Department of Conservation
Te Papa Atawbai

Meeting:	Conservation Services Programme (DOC)/ MPI Aquatic Environment joint presentation of research proposals for 2013/14
Date:	22 March 2013
Time:	9.30 am – 2:30 pm
Place:	Terrace Conference Centre, St John's House, 114 The Terrace in Wellington
Chairs	Hilary Aikman (ph: 04-471-3084 email: haikman@doc.govt.nz): CSP Martin Cryer (ph: 04-819-4253; email: martin.cryer@mpi.govt.nz): MPI
Attendance:	Jack Fenaughty (Sanford Ltd/Silvifish), Johanna Pierre (Dragonfly/JPEC), Rosie Hurst, Ian Doonan, Malcolm Clark, Suze Baird, David Thompson (NIWA), Pat Ried (Area 2), Paul Breen (Breen Consulting), Tom Clark (Seafood New Zealand), Carol Scott (Challenger Finfisheries), Laws Lawson (Fisheries Inshore New Zealand; Te Ohu Kaimoana), Richard Wells (DeepWater Group), William Aldridge, Ben Sharp, Michelle Beritzhoff, Vicky Reeve, Catherines Jones (MPI), Igor Debski, Kris Ramm (DOC)
Apologies:	Darryl Sykes (NZRLIC), Milean Palka (WWF), Doug Loder (Talleys, Federation of Commercial Fishermen),Katrina Subedar, Karen Baird (Forest and Bird), Liz Slooten, Steve Dawson, Bruce Robertson (Otago University), Di Tracey (NIWA), David Middleton (Seafood NZ)

MINUTES FOR CSP DISCUSSION

INTERACTION PROJECTS

INT-2 Identification of seabirds captured in New Zealand fisheries

- It was clarified that protocols for return/photos will be developed following advice from CSP TWG (see meeting of 7 March 2013)

INT-3 Identification of marine mammals, turtles and protected fish captured in New Zealand fisheries

- No substantive comments

INT-4 Optimisation of observer data collection protocols

PR – will this cover inshore and deepwater?

KR – yes, will try to apply what's been learnt from offshore to inshore

MClark – delving into what is being collect in diaries could be a big job

RW – this work should set a new benchmark for going forward

KR clarified that the intent is to develop better processes going forward

JP – strongly support, will make the data much more useable

INT-5 Assessment of cryptic seabird mortality on trawl warps and longlines

RW – deepwater as well as bottom longline and inshore?

KR – yes

IDebski/BS – focus on inshore and bottom longline was highlighted as these were areas with highest uncertainty in recent seabird risk assessment

RW – cost for design and analysis only? Observations made by observers?

KR – yes

LL – observers recording in course of other work

KR – yes, will be part of the planned duties

PR – use of word platform mean separate vessels involved?

KR – no

MB – would be tie in with protocol project

KR – yes, the protocol development component of the project would lead to standardised future data capture

POPULATION PROJECTS

POP2012-02 New Zealand sea lions – demographic assessment of the cause of decline at
        the Auckland Islands*

POP2012-06 Salvin's albatross – population estimate and at-sea distribution*

*These projects are multi-year projects consulted on in previous years and included here for the sake of completeness.

POP-1 Auckland Islands New Zealand sea lion population project

MB - will be useful to have methodology from previous years to inform planning

IDebski - agree, will be used at detailed planning stage

IDoonan – Option A abandons mark resight dataset

RW – not yet at the stage to confidently make a decision until a review of the previous years' data is done. Deepwater Group (DWG) supports the work and is currently leaning towards Option B.

RW- highlights the importance of tying in this work with any population estimation for white-capped albatross

IDebski – agree, these projects should be delivered together, as this year, to maximise cost effectiveness

RW- highlights the importance of being precautionary and keeping the mark recapture data point

PB – will a review of the pre-2004 data be brought into the decision making process?

IDebski- this being pursued through the CSP Technical Working Group

RC- 3rd option should be included which is a continuation of the status quo

IDebski – yes, there is in fact a range of possible combinations of population estimation and resight effort that could performed

IDoonan- is Option A about cost saving?

IDebski- yes following historic feedback on costly nature of work

RW- DWG's primary concern is more for scientific robustness than cost

POP-2 Auckland Islands white-capped albatross population estimate

RW - survival cannot be estimated as tagging work cannot be conducted. Highlights that lots of work has been done on conducting population estimates, and previously collected data should be analysed and presented before investing further in this work

IDebski - noted the delay in analysing this data was driven by cost savings of analysing 2 years of data at once

RW – supports in principle

LL – what about information that is available but has not yet been reported?

IDebski – draft findings from 2012 shows an increase, but there is still not enough data to understand the true pattern

IDoonan – is the variation in the data driven by sampling or biological factors?

RW – timing has shifted to align with sea lion work. Timing needs to be considered based on the past 2 years

IDebski and DT – there are a number of biological factors that may also be at play (e.g. the extent to which this species is a biennial breeder), and long data sets are probably required to aid understanding

TC – two surveys in a year would fix this. Why is this not planned?

IDebski – cost – would make the project more than twice the cost as a separate helicopter charter to the Auckland Islands would be required

TC – at least the work as it stands will allow for an index of relative abundance

POP-3 Auckland Islands Gibson's albatross population study

RW – Using grounds count methodologies?

IDebski – yes, extension of historic data collection

RW – population appears to be declining quickly

IDebski – this is the species which has strong evidence for decline from recent modelling with multiple contributing demographic factors

RW – agrees that this population needs monitoring, the question is who pays for it

POP-4 Black petrel population project

TC – are the methodologies comparable with previous work in order to get a trend?

IDebski – both study site and random transect methodologies can be considered. Current preference is for undertaking study site work this year to inform trend and

estimation of demographic parameters (e.g. survival) and then undertake random transect work on regular but not necessarily annual intervals.

RW – there is a need to document how this work feeds into risk assessments and the NPoA-Seabirds

POP-5 Development of coral distribution modelling

MClark- will this work be intended to improve distribution modelling or risk assessment?

IDebski – there is a focus on modelling in the first instance but also a need to understand impacts (location and intensity). Open to direction from the group on priority of either of these approaches

RW – not clear of the objective of the project and therefore the need for it

The group undertook some discussion around prioritisation

BS – have methods for this work been identified?

IDebski – this is identified in detail in the report for POP2011-6. This contains more detailed discussion on scope.

JF – are there synergies between this project and the work undertaken by GNS?

IDebski – all of this information would be collated at the risk assessment stage

POP-6 Update protected fish review: oceanic whitetip shark

* No substantive comments

MITIGATION PROJECTS

MIT2012-05 Protected species bycatch newsletter*

*These projects are multi-year projects consulted on in previous years and included here for the sake of completeness.

MIT-1 Sea trials of Kellian line setter

SC – will a dedicated vessel be used?

KR – yes

SC – will vessel time be costed into proposal?

KR – yes

SC – is the device patented by Dave Kellian?

KR – no

MIT-2 Surface longline mitigation

RW – are these trials testing existing devices in NZ conditions?

KR – yes?

LL – which devices are currently being tested?

IDebski – safeleads and lumino leads are currently being tested, smart hooks, hook pods and double line weighting were also identified by the Technical Advisory Group established to inform the current project

LL/TC – should consider findings from this year first, and this proposal should only be a place holder project

MIT-3 Inshore bottom longline: larger vessel characterisation and factors related to seabird capture

PR – what size of vessel does this proposal refer to?

KR – generally the vessels greater than 2m

RW – wouldn't dynamics be understood from earlier ling autoliner work?

KR – will review earlier findings

JF – agree, we understand causes, need to understand level of impacts

RW – yes, lack of information on impact levels

CS – suggest interview fishermen on what they do as first stage

KR – yes, that can be another investigative option for this topic

MIT-4 Basking shark mitigation: detection and avoidance

CS – noted that some information is included in protected species handbook, should be reviewing that

KR – outputs can feed into revision of the handbook or other resources

JF – not all vessels have sonar, may not be able to avoid, focus should be on how to deal with captures, for release in best possible condition

KR – yes, can consider optimal release methods as a focus for the project

RW – strong practical incentive to progress this, agree with focus JF suggests, but should progress as a meeting with Industry, don't need a project

MIT-5 Development of bird baffler design for offshore trawl vessels

VR – funding includes cost of building bafflers?

KR – yes, cost of building baffler was an obstacle to achieving their development in MIT2011-07

RW – industry is interested in develop bafflers as devices that don't need continued operation as tori lines do, need a robust development and testing process

RW – should seek collaboration with others e.g. Birdlife

OTHER COMMENTS AND GAPS

RW - For species with large investment a summary of what's available should be developed

LL – encourage also

ID/MCryer – agree in principle, processes are in place, though perhaps not very transparent

ID – suggested review documents similar to recent CSP protected fish review may be a reasonable detail to aim for

CS – where are risk assessments driving these proposals?

IDebski – clarified several projects refer to the recent seabird level 2 risk assessment

MC – this will shortly be finalised and published

CS – how are mitigation ideas chosen?

KR – pick up on research recommendations, advice from fishermen, international review etc

JF – where is offal management at?

IDebski – various studies have produced recommendations of best practice, and is being implemented through vessel management plans

RW described practices now being implemented

JF – ensuring offal discharge is away from danger zones is very important in removing capture risk, needs to be a priority

RW – net captures now a major area of interest

RC – any plans to pick up on recs from setnet mitigation?

KR – no as presented, but a placeholder project may be a good idea

MPI – MINUTES REPORTED SEPARATELY BY MPI

Suggested priority projects
PRO2013-01: Protected species capture estimation

PRO2013-13: Global seabird risk assessment (for NZ species)

PRO2013-06: Abundance and distribution of WCSI Hector's dolphins

PRO2013-02: Developing predictive models of protected species distribution

PRO2013-09: Population viability of Maui's dolphins

PRO2013-17: Repeat L3RA: southern Buller's albatross

PRO2013-11: Response to the review of the sea lion BFG model

ENV2013-01: Development of model-based estimates of fish bycatch

BEN2013-04: Spatially explicit modelling of benthic systems

PRO2013-08: Reanalysis of Hector's dolphin line transect aerial survey data

Other potential projects

BEN2013-05: Development of the BOMEC

ENV2013-03: NPOA sharks: age and growth of deepwater species (2 or 3 species)

BEN2013-06 Development of a web-based tool for trawl footprint assessment

ENV2013-08: Extension of flatfish CPUE modelling including environmental variables to the Kaipara Harbour

ENV2013-13: Assessing fish survival following capture and release

ENV2013-14: NZ QMS fish life history assessments

ENV2013-05: NPOA-sharks: Nursery areas for school shark

ENV2013-07: Land-based effects: next steps with toheroa

BEN2013-01: Monitoring recovery of benthic fauna on the Graveyard complex