

AFMA proposed changing the status of agenda item *Monitoring in the Gillnet fishery* from 'Yet to Start' to 'Pause Pending' as the EM team is still undergoing an investigation on a smaller/less expensive camera systems for lower effort operators.

SEMAC approved the changes to the Actions arising from previous meetings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Total Allowable Catch

## 2 Manager's Update

A written update was provided to SEMAC members on the key management issues arising since the last meeting in November 2024.

The update was taken largely as 'read' with the following key points discussed:

- The Department of Agriculture, Fishery and Forestry (DAFF) released a draft report on the reviews of the Commonwealth Fisheries Harvest Strategy Policy and Commonwealth Fisheries Bycatch Policy for public consultation in November 2024. Following consideration of submissions received on the draft report, DAFF will prepare a final report for consideration by relevant ministers in early 2025. Any revisions to the policies that are required based on the review findings will be made through a subsequent process subject to further public consultation. The review also considered the ongoing applicability of the Guidelines for implementation of both policies.
- AFMA submitted an application on the ecological sustainability of the SESSF to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) on 13 September 2024. Given the complexity of the fishery, the department has extended the assessment review period and export approval until June 2025. This export approval is modified and does not allow for the exportation of CITES species until the application is approved.
- Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) certification for Orange Rough Eastern zone is on its second MSC application and has been appealed once again by the AMCS under contention with stock structure of Orange Roughy. Hearing results were released end of January with Industry highlighting their continual commitment to MSC certification of Orange Roughy eastern stocks.
- Interest from Industry has initiated work between AFMA and South Australia on State/Commonwealth permit matters to improve efficiency of operations, including; consideration of a staged approach to allow dual jurisdiction fishing and consolidation of coastal water permits.

## 3 Industry Update

The Chair asked industry members to provide an update on any items arising since the last meeting in November 2024. SEMAC noted the following updates by:

Simon Boag (SETFIA<sup>2</sup>) on the Trawl fishery:

Following on from the points raised during the manager's update on the MSC certification of the Orange Rough eastern stock, there are three other MSC certificates on two SESSF species:

- Royal Red Prawns, where the certificate has a lot of conditions
- Two separate certificates for Blue Grenadier, however these will merge into a single certificate soon.

The following updates were provided to the MAC:

- Catch rates and prices in the shark fishery are good. Interacting with a lot of School Shark, impossible to avoid interactions, however School Shark passed MSC again.

---

<sup>2</sup> South East Trawl Industry Association

- Majority of Industry time is being dedicated to marine spatial issues. Southern ocean wind farm development moved to shallower waters and Illawarra wind zone has had little interest from developers, presenting two wins for marine space concerns for Industry.
- Industry made the Australian newspaper with a piece highlighting that the fishing Industry can only survive if there are no changes to Marine Parks Areas, no Illawarra windfarms and no developments on the Gippsland wind farm.
- SETFIA has engaged a fisherman to liaise with the Commonwealth fleets to gather opinions of wind farm developments.

Will Mure (Mures Fishing P/L):

- The 2024-25 fishing season has been steady.
- Blue-eye Trevalla catches and market price have been good.
- Killer whale interactions this season have been higher but Industry has been able to manage interactions.
- Pink Ling catches are good in the east, but patchy in the west. Market prices for Pink Ling are good.

Kyri Toumazos (Industry member, SSIA):

- Large amount of School Shark catch, reiterates the unavoidable interaction that is occurring.

John Harrison (Recreational Member):

- There have been no updates/comments/information received from the recreational fishing industry sectors regarding SEMAC discussions, minutes, or action items so there was nothing to report.

## 4 **SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025-26**

SEMAC considered TACs, overcatch and undercatch provisions and determined weights for all SESSF quota species (excluding Bight Redfish, Deepwater Flathead and Orange Roughy Albany and Esperance); and non-quota species for the 2025-26 fishing year.

SEMAC noted that of the 34 species requiring SEMAC TAC advice, there were:

- Six species/stocks with new stock assessments;
- Eight species classified as depleted that require bycatch TAC advice;
- Nine species/stocks with proposed changes to TACs or management issues that need to be resolved; and
- Eleven trigger species/stocks where no issues have been identified, and no new information is available.

To streamline the process for 2025, AFMA provided a table containing an overview of factors that influence the TACs each year at [Attachment E](#)

SEMAC discussions and recommendations are provided for each species in the *2025 SESSF species summaries* on the [AFMA website](#).

Considerable time was spent discussing the recommended TACs for School Shark, Gummy Shark, Pink Ling, Blue-eye Trevalla, Mirror Dory and Oreo Basket. These deliberations informed the recommended TACs described in *the 2025 SESSF species summaries* and are described in more detail below.

#### 4.1 School Shark

The MAC noted the following key points regarding School Shark TAC for the 2025-26 fishing season:

- After considering advice from SharkRAG and SEMAC, the Commission (at its 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting) settled on the RBC approach of SEMAC to determine the School Shark TAC at 197 tonnes for 2024-25.
- This was 8% lower than the SharkRAG-recommended TAC.
- To reduce fishing effort and ensure that the School Shark RBC was not exceeded, the Commission further reduced the Gummy Shark TAC by 8% to 1,558 tonnes for 2024-25 fishing season.
- Status depleted rebuilding species. Last assessed in 2019 CKMR. New CKMR assessment in 2025. The 'logbook' method was used by SharkRAG (December 2024) to calculate a School Shark TAC of 207 tonnes for the 2025-26 fishing season. This method has been used in the last few years to set the School Shark TAC and involves deducting all state removals and commonwealth discards from the mortality threshold from the CKMR assessment. For 2025, the CKMR mortality threshold was estimated at 306 tonnes: Mortality threshold 2025 (306 tonnes) less state removals (47.3 tonnes) less Commonwealth discards (51.7 tonnes) = 207 tonnes.
- This TAC was ~5% higher than the 2024-25 TAC and was based on recommendations made at SharkRAG (July 2024) with one exception. Instead of using the weighted average to estimate the 2025-26 fishing season catch by South Australia, this State's catch was assumed to be 13 tonnes, as it was considered a more reliable representation of recent catches.
- AFMA Management supported the SharkRAG recommended TAC of 207 t for School Shark for the 2025-26 fishing season, with no undercatch or overcatch provisions, and a determined amount of 2 t.

The MAC discussed the following key points regarding the School Shark TAC:

- The Recreational Member raised concerns that recreational catch is still not included in the TAC setting process for School Shark, as catches are significant and should be considered.
- State catches of School Shark:
  - South Australia (SA) reduced catches of School Shark considerably in the current fishing season, and SSIA were appreciative of SA efforts.
  - There has been no shark fishing in Victoria for years.
  - Western Australia (WA) catches are still considerably high. WA is an effort managed fishery, making it more difficult to constrain catches. This State is developing a new harvest strategy; however, it could still be another year before anything is released.
- There was a recommendation for SSIA and any other NGOs with School Shark catch interest to write to Western Australian government to emphasise the need to constrain catches of School Shark.
- Industry noted that Marine Parks in WA could push the shark fleet closer to the SA border, where there is higher catch of School Shark, emphasising that spatial exclusion can enhance the problem rather

than lessen it. Additionally, Marine parks may be an incentive for vessels to target School Sharks in the next year before more closures are introduced.

- The MAC was informed that the Scientific Member is involved in a strategic review on Shark fishing in WA with the Western Australian Fishing Industry Council (WAFIC), which highlights issues facing the Shark fishery. Should be available soon on the [WAFIC website](#).
- Industry highlighted that School Shark are a bycatch species and will be continually caught with other target species despite quota determination.
- Industry members highlighted their previous concerns with the CKMR assessment and its inability to match historical catch data. Industry have suggested an additional assessment be completed that can be used to compare against the upcoming CKMR results to test the robustness and accuracy of the CKMR assessment.
- A suggestion was put forward to work with State agencies to create a shared assessment process to ease the cost burden from AFMA and industry.
- AFMA suggested that the results of the second CKMR are likely to be more robust than the first model and questioned the cost complication of conducting two assessments for one stock. They also reminded the MAC that a CKMR assessment was chosen as the results of the Tier 1 assessment were not accepted by everyone.
- AFMA plans to review of the School Shark Rebuilding Strategy following the CKMR assessment.
- The MAC supported the SharkRAG recommended TAC of 207 t for School Shark for the 2025-26 fishing season, with no undercatch or overcatch provisions, and a determined amount of 2 t.

## 4.2 Gummy Shark

The MAC noted the following key points regarding Gummy Shark TAC:

- Gummy Shark was last assessed in December 2023, and there are currently no sustainability concerns for the stock.
- SharkRAG advised that either the 'Annual' RBC (1708 t) or 3-year average RBC (1733) be used to determine the TAC. Noting, that both are conservative as the 2024-25 TAC was constrained by 8% to reduce by-catch of School Shark. See table 2 for the details of the two options:

**Table 2.** Two Gummy Shark TAC options considered by SharkRAG in 2024.

Options	RBC (tonnes)	State catch (tonnes)	Discards (tonnes)	TAC (tonnes)	Change in TAC from 2024-25
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> yr of Annual RBC</b>	1,708	96.1	48	1,563.9	+5.9 t
<b>3-year average RBC</b>	1,733	96.1	48	1,588.9	+30.9 t

- Both provisional TACs are higher than the 1,558 t TAC for 2024-25.
- When discussing the merits of these two TACs, SEMAC noted that both are:
  - conservative, as the 2024-25 TAC was constrained by 8% to reduce the incidental by-catch of School Shark; and



- are expected to lead to an ABARES stock status of 'subject to overfishing' for School Shark due to the high levels of discards in the current fishing season.
- SEMAC also noted that the Gummy Shark fishery is healthy, as the base assessment model in 2023, had stock status above the target reference point of 48% B<sub>0</sub> for all three separate sub-stocks (Bass Strait, TAS and SA).
- It also noted that discards for School Shark for the 2024-25 season as of the 2<sup>nd</sup> of Feb were 68.9 t and this was much higher than the last 4 years, with several months to go in the fishing season. For this reason, it may be necessary to reduce the current TAC of Gummy Shark to lessen the incidental by-catch of School Shark and support the agreed rebuilding rate.
- If discards were to continue at current rates for 2025-26, the CKMR cap of 306,000 kg will likely be exceeded.
- To manage Commonwealth removals to 258,745 kg (i.e. CKMR-State catch level), the Gummy Shark TAC would need to be reduced to 1,398 t. And yet, there is still no guarantee that such a TAC will cap mortality to below the CKMR threshold because the by-catch of School Shark varies spatially, and the State catches may increase. Such a TAC would also have a major impact on the economic viability of businesses and is considered premature by AFMA Management given a new CKMR assessment for School Shark is due in late 2025 (i.e. before the next TAC setting meeting) and will provide more certainty in the rate of population growth for School Sharks.
- In addition, there are signs that the School Shark abundance is increasing, including an increase in the trawl CPUE (which has been used as a relative index of abundance for School Sharks in the past), anecdotal reports from industry across the fishery, and an increase in the amount of discards and state catches in recent years.
- Given these signs, SEMAC noted the importance to determine if the 3% projected population increase used in CKMR estimates remains appropriate. SEMAC noted that CKMR assessment (due in late 2025) will aim at determining the rate of increase in School Shark abundance.
- AFMA Management and a minority of SEMAC members recommended a Gummy Shark TAC of 1,563.9 t for the 2025-26 fishing season for several reasons:
- First, it was based on the second year of the annual step down, making it consistent with the Commonwealth Fisheries Harvest Strategy Policy (CFHSP) as last year's TAC was set using the first year of the Annual RBC.
- Second, it was more precautionary. The high level of School Shark discarding in the current fishing season have not been accounted for in determining the 2025-26 Gummy Shark TAC and if they continue at similar levels next fishing season, the 2025 CKMR mortality threshold for School Shark will likely be exceeded again. The risk of exceeding this mortality threshold increases with any additional Gummy Shark quota because it increases fishing effort and the incidental capture of School Sharks. In their submission to SEMAC, Industry proposed that the 2025/26 Gummy Shark TAC be 1,589 t (based on using the 3-year average RBC of 1,733 tonnes because increased School Shark mortality is being caused by increasing School Shark abundance (which has increased significantly given years of restrictions) not fishing effort. And that this short-term measure be reviewed following the release of the close kin mark recapture report in CY2025 which will provide critical advice about the state of School Shark. Gummy Shark is 84% of the fishery's catch and economically critical. It also has high pressure from AFMA levies and is at risk of collapse if over-precautionary management continues to

constrain catches. 100 t of Gummy Shark has a GVP (at the wharf) of roughly \$1.5 million. This TAC of 1,589 tonnes was supported by a majority of SEMAC members, who noted that industry has taken significant steps to constrain Gummy Shark fishing to support the rebuilding strategy for School Shark and the additional 25 tonnes provides meaningful additional revenue.

The MAC also discussed the following key points regarding Gummy Shark TAC:

- SEMAC members raised concerns with the School Shark recovery plan as it currently stands, and believed it was worthwhile to convene a nationally coordinated approach to managing School Shark and Gummy Shark catch-sharing between Commonwealth and States. The MAC noted that the current catch-sharing arrangements were impacting MAC decisions, and a continual drop of Gummy Shark TAC as a result of School Shark catch is unfair and needs to be more balanced nationally.
- Industry noted that historically, scientist and fishery managers from Western Australia used to be involved in SharkRAG and it was recommended that this process be re-introduced as it was one way to raise awareness between states and Commonwealth.
- The Australian Government is proposing to change the zonation (allowed fishing methods) within several south-east marine parks which will cause significant inefficiencies in CY2025.

### 4.3 Blue-eye Trevalla

The MAC noted the following points regarding the Blue-eye Trevalla TAC:

- The first Dynamic Tier 4 assessment of the Blue-eye Trevalla slope stock was conducted in 2024 and accepted by SERAG.
- The RAG recommended an RBC of 296 t for this stock and that work be undertaken to support a Tier 1 assessment in future. A 15% Tier 4 discount factor reduced the RBC by 44 tonnes and state catches of 5.8 tonnes were deducted from the RBC.
- AFMA recommended a TAC of 282 (246 slope + 36 seamount) tonnes for Blue-eye Trevalla during the 2025-26 SESSF season as the first year of a two-year RBC period.

The MAC discussed the following points regarding Blue-eye Trevalla TAC:

- One Industry member stated that the stock is in a good position and that they do not feel the need to increase the TAC due to uncertainty in the assessment as shown by the RAG and killer whale interactions. They would prefer to leave the stock at its current level.
- Industry has concern with using information prior to 2000 as part of assessment, as auto longline began around 1998-2000. However, AFMA noted that as part of the Dynamic Tier 4 assessment, specific years were used.

### 4.4 Pink Ling

The MAC noted the following points regarding the Pink Ling TAC:

- A Tier 1 stock assessment was conducted in 2024 for the eastern stock of Pink Ling and indicated that biomass was at 43% of unfished levels. This suggested that the stock was improving because the previous assessment had this stock at 34%.

- SERAG recommended a static 4-year 666 t RBC from the 2024 assessment for Pink Ling east and a 2-year ~8.5% stepdown RBC following the pattern from the 2021 assessment (i.e. an RBC of 1,004 t for the 2025-26 season, and 924 t for the 2026-27 season).
- AFMA recommended a TAC for Pink Ling east of 588 t (661 t RBC – 47 t state – 26 t discards) and for Pink Ling west 993 t (1,004 t RBC – 1 t state – 10 t discards). East and west TACs sum to 1,581 t.
- AFMA will seek advice from SESSFRAG on the timing of the next western Pink Ling assessment.
- SEMAC was asked to provide advice on the need (or otherwise) to continue with the eastern notional catch limit.

The MAC discussed the following points regarding Pink Ling TAC:

- Previously, the eastern and western assessments were conducted at the same time, however, due to the amount of work involved in transitioning to the Stock Synthesis platform it was decided not to proceed with a western assessment in 2024. The west stock is at the end of the three-year RBC from the 2021 assessment, and the interim option was to implement a step down process.
- Industry suggested that the two step-down values be an average to produce a stable TAC for the next two seasons in order to minimise disruption. The Economic Member concurred that certainty and stability impact the economics of the fishery.
- The next Pink Ling west assessment is scheduled for no earlier than 2026.
- SEMAC recommended that AFMA revisit the concept of regionalisation of Pink Ling stocks.

**ACTION:** AFMA to review the status of past consideration of stock regionalisation for Pink Ling and outline what steps would be required to progress this matter (noting that circumstances in the fishery have changed since previous efforts were made) and report back to SEMAC.

## 4.5 Mirror Dory

The MAC noted the following points regarding the Mirror Dory TAC:

- A Tier 4 assessment was conducted in 2024 for the East and West stocks of Mirror Dory, resulting in CPUE recent estimates of 1.0218 (target = 1.1657 and limit = 0.4857) and 0.8568 (target = 1.0196 and limit = 0.4248), respectively.
- As of the 3 February 2025, 91% of the Mirror Dory TAC for the 2025-25 season has been caught.
- The RBC estimates from the 2024 assessments for Mirror Dory east was 373 t (a 103 t increase) and Mirror Dory west was 108 t (31 t increase), summing of 481 t.
- Deduction of 75 t discards yields a provisional TAC of 334 t.
- The provisional TAC exceeds the TAC for the current season (182 t) by more than 50%. Application of the Large Change Limiting Rule (LCLR) produces a TAC of 273 t (91 t greater than the current TAC) for the 2025-26 season and 334 t for the 2026-27 season.
- This would be the first time setting a multi-year RBC for Mirror Dory. The new stock assessment and data services schedule means that standardised CPUE series will only be available every second (even numbered) year.

- AFMA proposed an alternative proposal of a static 2-year TAC that is mid-way between the TAC constrained by the LCLR and the unconstrained/provisional TAC. This mid-point equates to 304 t and would apply for two years. This proposal results in a greater increase in the TAC in the first year (120 t instead of 90 t) but no increase in the second year. It is also more conservative than the application of the large change limiting rule in the second year.
- There is an opportunity to revisit the TAC in the second year through the MYTAC working group or SERAG.

Industry proposed that AFMA should allow full utilisation of the 334 t provisional TAC for two years as Mirror Dory quota is effectively fully caught this season, and significant discarding of Mirror Dory is already occurring.

Furthermore, Mirror Dory is not a target stock, it is a byproduct of fishing for Pink Ling. The cyclical nature of Mirror Dory catches means that the TAC does not constrain catches in low catch years, but it does influence the amount of discarding in good catch years. Full utilisation of Mirror Dory catch will add almost \$600,000 in GVP to the trawl fishery, offsetting the costs associated with returns to unsubsidised levies in 2026.

The MAC discussed the following points regarding Mirror Dory TAC:

- Industry is appreciative of AFMA's mid-point proposal as an alternative option.
- AFMA is undergoing broader discussions with SESSFRAG on how to deal with Tier 4 assessments with RBCs for 2-years. As such, AFMA's recommendations are conservative given the 2-year RBC.
- There is a market for Mirror Dory, even with the extra catch.
- Industry highlighted that there are already many precautionary measures in place including a 15% discount factor, a large reduction in trawl boats and areas of the mid-slope closed.
- The scientific member supported the outputs from the Tier 4 assessments and noted that risks are accounted for through the use of the 15% discount factor.
- The MAC noted the wording of the LCLR in the [Harvest Strategy](#), which states that "the large change limiting rule may be applied for each year of the period until the RBC is achieved". Use of the word "may" implies that the application of the rule is optional.
- Last year's Commission decision to apply the LCLR was made when the TAC was not yet fully caught.

## 4.6 Oreo Basket

SEMAC noted the following points regarding Oreo Basket TAC for the 2025-26 season:

- The estimated RBC produced by the 2024 assessment was 548 t, more than three times greater than the 170 t RBC produced by the 2020 assessment.
- SERAG was concerned that the CPUE may no longer be an appropriate index of abundance for this basket of species.
- SERAG recommended maintaining the RBC of 170 t from the 2020 assessment until such time as the discard strata investigations by CSIRO are complete.
- The default 15% Tier 4 discount factor is not applied to this basket of species as 40% of Oreo habitat is protected by deepwater closures.

The MAC discussed the following points:

- Concern with Oreo Basket as an assessed species, as it a bycatch species that is not impacted by quota. Rather should focus on the species that can be controlled by quota.
- This is being considered as part of the Multi-Species Harvest Strategy project.
- Recommendation to use spatial management rather than quota as a management tool.

**ACTION:** AFMA to provide regular updates on the Multi-Species Harvest Strategy project to the MAC.

## 5 Climate Risk Framework

Daniel Corrie and Natalie Couchman sought advice from the MAC on the trial application of AFMA's Climate Risk Framework (CRF) in the SESSF. The MAC noted the application of the CRF to seven SESSF species (Royal Red Prawn, Orange Roughy, Jackass Morwong, Blue-eye Trevalla and John Dory, Gummy Shark and Elephant Fish). SERAG and SharkRAG have provided feedback on the application of the CRF on individual SESSF species.

General feedback from SERAG and SharkRAG include:

- The timeline of responses associated with risk profiles need to be reconsidered in the context of climate induced rate of change and practicalities of implementing management arrangements in short timeframes.
- Beyond typical application of harvest control rules, which can be implemented quickly, the framework should allow for a staged implementation of longer-term arrangements.
- The term 'risk' is typically associated with negative impacts. The framework recognises that climate may bring about positive impacts – the term 'impacts' might be more appropriate.
- Reconsider the category 'none' in the risk profile – there is no such thing as 'no' risk.
- A higher risk rating should be considered where climate impacts are unknown. For example, Royal Red Prawn is assessed overall to have a risk rating of 'none' despite there being uncertainty associated with climate impacts. While this is influenced by the stock being assessed as 'well above target', it does not seem reasonable that the overall risk ranking is 'none' for a species with uncertain climate impacts.
- Revise the 'stock status' categories for species with no biomass estimated, because the term 'near target' is not applicable for those species.

The MAC concurred with the residual risks produced by SERAG and SharkRAG for each of the example species.

The MAC discussed the following points:

- Maladaptation. For a multi-species fishery such as the SESSF, technical interactions mean a positive response for one species could have a negative response on another. AFMA is currently thinking on how this will be done both in the CRF and Harvest Strategy.

- The framework focusses on changes in biomass, but not range shift. This can be addressed through explicit consideration of range shift, where the information is available, at Step 1 of the framework.

## 6 WORDaC Murray Dogfish Closure update

SEMAC noted the following points regarding Orange Roughy research fishing in the Murray Dogfish Closure during the 2024-25 season:

- SEMAC supported a proposal by the South East Trawl Fishing Association (SETFIA) to undertake Orange Roughy research fishing in those parts of the MDC shallower than 700 m when it met in February 2024.
- Access to the MDC was granted on the basis that vessels have EM equipment fitted and are subject to 100% footage review before the vessel is permitted to re-enter the closure.
- Trigger limits and decision points were set for any interactions involving threatened dogfish.
- Approximately 70 t of Orange Roughy were caught in the MDC, representing 93% of the 75 t sub-limit for this area. No threatened dogfish were recorded by observers, reported by skippers or detected through 100% review of the EM footage from the two participating vessels.
- AFMA intends to extend the trial into the 2025-26 SESSF Season, under the same arrangements as the current season but without the requirements to carry observers for the first trip of the season or wait for the completion of footage review before the vessel can re-enter the MDC.
- Other vessels participating in the Western Orange Research Data Collection (WORDaC) program during the 2025-26 season may be permitted to access the MDC providing they meet the above requirements.

## 7 Modified dropline exemption for upper slope dogfish closures

The MAC noted the following points on the modified dropline exemption:

- To promote the recovery of these dogfish, AFMA has introduced a range of measures over the years (e.g. catch limits and spatial closures) and in 2012 implemented the Upper-slope Dogfish Management Strategy.
- The current strategy (2022) includes a network of targeted spatial closures, covering more than 4,738 km<sup>2</sup> between the depths of 200-650 m.
- When the strategy was last reviewed, an operator expressed an interest in using modified droplines in 2 dogfish closure areas off NE Tasmania, where valuable Blue-eye Trevalla grounds were located.
- To assess the effectiveness of this gear, 2 trials were recently undertaken in these 2 closure areas under several AFMA scientific permits.
- Results of trial 1:
  - 98.4% of the 16,309.4 kg landed in 26 sets was Blue-eye Trevalla; and
  - No dogfish were caught and there were no interactions with ETP species.
- Results of trial 2:
  - 87.2 % of the 557.1 kg landed in 2 sets was Blue-eye Trevalla (10.2% was Pink Ling).

- No Dogfish were caught and there were no interactions with ETP; and
- The Shellcatch EM system was effective at monitoring catch and has the potential to be used as an EM tool.
- Based on the results of these 2 trials, the operator requested continued access to these 2 dogfish closure areas without the need for a scientific permit.
- If an exemption for the use of modified dropline gear is granted, AFMA intends that any GHAT operator could adopt this gear, subject to the following measures to ensure the integrity of these Dogfish closure areas:
  - Fishing will be restricted to daylight hours;
  - Fishing will be restricted to the use of modified dropline gear that ensures all hooks remain at least 5 metres above the seafloor; and
  - An EM system is onboard and 100% of the EM footage is reviewed.
- Monitoring is necessary as a 12-month ban will be imposed on a vessel if >3 Dogfish are caught in a closure area during a fishing season.
- Such a ban is consistent with exemptions that already exist for the use of limited fishing methods (hydraulic hand reel drop lining) in several dogfish closure areas.
- Subject to how much fishing occurs under this exemption, AFMA may look to implement a cap in a closure area for all operators combined (e.g. 10 dogfish).

SEMAC discussed the following key points:

- Closures do not apply to recreational fishers as they are not monitored by AFMA.
- AFMA does not regulate the number of lines the operator has on one line.
- Specific places in the closure, such as areas known within the closure for more Dogfish interaction, will not be monitored more closely than other areas within the closure.
- Concerns surrounding consistency in closure regulations. These concerns include:
  - Consistency in rules across the fishery by allowing the method in all dogfish closure where dropline is currently prohibited.
  - Consider also allowing the use of 'hydraulic hand reel' in all dogfish closures that it is currently prohibited given the previous work completed by CSIRO to verify this method as being low impact on dogfish as well as the improved monitoring capability available now via EM compared to when the Dogfish Strategy was first implemented.
  - Adopt existing wording in closure direction for species included in the move-on trigger and well as ensure consistency in terms of the trigger number used across the fishery.
  - Adopt consistent wording for dawn and dusk hours used in other AFMA rules where daytime/nighttime need to be distinguished.
  - Adopt a closure-wide limit of 10 dogfish that would apply across all operators that fish in the closure and trigger a 12-month total fishing ban in the relevant closure.
- Recommendation for a review of the closure after 12 months of implementation.

- Industry member highlighted to the MAC the five principles of Fisheries Management Paper Number 15, [the AFMA Bycatch Strategy](#), to reiterate the importance of using the strategy when creating measure to mitigate protected species interactions.

## 7.1 Actions and recommendations for agenda item 7

SEMAC supported AFMA's proposal to provide an exemption to fish in upper-slope dogfish closure areas using modified droplines, in accordance with the requirements outlined in the paper and consideration of the following recommendations:

- Consistency in rules across the fishery by allowing the method in all dogfish closures where dropline is currently prohibited.
- Consider also allowing the use of 'hydraulic hand reel' in all dogfish closures that it is currently prohibited given the previous work completed by CSIRO to verify this method as being low impact on dogfish as well as the improved monitoring capability available now via EM compared to when the Dogfish Strategy was first implemented.
- Adopt existing wording in closure direction for species included in the move-on trigger and well as ensure consistency in terms of the trigger number used across the fishery.
- Adopt consistent wording for dawn and dusk hours used in other AFMA rules where daytime/nighttime need to be distinguished.
- Adopt a closure-wide limit of 10 dogfish that would apply across all operators that fish in the closure and trigger a 12-month total fishing ban in the relevant closure.

## 8 SPF Harvest Strategy

SEMAC noted SPFRAG proposed changes to the SPF Harvest Strategy including changes to exploitation rates for three quota species and the inclusion of one sentence to make it clear which biomass estimate is the most appropriate to use.

SEMAC is being asked to endorse the updated SPF Harvest Strategy, noting that the revised exploitation rates have been used as the basis for RBC and consequently TAC advice for the 2025-26 season for advice under Agenda item 9.

The MAC noted the following key changes:

- Two stages of the project *Review and Refinement of the Harvest Strategy for the Small Pelagic Fishery*.
- First stage resulted in a SPFRAG recommendation to change the Harvest Strategy to include explicit HCRs that reduce exploitation rates as the spawning biomass declines towards a point where recruitment may be impaired.
- Stage 2 of the project was to update the biological parameters and replicate the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) testing to refine settings in the HS. SPFRAG recommended increasing the exploitation rates for Jack Mackerel, Blue Mackerel and Redbait on the basis they account for new information and MSE testing shows they are meeting the requirements of the Commonwealth Fisheries Harvest Strategy Policy. See proposed changes in Table 3.



**Table 3.** Proposed changes to SPF species exploitation rate

Species	Current Max. Exploitation Rate %	Proposed Max. Exploitation Rate %
Blue Mackerel east and west	15	20
Jack Mackerel east and west	12	14
Redbait east and west	10	12
Australian Sardine east	20	20

- In addition to the revised exploitation rates, the following sentence has been included to make it clear that where more than one biomass estimate is available, the highest robust estimate will be used as the proxy for  $B_0$ :

*“In applying the HCRs, the highest robust estimate of spawning biomass available for each stock is used as the proxy for  $B_0$  against which other estimates of spawning biomass are compared.”*

## 8.1 Actions and recommendations for agenda item 8

SEMAC endorsed the revised SPF Harvest Strategy, the key change being the Tier 1 (maximum) exploitation rates for three of the species: Tier 1 Blue mackerel east and west from 15 % to 20 % · Jack mackerel east and west from 12 % to 14 % · Redbait east and west from 10 % to 12 % · and no changes for Australian sardine, maintaining it at 20 %.

## 9 SPF TAC recommendations for 2025-26

Sally Weekes introduced the agenda item seeking SEMAC to provide TAC advice for the SPF during the 2025-26 fishing year.

SEMAC to note that the SPFRAG advice and AFMA recommendations are based on the revised exploitation rates considered in agenda item 8. Excluding Jack mackerel east, AFMA’s TAC recommendations are consistent with SPFRAG RBC advice and the revised SPF Harvest Strategy that requires all known sources of mortality to be considered when calculating a TAC.

SEMAC discussions and recommendations are provided for each species in the *2025 SPF species summaries* on the [AFMA website](#). Considerable time was spent discussing the recommended TACs for Jack Mackerel east. These deliberations informed the recommended TACs described in the *2025 SPF species summaries* and are described in more detail below.

- Jack Mackerel east assessment results were too uncertain to use. Ultimately, the RAG agreed to apply the harvest strategy and drop this species to a Tier 2 as a robust biomass estimate could not be calculated, and recommended increasing undercatch from 10% to 20% to provide extra catch for the next year to alleviate pressure on Industry.
- If the Jack Mackerel east Tier drops TAC will go to 10,000, however the RAG noted that a TAC up to 13,000 t is sustainable, with catches to date are around 10,000 t.
- AFMA supports development of the fishery and undertaking a new Jack Mackerel east, Daily Egg Production Method (DEPM) estimate in 2 years’ time (2027), however if there is no commercial interest to maintain the TAC level then AFMA would recommend this species drops to Tier 2 as per the SPF Harvest Strategy.

SEMAC noted a summary of the RBC and TAC AFMA advice in Table 4:

**Table 4.**

Species	2024-25 TAC (t)	2025-26 Tier (season no.)	2025-26 RBC (t)	2025-26 recommended TAC (t)	Change in TAC from 2024-25 (t)
Australian Sardines	8,130	1 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	8,545	8,100	-30
Blue Mackerel east	11,530	1 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	16,000	15,510	+3,980
Blue Mackerel west	3,240	3 (9 <sup>th</sup> )	4,325	4,320	+1,080
Jack Mackerel east	18,650	2 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	10,940	TBC	
Jack Mackerel west	2,100	1 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	8,493	8,490	+6,390
Rebait east	5,380	1 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	6,480	6,470	+1,090
Redbait west	3,340	2 (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	4,007	4,010	+670

Simon Boag provided a brief overview of the letter from Industry which aims to provide input from these associations to SEMAC members prior to their advice on eastern Jack Mackerel:

- Given there has been no fishing in the western region, and low Australian Sardine catches, Industry has elected to allow western stocks to degrade through tiers and not undertake Sardine surveys.
- In 2023 a survey of eastern Jack Mackerel failed to locate spawning fish either spatially/ or temporarily (and potentially complicated by trawl closures). SPFRAG has recommended that a new survey be run this year. With some additions to the work proposed to better understand spawning patterns the likely cost (gross of public good) of this program is roughly \$1 million. Other levies are additional to these levies. Considering risk/catch/cost, 1 – 1.5 vessels cannot afford to do the survey.
- Industry had 6 proposals:
  1. Adopt SPFRAG advice about new exploitation rates;
  2. Allow Australian sardines and western stock to degrade through tiers;
  3. Adopt SPFRAG advice for a transitional 13,000 t RBC for Jack Mackerel east in 2025/26;
  4. Not undertake an additional Jack Mackerel east survey allowing the RBC to degrade into Tier-2 in 2027/28 (Industry will likely support another survey in time to ensure the stock does not fall to Tier-3);
  5. Allow Redbait to drop to Tier 2 (noting new exploitation rates); and
  6. Support AFMA investigation in why there was no short interval control on the survey vessel that could have ended the survey when it was clear that fish were not spawning. And the reasonableness of the period between the realisation that the survey had failed, and subsequent advice to AFMA.

The MAC discussed the following key points:

- AFMA noted to the RAG that undercatch and overcatch is not the best strategy to allow for extra catch and would recommend stepping outside the TAC rather than changing under/over catch.

- If the catches in the fishery continue as is, there is no threat to exceeding the TACs (currently taking approximately 50% of the TAC). The MAC note that Jack Mackerel is a winter catch, with the main operator indicating they would not be fishing during winter of 2025.
- AFMA raised concerns that if main species Blue Mackerel being targeted the TAC may be fully caught, this could potentially increase Jack Mackerel east catch which could become limiting or stop fishing operations.
- Without a new DEPM Redbait East will drop to Tier 2 in 2027-28 noting that another DEPM should be undertaken prior to dropping to tier 3.
- Highlighted that SPFRAG agreed that a 13,000 t TAC for Jack Mackerel east for the 2025/26 season was sustainable.
- AFMA agree that it is justifiable to review the process for the 2024 Jack Mackerel east DEPM survey and look at developing a methodology to apply for future surveys that would allow a survey to cease should significant issues arise. It appeared that the survey did not coincide with the peak spawning season, without these parameters a robust estimate of spawning biomass could not be calculated, therefore developing a process to incorporate these limitations should reduce the risk of paying the full cost of the survey that resulted in unusable outcomes.

**ACTION:** AFMA to review the process for the 2024 Jack Mackerel East DEPM survey and consider incorporating decision points for future surveys, which would allow the survey to be terminated if an issue was significant enough. This should reduce the risk of paying the full cost of a survey that results in unusable outcome.

## 10 SEMAC letter to the Commission

The MAC discussed the following points regarding the letter from SEMAC to the AFMA Commission:

- AFMA has concerns that the letter may potentially be re-iterating an issue that the Commission is well aware of. It may be more constructive for the letter to state how the issue impacts the way in which the MAC provides advice.
- The MAC agreed that providing examples on how marine spatial planning is impacting management decisions would better illustrate the MAC's concerns.
- One Commissioner attending the meeting as an observer highlighted the Commission's interest in knowing the effect of broader policies on the MAC's
- The scientific member highlighted that offshore windfarm planning processes in the EU and UK consider commercial fishing and shipping routes (amongst other things). The planning process in Australia lacks this level of coordination.
- Industry requested that AFMA review its fishery closures to counteract a range of other closures that are impacting Industry. AFMA informed the MAC that it is considering this request and highlighted that improved reporting driven by EM may allow for some areas to be reopened.

**ACTION:** SEMAC members to provide comments out-of-session to finalise the letter to the Commission.

## **Other Business**

The Chair has advised that he and John Harrison, Recreational member, will be stepping down after six years on the committee and thanked the Committee for the great opportunity and work towards complex fishery issues.

SEMAC thanked and commend David and John for their work and contribution to the South East Management Advisory Committee.

## **Close of meeting**

The Chair thanked the MAC for their contribution and closed the meeting on Day 2 at 14.14 PM.

## Attachment A - Register of Interests

Members	Declared interests - Last updated: July 2023
Dr David McGlennon	Chair - No interest pecuniary or otherwise
Ms Anissa Lawrence	No pecuniary interest Director of TierraMar Ltd Independent consultant Undertakes contracts for a number of Conservation NGOs, government departments, non-government agencies and the private sector on a range of fishery related matters Conservation member on SharkRAG, SPFRAG, SEMAC, Spencer Gulf Prawn RAC and the South Australian Rock Lobster MAC Chair of Ocean Future Fund Inc.
Mr Gerry Geen	No pecuniary interest. Industry member of SPFRAG
Mr Will Mure	Sole Director of Mures Fishing P/L Commonwealth fish receiver permit Tasmania fish processing licence Scalefish hook boat SFR, SEQ Quota Holding Permits, Auto longline fishing permit High Seas permit Blue eye trevalla SFRs, Ling SFRs, Ribaldo ITP Mixed species Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) and SFRs Member of various fishing related associations including Seafood Industry Australia (SIA), South East Trawl Fishing Industry Association (SETFIA), Southern Shark Industry Alliance (SSIA), Tasmanian Seafood Industry Council (TSIC) Industry member on SERAG
Dr Paul McShane	Chair of SERAG and a member of SEMAC and SESSFRAG. No pecuniary interest in the SESSF. Principal of Global Marine Resource Management Pty Ltd. Adjunct Professor (Fisheries and Aquaculture) College of Science and Engineering, James Cook University.
Dr Sarah Jennings	Economics member on SERAG and SESSFRAG. Member of AFMA Economics Working Group. Independent economics consultant. No pecuniary or other interest.
Mr John Harrison	Panel Member of the Independent Review of the Domestic Commercial Vessel Safety Legislation and Cost and Charging Arrangements.
Mr Simon Boag	Industry member on SERAG. Executive Officers to SETFIA, SSIA and SPFIA. SETFIA and SSIA receives funding from AFMA to complete projects under co-management agreements. Undertakes contracts as an independent consultant.
Ms Sally Weekes	AFMA Demersal and Midwater Senior Manager (Acting) – AFMA SEMAC member – no interest pecuniary or otherwise.

Executive Officer	
Miss Audrey Kent	AFMA – Senior Management Support Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
AFMA Attendees	
Ms Anna Willock	Employed by AFMA, Acting CEO, Fisheries Management Branch, no interest, pecuniary or otherwise.
Mr Daniel Corrie	Employed by AFMA, Senior Manager, Climate Adaption and Strategic Reform, no interest, pecuniary or otherwise.
Dr Mark Grubert	Employed by AFMA, South East Trawl & Great Australian Bight Trawl Manager – no interest, pecuniary or otherwise.
Ms Jennifer Power-Geary	Employed by AFMA - Management Support Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
Ms Yvette Lamont	Employed by AFMA – Manager SPF, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
Ms Alannah Wood	Employed by AFMA - Senior Management Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
Ms Micheel Henriksen	Employed by AFMA - Senior Management Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
Ms Natalie Couchman	Employed by AFMA - Manager, Climate Adaption and Strategic Reform. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.
Mr Anthony Coggan	Employed by AFMA - Senior Management Officer, Demersal and Midwater Fisheries. No interest pecuniary or otherwise.

## Attachment B – Agenda

### Day 1: Agenda

Start (Duration)	Item	Purpose	Presenter/s
<b>08:30</b> <b>(30 min)</b>	1. Preliminaries		
	1.1. Welcome and apologies	For ACTION	Chair
	1.2. Declarations of interest	For ACTION	Chair
	1.3. Adoption of agenda	For ACTION	Chair
	1.4. Minutes from previous meetings	For NOTING	Chair
	1.5. Actions arising from previous meetings	For NOTING	AFMA
09:00 (15 min)	2. Manager's Update (taken as read)	For NOTING	Sally Weekes
09:15 (15 min)	3. Industry Update (taken as read)	For NOTING	Industry
09:30 (60 min)	4. SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025–26	For ADVICE	AFMA
10:30 (15 min)	<b>Morning Tea</b>		
10:45 (105 min)	4. SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025–26 (contd.)	For ADVICE	AFMA
12:30 (60 min)	<b>Lunch</b>		
13:30 (90 min)	4. SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025–26 (contd.)	For ADVICE	AFMA
15:00 (15 min)	<b>Afternoon Tea</b>		
15:15 (75 min)	5. Climate Risk Framework: SESSF Trial	For ADVICE	Daniel Corrie
16:45 (15 min)	Review of action items	For ADVICE	Membership
<b>17:00</b>	<b>End of Day</b>		

## Day 2: Agenda

Start (Duration)	Item	Purpose	Presenter/s
08:30 (60 min)	4. SESSF TAC recommendations for 2025–26 (contd.)	For ADVICE	AFMA
09:30 (15 min)	6. WORDAC Murray Dogfish Closure update	For NOTING	AFMA
09:45 (45 min)	7. Modified dropline exemption for upper slope dogfish closures	For ADVICE	AFMA
10:30 (15 min)	<b>Morning Tea</b>		
10:45 (45 min)	8. SPF Harvest Strategy	For ADVICE	AFMA
11:30 (45 min)	9. SPF TAC recommendations for 2025-26	For ADVICE	AFMA
12:30 (60 min)	<b>Lunch</b>		
13:30 (30 min)	10. SEMAC letter to the Commission	For ADVICE	Membership
14:00 (15 min)	11. Other Business	For NOTING	Chair
14:00 (15 min)	Review of action items and next meeting	For ADVICE	Membership
<b>17:00</b>	<b>Close of meeting</b>		



## Attachment C

**Table 6** Action items arising from previous SEMAC meetings

Complete/Redundant			Underway	Yet to start		SEMAC advice required / for noting
	Agenda item	Meeting No.	Description	Responsibility	Timeframe	Status update
	3. Industry update	55	AFMA to provide SEMAC with a summary of its engagement in various Australian Government marine spatial planning processes and the status of those efforts.	AFMA	As soon as possible	<u>Yet to start</u>
	3. Industry update	55	SEMAC to write to the AFMA Commission to further emphasise the need for coordinated marine spatial planning.	SEMAC Chair	As soon as possible	<u>Underway</u> The SEMAC Chair has drafted a letter that will be finalised during agenda item 10 at SEMAC 56.
	7. Protected Species Updates and Management Arrangements	54	AFMA to investigate the reason for a high proportion of protected shark species interactions that occurred between 2021-2022 in the Gillnet and Shark Hook Sector fishery (as shown in Figure 15 of the <a href="#">Protected Species paper 7 SEMAC 54</a> ).	AFMA	SEMAC (July 25)	<u>Underway</u> Further investigation will be undertaken as part of the development and refinement of the automated data dashboards. SEMAC will be updated accordingly.
	9. EM Trial Project	54	AFMA to provide SEMAC with the EM privacy impact statement when available.	EM team	As soon as possible	<u>Underway</u> Currently awaiting clearance.
	6. Monitoring in the Gillnet fishery	52	AFMA to provide Industry with an estimated breakdown of the cost savings for expanding EM against the additional costs for installing and reviewing EM for the remaining Gillnet boats.	EM team	As soon as possible	<u>Yet to start</u>

## Attachment D

**Table 7** Actions from Meeting 56

Agenda Item	No.	Action	Entity Responsible	Timeframe
4. SESSF TAC Recommendations	1.	AFMA to review the status of past consideration of stock regionalisation for Pink Ling and outline what steps would be required to progress this matter (noting that circumstances in the fishery have changed since previous efforts were made) and report back to SEMAC.	AFMA	As soon as possible
4. SESSF TAC Recommendations	2.	AFMA to provide regular updates on the Multi-Species Harvest Strategy project to the MAC.	AFMA	As soon as possible
9. SPF TAC Recommendations	3.	AFMA to review the process for the 2024 Jack Mackerel East DEPM survey and consider incorporating decision points for future surveys, which would allow the survey to be terminated if an issue was significant enough. This should reduce the risk of paying the full cost of a survey that results in unusable outcome.	AFMA	As soon as possible
10. Letter to the Commission	4.	SEMAC members to provide comments out-of-session to finalise the letter to the Commission.	SEMAC	As soon as possible

## Attachment E

**Table 8:** Overview of relevant considerations in the TAC setting process; A/E = Albany and Esperance; BC = Bycatch; D/A = Determined Amount; New = New assessment; P = Page Number in the 2025 SESSF Species Summary document; SL= Slope; SM=Seamount; U/O = Overcatch and Undercatch; WoE =Weight of Evidence; 1° = Primary; 2° = Secondary; 3° = Tertiary/Byproduct.

Species	Assessment Tier (year)	Economic value	Species category	RBC maintained by SESSF/RAG?	Stock status	Climate projections	AFMA recommended TAC 2025-26 (t)	Change in TAC from 2024-25 (t)	Issues Discussed by SERAG/SHARKRAG	Requires MAC Input?
Orange roughy (East), p41	1 (2021)	1°	4-yr RBC	Yes			880	+1		No
Orange roughy (Cascade), p46	1 (2009)	1°	Annual RBC	N/A			397	0	Proposal to categorise as trigger species	No
Oreo, basket, p50	4 (2020)	3°	RBC period TBC	N/A			137	0	2024 assessment rejected due to concerns with CPUE and strata design	Yes
DW Shark (East), p54	WoE (2024)	2°	Annual RBC	N/A			24	0	Dynamic Tier 4 assessment deferred	Yes
DW Shark (West), p58	4 (2023)	2°	3-yr RBC	N/A			327	0	Dynamic Tier 4 assessment deferred	No
Orange roughy (S/PB), p62	1 (2021)	1°	4-yr RBC	Yes			67	0		No
Orange roughy (S), p62	1 (2000)	BC	Depleted	N/A			31			Yes
Orange roughy (West), p66	1(2002)	BC	Depleted	N/A			60	0	200 t RCA	Yes
Blue warehou, p69	4 (2013)	BC	Depleted	N/A			30	0		Yes

Species	Assessment Tier (year)	Economic value	Species category	RBC maintained by SESSFRAG?	Stock status	Climate projections	AFMA recommended TAC 2025-26 (t)	Change in TAC from 2024-25 (t)	Issues Discussed by SERAG/SHARKRAG	Requires MAC Input?
Flathead, p73	1 (2022)	1°	3-yr RBC	N/A			2,333	0	Continue to constrain TAC to limit Jackass Morwong discards	Yes
Jackass morwong (East), p79	1 (2021)	BC	Depleted	N/A			50	0		Yes
Jackass morwong (West), p79	1 (2018)	3°								
John dory, p85	4 (2021)	BC	Depleted	N/A			60	0		Yes
Mirror dory, p89	4 (2024)	2°	2-yr RBC	N/A			273	<b>+91</b>	New assessment. Application of large change limiting rule	Yes
Redfish, p93	1 (2020)	BC	Depleted	N/A			30	0		Yes
School whiting, p97	1 (2024)	1°	2-yr RBC	N/A			1,202	<b>+288</b>	New assessment	Yes
Silver trevally, p103	1 (2023)	2°	3-yr RBC	Yes			25	0		No
Blue-eye trevalla (SL), p108	DT4 (2024)	1°	2-yr RBC	N/A			282	+19	New assessment. TAC at left includes 36 t seamount component	Yes
Blue grenadier, p114	1 (2022)	1°	3- RBC	Yes			17,084	0		No
Gemfish (East), p119	1 (2010)	BC	Depleted	N/A			100	0		Yes

Species	Assessment Tier (year)	Economic value	Species category	RBC maintained by SESSFRAG?	Stock status	Climate projections	AFMA recommended TAC 2025-26 (t)	Change in TAC from 2024-25 (t)	Issues Discussed by SERAG/SHARKRAG	Requires MAC Input?
Pink ling (East), p124	1 (2024)	1°	4-yr RBC	N/A			1,581	+48	East: New assessment and eastern notional limit West: Step-down RBC proposed by SERAG	Yes
Pink ling (West), p124	1 (2021)	1°	2-yr RBC							
Silver warehou, p130	1 (2021)	1°	3-yr RBC	N/A			350	0	2024 assessment rejected by SERAG. Proposal to maintain the TAC from the most recent accepted assessment.	Yes
Gummy shark, p31	1 (2023)	1°	RBC period TBC	Yes			TBC	TBC	Discarding of School Shark.	Yes
School shark, p36	1 (2018)	2°	Depleted	N/A			207	+10	CKMR estimate used to cap removals. Accounts for all sources of mortality.	Yes
Orange roughy (non-quota), p135	N/A	BC	N/A	N/A	N/A		50	0		No
Hagfish (non-quota), p135	N/A	1°	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	0	See update to SERAG at Appendix B	No

Table 9: Trigger species summary (footnotes overleaf)

Species/stock	Previous assessment or review	Assessment tier	Current biomass (or proxy)	Target biomass (or proxy)	Limit biomass (or proxy)	Review year	GVP 22–23 FY (\$M)	Fishing mortality	Biomass	Climate sensitivity	TAC or catch limit (t)	Catch trigger (t)	24–25 Catch (t) @20/01/25	24–25 %TAC @20/01/25	RAG review outcome
Alfonsino <sup>a</sup>	2013	3	0.022	0.149	0.479	2024	0				1,017	50	0	0%	Footnote (i)
Royal Red Prawn <sup>b</sup>	2020	4	1.605	0.946	0.394	2024	0.06				628	50	92.2	14%	Footnote (ii)
Smooth Oreo - Cascade <sup>b</sup>	2010	4	1.358	0.499	0.200	2024	n/a				150	50	0	0%	Footnote (iii)
Elephantfish <sup>c</sup>	2020	WoE	$F < F_{MSY}$	0.130	0.190	2026	0.11				114	86	23.4	19%	-
Smooth Oreo - other <sup>c</sup>	2020	WoE	$F < F_{MSY}$	0.160	0.230	2026	0.09				90	68	0.1	<1%	-
Ocean Perch <sup>b</sup>	2020	4	1.077	0.927	0.464	2026	0.75				318	236	87.2	25%	-
Ribaldo <sup>b</sup>	2020	4	0.789	0.373	0.186	2026	0.13				393	295	59.5	14%	-
Sawshark <sup>b</sup>	2020	4	0.948	0.729	0.365	2026	0.93				525	395	83.8	10%	-
Blue-eye Trevalla seamount <sup>d</sup>	2021	5	33%	48%	20%	2027	n/a				36	27	1.6	4%	-
Gemfish - West <sup>b</sup>	2022	4	1.046	1.029	0.429	2028	0.19				180	135	32.7	17%	-
Boarfish ECDWT <sup>c</sup> (catch limit)	2023	WoE	Using Boarfish in CTS as proxy			2029	0				200	10	0	0%	-

### Reference points for each species/stock

a =  $F$ -based reference points:  $F_{48}$  (target) and  $F_{20}$  (limit)

b = CPUE-based reference points

c = Weight of Evidence (WoE) approach based on outputs of ecological risk assessments and recent catches

d = Relative biomass reference points:  $B_{48}$  (target) and  $B_{20}$  (limit)

### **2024 RAG review outcomes for relevant species**

(i) Alfonsino (time period triggered): At its November 2024 meeting, SERAG noted concerns from Fish Ageing Services on the veracity of a recent ageing paper on Alfonsino and found no evidence to deviate from previous TAC or trigger advice for this species. AFMA intends to implement a permit condition requiring prior notice when fishing in the area of the ECDTWS to improve biological data collection from this sector.

(ii) Royal Red Prawn (catch triggered): The 50 t catch trigger for Royal Red Prawn was breached in September 2024. One operator owns >95% of Royal Red Prawn quota and has MSC certification for the harvest of this species. Industry intends to progress an assessment of Royal Red Prawn in the near future to satisfy an MSC condition. AFMA will review the categorisation of Royal Red Prawn as a trigger species following any such assessment.

(iii) Smooth Oreo Cascade (time period triggered): SERAG found no evidence to deviate from the previous TAC or trigger advice for Smooth Oreo Cascade when it met in November 2024. AFMA intends to implement a condition on SESSF Trawl Boat SFRs requiring prior notice when fishing the Cascade Plateau to improve biological data collection from this area.