



Australian Government

Australian Fisheries Management Authority



Australian Government



Queensland  
Government



TORRES STRAIT  
**PZJA**  
PROTECTED ZONE  
JOINT AUTHORITY



# Torres Strait Prawn Management Advisory Committee (TSPMAC)

**MINUTES  
TSPMAC 10  
30 JUNE – 1 JULY  
2010**

**NORTHERN FISHERIES CENTRE CAIRNS**

**CHAIR: Mr. Jim Gillespie**



Queensland  
Government



**TORRES STRAIT PRAWN  
MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING No. 10**  
30 June – 1 July 2010: Commencing at 9:00 am  
Venue: Northern Fisheries Centre - 38-40 Tingira Street, Portsmith, Cairns

**Preliminaries – Chairs opening remarks/Adoption of Agenda/Disclosure of Interests/Apologies**

**AGENDA**

- 1 Meeting Administration**
  - 1.1 Ratification of TSPMAC No. 9 meeting record (AFMA)
  - 1.2 Actions and/or business arising from previous TSPMAC meetings (AFMA)
  - 1.3 TSPMAC correspondence
- 2 Reports**
  - 2.1 Industry update – 2010 to date (Industry)
  - 2.2 Management update (including observers) (AFMA)
  - 2.3 Compliance report - Season update on activities (QB&FP)
  - 2.4 Environment report (AFMA)
  - 2.5 Data preliminary analysis of trends in 2010 catch and effort data (QPI&F research)
- 3 Research**
  - 3.1 Future funding for routine data assessment and reporting (currently Clive) position (QPI&F)
- 4 Management**
  - 4.1 TSPF Harvest Strategy (AFMA)
  - 4.2 Review of TSPF management arrangements including 20m boat limit (AFMA)
  - 4.3 Ghost nets and marine debris - outcome of survey or rubbish (TSRA)
  - 4.4 Sponge Farm – marker buoys and current progress on farm (TSRA)
  - 4.5 External leasing – update (QPI&F)
  - 4.6 Industry code of conduct for the responsible disposal of trawl rubbish (AFMA)
  - 4.7 investment warning (AFMA)
- 5 Finances**
  - 5.1 2010/11 draft budget (AFMA)
- 6 Other business**
  - 6.1 Dates and location for next meeting

Individuals wishing to attend the meeting as an observer are required to contact the Chair (Mr. Jim Gillespie: care of Lisa Cocking, TSPMAC Executive Officer; [lisa.cocking@afma.gov.au](mailto:lisa.cocking@afma.gov.au)) notifying him of your desire to attend.

## TSPMAC 10 decision record

- 1.1.1 The TSPMAC **AGREED** to adopt the minutes from the TSPMAC 9 meeting held on December 8-9, 2009.
- 1.2.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the information updates provided regarding the action items from previous TSPMAC meetings.
- 1.3.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the correspondence received since the last TSPMAC meeting.
- 2.1.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the Industry report provided verbally in respect of the 2010 Torres Strait Prawn Fishery, both the season to date and an outlook.
- 2.2.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the information updates on the management of the TSPF.
- 2.3.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the Domestic Compliance Report for the period December 2009 to June 2010.
- 2.4.1 That TSPMAC **NOTED** the current environment report.
- 2.4.2 The TSPMAC **DISCUSSED** whether the observer program objectives and protocols could be improved to collect more useful data for the TSPF.
- 2.5.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the final catch statistics for the 2009 fishing season; and the preliminary information presented on the monthly trends in the 2010 catch and effort data compared with earlier years.
- 3.1.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** workload requirements relating to data assessment and reporting in the Torres Strait Prawn Fishery (TSPF).
- 3.1.2 The TSPMAC **DISCUSSED** the possibility of funding routine data assessment and reporting work through observer programme savings and **AGREED** that these services should be recovered through the levies for the 2010/11 budget, noting AFMA will try to make additional savings in observer and overhead costs.
- 4.1.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED**:
  - (a) *the draft TSPF Harvest Strategy which will be provided to the PZJA via the PZJA Standing Committee for consideration and endorsement;*
  - (b) *the reasons for setting the harvest strategy target at  $B_{MSY}$  instead of  $B_{MEY}$ ; and*
  - (d) *the progress on PZJA agencies reviewing the profitability of the current management arrangements for the TSPF.*
- 4.1.2 The TSPMAC **AGREED** that an amendment should be made under trigger 1 to include “within the Australian jurisdiction” so it is clear this is not referring to effort with the PNG and Australian jurisdiction combined.

- 4.1.3 The TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** the draft TSPF harvest strategy to the PZJA, noting the changes recommended by the TSPMAC.
- 4.1.4 TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the TAE for the 2011 season for the TSPF be set at 9,200 days in accordance with the draft harvest strategy.
- 4.2.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the letter received from A Raptis and Sons PTY LTD requesting that the TSPMAC consider the possibility of lifting the 20m boat rule for the TSPF.
- 4.2.2 The TSPMAC **DISCUSSED**;
- a) the option of removing the 20m boat rule from the TSPF to facilitate full utilisation of the fishery resource within the sustainability and economic guidelines of the harvest strategy.
  - b) The pros and cons or concerns of the TSPMAC regarding the removal of the 20m boat rule.
- 4.2.3 The TSPMAC **CONSIDERED** the range of issues, both positive and negative regarding the 20m boat limit for the TSPF.
- 4.2.4 The TSPMAC **AGREED** to further explore ways to increase the participation with the TSPF to benefit all stakeholders.
- 4.3.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED**:
- (a) The outcome of the survey which identified the level of marine debris problem on the seabed adjacent to Kodall Island; and
  - (b) That TSRA, DEEDI and the community will continue to explore options on removal of marine debris; if that is the preferred option once the investigation is complete.
- 4.3.2 The TSPMAC **NOTED** the concerns with the level of the marine debris in the area of the crabpot and supports the initiative for it to be removed.
- 4.4.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED**:
- a) The status of the actions regarding the sponge farm from TSPMAC 9 which sought to eliminate the potential risk to personnel and infrastructure on the farm site;
  - b) The CFG representative for Masig's concerns that more work could still be done to eliminate risks to personnel and infrastructure on the site;
  - c) The recent report from *Kailag Enterprises Sponge aquaculture farm*;
- 4.5.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED** progress regarding the development of more formal external leasing arrangements in the TSPF.
- 4.5.2 The TSPMAC **DISCUSSED** potential business rules surrounding the temporary transfer of licences.
- 4.5.3 The TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the external leasing policy provide for the temporary transfer of licenses to occur using the same method that is currently used for temporary transfer of units in the TSPF.

- 4.6.1 The TSPMAC **DISCUSSED** the final draft of the industry code of practice for responsible disposal of marine debris.
- 4.6.2 The TSPMAC **AGREED** to the content of the industry code of practice for responsible disposal of marine debris with the suggested amendments.
- 4.6.3 TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the code of practice be printed and distributed to license holders with the 2011 season handbook and the weblink on the PZJA website be provided to license holders through the industry TSPMAC 9 letter.
- 4.7.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED**;
- a) that the investment warning in the TSPF is no longer considered necessary now that the TSPF Management Plan 2008 has been implemented; and
  - b) that the TSPF does not currently have an investment warning issued on the PZJA website.
- 4.7.2 The TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the TSPF investment warning be lifted.
- 4.7.3 The TSPMAC **AGREED** that PZJA agencies should seek to lift the investment warning.
- 5.1.1 The TSPMAC **NOTED**;
- a) the draft 2010/11 budget for the TSPF which is based on the PZJA approved cost recovery framework (AFMA's 2004 Cost Recovery Impact Statement (CRIS)); and
  - b) that AFMA has a new cost recovery framework for 2010 onwards and that the PZJA will be asked to consider whether this CRIS should apply to the entire TSPF budget. To advise the PZJA the TSPMAC will be asked later in 2010 to consider various options.
- 5.1.2 TSPMAC **AGREED** to include the costs for routine data analysis for the TSPF in the budget, to request that AFMA reduce observers to 60 days on the basis that this would still meet the target observer coverage and to request that AFMA review overheads.

The TSPMAC **NOTED**;

- 6.2.1 the research priorities for the Torres Strait Prawn fishery identified by the Torres Strait Scientific Committee for its 2010 draft Annual Operational Plan; and
- 6.2.2 that the TSPMAC will be given opportunity to provide feedback if appropriate at an OOS meeting in the coming months.

The following members and observers were in attendance at TSPMAC 10.

**Members**

Chair – Mr Jim Gillespie  
AFMA and EO – Ms Lisa Cocking  
QPIF – Mr Ian Jacobsen  
QPIF – Mr Eddie Jebreen  
AFMA – Mr Malcolm Southwell  
Scientific member – Dr Clive Turnbull  
QPIF  
QBFP – Mr Bob Russell  
Industry – Mr Marshall Betzel  
Industry – Mr Ron Earle  
CFG – Mr Gavin Mosby  
CFG – Mr Francis Pearson  
TSRA – Mr Neville Nakata

**MEETING RECORD FROM THE TSPMAC 10**

**Preliminaries**

The TSPMAC Chair Mr Jim Gillespie welcomed participants to the meeting and introduced Mr Malcolm Southwell, AFMA member who had only met the TSPMAC through teleconferences to date.

The Chair noted that there were no new disclosures of interest to be noted, as no new TSPMAC members were present.

The Chair announced apologies from TSPMAC industry members Ms Kylie Paulsen and Mr Chris Bourke, as well as from Mr Paul Pak Poy, permanent observer from DAFF.

**Agenda Item 1.1 Ratification of TSPMAC 9 meeting record**

The TSPMAC Executive Officer Lisa Cocking explained the process undertaken to finalise the TSPMAC 9 minutes following the last meeting. The TSPMAC noted that no additional changes were required and the minutes were ratified by the TSPMAC as in their format in attachment 1.1A.

**Agenda Item 1.2 Actions or business arising from previous TSPMAC meetings**

The TSPMAC Executive Officer went through the actions arising from past TSPMAC meetings.

Discussion was undertaken regarding action item 8.15; “*QPIF to liaise with Mr Harris to determine whether funding can be sourced from the CRC for TSPF research needs*”. Mr Ian Jacobsen from Queensland Fisheries commented that the QSIA are currently trying to join the seafood CRC, and it is a requirement that you are a member before you can seek funding from this body. He commented that this would be discussed more under agenda item 3.1.

The TSPMAC went on to discuss action item 1.3 from the OOS meeting in May 2009. This action was for TSPMAC industry members to develop a proposal for Government to pay 25% of the budget as this portion of the effort in the fishery is put aside for PNG. Industry commented that they would still like to address this however would need guidance from Government on the development of this paper. Mr Southwell commented that it is important to note that it isn't as simple as the budget being 25% attributed to the PNG portion of the effort, as there are a number of costs etc that are not charged to industry (such as DAFF and TSRA). He commented that this doesn't mean it shouldn't be addressed however it would need to be assessed in detail. He suggested that a way forward was to assess this as part of discussions on the application of the cost recovery impact statement for the TSPF as this is the document which attributes cost splits between Government and industry depending on the stakeholders who benefit from the given services. Mr Ron Earle asked if Government can assist with developing this proposal. It was agreed that additional discussion would be undertaken regarding this item outside of the TSPMAC.

***ACTION: TSPMAC Industry members to liaise with AFMA regarding the application of the cost recovery impact statement and the attribution of costs that relate to the PNG portion of the fishery.***

The TSPMAC discussed action item 6.18 regarding disseminating information from Dr Roland Pitcher and Clive Turnbull's reports which were presented at TSPMAC 6. Ms Cocking commented that this item unfortunately hadn't been followed up do to other priorities in the fishery at present. Mr Jebreen commented that the information in the report is very complex and would be difficult to summarise concisely. He added that the report does not give a complete view of the effects of trawling, as it doesn't show the effects on TEP species etc. It was also specifically undertaken in the East Coast fishery area and showed the rates of recovery of trawl groups once they are no longer trawled. Mr Jebreen explained that the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority are doing work to determine the effects of trawling in GBRMP using the results of Dr Pitchers report, combined with a number of other reports which will give a more wholesome summary of the effects of trawling.

They will be putting a package of information together for education programs ranging from school level to educating government agencies and international Government bodies. He suggested that this information could be used for the TSPF when it is released at the end of 2010.

TSPMAC industry members commented that they believed that the key information from the report was going to be distributed as it seemed to be a very valuable report and it would be a shame not to share the good news within it. The project from GBRMPA seems to be more complex than what they were wanting.

Mr Jebreen again voiced his concern with giving out information regarding the effects of trawling if it isn't explaining the whole picture.

Mr Russell commented that he recalled the purpose of the action item was to show video footage of trawling so people could better understand the processes of trawling, rather than its direct effects. Mr Pearson, Community Fisher Group Representative commented that this is true, as there are many community members who think people are trawling when they are just cleaning their nets. Showing footage such as this would help people to better understand these things.

Mr Earle offered the use of footage he has recorded on his vessels showing trawling in action. This may be complimentary to the underwater footage of Mr Pitcher's to help educate the Islander Community about trawling practices.

***ACTION: PZJA agencies to further consider how information regarding trawling can be shown to Torres Strait Island communities or if it should be removed as an action item.***

***ACTION: TSPMAC to review the GBRMPA report on the effects of trawling when it is released.***

The TSPMAC Executive Officer went on to explain the action item regarding the gear survey. The survey was proposed to be undertaken over the phone if there were minimal responses. Ms Cocking asked if the MAC saw this as a good option for progressing the survey considering the minimal response. It was agreed that it would be worthwhile contacting license holders by phone to assist them with/ encourage them to complete the survey in order to ensure gear information is known for our records.

***ACTION: TSPMAC industry members to include information encouraging TSPMAC members to complete the gear survey and its importance in the industry TSPMAC 10 summary letter.***

#### ***Self assessment***

The TSPMAC discussed the self assessment process that was to be undertaken this year. It was agreed that the TSPMAC Executive Officer would distribute the relevant self assessment documents and the assessment would take place at the next OOS meeting in 2010.

***ACTION: TSPMAC Executive Officer to distribute self assessment documents to the TSPMAC.***

***ACTION: TSPMAC to undertake a self assessment process at its next OOS meeting in 2010.***

## **2.1 Industry Update – 2010 season to date**

The TSPMAC industry members provided an update of the happenings in the fishery for the 2010 season to date. The main points included:

- There is less fishing occurring than last season, about half a dozen license holders are consistently fishing with a range of 4-12 operators at any one time.
- The nights fished, and the catch of tiger prawn (88t compared to 378t) and endeavour prawn (30t compared to 562t) are all down considerably compared to the average over past years. This is due to the reduced effort in the fishery rather than poor catch rates.
- Overall sizes are bigger for tiger prawns than in previous years. Endeavour prawn sizes have also been better than recent seasons. This may be a result of reduced effort allowing prawns to grow larger or may be due to seasonal changes in the stocks or be a result of changes to targeting.
- Incidental catch is down for squid and bugs.
- Quality has improved however catch is down due to decreased effort.
- Motherships are operating fortnightly to the fishery
- Air services into Torres Strait continue to be limited and are affecting the ability to function efficiently. Further, any air courier of goods is often bumped off the service due to lack of room on flights. Any urgent air shipping receives large penalties.

**Comment [A1]:** What is this trying to say?

- the price of product is worse than last year – (\$10/kg for tiger prawns). Gulf tigers prawns receive a higher price due to the larger size (16/20 in TSPF, 9/12 in Gulf).
- There is limited export market at the moment which is also effecting prices. This used to be a large part of the TSPF prawn market.

Ms Cocking commented that there is a new cargo service in place servicing the Torres Strait. Mr Betzel added that it is a cargo service rather than a mother ship service like Seaswift. The new vessel services Horne and Thursday Islands, however Seaswift also operates feeder runs further up to other islands.

## **2.2 Management Update**

Mr Malcolm Southwell presented an update on the general management of the TSPF. He commented that the fishery has changed staff structure, with the TSPF now being managed under Melissa Brown. This will help to reduce the costs of the fishery by reducing staff time.

### ***Observers***

Mr Southwell went on to provide a summary of the observer program from the 2009 season. He explained that 86 days were achieved (of a budgeted 180) for the 2009 season. This was 4.4% of the actual nights fished. He went on to explain that for the 2010 season AFMA has budgeted 90 days of observer coverage for 2010. The target coverage is 2.6% of actual effort for the fishery. He commented that the 90 days was considered to be a conservative estimate based on the effort from the 2009 season. It was necessary to be conservative to balance the risk of overshooting the 2.6% target for effort.

### ***Broader PZJA Business***

Mr Southwell also provided an update from the Torres Strait Fisheries MAC (TSFMAC) in October 2009. The following is a summary of outcomes from the meeting;

- The TSFMAC had discussions on master fishermen's licenses for TRL and their requirement on tender boats and how this should be managed;
- The TSFMAC endorsed in principle the development of the community based harvest strategies for hand collectable fisheries.
- The TSFMAC recommended to the PZJA that winged pearl oyster (*Pteria*) is included in the Pearl Shell Fishery by amending Fisheries Management Notice no. 69.
- The TSFMAC recommended to the PZJA that a fisheries management instrument is developed for the Torres Strait Sponge fishery to prohibit the harvest of sponges, with the exception of the Torres Strait Island sponge farms.
- The TSFMAC recommended to the PZJA that a fisheries management instrument be developed for the Coral Collecting Fishery to prohibit harvest of coral (*Cnidaria*) and live rock in Torres Strait.
- Recommended the development of a relevant mechanism to monitor and manage the use of TRL holding cages in the TSPZ.
- Agreed in principle to the draft management outline and objectives to be included in the draft Finfish Management Plan, subject to further collaboration and input from CFG representatives via TSRA.
- That a Fisheries Management Instrument be developed to implement net size restrictions for traditional finfish fishing to the dimensions of 4 inch mesh, 2.5m drop and 100m length. This is to assist with turtle and dugong protection.

## **2.2 Compliance Report**

Mr Russell from Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol presented an update on compliance for the 2010. He explained that a restructure had taken place to utilise police vessels rather than customs vessels in order to reduce resource costs of the program. This new system means that boardings will occur with a police officer and police checks will occur at the same time simply because the police vessel is being used. He added that the compliance program still target five compliance days per month. Due to the remote locality of the fishery, there are often a larger number of days attained in one month, then less in other months, as it can take half a day to steam between vessels when there are a limited number in the fishery.

He went on to explain that they have reduced their costs which is reflected in levy costs. Mr Nakata questioned whether the program is still as effective if police vessels are being used as they must have other priorities that take precedent over fisheries issues. Mr Russell commented that the police have agreed to make up any days that are lost as a result of police operations such as search and rescue by extending the trip or adding days to another trip.

Mr Nakata raised concern that there is not enough compliance days and had concerns regarding the foreign fishing vessels around the Torres Straits particularly around Warrior Reef. Mr Southwell commented that foreign compliance was AFMA's jurisdiction, and that the responsible agency remains focussed on maintaining the strong deterrence to illegal foreign fishing in the Torres Strait and around Warrior Reef. He explained that both sightings and apprehensions are down on past years. He added that whenever a banana boat is sighted on this side of the fisheries jurisdiction line, an asset is tasked by the Border Protection Command to respond.

Mr Mosby had concern with traditional families visiting and taking lots of catch illegally when they are travelling back over the boarder to PNG. He questioned if a compliance officer can come and present information in the community regarding marker buoys and infringements for community vessels as there was a lack of knowledge there at present. It was agreed that this would be further discussed under the sponge farm agenda item.

## **2.3 Environment Report**

Mr Southwell presented the key points from the environment report. He explained that the Ecological Risk Assessment process has undertaken a level 1 scale, intensity, consequence analysis (SICA) however additional work had not been done to date. He added that due to the low level of effort in the fishery at present, there is considered to be a low level of risk to the listed "at-risk" species and thus it is considered most cost effective to wait to undertake progression of the ERA process until more effort is attained. It was decided that the ERA will be progressed once the triggers under the harvest strategy are achieved.

Mr Southwell went on to discuss the TSPF observer program. Changes to objectives occurred prior to the commencement of the 2010 season and have been included in the current protocol. It was suggested that the MAC consider whether the best use of the observer program was occurring. The MAC agreed that they were happy with the objectives and no further changes were required.

Mr Gillespie questioned the comment within the report regarding the lack of reporting of sygnathids in the Torres Strait Prawn Fishery. The report questioned if individuals are being caught and not reported, as they are recorded in neighbouring fisheries. Mr Turnbull commented that minimal sygnathids were caught during their independent

surveys and he thinks it is unlikely there are many in the TSPF area. There are also minimal saw sharks indicated from his independent surveys.

***ACTION: Mr Turnbull to confirm the number of sygnathids caught during the independent surveys.***

***ACTION: AFMA to have discussions with the observer section to determine whether sygnathids are interacted with during fishing operations.***

***ACTION: AFMA to liaise with AFMA environment section to inform them that sygnathids are not generally found in the TS rather than not being reported.***

Mr Jebreen went on to discuss a study by Tony Courtney regarding post capture mortality of seasnakes. The report showed that post capture mortality is generally quite high. He added that results of a study undertaken for the northern bioregional planning process indicated that the risks to sawfish are significant for demersal trawl fisheries. The northern bioregional plan doesn't apply to the Torres Strait however adjoins onto the fishery. As such, there may be information relevant to vessels steaming to and from the fishery through these areas.

## **2.5 Data and Preliminary Trends in Catch and Effort Data**

Mr Clive Turnbull presented information of the trends in catch and effort data for the TSPF for the 2010 season to date. The following key points were obtained for the 2010 season to date:

- The catches are well below historic levels and MSY;
- This is a direct result of the very low levels of effort in the fishery during 2009;
- Tiger prawn catch rates (CPUE) are the highest recorded;
- Due to fishers targeting tiger prawns & catch < MSY in recent years;
- The low harvest and high CPUE indicates that the tiger prawn biomass is probably well above  $B_{MSY}$ ;
- Endeavour prawn catch rates (CPUE) are lower than average;
- This however, is probably due to fishers targeting the higher value tiger prawn;
- Due to the very low harvest of endeavour prawns in 2009 fishing mortality on the endeavour prawn stock would also have been very low;
- Effort and catch appears to be tracking at ~60% of 2009 effort and catch;
- Tiger prawn CPUE for the first quarter of 2010 season is similar to the first quarter of 2009;
- Endeavour prawn CPUE for the first quarter of 2010 is lower for the first quarter of 2009; and
- King prawn CPUE for the first quarter of 2010 is below average but is following the monthly trend and is not the lowest recorded in the historic time series.

Mr Betzel commented that endeavour prawns are almost an incidental catch now with little if no targeting. Mr Earle agreed as operators can target areas of high tiger prawn catches or high endeavour prawn catches, so catch rates and catches are partially based on behaviour.

Mr Turnbull also questioned whether high fishing effort improves endeavour catches as catch rates are very high at present. This may indicate that they thrive with higher catch rates, perhaps due to reduced competition. He also added that past industry members of the MAC were of the opinion that the different species are affected differently by the seasons. Endeavours are believed to thrive after a wet season and tigers after a dry season.

The MAC discussed that if the tiger prawn export market increased again, endeavour prawn prices would likely increase.

***ACTION: TSPMAC Executive Officer to distributed Mr Turnbull's PowerPoint presentation to the TSPMAC***

### **3.1 Future Funding for Routine Data Assessment and reporting**

Mr Jacobsen presented a paper regarding the future funding sources for the ongoing routine data research which occurs in the TSPF, currently undertaken by Mr Turnbull. He explained that this routine work is generally funded through salaries of a routine staff member. He added that this work is undertaken in all Commonwealth fisheries by a staff member within the fishery team. In this case it seems different as Mr Turnbull is external to the two teams of staff that undertake general management of the fishery.

He went on to explain that he considered the TSSAC as a funding source for this work, however the TSSAC have a finite amount of money which is generally not used for routine research. He added that there may be some concerns that if it is used for this now, it will set a precedent for other fisheries and similar projects.

Mr Betzel suggested they do attempt to obtain funding from the CRC as he is aware of funds still being available which will expire and they have run out of projects. Mr Jacobsen commented the CRC will likely have the same view as the TSSAC.

Mr Jebreen added that if a funding application was worded correctly, funding may be able to be sourced as a one off from either of these sources. However this work is ongoing and there is a need to source an ongoing funding source. It was reiterated that this sort of work is generally recovered through the levies through salary costs as it is routine fisheries management work that is required for any fishery. If we get funding through the CRC or TSSAC we will come up against this same problem next year.

Mr Southwell added that if funding is not sourced the work would not be able to continue, which would compromise the ability to effectively manage and monitor the fishery. The TSPMAC identified the need for this work and agreed to discuss funding options under the budget item at 5.1.

### **4.1 TSPF Harvest Strategy**

Mr Southwell presented the item regarding the draft Torres Strait Prawn Fishery Harvest Strategy. He explained that the TSPF Management Plan provides for a Total Allowable Effort (TAE) limit for the TSPF that has to be set at least every three years and there is a need to have framework in place for setting the TAE.

He explained that the framework for the harvest strategy including decision rules and target and limit reference points were developed by the TSPF harvest strategy working group in December 2009 before being presented and further developed at TSPMAC 9 in December 2010. The Harvest Strategy was then developed in line with the recommendations of the TSPMAC. He commented that the only change from the recommendations was relating to the target for the harvest strategy. The TSPMAC agreed that there should be a target reference point of  $B_{MEY}$ , however the TAE for the fishery would continue to be set at 9,200 days (which corresponds to  $B_{MSY}$ ) until triggers under the decision rules were reached. He explained that after consideration of this, it was agreed that it isn't best practice, and may be confusing to set a TAE

that is not in alignment with the target for the fishery. As such, it was agreed that the target should be changed to have a short term target of  $B_{MSY}$  with a long term target of  $B_{MEY}$  which will be set when the targets are reached under the harvest strategy. He explained that this achieves the same objective, it just has a more transparent process.

The TSPMAC agreed that this change was okay. It was also agreed that all references within the Harvest Strategy to *brown* tiger prawn and *blue* endeavour prawn should be amended to have a generic reference to tiger prawn and endeavour prawn with a footnote explaining that this broad category includes 3 and two species consecutively, with brown tiger and blue endeavour making up the majority of the catch.

**ACTION: AFMA to amend references to brown tiger prawn and blue endeavour prawn within the TSPF draft harvest strategy to refer generically to tiger prawn and endeavour prawn, with a footnote explaining the brown tiger prawn and blue endeavour prawn are the key species caught.**

Mr Jacobsen questioned if PNG has seen a draft of the harvest strategy and whether they need to before it is finalised. Mr Southwell commented that he didn't think it was necessary as they are not currently fishing in the Australian jurisdiction and it doesn't effect their area of jurisdiction. He added that the joint management issues are dealt with through the bilaterals. It was added that PNG are members on the TSPMAC and they have had opportunity for input through this and have received the papers and draft harvest strategy through this format.

The TSPMAC **AGREED** that an amendment should be made under trigger 1 to include "within the Australian jurisdiction" so it is clear this is not referring to effort within the PNG and Australian jurisdiction combined.

Mr Southwell went on to explain that the 1000 day minimum effort trigger discussed at the working group was not included in the harvest strategy. He explained that this will still be in place as a management policy objective, where management agencies will continue to ensure that the level of management is undertaken at an appropriate level considering effort levels and risks to the fishery. He explained that it is not considered suitable to include it as a harvest strategy decision rule as it does not fit the criteria. The TSPMAC were happy to have it as a management decision and commented that this may have always been the intention of this.

The TSPMAC discussed whether it would be appropriate to recommend a level for the TAE for the 2011 season now in order to allow this information to be provided to the PZJA and thus industry earlier to facilitate easier business management. The MAC also discussed whether a recommendation should be made as to whether PNG nights should be offered to industry if they are offered from PNG for the 2011 season. Ms Cocking added that the TAE and PNG day recommendation usually go to the PZJA together. She explained that the days were not offered to license holders in 2010 out of concern that they would undermine the leasing market. The levies still provided for additional days to be charged for in case the PZJA decided to allocate them during a season. TSPMAC Industry members decided that they require more time to consider their view on whether PNG days should be offered or not in 2011.

TSPMAC **RECOMMEND** the draft TSPF harvest strategy to the PZJA noting the changes recommended by the TSPMAC.

TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the TAE for the 2011 season for the TSPF be set at 9,200 days in accordance with the draft harvest strategy.

***ACTION: AFMA to submit the harvest strategy to the PZJA SC and PZJA OOS.***

***ACTION: TSPMAC to consider at its next OOS meeting, whether they would like to recommend to the PZJA whether PNG days should be offered to TSPF licence holders in 2011 if they are made available by PNG.***

#### **4.2 Review of Management Arrangements for the TSPF Including 20m Boat Rule**

Mr Southwell presented this paper and explained that at TSPMAC 9 in December last year, the TSPMAC discussed potential ways to increase effort in the TSPF. He explained that a number of options were identified including changes to gear and vessel restrictions such as the 20m boat limit as well as reviews of closures, allowing fishing in PNG and formalising external leasing arrangements.

Mr Southwell went on to explain that a letter was sent to the TSPMAC chair requesting that the TSPMAC consider the possibility of lifting the 20m boat rule in order to allow Gulf vessels to buy unused licenses and increase effort in the fishery, facilitating it to be more viable.

Mr Southwell commented that Gulf vessels are most likely to operate before and between NPF seasons and there are only a limited number of vessels that have registered interest in entering the fishery at this point.

Mr Southwell explained that there are a number of perceived issues that will need to be addressed in the paper and a number of perceived benefits and this paper seeks discussion and comment from the TSPMAC on these as well as comments regarding the level of consultation that the TSPMAC considers appropriate.

Mr Jebreen commented that fishing power is the main point that needs to be considered if larger vessels are introduced to ensure that effective effort does not surpass the effort level set under the harvest strategy (currently maximum sustainable yield). He explained that QLD use hull units to regulate fishing power in the East Coast fishery and the most appropriate way for the TSPF to regulate this needs to be considered. He commented that the NPF fishery uses gear units which works fairly well for their fishery. He added that it may be useful to have set gear that can be used, as NPF have no guidelines which means every operator could have different allowances making compliance slightly more complex. This may be appropriate for use in the TSPF. Mr Turnbull commented that net restrictions will limit fishing power increases even if vessel sizes are increased. Mr Jebreen stated that changes to boat sizes should only occur, and would only be of benefit if we also change net restrictions. When you combine a change of a range of restrictions together you usually see a better result.

Mr Nakata questioned whether we should be addressing why there are only 6 boats before looking to change the 20m rule. Mr Southwell explained that the reason for the low number of boats is intertwined with the boat limit and a number of other issues. Mr Southwell added that it is a complex issue and we need to provide some advice to the PZJA as to the TSPMAC's recommended way forward. If the TSPMAC comes to a unanimous decision then this could be a recommendation as to whether the 20m boat rule should be introduced or not, otherwise the TSPMAC should provide advice as to the things that should be considered when making a decision.

Mr Earle recommended we don't look at the 20m boat restriction in isolation and that we consider it with other changes that can occur such as external leasing, gear restrictions (in particular), etc. He added that from a personal perspective, allow larger boats in isn't necessarily good, as he has concerns with there being a pulse of fishing effort at the beginning of the season which could effect catches later on. However he sees it as being beneficial for the fishery as a whole allowing latent effort to be purchased from other operators.

Mr Mosby commented that he has taken the proposal for boats larger than 20m back to his community and they have the same ongoing concerns that larger boats will result in more incidents with sinking vessels. Mr Earle explained that larger boats are actually less likely to sink as they are a more stable and safer vessel. They also have more safety requirements than a small boat such as often having an on board engineer and more qualified crew. Mr Mosby explained that he understands that larger vessels are safer, however there are increased problems if larger vessels do sink as they are then more difficult to recover and pose more risks to the environment holding more fuel etc. He commented that he wouldn't want to see larger vessels up in the fishery if they aren't limiting the number of licenses to counteract.

The TSPMAC discussed that the majority of the vessels currently fishing in the TSPF would be close 20m. In 2006 the average vessel length was 18m and they are now generally 19.5m-20m. Ms Cocking added that the vessels interested in entering the fishery are only 22m in length, which isn't much bigger than the current vessels. Mr Earle added that there are still several vessel greater than 20m in the fishery anyway from before the boat restriction was introduced. Mr Pearson commented that if people new that the new vessels were not going to be any bigger than ones that are there now than they may not be as concerned but it is important to show communities what a bigger boat looks like to help them consider the issue.

Mr Southwell requested that the TSPMAC record the major arguments for and against having larger vessels in the fishery so it can be presented to the PZJA.

#### **Positives**

1. there may be some increased demand for licenses/ units. However the benefit will be dependant on rules around letting larger vessels in such as larger vessels must have two licenses for one vessel;
2. profitability of larger boats may be greater depending on other restrictions. Profitability is unlikely to increase without changes to gear restrictions as well; and
3. some MAC members held the view that bigger vessels allow value adding through processing aboard vessels

#### **Concerns**

1. Increased competition focused around the commencement of the season may cause a pulse fishing effect;
2. we will need to ensure fishing power is properly accounted for so effective effort does not increase past the recommend TAE;
3. there are community perceptions around larger boats and a lack of understanding about what this means;
4. there are environmental concerns amongst community about larger boats if they do sink, they will be more difficult to salvage etc;
5. if there are changes to gear, increased net sizes may make them more dangerous to turtle and dugong;
6. will we have an open ended change or place a new cap on boats size;

7. if larger vessels come in and there are less vessels overall, we will need to determine if the increased profits out way the increases of levies through being spread across a smaller pool of license holders;
8. increased employment hopefully to indigenous sector as well; and
9. compliance concerns with added complexity with different net sizes.

Ms Cocking questioned if larger vessels will save money steaming to get fuel as they can carry more. Mr Earle commented that fuel isn't much of a benefit as vessels are serviced biweekly by a mothership, and most have the capacity to carry enough fuel for this period of time.

Mr Nakata again voiced his concern that if there are larger boats coming in, there will be too much effort. Ms Cocking explained that if larger vessels come in, there will be no change in the actual effort for the fishery, as fishing power will be controlled.

Mr Jebreen explained that if you have bigger vessels they may have less days than a smaller one, and there may be less vessels in the fishery as a whole (see table below). He explained that there are 9,200 effort units in the fishery. This will never change. In the current situation, this currently converts to 9,200 days and is distributed across 61 license holders. If larger boats are introduced, we may only allow for 50 vessels and 5000 days if effort. If larger boats and different nets are introduced, this may mean there are only 30 license holders allowed in the fishery and only 3000 nights. **(It is important to note that these are only examples that were raised at the meeting for ease of explanation, not official regimes that are being considered at this point).**

	Current situation	Larger boats same nets	Larger boats bigger nets
Effort	9,200	9,200	9,200
Boat	61	50	30
Days	9,200	5000	3000

Mr Jebreen also added that as a general rule, as profits decrease, safety and environmental safety decrease before anything else. As we get more profitable, these things are properly taken care of.

Mr Southwell commented that we now need to decide on a format to move forward on this. He suggested that the summary be made of the information above regarding issues to be considered when making a decision about the 20m boat rule. This should be provided to the PZJA Standing Committee and PZJA for consideration. He explained that the TSPMAC can provide a recommendation for or against changing the 20m boat limit if they have come to a unanimous decision, however he doesn't think this is the case yet. The TSPMAC acknowledged there were still issues that need to be worked through before a recommendation could be made by the TSPMAC. The TSPMAC agreed that AFMA and QLD Fisheries should work through the issues raised in the attached paper and develop a discussion paper to take to the TSPMAC OOS. They also agreed that an OOS paper should be developed for the PZJA Standing Committee on options for improving the utilisation of the fishery for the benefit of all stakeholder groups.

The Chair commented that we will also need to develop a response to Raptis's letter following the TSPMAC. Mr Southwell commented that this response would be similar to the initial PZJA Standing Committee paper, advising that a discussion had occurred and further options as to ways to increase the participation within the fishery

are being considered and further information will be provided as this issue is progressed.

The TSPMAC discussed the options of consultation regarding this issue and whether an industry forum would still be worthwhile. It was agreed that it would be more beneficial to have such a forum after the discussion paper has been considered by the TSPMAC in order to have more information to discuss.

The TSPMAC **AGREED** to further explore ways to increase the participation with the TSPF to benefit all stakeholders.

***ACTION: AFMA to develop an OOS TSPMAC paper working through the issues raised at TSPMAC 10 regarding the 20m boat rule, and meet OOS to discuss.***

***ACTION: develop discussion paper for PZJA Standing Committee***

***ACTION: AFMA to develop some words regarding the 20m boat rule discussion for inclusion in the industry summary and chairs summary.***

***ACTION: TSPMAC Executive Officer to draft a letter of response to Mr Raptis regarding his letter informing him of the process being undertaken to consider this issue.***

#### **4.3 Ghost Nets and Marine Debris - Outcome of Survey of Rubbish**

Mr Nakata provided information on the outcomes of the survey undertaken to assess the level of commercial rubbish on the seabed adjacent to Kodall Island in an area commonly known as the 'Crabpot'. A reconnaissance survey was undertaken by a survey team from DEEDI on Tuesday 23 February 2010 with support from Mr Mosby and Kailag Enterprises sponge farm employees. The surveys involved towing a camera which was dropped down from the surface to approximately 20m. This technique proved to be unsuccessful in scoping the wide area of debris on the bottom. Local community members undertook some dives with cameras which gave a better indication of rubbish on the seabed and it was decided that this would be the best option to use for a future assessment. DEEDI will be returning to the Torres Strait in July to discuss with the local community how the survey can be better undertaken with their assistance. At this point it is thought that the cheapest and most effective option will be to allow community divers to undertake the surveys using gear (cameras etc) provided by DEEDI. Mr Mosby explained that they need to determine which items of rubbish can be removed as some may have become a part of the ecosystem and cause harm to remove. However he noted that they would at least like to remove the large items partially with the purpose of making a point to industry that it is not okay to dispose of rubbish at sea.

The next survey will take approx 12 days to complete surveying a 400-500m long area. Costs are estimated at around \$15K including community divers, boat crew and equipment etc. They anticipate it will be undertaken following the July consultation with the local community.

The TSPMAC **NOTED** the concerns with the level of the marine debris in the area of the crabpot and supports the initiative for it to be removed.

#### **4.4 Sponge Farm – marker buoys and current progress on the farm**

Mr Mosby provided an update of the progress of the Masig sponge farm. He explained several incidents occurred during 2009 which were discussed previously at TSPMAC 9. Several actions came out of these discussions including the need to determine the marine navigation marks that are required on the sponge farm. He explained that AFMA had discussions with MSQ and they informed them of the requirements for buoys for the farm, which match those currently being used. He further informed the MAC that discussions had been held between PZJA agencies and the sponge farm steering committee where it was decided that adequate information had been provided to operators alerting them to locality of the farm and buoys.

Mr Mosby added that they are still collecting the 10,000 sponge stock for the farm which means divers are still working in areas outside of the farm at present, increasing potential danger from nearby vessels. Once the wild sponge are harvested they will just be working within the farm area.

Mr Russel questioned whether the sponge farm area had been excluded from fishing or simply had the area listed for information of vessels. Mr Nakata confirmed that there was a notice to mariners issued, not an exclusion to fishing. Mr Russell stated that without an exclusion to fishing you can not prosecute people for entering the area. Mr Jebreen commented that exclusions around aquaculture areas are not usually granted in QLD however they could try for one if they wished to. Mr Russell added that they can make trawlers aware of the sponge farm when they board vessels.

Mr Mosby commented that he would like compliance to do a community talk on the island to education local community members about the dive flag, what it means and general safety regarding the farm.

Mr Mosby added some additional general advice about the progress of the farm. He commented that they are currently adding in structures that will attract fish to the farm. These fish will then clean the sponges, meaning this work will not be required by human divers. Mr Nakata added that the outcome of the turtle monitoring program on the farm had also been determined. They found that there has been no effect to date on turtles feeding on the aquaculture sponges as there are no sponges being found in hawksbill stomachs.

***ACTION: QLD Fisheries to look into QLD legislation regarding exclusion zones around aquaculture infrastructure and report back to the Executive Officer.***

***ACTION: QBFP to facilitate a community talk regarding safety for divers on the sponge farm in the Torres Strait.***

***ACTION: TSPMAC industry members to include information in the industry report again regarding the sponge farm.***

#### **4.5 External Leasing**

Mr Jacobsen provided an update on the development of an external leasing policy for the TSPF. He explained that a draft policy was being developed however the concept is yet to go to the PZJA Standing Committee for consideration as there have not been any meetings of late. The policy needs to go through the PZJA SC before it can be progressed.

He explained that the QLD Fisheries legal department have given advice that external leasing can occur as the management plan is silent on temporary transfers of licenses, and external leasing is provided for in the TSF Act. However they do

recommend that an amendment to the management plan be undertaken in the future to provide for this function in the long term.

Mr Jacobsen commented that he sought advice from the TSPMAC regarding the process in which licenses will be transferred back at the end of the season. He explained that the QLD East Coast Trawl Fishery currently has a system whereby the license is transferred back once the licensing system is initiated for a season. This would occur before the new levy invoices are paid. Because this system is already in place in the east coast fishery it will reduce costs of administering it in the TSPF.

Mr Earle questioned if this method would mean the timeline is too tight for levies to be paid and the license transferred before the commencement of the season. Mr Jacobsen explained that they could begin the process for transferring the license and the official transfer simply occur once the levies are paid. No new licenses can be issued before 25 February when current licenses expire.

The TSPMAC questioned whether it is possible to lease out a license but hold onto some units. QLD Fisheries commented they were unsure and would need to look into it.

***ACTION: QPIF to determine if you can lease out a license but hold onto units which are not attached to a license.***

The TSPMAC agreed that the license system could operate in a way similar to the QLD system and the current system used for transfer of units in the TSPF. That is, licenses will be automatically transferred back to the transferee once the licensing system is initiated for the season following the transfer.

4.5.4 The TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the external leasing policy provide for the temporary transfer of licenses to occur using the same method that is currently used for temporary transfer of units in the TSPF.

## **4.6 Industry Code of Conduct for the Responsible Disposal of Trawl Rubbish**

Ms Cocking presented the updated draft code of practice for responsible disposal of marine debris in the TSPF. She explained that following TSPMAC 9, the suggested changes were incorporated leaving the attached document. Mr Gillespie questioned whether the industry members would understand it and what they can and can't do from the code, specifically in relation to legislation governing the principles of marine debris such as MARPOL. Mr Cocking explained that the code explains that license holders must be aware of the governing legislation and this code is a guide to provide additional information.

The TSPMAC agreed to the document with the following changes:

- update table of contents and add in the heading "respecting Torres Strait Islander ways of life"
- edit for spelling errors
- ask AFMA communications section to edit.

TSPMAC **RECOMMENDED** that the code of practice be printed and distributed to license holders with the 2011 season handbook and the weblink on the PZJA website be provided to license holders through the industry TSPMAC 9 letter.

**ACTION: TSPMAC industry members to include the website link to code in their TSPMAC summary letter.**

**ACTION: AFMA to get the communication section to edit the document before going to print.**

#### **4.7 Investment Warning**

Mr Southwell provided an update on the investment warnings for the TSPF. He explained that it is considered that an investment warning for the TSPF is no longer required. He explained that there is an all Torres Strait Fisheries investment warning in place and PZJA agencies are still determining which fisheries this is required for.

Mr Southwell explained that an investment warning is usually issued before changes are made in a fishery that can effect peoples' investment. It acts as a warning to potential investors that it isn't a static operating environment. Mr Earle questioned whether an investment warning is needed considering the potential changes that may occur if the 20m boat rule is changed. Mr Southwell commented it is not considered necessary in the case of the 20m boat rule, as this could facilitate increased investment in the fishery rather than potentially limit it.

The TSPMAC <b>AGREED</b> that PZJA agencies should seek to lift the investment warning.
---

#### **5.1 TSPF draft budget**

Mr Southwell presented the paper on the draft budget for the TSPF. He explained that the overall combined budget for AFMA and QLD was \$473,043 for 2010/11, a reduction of \$66,337 compared to 2009/10. He explained that the AFMA portion of the budget makes up \$325,019 (a reduction of \$59,346 compared to last year) and the QLD component is \$169,876, an increase of \$16,594 compared to last year which is largely associated with CPI. Mr Southwell ran through the individual budget line items and then welcomed comments from members on the draft budget. Mr Betzel questioned the large increase in sitting fees. Mr Southwell explained that in the past, TSPMAC members had not claimed sitting fees, and the Chair also used to be exempt as a DEEDI employee, however Mr Gillespie is now retired and thus sitting fees have been budgeted for. He commented that industry members are eligible for sitting fees and they are meant to offset the lost income related to sitting on the MAC for these periods.

Mr Betzel questioned if the compliance budget could be further reduced considering the minimal effort in the fishery. Mr Jacobsen commented that the compliance portion of the budget is a minimal portion of the overall budget and there is a minimum level of compliance effort that will allow them to undertake the services properly. Mr Russell added that there are some additional costs of compliance in the TSPF due to the remoteness of the fishery.

Mr Earle questioned the large increase in overheads and why these are no longer partly government funded. Mr Southwell stated that there have been some changes to how the costs are incurred and distributed between industry and Government and this may be attributed to this. Mr Earle suggested that it would be good to reduce some of these overhead expenses if at all possible. Mr Southwell explained that AFMA's total costs are capped in terms of Government funding along with the total levies collected across the agency. They only increases to levies at present are through CPI, however the way overheads and other costs are attributed between

fisheries has changed with a change in CRIS. Some fisheries benefit and some don't as much. Mr Southwell explained that the only way to receive increased funding from Government is to put up a new policy proposal. Mr Earle stated that he doesn't want to get money from other fisheries but AFMA needs to be mindful that it is managing resources which are shrinking and management needs to reflect this. He added that overheads in AFMA have always been a concern. They are very high compared to savings in other areas (not relating to the decreased budgets). Mr Southwell explained that this is due to some of the big overhead items such as rent which AFMA are reviewing at the moment to determine ways of reducing it. Mr Southwell agreed to speak with the AFMA finance section regarding overheads to see if there is any room to move.

The MAC went on to discuss other potential areas to make savings. Mr Southwell noted that there is no room to move with data management however the industry will get back what they do not spend. He commented that we may be able to further reduce observer days however this is getting to a low level of coverage and we could go over budget in order to ensure we are meeting the 2.6% effort requirement under the Strategic Assessment Report if effort increases.

The TSPMAC discussed the ongoing data management and research costs of which the work is currently undertaken by Mr Turnbull. The MAC agreed to incorporate the ongoing data management costs (approximately \$22K) into the budget and to try to cover this cost through additional savings of reducing observer coverage to 60 days and trying to realise savings from overheads. Mr Southwell explained that the savings from observers won't be as large as cutting costs by a third but it will be a reasonable amount.

***ACTION: AFMA to seek advice regarding overhead costs and determine if there are any ways they can be reduced.***

***ACTION: AFMA to determine whether observer days can be further reduced to 60.***

Mr Southwell added that the TSPMAC will need to provide some advice at some point over the next 12 months regarding the CRIS and its application to the TSPF.

TSPMAC **AGREED** to include the costs for routine data analysis for the TSPF in the budget, to request that AFMA reduce observers to 60 days on the basis that this would still meet the target observer coverage and to request that AFMA review overheads.

***ACTION: AFMA to draft a letter from TSPMAC Chair to Mr Hurry regarding the draft budget comments.***

## **6.2 Research Priorities for the TSPF and TSSAC annual operational plan**

Mr Southwell briefly presented the paper regarding research priorities for the Torres Strait Scientific Advisory Committee operational plan. He explained that the TSPMAC needs to provide advice on the annual operational plan. He added that due to the limited time to consider the paper, MAC members should take it away and it will be considered at the next TSPMAC OOS meeting in August.

Mr Jacobsen commented that TSPF isn't a high priority at the moment and this will probably improve once we hit the triggers under the harvest strategy as stock

assessments etc will be required. Mr Southwell added that PNG are willing to offer in kind support by matching funding.

Mr Betzel questioned how long funding lasts for the SAC. Mr Jacobsen commented that he thinks it is one year.

***ACTION: TSPMAC industry members to ask industry for comment on operational plan in their TSPMAC 10 summary letter.***

### **6.3 Industry Forum**

The TSPMAC discussed whether it is necessary to hold an industry forum to discuss potential ways to increase effort in the TSPF as discussed under agenda item 4.2. Mr Betzel thinks it would be beneficial to have an industry forum. Mr Earle commented he was cautious of an industry forum at this stage. He thought it would be more appropriate to wait until Government has developed the discussion paper regarding options.

The TSPMAC agreed the process regarding the 20m boat rule should be progressed as it was suggested under agenda item 4.2 and a forum could be held later on.

### **6.1 Next meeting**

The TSPMAC chair thanked members for attending the meeting. The TSPMAC agreed that the next meeting would be held in Brisbane on

Actions items to be progressed from TSPMAC 10

<b>Action reference number</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date item was added</b>	<b>responsibility</b>	<b>Status</b>
TSPMAC 10.1	PZJA agencies to further consider how information regarding trawling can be shown to Torres Strait Island communities or if it should be removed as an action item.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA	
TSPMAC 10.2	TSPMAC to review the GBRMPA report on the effects of trawling when it is released.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	QPIF	
TSPMAC 10.3	TSPMAC industry members to include information encouraging TSPMAC members to complete the gear survey and its importance in the industry TSPMAC 10 summary letter.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC industry members	
TSPMAC 10.4	TSPMAC to undertake a self assessment process at its next OOS meeting in 2010.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC EO	
TSPMAC 10.5	TSPMAC Executive Officer to distributed self assessment	TSPMAC 10 –	TSPMAC EO	

	documents to the TSPMAC.	30 June – 1 July 2010	
TSPMAC 10.6	Mr Turnbull to confirm the number of sygnathids caught during the independent surveys.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	QPIF Research
TSPMAC 10.7	AFMA to have discussions with the observer section to determine whether sygnathids are interacted with during fishing operations.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.8	AFMA to liaising with AFMA environment section to inform them that sygnathids are not generally found in the TS rather than not being reported.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.9	TSPMAC Executive Officer to distributed Mr Turnbull's powerpoint presentation to the TSPMAC	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC EO
TSPMAC 10.10	submit the harvest strategy to the PZJA SC and PZJA OOS.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.11	TSPMAC to consider at its next OOS meeting, whether they would like to recommend to the PZJA whether PNG days should be offered to TSPF licence	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC EO/ AFMA

TSPMAC 10.12	holders in 2011 if they are made available by PNG. develop an OOS TSPMAC paper working through the issues raised at TSPMAC 10 regarding the 20m boat rule, and meet OOS to discuss.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.13	develop discussion paper for PZJA Standing Committee and the PZJA asking them to consider the issue and whether consultation should occur or something else	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.14	develop some words regarding the 20m boat rule discussion for inclusion in the industry summary and chairs summary.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.15	draft a letter of response to Mr Raptis regarding his letter informing him of the process being undertaken to consider this issue.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC EO
TSPMAC 10.16	look into QLD legislation regarding exclusion zones around aquaculture infrastructure and report back to the Executive	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	QPIF

TSPMAC 10.17	Officer. QBFP to facilitate a community talk regarding safety for divers on the sponge farm in the Torres Strait.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	QBFP
TSPMAC 10.18	include information in the industry report again regarding the sponge farm.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC industry members
TSPMAC 10.19	determine if you can lease out a license but hold onto units that are not attached to a license.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	QPIF
TSPMAC 10.20	include website link to code in their TSPMAC summary letter. AFMA to get the communication section to edit the document before going to print.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC industry members
TSPMAC 10.21	Determine whether overhead costs and observer days can be reduced in the 2010/11 budget.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.22	draft letter from TSPMAC Chair to Mr Hurry regarding the draft budget comments.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.23	ask industry for comment on operational plan in their TSPMAC 10 summary letter.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC industry members
TSPMAC 10.24	seek advice regarding overhead costs and determine if there are any ways they can be reduced.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA

TSPMAC 10.25	determine whether observer days can be further reduced to 60.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.26	draft letter from TSPMAC Chair to Mr Hurry regarding the draft budget comments.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA
TSPMAC 10.27	TSPMAC Industry members to liaise with AFMA regarding the application of the cost recovery impact statement and the attribution of costs that relate to the PNG portion of the fishery.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	TSPMAC industry members
TSPMAC 10.28	Print the code of practice and distributed to license holders with the 2011 season handbook. Also place on the PZJA website.	TSPMAC 10 – 30 June – 1 July 2010	AFMA

#### Ongoing or incomplete action items from previous TSPMAC meetings

Action reference number	Action	Date item was added	responsibility	Status
TSPMAC 9.1	Ms Paulsen to get more information from Jim Foggerty of FRDC regarding the prawn campaign and see if it is possible to extend it to the	TSPMAC 9	Kylie Paulsen	<b>Incomplete.</b>

TSPMAC 9.2	TSPF. AFMA to determine whether there are any CMOs from the NPF fishing in the TSPF that can collect additional data	TSPMAC 9	AFMA	<b>Ongoing.</b> AFMA had discussions with the NPF Industry Pty Ltd project manager regarding this. The manger informed them that there may be one CMO that also fishes in the Torres Straits. AFMA are still awaiting confirmation of the details of this CMO.
TSPMAC 9.5	AFMA to determine if there are better species ID sheets for the AFMA protected species identification chart as the images in these sheets are not adequate for identification	TSPMAC 9	AFMA	<b>Incomplete/ removed as an action item.</b> No TSPMAC industry member could recall the problems with these ID sheets so no progress could be made on this item.
TSPMAC 9.11	Fisheries QLD to put together a business case for the funding of routine scientific work that considers using savings from reducing observer coverage or the 25% manage costs	TSPMAC 9	Fisheries QLD	<b>Complete.</b> The TSPMAC agreed to ongoing observer costs being funded through the levies, noting the reduced costs in observers etc would offset this cost.

TSPMAC 9.15	attributed to the PNG allocation TSPMAC industry members to inform industry in their MAC letter that a survey reviewing rubbish in the areas of Kodall and Masig Islands is being undertaken and remind them of the need to be responsible with rubbish, mention the code of conduct	TSPMAC 9	TSPMAC Industry members	<b>Complete.</b> This information was included in the TSPMAC industry letter which was distributed in May 2010.
TSPMAC 9.17	MSQ to determine whether there is a problem with the visibility of the north most buoy of the sponge farm	TSPMAC 9	MSQ	<b>Complete.</b> The buoy is of the required MSQ standards.
TSPMAC 9.19	AFMA to enquire about whether spill response kits are present on York Is and the mothership	TSPMAC 9	AFMA	<b>Complete.</b> A spill response kit is available from the State Emergency Service office on Yorke Island, as well as aboard all Seaswift mother ships. The contact details of the SES have been added to the code of conduct for disposal of marine debris, and will be added to next years TSPF handbook.
TSPMAC 9.20	TSRA to seek additional avenues for funding for	TSPMAC 9	TSRA	

	placing more buoys on the sponge farm, or discussing other ways of improving visibility of the sponge farm			
TSPMAC 8.3	AFMA to upload the PZJA historic decision record to the PZJA website	TSPMAC 8	AFMA	<b>Incomplete/ removed as an action item.</b> This is no longer considered necessary by the TSPMAC. Decisions are available on the PZJA website.
TSPMAC 8.15	QPIF to liaise with Mr Harris to determine whether funding can be sourced from the CRC for TSPF research needs.	TSPMAC 8	QPIF	<b>Ongoing.</b> QSIA are seeking to become members of the CRC. Until this occurs, we are not eligible for funding.
TSPMAC 8.16	AFMA to determine whether an investment warning is still required for the fishery and the methods of lifting it.	TSPMAC 8	AFMA	<b>Ongoing.</b> PZJA agencies have determined the process for lifting the investment warning. However as a whole of TS investment warning was in place, we need to ensure warnings stay in place for the fisheries they are required for.
TSPMAC 8.18	AFMA to assess whether a summary of bycatch data can be put in the TSPF handbook for the	TSPMAC 8	AFMA	<b>Incomplete/removed as an action item.</b> The MAC agreed that this should be removed as an action item as it isn't a priority at this time

TSPMAC 8.21	2010 season. PZJA agencies to develop an article to distribute positive information regarding the TSPF including bycatch reduction for presentation in forums including the TSRA newsletter, the QSIA news letter and the Torres News.	TSPMAC 8	AFMA & QPIF	<b>Incomplete/removed as an action item.</b> Not considered a priority at this time.
TSPMAC 8.22	AFMA to develop a letter to license holders informing them of the process being undertaken to develop the HS and HSWG industry member	TSPMAC 8	AFMA	<b>Incomplete/ removed as an action item.</b> The harvest strategy process is complete. The TSPMAC industry member letter contained information regarding HSWG contacts.
TSPMAC 8.23	EO to distribute the TSPMAC chairs summary to all TSPF license holders via email as a preference as well	TSPMAC 8	TSPMAC EO	<b>Ongoing.</b> The Chairs summary is sent with each industry letter following a MAC meeting.

as posting it on the PZJA website.

TSPMAC 070509	OOS 1.3	TSPF Industry members to develop a proposal for Government to pay 25% (the PNG portion) of the budget which benefit this sector of the fishery.	TSPMAC 070509	OOS	Industry
TSPMAC 070509	OOS 1.5	AFMA to provide a summary of some comments from other MACs regarding the CRIS at TSPMAC 8.	TSPMAC 070509	OOS	AFMA
TSPMAC 6.3		TSPMAC to undertake an annual self assessment against PZJA indicators outlined in PZJA FMP No. 1 (May 2008).	TSPMAC 6		TSPMAC
TSPMAC 6.15		DAFF to determine whether PNG caught product will need to be clearly	TSPMAC 6		DAFF

**Incomplete.** Industry members would still like to develop a paper and may do it for TSPMAC 10.

**Incomplete/ removed as an action item.** This process has now finalised and the MAC has informed that comments are no longer requested.

**Ongoing.** Self assessment is not thought to be appropriate at this time considering the change over of MAC members. The MAC agreed to conduct a self assessment at TSPMAC 10 in November 2010.

**Ongoing.** This action item is awaiting finalisation of import rules by Biosecurity Australia and AQIS. These rules cannot be finalised until the TSPMAC provides responses to certain questions from

	marked with the jurisdiction in which it was caught.			AQIS (see TSPMAC paper 4.6)
TSPMAC 6.18	AFMA to work with the TSRA and AFMA communications section to consider a method of disseminating the information from Mr Turnbull and Dr Pitcher's reports to the indigenous sector.	TSPMAC 6	AFMA	<b>Incomplete/ removed as an action item.</b> Moved under action item TSPMAC 10.1 and 10.2
TSPMAC 6.29	AFMA to apply a 3 tiered approach to the TED, BRD and try net survey, which includes;  1. sending out surveys to all licenses holders and wait two weeks for a response;  2. following up surveys with a	TSPMAC 6	AFMA	<b>Ongoing.</b> This has been decreased in the work priority list as due to other critical issues. However AFMA is finalising the BRD survey and will undertake the survey in early 2010.

phone call  
offering phone  
surveys;

3. QB&FP and  
AFMA observers  
to conduct  
surveys whilst in  
the field.