## IEMRS Implementation Advisory Group – Meeting Minutes

27 June 2017	27、	June	2017
--------------	-----	------	------

Attending Members	on Watt (Chair), Stuart Anderson, Josh Barclay, Amanda Leathers, Storm Stanley (for Jeremy Cooper), Rob nanski, Jeremy Helson, Laws Lawson, Geoff Keey (for Karen Baird), Rosemary Hurst, Mark Edwards, George ment, Kris Ramm (for Ian Angus), Keith Ingram	
MPI Officials	Idil Kaplan, Matthew Perkins, Sylvie Ots	
Guests		
Apologies	Bryan Wilson, Jeremy Cooper, Daryl Sykes, Ian Angus, Lesley Campbell, Karen Baird, Michael Looker	

Item	Discussion and agreed points	Actions
1. Welcome and approval of previous minutes       •         •       •         •       •	<ul> <li>The Chair welcomed the members and noted apologies for Jeremy Cooper, Bryan Wilson, Daryl Sykes, Ian Angus, Lesley Campbell, and Karen Baird.</li> <li>The Chair acknowledged a letter from Fisheries Inshore New Zealand, Deepwater Group, Paua Industry Council, Te Ohu Kaimoana and New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council and invited comments on the minutes from all members. The letter raised concerns that the minutes from the IAG meeting held on 6 June omitted several points made, including things that have not reached an agreement or have been proposed, which could have been put on the agenda for the IAG meeting, 27</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MPI to have draft minutes circulated for comment during week beginning 3 July.</li> <li>MPI to address topics raised in letter from Fisheries Inshore New Zealand, Deepwater Group, Paua Industry</li> </ol>
	<ul> <li>June.</li> <li>One concern raised was that the 6 June minutes implied that the TWG had given positive feedback on the draft regulations when the group had not seen the regulations.</li> <li>The letter proposed four topics to discuss: <ol> <li>Transmission of data and frequency of that transmission</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Council, Te Ohu Kaimoana and New Zealand Rock Lobster Industry Council, in the subsequent IAG agenda.</li> <li>3. The minutes of the 6 June IAG meeting to be</li> </ul>

2. Cost assumptions, benefit assumptions and cost benefit analysis	amended to clarify that
3. Information needs analysis to support IEMRS requirements	the feedback on the
4. Content and process regarding the IEMRS regulations	draft regulations had not come from the TWG.
• The relevant members made the point that it is important to discuss these matters in more depth.	<ol> <li>MPI to consider how topics raised re MLS and</li> </ol>
• MPI is now focussing on giving effect to the Cabinet decisions, which have already been made, and implementing these.	Deemed Value can be put on a pathway for discussion in the most suitable forum.
Members expressed a desire to discuss how to attain efficiencies.	suitable forum.
• There was concern that members are being given information from MPI during these meetings, rather than being asked to advise on matters.	
<ul> <li>It was recommended by some members of the group that the following two items are kept in-scope: <ol> <li>The concern that MLS is legitimising high grading and that cameras cannot determine how big a fish is.</li> <li>The concern that Deemed Value is too high and is therefore driving up the ACE, which will have an impact on IEMRS.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	
• It was acknowledged that there is some policy work around landings and discards which is not unrelated to IEMRS.	
• It was noted that some members would still like Eco to be a part of the IAG, although MPI indicated it was happy with the balance of NGO representation (having made other additions to the IAG membership).	
• There was concern that it will be difficult, space wise, to get observers on inshore boats.	

2. Revised Terms of Reference	<ul> <li>The decision to remove the Consensus clause was queried.         <ul> <li>There was a suggestion that the group should have some ability to make a decision, given that many of the key fisheries interest groups are represented.</li> <li>MPI clarified that while this group has been created to give advice, key decisions are made by the Minister and MPI.</li> <li>There was a suggestion that if consensus can be reached, it should be noted.</li> <li>It was agreed that the TOR can be changed slightly to reflect that although consensus is desired within the group, it may not necessarily always be reached.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Clause 8.4c was discussed. With regards to media, it was explained that members are free to comment about their organisation's position on IEMRS more generally but not on the business of the group.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MPI to provide a revised version of the TOR during the week beginning 3 July.</li> <li>TOR to reinstate Consensus clause in an amended form, acknowledging that consensus is desired but may not always be reached.</li> <li>The word "support" to be revisited in clauses</li> </ol>
	<ul> <li>Keith Ingram, representative of NZ Recreational Fishing Council, disclosed his interest in media. It was noted that member, Keith Ingram, Editor, Skipper Magazine, will continue to report on fisheries matters but not on what has been discussed in the IAG meetings, unless it is information that has been released by the Chair or gained from the public domain.</li> <li>In clauses 2.1a and c, there was some concern that the word "support" could be misinterpreted.         <ul> <li>With regards to 2.1a, it was agreed that "to support smooth and timely implementation" will be changed to "to discuss and advise on timely implementation"</li> <li>Regarding the Declaration of interest, clause 9, it was explained that this</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2.1a and c.
	information (i.e. interests declared) is purely to assist with the stakeholder engagement occurring through the TWG and IAG groups and not for outside parties.	

3. IEMRS timeline	<ul> <li>MPI presented an updated IEMRS timeline, including an overview of timeframe and process:         <ul> <li>The regulations will be finalised mid-July. These will be at a high level.</li> <li>From there, draft circulars, at a more detailed level, will be available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	8. MPI to provide a simplified, electronic version of the IEMRS timeline
	<ul> <li>Once circulars are available, four weeks of consultation will follow.</li> <li>The circulars will be finalised in early September.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MPI to follow up the issue of what data should be collected on forms. This is to be</li> </ol>
	• There was concern raised about the start date of 1 October 2017 being too early to achieve a successful implementation across all the fishing vessels.	addressed by MPI's own scientists.
	• MPI reiterated that 1 October is the start of the implementation process.	10. MPI to touch base with the Data Working Group
	• There was concern that some fishers could be in a situation where they may not be able to fish until they know exactly what is required by way of electronic reporting.	and report back to IAG.
	<ul> <li>There was some concern that data being collected on forms could be improved but that this issue hasn't been addressed and scientists aren't getting a chance to advise.</li> <li>MPI has had ongoing engagement on this issue, with its own scientists and fisheries management.</li> </ul>	
	• There was a query about whether MPI has been in contact with the Data Working Group and a suggestion that the group in question should have a chance to look at what the TWG and IAG groups have been working on. This will be followed up by MPI.	
	<ul> <li>Regarding the specifications, there was a query as to why PAU, PAA and PAI have been changed.</li> </ul>	
	• There was a general consensus from the group that it is very important to get IEMRS implemented successfully, even if it means a more flexible timeframe.	
4. Technical Working Group (TWG) Chair's report back covering:	<ul> <li><u>The key items discussed during the second TWG meeting (26 Jun):</u></li> <li>Requirements for ER regulations and comparisons with current requirements.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MPI to provide an overview of the ownership and use of</li> </ol>

a) Differences between existing and new ER requirements	Discussion around Terminology of specifications.	data at the next IAG meeting.
b) E-logbook specs c) Log book development	Requirements for frequency of reporting.	12. MPI to arrange for a more detailed discussion
update from technical providers	• Overview of regulations, timeline and publication of circulars.	of the electronic reporting summary
	• Details of the implementation process from 1 October 2017.	paper to occur with relevant parties through
	• The point was made by some of the TWG members that the timeframe is very tight.	SRE meetings in July, i.e, outside of the IAG meetings.
	• MPI will engage with a broad range of fishers, not all of which are captured by SREs.	<ol> <li>MPI to provide a briefing on where the data goes, who owns it and who</li> </ol>
	• There was a query around the accessibility of data by the quota holders who submit the data, which is something MPI will be following up on.	controls it.
	• The TWG will be meeting soon after the circulars are out in mid-July.	
	Discussion from IAG members	
	• Several of the IAG members felt it would be useful to have a briefing on:	
	<ul> <li>Where the data goes</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Who owns it</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Who controls it</li> </ul>	
	• A more detailed discussion of the electronic reporting summary paper would occur separately, outside the group.	
	• There was some concern that MPI have not yet engaged with fishers.	
	• There was some feeling that certain things in the Cabinet paper are not yet possible.	

	<ul> <li>There was a query on how equipment could be placed on certain vessels, e.g. rubber tubes. Rather than a broad approach, each fishery will need to be looked at on an individual basis.</li> <li>Once the regulations are out, the pathway to transition will be clearer, then MPI will work with industry and reach out to fishers to get IEMRS implemented in an effective and timely manner.</li> <li>Frequency of reporting was discussed <ul> <li>A concern was expressed that this is an extension of Cabinet direction.</li> <li>MPI believe daily reporting to be a compliance benefit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul> <li>5. IEMRS Implementation <ul> <li>a) Debrief and learnings from international models</li> <li>b) Discussion</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Stuart Anderson gave the group an overview of some of his key findings from an overseas trip to various countries across the EU, Scandinavia and the UK.</li> <li>Every country visited was interested in the three IEMRS technologies that will be implemented in New Zealand.</li> <li>ER is in place across the EU, UK and Norway.</li> <li>There was generally a strong recognition from these countries of the value that cameras on boats can deliver.</li> <li>There has been good analysis on catch reporting and geospatial reporting for risk-ranking and identifying issues.</li> <li>Operationally, some countries are already using video footage to measure fish. In the UK, fisheries management has benefited from cameras on boats in these areas: <ol> <li>Determination of species</li> <li>Determination of size</li> <li>Estimated weight</li> </ol> </li> <li>There is now a market for smaller-sized fish, where there was none before.</li> <li>Some countries are using IEMRS to help set the TAC.</li> <li>Monitoring for bycatch of endangered species did not come up as a key issue in these countries.</li> <li>There was an overall comment from all countries visited, that for a successful</li> </ul>

	implementation, a lot of information and support is needed.		
5. Any other business and wrap up	•	It was suggested that we have subsequent meeting times earlier in the day, for the benefit of those members who are travelling from other parts of the country.	14. MPI to set the date for the next IAG meeting.
	•	It was suggested that subsequent meetings should be extended to 3 hours duration.	
	•	The group was reminded that individual expense claim forms need to be emailed to MPI by Friday 30 June, for processing.	

Next meeting is scheduled for Friday 28 July, 11.30-2.30.