

QUESTIONS

The three Steering Committees are asked to provide answers to a number of questions. The questions provided are the same for each Steering Committee and are designed to be thought provoking (there is no 'right answer'). The answers to these questions will provide guidance for future stages of the project (Phases 2 and 3). The Investigators, leading the workshops, appreciate an open-minded approach to assist us through the project and look forward to receiving your contributions.

CONSERVATION SECTOR ANSWERS

The genuine enthusiasm of the group for being involved in this project prompted much discussion which was positive and useful, but somewhat eroded the time available to answer the questions. The group recognised that with ongoing involvement in the project they would be able to provide fuller and more informed answers to the questions. Nevertheless, all of their answers have been provided below and make an important contribution to the framing of this project.

1. What is co-management?

- Not self-management
- Not 100% voluntary decisions/actions
- Collaborative, cooperative
- An ongoing collaboration between (at least) industry, government and conservation sectors

The group was then informed of one outcome from the industry and government groups, specifically that the term 'co-management' can embrace a spectrum from 'centralised' to 'delegated'. The group acknowledged this continuum but made it clear that they were more interested in the collaborative model than the fully delegated model (if delegated to a single organisation). The group was interested to know where on the spectrum industry currently considered themselves to be.

2. What are the pre-requisites for moving to co-management?

- Involvement of conservation sector
- Organisations involved would need to be positive and open
- Organisations involved would need to be representative and officially representative
- Independent scrutiny – separation of powers (note this means independence from both industry and government – and in the latter case SARDI is not seen to be independent of PIRSA).
- Effective management controls in place (input and output) to achieve sustainability goals
- All fishers would have to be involved under the same management arrangements
- Increased transparency

3. Why should the State Government and/or industry move towards a co-management model?

4. What benefits are associated with co-management?

- Increased involvement of the conservation sector arising from a genuine “co”-management framework. Conservation sector will be easier for Government and industry to work with if engaged up front with appropriate levels of information. This would develop stronger and more robust relationships, and allow the knowledge of conservation sector to be drawn upon.
- Benefit to conservation sector of becoming more informed about this fishery and fishery management in general
- More effective and sustainable industry which does benefit everyone.
- Better outcomes arising from greater ownership of the issues by those who may well be best placed to solve them.
- Increased eagerness by industry to work more effectively with Government and other stakeholders.
- Potential for greater transparency if there is genuine engagement with other stakeholders
- A greater pool of people able to undertake tasks (e.g. as observers)

5. What fisheries management responsibilities can be shared with, or delegated to industry?

9. What fisheries management functions should remain with Government?

In general, it was thought to be too early for the conservation sector to give detailed responses, as a greater understanding of existing arrangements is required. With more time at this first meeting it may be possible to provide some general answers (high level categories such as compliance, policy development, stock assessment etc).

Although there were some indications that members of the group may have some resistance to a number of functions being shifted from government responsibility, there were also indications that they had an open mind (e.g. were prepared to explore possibilities for greater industry involvement in the reporting of illegal activities, if the right incentives could be established).

6. What resources would be required to implement co-management?

- The right people from all sectors engaging in long-term relationships through a committee structure something like the FMCs
- Adequate resources for genuinely independent surveys
- Adequate information dissemination (e.g. through websites from organisation(s) involved in co-management)

7. What risks are there in moving towards great co-management?

- Risk to conservation sector, and particular individuals (i.e. our reference group members) of losing independence or perceived loss of independence. Ability to function effectively in other multiple stakeholder forums (e.g. Marine Parks Council) may also be compromised.
- Transfer of responsibility away from government should not weaken their overall capacity to manage fisheries
- Potential lack of independence in surveys
- Policing and prosecution might become weaker if industry were involved

8. How could these risks be managed? Who by?

(These relate mainly to the third dot point of Question 7)

- Peer reviews of assessments
- Shared control over decisions on service providers for surveys, research
- Conservation sector control over a separate fishery independent research fund