

Minutes – February 2015

Date: 12 February 2015

Venue: Oamaru Opera House

Chair: Maree Baker-Galloway

Attendees:

Forum Members

- Fergus Sutherland
- Philippa Agnew
- Carol Scott
- Simon Gilmour
- Gail Thompson
- Stephanie Blair
- Edward Ellison
- Nelson Cross
- Ate Heineman
- Chris Hepburn
- Tim Ritchie
- John Henry

DOC

- Ruth Mackenzie – White
- Leeann Ellis
- Greig Funnell
- Sarah Bagnall
- Megan Linwood
- Marie Long

MPI

- Tania Cameron

Apologies

- Khyla Russell
- Neville Peat
- Sue Maturin

1. Welcome and Introductions

Edward Ellison opened the Forum meeting at 8.41am with a mihi whakatau.

The chair welcomed the Forum to the first meeting of 2015, and made a special thanks to Leeann Ellis for organising the meeting and Philippa Agnew for showing the Forum the Oamaru Blue Penguin Colony the prior evening. It was noted that the opportunity to view a significant local site was a good opportunity for the Forum to appreciate the issues facing each location and different sector group interests. The chair then gave an outline of the meeting schedule.



Action: Forum members to consider what local areas they would like to show their Forum colleagues, which will help the Forum understand the issues/importance of the marine environment at that location.

2. Review of previous meeting minutes

The chair asked for comments on the minutes from the November Forum meeting. Clarification was sought about a comment on page 5, reading *“The chair questioned if it was a matter of terminology being used, as opposed to a fundamental difference in intent, by referring to “fishery enhancement” instead of “marine protection”*”. It was explained that the conversation that took place was addressing whether the members of the Forum were viewing the same goal with different lenses, or were actually approaching the conversations with different goals. No answer was provided. It was also noted that ‘enhancement’ is not the best description, and ‘recovery’ would be more aligned to the policy. It was agreed that the minutes would not be changed, as they reflect what was said at that time.

A discussion then took place about the goal of the Forum and the relationship between focusing on marine protection versus fisheries recovery. While some members felt the focus should be limited to biodiversity protection, several of the Forum members felt that fisheries recovery is interwoven with marine protection and that promoting fisheries recover will be a trigger for public engagement. It was agreed to continue the conversation later.

The following sentence was also questioned “The Forum should not be seen to be advocating for marine protection” – it was noted that this was in the Communications report, and would be discussed later.

Fergus moved to ratify the minutes and Simon seconded this.

Agreement: The November Forum minutes were confirmed as accurate.

3. Matters arising: actions

The Forum reviewed the progress of the action registers.

It was agreed that the support staff would provide Forum members with kits for Forum members to take to engagement meetings.

<p>Action 145: Ruth to follow up with Forum members about suggestions for tools they would like to have in a kit to use at engagement meetings (e.g. large aerial photographs).</p>
--

The upcoming science workshop was discussed. Chris asked that the Forum advise him as to what topics they would like included. Ideas suggested were: experienced scientists from the region who could advise to the plausibility of areas recovering; nature of the seabed; the land interface and impact on the marine environment; research on the state of rivers; and a perspective about what 'mistakes' to date have been made in the region.

Action 146: Forum members to send ideas for topics to be discussed at science workshop in April. These need to be sent through before the end of February so the speakers can be booked.

Chris proposed that the Forum have two science sessions – one to understand the marine environment at present and one, later in the process, to assist with designing a network.

The Forum discussed whether members would like to be notified about any pending consent requests happening within the Forum boundary. It was agreed that the Forum should be aware of these.

Action 147: The chair will write to three regional councils to request that the Forum be treated as an affected party, and notified of resource consent applications that may affect the CMA.

Action 148: Forum members and officials to send advice on consents within the Forum area that they are aware of to Ruth, who will share the information with all Forum members.

The Forum discussed engagement. Ruth asked for Forum members to continue to send through advice of events at which the Forum could be represented.

Action 149: Forum members to send dates for all public activities/functions happening within the Forum boundary to Ruth– these don't have to be focused on fishing/marine e.g. Market Days, A&P shows.

The Forum questioned how the outcomes of the engagement sessions could be recorded – would they have support staff available to do this. Requests for support need to be noted in sector engagement plans and the agencies will attempt to ensure these needs are met. Fergus noted that, when he has been engaging with the public, he encourages them to complete a survey to ensure their feedback is captured.

Action 150: Forum members to ensure requests for support from agencies, at engagement meetings, are included in engagement sector plans.

4. Officials Update

Sarah updated the Forum on the legislation review. The timeframe of the discussion document has been delayed, and is now expected partway through 2015. The suite of tools proposed is still being examined, but it is important that the Forum do not get swayed by these propositions, as the changes may not be implemented within the Forum time period.

The document explaining marine protection tools that had been included in the meeting pack, was discussed. It was noted that to date no customary areas (taiāpure and mātaihai reserves) have been modified to meet marine protection standards. It is up to the relevant Rūnanga or Tangata Tiaki/Kaitiaki to determine whether there needs to be changes to the rules in customary areas to increase protection levels; it is not a decision for the Forum.

Action 151: Officials will include advice on the processes for making bylaws and regulations (that could be used to increase marine protection levels within customary areas) in the engagement kits.

5. Correspondence

Since the meeting papers were distributed, a response from the Minister of Conservation was received. She advises that the Forum process is important to her and her schedule is committed until September. She suggests the Forum engage with Nicky Wagner, Associate Minister of Conservation until then.

It was agreed that the chair would write to Nicky Wagner and invite her to a Forum meeting.

Action 152: Maree to compose a letter to be sent to the Associate Minister of Conservation, inviting her to attend a Forum meeting.

Action 153: DOC officials are to keep the Minister of Conservation aware of the progress of the Forum and agenda information by regularly updating the agencies status report to her.

6. Members update

Carol: Included a smaller version of the poster in the Federation of Commercial Fishermen's newsletter. She is waiting for a response from fishers on the voluntary trawl information and is working with a reporter on an article to go in the Seafood New Zealand magazine.

Edward: Has been working on the stakeholder engagement plan – it is not as far completed as he would like. The Ngāi Tahu representatives will run the engagement region by region. So far Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT) has not been involved.

Simon: Has been organising meetings and is finding it a struggle to get some people involved. There is a meeting of commercial fishers scheduled on March 16th, which will begin with addressing sector representatives and then local fishers.

Ate: Is finding it difficult to find a suitable time to meet with the commercial fishing sector (has been good fishing weather). Has a meeting scheduled for Hampden and Port Chalmers, and trying to schedule time for meetings at Moeraki, Oamaru and Karitane. Ate has also been speaking with someone involved in environmental protection in Holland – they have a holistic approach and are of the view that the land around the ocean needs to be addressed as well.

Nelson: Has been talking to recreational fishers and finding that a number of them want to see suggested areas for MPAs before engaging. He also created a simpler version of the survey and sent it to 20 fishing clubs. He has had a good return on these (predominately negative views, but some have made suggestions for enhancement).

The chair noted that it is preferable to have one dataset from survey responses, as that would be more robust. She would like the Forum to utilise the survey that has been specifically created and linked to SeaSketch and to send out hard copies of that when needed.

Action 154: Forum members to direct the public to the official survey only.

Chris: Attended an East Otago Taiāpure Committee meeting. The Committee is in support of the process and expresses appreciation that the Forum visited. Chris has also been including information about the Forum in his lectures. He will be presenting at a meeting in Auckland and will include a summary of the Forum in this, too. He noted that he has received feedback that it is not clear how to access the survey from the webpage.

Action 155: Ruth to update the webpage so that it is more obvious how to complete the survey.

Steph: Bluff hosted celebrations for Waitangi Day (450-500 people) and she was able to discuss the Forum process with some of them. She found there is still some uncertainty about the process. She will also address the Mahinga Kai Forum in February. At this stage, she is focusing on face-face interactions, which will assist with building trust. Steph also suggested that Nigel Scott from TRONT be invited to present to the Forum, about the customary areas protection network.

Action 156: Leeann to add presentation from Nigel Scott to future agenda register.

Fergus: Has been engaging with the tourism industry – sending out information from Forum meetings and attending local meetings. Recently, he attended a Catlins Coast meeting – found that generally they are supportive of marine protection. Fergus has also been engaging with the local community, in particular with local leaders. He has attended the local fishing club competition, Papatowai carnival and Kaka Point market day. Fergus has also been engaging in discussions on Facebook.

Philippa: Has been focusing on increasing the awareness of the Forum process. She had a stall at the Oamaru Farmers' Market, attended the launch of the Waitaki District Council biodiversity strategy and is booked in to speak to the Council. She is also scheduled to talk to the local tourism operators and will run a presentation at the library for SeaWeek.

Tim: Was able to visit Poor Knights Island and learn about Leigh Marine Reserve. He proposed that the Forum undertake a visit to a well established marine reserve to get a better understanding of the issues faced and successes achieved. Tim has also been engaging with experienced recreational fishermen of the Forum's area.

John: Met with the Rūnanga and mātaihai committee to inform them about the process. There is some distrust evident, as people feel they will be losing something.

Action 157: Investigate a Forum trip to an established marine reserve to learn about the issues facing them, and successes seen there.

7. Communications Report

Ruth gave an update on what has been accomplished to date:

- Facebook: currently have 200 'friends'. Ruth posted a link to the survey on Paua to the People's page, which resulted in 600 views.
- An ad was placed in the Otago Daily Times over New Years.
- A draft poster for boat ramps has been developed (and included in the meeting pack). This would be printed on corflute¹. Feedback from Forum members included adding a QR code or contact phone number/address for those who are averse to using the internet.

Action 158: Ruth to investigate setting up a 0800 number to display on posters.

¹ Corflute is constructed from a durable polymer that can withstand many weather conditions, and is constructed similarly to cardboard. It is often seen in real estate signs.

Action 159: Leeann to ask DOC services staff for advice on putting up posters at boat ramps/other public spaces.

- A SEMPF presentation has been booked at Otago Museum for SeaWeek (1st March). This will follow a presentation by Andrew Penniket. The chair is unable to attend and requested volunteers from the Forum to run this. Simon, Fergus, and Ate volunteered.

Action 160: Ruth to Include information about SeaWeek presentation into Forum newsletter.

- Labels displaying contact information for each Forum member have been created for the Forum to attach to the posters.

Action 161: Forum members to notify Ruth or Leeann if any details for the contact detail stickers need to be changed.

- It was noted that Fergus has updated his email signature to include a link to the website and a line explaining he is a member of the Forum. Ruth suggested that all Forum members could do this, as it would assist getting the website more recognised in 'Google searches'.
- A list of dates for the Otago and Southland Conservation Boards' meetings was included in the meeting pack – these will be updated to include the Canterbury dates, and included in the next newsletter for Forum members to volunteer attending a session.

8. MPI Compliance Officers

Murray Pridham, District Compliance Manager for MPI addressed the Forum, explaining the role of MPI compliance officers in Otago. The Forum asked what type of information the compliance officers collect that might assist in understanding where people are fishing and what they are catching. Murray explained that most information is known to individual compliance officers, and not recorded, but there are records kept of inspections. He advised that he would be willing to work further with the Forum to capture information about fishing locations in Otago. To gather similar information for the part of the most southern part of the Forum area, the Forum would need to engage with the Southland compliance team. From his experience with new legislation, Murray also explained that if the rules are clearly understood by the public, and accepted, then there is more compliance. The compliance team can also provide guidance to the Forum on the workability of proposed legislation.

Action 162: Greig, Tim, Nelson and Fergus will determine what information, that the compliance officers can provide, would be most beneficial. They will work with the compliance officers (for Otago and Southland) to obtain information about fishing habits in the region.

Action 163: Tania to follow up with Neville Smith (a scientist at MPI), to determine what concerns were raised about methodology of recreational fishing surveys prior to the recent Panel Survey.

Action 164: Chris to complete information on East Otago fishing data.

9. SEMPf Governance Group – Marie Long

Marie Long, chair of the Governance Group overseeing the South-East Marine Protection Forum, addressed the Forum about the context in which the Governance Group were operating and their expectations. She noted that it is the Governance Group's role to provide the Forum with the resources needed, in a suitable timeframe and budget, within the boundaries of the Policy. She explained that this is the first MPA process with such a short timeframe and it is important that it is met. Based on knowledge of previous engagement projects, Marie also suggested that the Forum make use of the resources available, as often these processes become bigger than anticipated.

The Governance Group are tasked with ensuring the Forum work within the existing MPA Policy and Guidelines (which includes special legislation). She suggested Forum members avoid the discussions about legislation reform at this stage, as it will not impact this forum until later in the process (if at all). Marie also explained that the Policy is clear that at least one marine reserve will be established, but there is flexibility in what restrictions are set, and it is possible to have a generational review (a review at a predetermined date or dates) built in when the marine reserve is established.

Action 165: Officials to provide a list of what regulations have been included in marine reserves to date.

Whilst this Forum can use the recommendations to advocate for land based protection, there is no example of land based policy being influenced by these processes. If two locations that are candidates for protection are similar in all other matters, then there might be worth in considering the history of the council/landcare groups active in those areas to determine the best option in terms of protecting the catchment, as that will influence protection of the marine location.

Marie reiterated the importance of being active in engagement – gathering ideas, recording them and bringing them back to the Forum.

Forum members asked Marie about the appropriateness of looking at fisheries management in the context of the MPA Policy. Marie responded that the MPA Policy is clear that MPAs are to protect habitat and ecosystems, not a specific species. Forum members should be cautious of selling species abundance to the public – Marie suggested they look at previous examples and species productivity.

Marie and Forum members then had a discussion around whether the Forum should be seen to be advocating for marine protection. It was noted that, if Forum members share their own views, they will be less likely to get a wide range of perspectives back. All ecosystems react differently to protection, so Forum members should be cautious about overselling the benefits. Another tool is to use the public's own words on the website – this can be more powerful than the Forum's views. At the moment, the Forum can advocate for the SEMPf process. Once the Forum are sharing the draft recommendations with the public, at that point, they can advocate for the recommendations.

10. Planning for public session

The chair reviewed the public session at the previous Forum meeting, and explained that the public session would be run similarly.

11. Role of the Forum: Workshop

The chair led the Forum in a conversation around what it means to be a Forum member.

What it means to be a Forum member:

- Agree to a level of marine protection
- Develop collaborative process to engage
- Representing a sector group
- Formulate marine protection initiatives
- Recommend options to Ministers
- Open to other points of view
- Collate information about the marine environment
- Sustainability
- Preservation
- Education
- Connection point to community (not a gate keeper)
- Encourage engagement/contributions
- Compromise

- Minimal cost
- Protect habitat, biodiversity and ecosystems with as many benefits as possible for other marine management objectives
- Be honest about constraints

How to accomplish this?

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| • Communication | • Float options |
| • Feedback | • Non-combative |
| • Carefully | • Bring ideas |
| • All media | • Challenge stakeholders |
| • Use officials | • Motivate |
| • Personal | • Be positive |
| • Open | • Inform |
| • One voice | |

The Forum then had a conversation around protecting habitat versus species. It was noted that the Forum would like a better understanding about the habitat types present within their boundary.

Action 166: Greig to give a presentation at March meeting about the habitat types present within the Forum boundary.

A discussion took place about how to run a community led process, while still meeting the mandate of the MPA Policy. There was concern that there might be differing priorities and that this might become a habitat mapping process. Officials advised that the MPA Policy gives the Forum some guidelines, but collaboration with the public will determine where and how the tools are utilised. The role of the community is in providing information, helping to determine site preference, responding to draft recommendations (indicating support or otherwise), and perhaps providing a strong reason for deviating from the policy. It was noted that previous examples of presenting the public with pre-determined locations does not work (e.g. process at Nugget Point). So, it is the job of the Forum to get engagement from the public early in the process. It is too early in the process to be debate the use of specific tools. At this point the Forum should focus on what is important, what the values are, and identify what needs protecting.

Action 167: Forum members are to read the MPA Policy and Guidelines documents to ensure they are familiar with them.

12. Stakeholder Plans

The Forum broke into sector groups to further develop their engagement plans.

13. Rosalie Goldsworthy – Penguin Rescue

South-East Marine Protection Forum - November Minutes
Roopu Manaaki ki Toka

Rosalie Goldsworthy, penguin rehabilitator in Moeraki gave a presentation to the Forum.

Rosalie introduced the Penguin Rescue Trust and its work. The aim of the Trust is to provide a sanctuary for penguins. Rosalie explained how, over the last 30 years (since the Trust was established), the number of penguins has increased from an initial 4 nests to 60 nests on the Moeraki Peninsula this year. Rosalie also detailed the importance of the peninsula to marine mammals and sea birds including spoonbills, shearwaters, petrels, prions, shags, oyster catchers and terns, all of which nest on the Moeraki Peninsula.

Rosalie talked about penguin die back (40% this year) and the theory that it is due to marine conditions. She explained the yellow-eyed penguin feeding habits (feeding on the bottom, eating species that live on the bottom, and travelling long distances to feeding grounds). She talked about the high value of the penguins to the New Zealand economy in terms of tourism interest.

Rosalie talked about the importance of the Moeraki trench for marine life and suggested the area is an ideal candidate for marine protection. She suggested protection (in the form of a set net and trawling ban) to the edge of the shelf would be ideal (out from the Otago Harbour entrance in the south and from Moeraki town in the north).

Rosalie also recommended that there be protection from spear fishing within 100m of the yellow-eyed penguin colonies throughout Otago. Edward suggested Rosalie talk to the local rūnanga about the possibility of introducing a bylaw to control spear fishing within the Moeraki Mātaitai Reserve.

Rosalie acknowledged the existing Moeraki Mātaitai reserve and advised the existing set net ban had helped.

The Fom meeting was closed at 3.45pm.