

TORRES STRAIT PRAWN MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	Meeting No. 2 19-20 September 2006
Ratification of record of previous TSPMAC meeting	Agenda Item No. 1

THE TSPMAC RECOMMENDS

That the PZJA **NOTES** the minutes and additional attachment on clarification of units from the June 2006 TSPMAC meeting.

BACKGROUND

Minutes of the June TSPMAC meeting were distributed to members on 4 July, with comments sought by 4 August. An additional attachment to the minutes seeking clarification on the discussion on units was distributed to members on 11 July, with comments sought by 2 August.

DISCUSSION

Comments were received by a number of members on both the draft minutes and the additional attachment. Changes have been made as required and the revised versions are included as attachments 1 and 2 for approval by the TSPMAC.

Torres Strait Prawn Management Advisory Committee - Draft Record 13 -14 June 2006 Cairns Cruising Yacht Squadron

Attendance

The following members and observers were in attendance at the Torres Strait Prawn Management Advisory Committee (TSPMAC) meeting:

Members

Mr Jim Gillespie (Chair)
Mr Ken Bedford (CFG – Darnley Island)
Mr Charles David (CFG - Yam Island)
Mr Lota Warria (CFG – Yorke Island)
Mr Barry Wilson (Industry)
Mr Mark Millward (Industry)
Mrs Rosemary Millward (Industry)
Mr Toshi Nakata (TSRA)
Mr Mick George (AFMA)
Ms Dorothea Huber (AFMA)
Mr Shane Gaddes (QDPI&F)
Mr Lyndon Peddell (QB&FP)
Mr Clive Turnbull (QDPI&F)
Mr Don Mosby (TSRA)

Observers

Mr Stephen Colquitt (DAFF)
Mr Robert Ferguson (DEH)
Mr Dan Sweeney (QB&FP)
Mr David Galeano (ABARE)

Opening

The Chair opened the meeting at 900 hrs acknowledging that this was the first meeting of the TSPMAC after it was upgraded from its previous status as the Prawn Working Group. Members introduced themselves.

Apologies

Apologies from the following members were noted:

Mr Bob Robins (Industry)
Mr Rob Giddins (Industry)
Mr Lester Baule (NFA PNG)
Mr Phil Polon (NFA PNG)

Adoption of meeting agenda

The Agenda was adopted. The Chair proposed an additional item be added to the agenda, specifically the creation of a document summarising the historic management arrangements used in the fishery.

Action Arising

- ***Draft a summary of the historic management arrangements in the Torres Prawn fishery.***
Responsibility - QDPI&F / AFMA / Industry

1. Ratification of previous meeting record

The record of the previous working group meeting was ratified without amendment.

2. Actions arising from previous meeting

Members noted the actions arising from the 10 November 2005 Prawn Working Group Meeting.

3. Outcomes of PZJA meeting 19

This item was delayed until after Item 6.2 due to the official record of PZJA 19 not having been signed.

Mr Colquitt advised that the record had been signed by the Commonwealth Minister the Hon. Eric Abetz on behalf of the PZJA. The major issues affecting the TSPF were:

- The creation of the TSPMAC (including membership),
- The amendment of the Fisheries Management Notice for TEDs,
- The Statement of Management Arrangements,
- Amendment of the trading rules for allocated fishing days,
- The administration of surrendered entitlements,
- The allocation of days to PNG.

Mr Colquitt advised members that the open tender run by the Australian Government resulted in the acquired licences being cancelled and the allocated fishing days held by DAFF pending the outcomes of the Bilateral meeting.

Members discussed the involvement of PNG stakeholders on the MAC, particularly as PNG was entitled to access 25% of the fishery. It was noted that anything above observer status may not be legal, however PNG should be encouraged to participate in all future MAC meetings and management forums.

Action Arising

- ***That the MAC should ensure good communication occurs with PNG stakeholders.***
Responsibility – Chair
- ***Encourage PNG stakeholders to attend future MACs and participate in future management forums.***
Responsibility – Mick George

4. TSPMAC Members

Mr George spoke to this item. Members were each provided a copy of Fisheries Management Paper No.1 which outlined the operation of the MAC and advised that official letters of appointment would be forthcoming.

The Chair stressed the need for the MAC to operate efficiently and encouraged members to act in the best interests of the fishery. It was requested that members be provided with a copy of the QDPI&F MAC guidelines in addition to FMP No.1.

Members discussed the nomination process, specifically whether membership was based on a specific position within an organisation or based on the relevant expertise of the actual person. In light of this discussion Mrs Millward requested clarification whether her position needed a nomination as it was not rolled over from the Working Group like the other members' positions.

Action Arising

- **Provide MAC members with the QDPI&F MAC guidelines**
Responsibility: Shane Gaddes
- **Determine why Mrs Millward's position on the MAC was not rolled over from the Prawn Working Group as per other members**
Responsibility: Mick George

5. Unit system for 2007

Ms Huber spoke to this item. Members were informed of the rationale behind unitising the fishery for the 2007 season. Unitisation of the fishery would allow greater flexibility for adjusting individual licences when changes to the Total Allowable Effort (TAE) were made. This would effectively reduce that administration required when a change was made as a decision would not need to be made on every licence.

Members discussed the strengths and weaknesses of an unitisation system in depth. Industry members expressed a view that the fishery already had a form of unitisation with allocated fishing days per licence and pointed out that changes to individual licences had already been made when the TAE was adjusted. Further concerns were raised regarding the possibility that financial institutions would need to reassess mortgages if a significant change to the current system occurred.

Ms Huber outlined the options for an unitisation system and the nature of each. These included:

- Individual Transferable Quotas
- Tradable Time units
- Gear based units (as used in NPF)
- Effort units

After an in-depth discussion regarding the unitisation of the fishery, members agreed that the preferred option at this time would be to formalise the current system as "time based effort units".

Members recommended that the time-based effort unit should be allocated to existing operators in the TSPF on a 1:1 basis dependant on the number of days allocated on the individual TSPF fishing licences at the time the management plan is implemented. Time based effort units are acknowledged to equate to an overall percentage of the sustainable total fishing effort in the TSPF, also known as a TAE that will be set for the fishery. The TAE will be set by the PZJA.

When licenses are issued by the PZJA the licences will reflect a number of allocated fishing days available under the fishery TAE, this should also be represented as an overall percentage of the fishery.

E.g. "XXX allocated fishing days which equates to X.XX% of the TAE for the TSPF"

Members recommended that in the case where partial days are calculated based on the time based effort units held by individual licences, allocated days will only be issued as whole days. A system for rounding up or down the allocated fishing days was to be considered by a management plan working group and it was recommended that the possible systems be tested against the existing fishery data.

Action Arising

- ***That the working group formed to progress the management plan models certain scenarios for the rounding up or down of days and reports back to the MAC
Responsibility: Shane Gaddes, Working Group***

6. Management Plan

Mr George presented a draft management plan for the fishery to members. Primarily members were requested to agree on a set of objectives for the fishery on which the process for drafting the rest of the management plan could be based.

Mrs Millward noted that in order to draft the management plan, it would be appropriate for the MAC to consider all previous management notices and PZJA decisions.

Ms Huber briefed members on the Ministerial direction to AFMA that Commonwealth managed fisheries be returned to sustainable and profitable circumstances in the medium term. The Ministerial direction also outlined a "Commonwealth Harvest Strategy Policy" which was designed to put an end to overfishing and ensure that overfished stocks are rebuilt within reasonable timeframes. A copy of the direction was provided to members.

Members re-drafted the set of proposed objectives for the fishery noting those already approved for the Tropical Rock Lobster Fishery Management Plan. A brief discussion on the "measures by which objectives are to be attained" was also held. The objectives were discussed and developed are included as Table 1 below.

Members discussed the timeframes associated with implementing the management plan. Mr George advised that at this time the goal was to have the process completed by mid 2007 with PZJA approval and an implementation date in early 2008. The goal for PZJA 20 was for a quality draft management plan, draft consultation documents, a draft Regulation Impact Statement, draft Cost Impact Statement and draft Small Business Statement to be ready for discussion.

Mr Millward queried whether an Allocation Advisory Panel (AAP) was required as part of the implementation of the new management arrangements and advised that Industry was opposed to an AAP and did not wish to pay for it. Members consequently

discussed the need for an AAP and noted that it would only be required if there was a significant change caused by the unitisation method introduced to the fishery.

Members agreed that a small working group be set up to progress the draft management plan out of session. The working group would be tasked with expanding the “measures by which objectives are to be attained” and the “performance criteria/indicators to assess measures taken” sections. The aim would be to complete the work via email/phone conference as much as possible with a second draft of the Management Plan considered by the MAC out of session.

Mr Mosby expressed concerns about not being able to identify the agency responsible for removing/remediating sunken trawl vessels. Mr Gaddes undertook to find out and get back to him.

DRAFT

Table 1 – Management Plan Objectives and Performance Measures discussed at TSPMAC meeting June 2006

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE (PROPOSED)	PERFORMANCE MEASURE	PROJECTS REQUIRED/PROGRAMME
<p>1. To maintain fishing mortality for all target species below the point where MSY (BMSY/EMSY) is achieved accounting for all sources of fishing mortality.</p>	<p>(a) setting the total allowable effort each year in the fishery, as necessary taking into account target and reference limits;</p> <p>(b) implementing a program of research, data collection and monitoring relevant to the assessment and management of the fishery;</p> <p>(c) establishing an effective program of catch monitoring and surveillance of the fishery to ensure compliance with the Management Plan;</p> <p>(d) developing a series of biological, economic and other data that can be used to assess the fishery</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock assessments • Observer program • Industry participation in management
<p>2. To give regard to the rights and obligations conferred on Australia by the Treaty and in particular to the traditional way of life and livelihood of traditional inhabitants, including their rights in relation to traditional fishing)</p>	<p>(a) To maximise/maintain/promote economic development in the Torres Strait area with an emphasis on providing the framework for commercial opportunities for traditional inhabitants.</p> <p>(b) To promote/assist/encourage appropriate commercial and employment opportunities that are socially and culturally appropriate for the Torres Strait.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs further discussion at CFG as to appropriate measure
<p>3. To provide for cooperative and cost efficient management of the resource, with PNG and Queensland.</p>	<p>(a) granting transferable fishing licences for the fishery;</p> <p>(b) directing licence holders, as necessary, not to engage in fishing to ensure the sustainability of the resources of the fishery;</p> <p>(c) setting the total allowable effort each year in the fishery, as necessary;</p> <p>(d) implementing a program of research, data collection and monitoring relevant to the assessment and management of the fishery;</p> <p>(e) developing a series of biological, economic and other data that can be used to assess the fishery;</p> <p>(f) complimentary management measures in place</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data sharing (PNG, frequency) • Compliance issues/obligations PNG

<p>4. To minimise impacts associated with interactions between the prawn and all other fisheries – impacts on other fisheries</p>	<p>(a) complimentary management measures in place (b) implementing a program of research, data collection and monitoring relevant to the assessment and management of the fishery; (c) establishing an effective program of catch monitoring and surveillance of the fishery to ensure compliance with the Management Plan; (d) developing a series of biological, economic and other data that can be used to assess the fishery (e) incidental catches of non-target commercial and other species in the Fishery is reduced to a minimum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observer program
<p>5. To maintain appropriate controls in the fishery so as to minimise the impacts on the environment</p>	<p>(a) Minimise bycatch discard (TEDs, BRDs, hoppers) (b) Check closures (c) Regional marine planning implications</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to strategic assessment and BAP • Risks to environment?
<p>6. To (maximise /maintain /promote) economic development in the Torres Strait area with an emphasis on providing the framework for commercial opportunities for traditional inhabitants.</p>	<p>(a) To promote/assist/encourage appropriate commercial and employment opportunities that are socially and culturally appropriate for the Torres Strait.</p>	
<p>7. Optimise the profitability of the fishery</p>	<p>(a) Catch/effort set below MSY (MEY) (b) Management regime to minimise fishing costs (c) Maximise catch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanisms to manage for all species not just vulnerable spp – alternative management arrangements

Action Arising

- **Undertake an audit of Fishery Management Notices and PZJA decisions for consideration during the drafting of the Management Plan.**

Responsibility: Shane Gaddes / Mick George

- **Form a working group to progress the draft management plan. Issues that can't be dealt with by the working group are to be referred back to the MAC.**

Responsibility: Mick George (Chair), Shane Gaddes, Toshi Nakata, Barry Wilson, Clive Turnbull, Kenny Bedford, David Galeano (If required)

- **Find out which agencies are responsible for sunken trawlers in the Torres Strait region and report to Islander members.**

Responsibility: Shane Gaddes

Day 2

7 Spatial Management Options

Mr George spoke to this item. The ABC Landline program on the Spencer Gulf Fishery was not available for this meeting due to a mix-up with the ABC.

Members discussed the summary of the Alternative Management Workshop contained in the TSPF handbook.

Industry members noted their support for the management options proposed at the workshop. However, they argued that these options could not be used in addition to the 32% reduction in fishing days. Components proposed by the workshop would only be acceptable to industry if it increased the TAE for the fishery.

Members noted the research funding provided by the Australian Government was aimed at assisting a possible move towards spatial management. In particular, it was noted that an endeavour prawn stock assessment was required to implement a spatial management system.

Mrs Millward stressed that this issue needed to be progressed as a matter of priority as industry members could not wait three years under current economic conditions for an increase in the TAE.

Members discussed the benefits of a system like that used in the Spencer Gulf fishery. It was agreed that there were clear benefits too such a system. However the remote nature of the fishery and the significant training required for skippers would make it more difficult to implement in the TSPF.

Mr David proposed a closure to trawling in area around Deliverance Island. He advised that the area was very rarely trawled and was a valuable area for turtle and dugong populations. This matter was to be reconsidered under Item 15.2.

Action Arising

- ***That the implementation of a spatial management system be considered at the next MAC meeting. In the longer term, consideration will be given to the revised stock assessment with a view to increasing the Total Allowable Effort in the fishery.***

Responsibility: MAC

8.1 Research funding and priorities

Mr Colquitt spoke to this item. He advised of the funding that had been made available by the Australian Government to identify other options for the management of the TSPF. In particular, the funding was to be used to increase the TAE within the sustainability limits based on the results of research.

Industry members pointed out some errors in the agenda item and requested these be addressed in for future meetings.

In light of the proposal to move towards an adaptive spatial management system, Mr Turnbull outlined the premise for the spatial management model using a trigger for effort directed at the tiger prawns. After the trigger is reached, the main tiger prawn grounds would be closed and effort would be applied to the southern endeavour prawn grounds where the fishing mortality on tiger prawns is much lower. In this fashion it may be possible to apply effort greater than the EMSY as a proportion of the effort is predominantly directed at endeavour prawns.

Mr Turnbull expressed that opinion that tagging had already been done and was no longer required. He also indicated the areas that he thought required further research and advised that the spatial survey would be of value, as would an endeavour prawn stock assessment.

Industry members indicated that any such research program should have Mr Turnbull involved, as he has a great deal of experience with the fishery.

Members discussed the following potential projects:

Project	Timeline	Funding
Tiger stock assessment (update)	November 2006	Currently funded
Endeavour Stock Assessment	1 st Half 2007	DAFF
Spatial survey (and Scenario Modelling)	March 2007 – 2008	DAFF
PNG Survey	2007 -2008	DAFF
Research Support	2006-2008	DAFF

Members agreed that the research plan needed to be discussed further with industry before the tender documents for research agencies were drafted. Industry was requested to provide a contact to DAFF for further discussions about the research plan.

Ms Huber requested that members be provided with quarterly updates on the progress of the research plan.

Action Arising

- ***That the MAC notes industry concerns regarding inaccuracy in agenda papers and prevents inaccuracies in the future.***
Responsibility: AFMA, DAFF, DPI&F
- ***That a survey of prawn stocks in PNG waters is added to the Bi- Lateral talks agenda.***
Responsibility:DAFF
- ***An industry contact is nominated for discussions with DAFF regarding the research plan. Nomination required by 20/6/06***
Responsibility:Mark Millward
- ***Quarterly updates on the progress of the research plan are provided to the MAC.***
Responsibility:Stephen Colquitt

8.2 Resource Assessment Group costing and funding options

Mr George spoke to this item. Members were informed of the need for a resource assessment group (RAG) for the provision of scientific advice and the review of research and stock assessments.

Members discussed the costs associated with the RAG and the benefits associated with having the extra scientific expertise available for specific projects. The ability to use the SAC rather than the RAG for this purpose was also considered, as it would save a considerable amount of money.

Members supported the RAG in-principle but to be more cost effective agreed:

- To try to utilize the SAC as much as possible; and
- To hold research meetings from time to time as required, but preferably back-to-back with MAC meetings.
- To decide a sub-membership or working group on a case-by-case basis.

It was also recommended that this action be reported to the SAC with a recommendation that the role of the SAC be expanded accordingly.

8.3 Ecological Risk Assessment & Data Plan

Mr George updated members on the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) progress to date. The ERA began in 2001 and was due for completion in 2006. A two day workshop was scheduled for late 2006.

Mrs Millward expressed concerns that there was a lot of duplication between the Bycatch Action Plan, Strategic Assessment and ERA and that all these documents need thorough industry reviews.

Mr Turnbull noted that while there was duplication, the ERA has a much wider coverage and draws on the other processes as inputs to the assessment.

9 Observer program

9.1 2005 Trip report and 2006 program update

Mr George informed members that the observer reports had been drafted but not finalised and were due for completion in August. The 2006 season was off to a good start with operators willing to take observers onboard their vessels. The second part of the observer program for 2006 was due to begin in August.

Mr Millward asked if the same boats were used every season or if different boats were used. He indicated that it would not be representative if the same boats were used consistently. Mr George agreed to check on this.

Mr David requested the qualifications required for employment as an observer. Mr George indicated that most have science degrees and agreed to provide the selection criteria from the last recruitment process.

Action Arising

- ***Investigate the boats that observers use each year to determine if a representative sample of the fleet is achieved or if the same boats are being used each year.***

Responsibility: Mick George

- ***Send 2005 and 2006 observer reports to members when they are completed.***
- ***Future observer reports are to be sent to MAC members on completion for out of session comment***

Responsibility: Mick George

- ***Send selection criteria for observer positions to Charles David.***

Responsibility: Mick George

9.2 Observer program – 2007 Program Plan

Members agreed that the 2007 program plan would need to be deferred until the 2005 report is complete.

10 National Plan of Action (NPOA) for Sharks

Mr Gaddes spoke to this item. The previous working group meeting requested that the synergies between the NPOA for sharks, the bycatch action plan and the recommendations from the strategic assessment be analysed.

Members noted that the only issue that required immediate attention was the creation of a Code of Practice for the handling of sharks at sea to increase survival. It was agreed that a code of practice would be developed with industry input and included in the next handbook.

Members agreed that the NPOA for sharks should be considered again after the completion of the ERA if any shark species are identified as being at a high risk of overexploitation.

Actions Arising

- ***Draft a code of practice for handling sharks for inclusion in the next Handbook.***
Responsibility: Shane Gaddes/Industry
- ***Reconsider the NPOA for sharks after the ecological risk assessment has been completed.***
Responsibility: MAC

11 TED Modification

Members discussed the draft Fisheries Management Notice (FMN). The major issue of discussion was the issue of flotation with industry members concerned that the content of the FMN was not consistent with the advice provided by US delegates during a visit to Innisfail earlier this year.

It was also noted the East Coast Trawl Fishery (ECTF) had let the US accreditation lapse due to difficulties with negotiations. Members agreed to seek further advice from the US and reconsider the FMN when this advice had been provided.

Action Arising

- ***Seek further clarification regarding the TED flotation issue from US gear technologist***
Responsibility: Mick George
- ***Reconsider draft fisheries management notice at next meeting after US advice on flotation has been provided.***
Responsibility: MAC

12 Finances

12.1 2006/7 Final Budget

Ms Huber informed members of the outcomes of a budget meeting with industry in March 2006 and briefed members on the key budget items for 2006/7. The MAC noted that the budget had increased significantly on the previous year.

Industry members expressed concerns with the increase in the budget and the inability of agencies to provide specific itemised reasons for these increases. Further concerns were raised about the process undertaken when the budget was finalised and not all the required information was available (e.g. Queensland budget).

Mr Colquitt advised members that while the budget represented a significant increase on the previous year, the Australian Government was providing levy relief to decrease the impact of this rise on Industry.

Mr Gaddes undertook to review the increases in the QDPI&F component of the budget and report back to industry.

Industry also argued that PNG should be responsible for 25% of the budget as it was afforded 25% of the catch. This view was noted by Mr. Colquitt as the DAFF representative and he requested that this view be expressed in writing to the Australian Government.

Mr George advised that the Australian Government policy on such matters was that full cost recovery would occur until catch sharing arrangements have been accepted by all signatories.

Action Arising

- **AFMA and DPI&F to liaise and jointly provide future budget information to industry for comment prior to the budget being finalised.**
Responsibility: AFMA/DPI&F
- **Provide industry members with further details regarding the 2006/07 QLD budget and reasons for increases on last year's figures.**
Responsibility: Shane Gaddes
- **DPI&F managers to discuss budget issues with Industry members**
Responsibility: Shane Gaddes, Dan Currey, Jim Gillespie

12.2 Australian Government Levy Relief

Members noted the levy relief funding and discussed whether there would be any benefit in spreading the funding over three years. Mr Colquitt advised that the second year's funding could be split over two years if any benefit could be identified.

13 Compliance

Mr Peddell provided an update on the compliance activities in the fishery. Resources have been reduced with QBFP no longer having access to the Customs vessels or Aircraft. The targets for inspections were reached with no breaches reported.

Mr Peddell indicated that while the fleet as a whole was co-operative with the QBFP, there were cases of individual fishers not co-operating. Mr Sweeny advised that Torres Strait issues were becoming a higher priority and that more Department of Transport inspections could be expected in the future.

Mr Mosby expressed concerns regarding crew being deserted or abandoned on islands with no means of returning to the mainland. Mr Millward undertook to write to entitlement holders asking them to ensure crew have transport arranged before leaving the vessels.

Action Arising

- **Send a notice to Torres Strait Prawn Entitlement Holders about ensuring crew members have a way home from Torres Strait when leaving vessels.**
Responsibility: Mark Millward

14 Date for next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for 13 to 15 September.

15 Other Business

15.1 Comparative impacts of twin vs. quad gear

Members noted the report.

15.2 PNG/Australia Bilateral Meeting

Members discussed issues for inclusion on the bilateral agenda. These issues included:

- The prawn budget (PNG paying 25%)
- Catch sharing arrangements
- A trawl closure around Deliverance Island
- Regulations for PNG vessels (VMS, gear, boat size etc)
- Access to unused PNG allocation in Australian waters

Industry members were requested to nominate a representative to attend the bilateral meeting. Mr Millward agreed to provide a nominee by 20 June 2006.

Action Arising

- ***Check PZJA decision on regulations for PNG boats working in Australian waters to determine if these boats are subject to the same regulations as Australian boats.***

Responsibility: Mick George

- ***An industry contact is nominated for attendance at the Bi-Lateral talks meeting. Nomination required by 20/6/06***

Responsibility: Mark Millward

15.3 Strategic assessment

Members discussed the progress on the recommendations from the strategic assessment of the fishery. Mr Ferguson indicated that good progress was being made towards meeting the recommendations.

The only issue which warranted discussion was that of the compliance risk assessment (CRA) for the fishery. Mr George undertook to look into the planning process for the CRA and report back at the next MAC.

Action Arising

- ***Provide an update on the compliance risk assessment process at the next MAC meeting.***

Responsibility: Mick George

15.4 Abare Reports

Mr Galeano informed members of the results of the 03/04 Abare survey of the TSPF. A quarter of the fleet was surveyed for this study. Despite a stable catch in the fishery, GVP has declined due to decreased prawn prices and an increase in the value of the Australian dollar. It was anticipated that net returns to the industry were likely to be negative in the years after 2003 due to large increases in fuel costs.

The next survey was scheduled for late 2006. Industry members noted that August was an appropriate time to complete the survey.

Summary of Actions Arising

	Action	Responsibility
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Draft a summary of the historic management arrangements in the Torres Prawn fishery.</i> 	<i>QDPI&F / AFMA / Industry</i>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>That the MAC should ensure good communication occurs with PNG stakeholders.</i> 	<i>Chair</i>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Encourage PNG stakeholders to attend future MACs and participate in future management forums.</i> 	<i>Mick George</i>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Provide MAC members with the QDPI&F MAC guidelines</i> 	<i>Shane Gaddes</i>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Determine why Mrs Millward's position on the MAC was not rolled over from the Prawn Working Group as per other members</i> 	<i>Mick George</i>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>That the working group formed to progress the management plan models certain scenarios for the rounding up or down of days and reports back to the MAC</i> 	<i>Shane Gaddes, Working Group</i>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Undertake an audit of Fishery Management Notices and PZJA decisions for consideration during the drafting of the Management Plan.</i> 	<i>Shane Gaddes / Mick George</i>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Form a working group to progress the draft management plan. Issues that can't be dealt with by the working group are to be referred back to the MAC.</i> 	<i>Mick George (Chair), Shane Gaddes, Toshi Nakata, Barry Wilson, Clive Turnbull, Kenny Bedford, David Galeano (If required)</i>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Find out which agencies are responsible for sunken trawlers in the Torres Strait region and report to Islander members.</i> 	<i>Shane Gaddes</i>

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That the implementation of a spatial management system be considered at the next MAC meeting. In the longer term, consideration will be given to the revised stock assessment with a view to increasing the Total Allowable Effort in the fishery.</i> 	MAC
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That the MAC notes industry concerns regarding inaccuracy in agenda papers and prevents inaccuracies in the future.</i> 	AFMA, DAFF, DPI&F
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>That a survey of prawn stocks in PNG waters is added to the Bi- Lateral talks agenda.</i> 	DAFF
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An industry contact is nominated for discussions with DAFF regarding the research plan. Nomination required by 20/6/06</i> 	Mark Millward
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Quarterly updates on the progress of the research plan are provided to the MAC.</i> 	Stephen Colquitt
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Investigate the boats that observers use each year to determine if a representative sample of the fleet is achieved or if the same boats are being used each year.</i> 	Mick George
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Send 2005 and 2006 observer reports to members when they are completed</i> • <i>Future observer reports are to be sent to MAC members on completion for out of session comment</i> 	Mick George
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Send selection criteria for observer positions to Charles David</i> 	Mick George
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Draft a code of practice for handling sharks for inclusion in the next Handbook.</i> • <i>Reconsider the NPOA for sharks after the ecological risk assessment has been completed.</i> 	Shane Gaddes/Industry MAC
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Seek further clarification regarding the TED flotation issue from US gear technologist</i> • <i>Reconsider draft fisheries management notice at next meeting after US advice on flotation has been provided.</i> 	Mick George MAC

20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>AFMA and DPI&F to liaise and jointly provide future budget information to industry for comment prior to the budget being finalised.</i> • <i>Provide industry members with further details regarding the 2006/07 QLD budget and reasons for increases on last year's figures.</i> • <i>DPI&F managers to discuss budget issues with Industry members</i> 	<p><i>AFMA/DPI&F</i></p> <p><i>Shane Gaddes</i></p> <p><i>Shane Gaddes, Dan Currey, Jim Gillespie</i></p>
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Send a notice to Torres Strait Prawn Entitlement Holders about ensuring crew members have a way home from Torres Strait when leaving vessels.</i> 	<p><i>Mark Milward</i></p>
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Check PZJA decision on regulations for PNG boats working in Australian waters to determine if these boats are subject to the same regulations as Australian boats.</i> 	<p><i>Mick George</i></p>
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>An industry contact is nominated for attendance at the Bi-Lateral talks meeting. Nomination required by 20/6/06</i> 	<p><i>Mark Milward</i></p>
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide an update on the compliance risk assessment process at the next MAC meeting.</i> 	<p><i>Mick George</i></p>

Clarification on “unit system for 2007”

Currently Australian operators have allocated fishing days on licences equating to a total of 6867 fishing days. In 2007 those fishing days will be converted on a one-for-one basis to “time based effort units”, assuming all licences are renewed for the 2007 fishing season that would result in the allocation of a total of 6867 units in the fishery. Following the allocation process the total number of units issued to Australian operators in the fishery would be fixed at 6867 units under the management plan for the fishery. Each unit issued to an operator would thus equate to 0.01456% ($1/6867 \times 100$) of the Australian share of the Total Allowable Effort (TAE) in the TSPF.

For an operator holding 100 nights in 2006, that would equate to an allocation of 100 units in 2007, worth 1.456% of the Australian share of the TAE for the fishery.

By definition, the conversion of the number of units held by an operator under a time based effort unit system to a percentage holding in the fishery would be used to calculate the number of fishing days that can be fished in any given season. Assuming the TAE in 2007 is set at 6867 nights, every time based effort unit held by an operator would equate to 1 allocated fishing day under the following equation.

$$\begin{aligned} (1 \text{ unit} / 6867 \text{ units}) \times \text{TAE} &= \text{days held} \\ \text{or} \\ 0.01456\% \times 6867 &= 1 \text{ day} \end{aligned}$$

TAE changes

Any changes to the TAE in the fishery would be made as required by the PZJA, according to scientific information and through consultation with the TSPMAC.

Trading

The time based effort units will be transferable under the new unit system. All operators would be entitled to trade units to other operators, in a similar way to that currently used by operators to trade fishing days. Following the allocation of units in 2007, operators would trade units with a value of 0.01456% of the Australian share of the TAE, such that someone trading 100 units will trade 1.456% of the TAE, (equating to 100 nights assuming the TAE is maintained at 6867 nights).

Banks and wording on licences

Industry members informed the TSPMAC how important it was to be able to take their licences to bank managers to illustrate and borrow money against a number of “allocated fishing days”, as this is the system has been used historically in the fishery. They requested that licences issued following the move to the unitised management system should indicate the number of allocated fishing days. The TSPMAC recognised this and suggested that statements be issued on licences that nominated “XXX allocated fishing days which equates to X.XX% of the TAE for the fishery”. The calculation of “XXX allocated fishing days” would be made by licensing staff based on the number of units held by the operator at the time the licence was issued.