

**Meeting:** Conservation Services Programme Technical Working Group  
**Date:** 13 December 2016  
**Time:** 9:00 am  
**Place:** Fusion Café, Corner of Manners St. & Willis St.  
**Chair:** Ian Angus (ph: 04 417 3081, email: [iangus@doc.govt.nz](mailto:iangus@doc.govt.nz))  
**Attendees:** Richard Wells (DWG), Tom Clark (FINZ), Jack Fenaughty (Sanford Ltd), David Thompson, Malcolm Francis, Rosemary Hurst, Malcolm Clark, Kim Goetz (NIWA), Ed Abraham (Dragonfly Science), Dominique Vallieres, Rich Ford, Greg Lydon, Jo Lambie, Tiffany Bock (MPI), Ian Angus, Katie Clemens-Seely, Kris Ramm, Igor Debski (DOC)  
**Apologies:** Karen Baird (Forest and Bird), Amanda Leathers (WWF)

### Overarching comments

RW – The latest observer programme data should be made available before the February Research Planning meeting. Other MPI commissioned work will also be useful at that stage (i.e. level 3 updates, seabird risk assessment, marine mammal risk assessment). Requested a list of the key reports (Risk Assessments, Observer data, significant population projects, etc.) and dates for when they will be made available and would like that to be released before Christmas.

### CSP Objectives

TC noted the current CSP Objectives refer to “adverse effects”.

### CSP Medium term research plans

RW – How are level 3 risk assessments considered alongside the Medium Term Research Plans (based on level 1 or 2 assessments), and how do we deal with other external research drivers (e.g. ACAP priorities)?

- ID – This is the purpose of the RAG; these are tools to develop indicative base plans. As always, there are things that must be interpreted and other factors play a role, but we use these tools to identify gaps to then present a base case to be discussed with stakeholders.
- RF – Certain factors should be considered case by case, and in discussions with government, stakeholders, etc.

### Interaction projects

MF – Is there work being done on getting fishers to return specimens instead of disposing at sea?

- KR – Yes, there is ongoing work on that front, currently it is much easier to return specimens when attached to a specific project, and there is knowledge around the timelines and of the specific vessels that would be involved, etc.
- MF – So more practical changes and not legislative changes?
- KR – A blanket permit would be best, but that will take a long time to organise.

There was discussion around the issues with the observer collected photos and data and the need for improved data management.

### Population project – Seabirds

RW highlighted the need to get previous data from Chatham Albatross MR study so that it can be analysed together with outputs from the CSP project POP2016-01.

Quantifying the survival of juvenile black petrels was identified as a research gaps for the seabird projects.

**Mitigation**

RW – Expressed an interested in a review of the bycatch media work (incorporating social media, etc.). The project needs a rethink and better alignment with the industry (i.e. the target audience).

- KR – The bycatch media project is a link with the liaison work as well, none of this should be done in isolation.

**Coral research planning**

RW – An inventory of the work and institutions that are engaging in that work should be done, all current work should be collated, sent out to all the parties with a current interest and see what comes back.

There was discussion over the constraints and difficulties that research planning for coral work might encounter.

IA agreed to identify an appropriate group to convene to sort the issues with corals and who should be included.

**Queries received following the meeting**

The consultation process to develop the CSP seabird medium term was queried.

- This plan was developed as an action arising from the first RAG meeting (December 2013), and presented in draft form at the second meeting (March 2014). Updates have since been presented to the RAG.