

## 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.

## INDUSTRY RESPONSES

### 1. What is co-management?

Working in cooperation with other bodies.

Other bodies include government and the community generally.

Currently industry is working with PIRSA and SARDI (and not the community).

More professional approach

Team work

Spreading and sharing responsibilities

Government currently consulting with the community

Already have some management responsibilities

Can be anywhere from where we are now to where we 'want' to be

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

Level of confidence and trust from the government and community – industry is accountable and honest

A method of being audited external to industry

Industry data collection and analysis

Association systems for data collection

Independent reviewer (to go through peer review) of data collected and analysis

Independent auditing system

Community involvement / information

Informing community of fishery – community understanding of how it operations

Website – public access of information

Full access to historical data currently with SARDI

Processes in place to do work

- Harvest strategies
- Succession planning
- Survey development

Electronic communication – all of industry

Strong industry organisation with good governance

- Currently have Association constitution, Code of Conduct, Charter (signed agreement by members and their skippers)
- What else would we need???

Process of communication (building trust) with government and the community

- The FMC structure worked well

Stakeholder ownership and price – through industry

Financially capable / ability to source funding to run industry

**3. Why should industry move towards a co-management model?**

Potential cost savings – and know what we are paying for  
Lessen government responsibility – greater independence by industry  
More streamlined system – less people involved in management decisions ‘Less Red Tape’  
Time saving – and the processes to provide confidence  
Valuable regional contributor (jobs – direct and indirect, value to the state’s economy - \$35M)  
Level of responsibility to sustainability and environmental awareness and action – industry is going to look after the environment responsibly  
Proven management (3<sup>rd</sup> generation of stakeholders)  
Improve relationships with community  
Do it ourselves

**4. What benefits are associated with co-management?**

Time savings  
Cost savings  
Streamlined systems  
Recognition for our industry’s good practices  
Believe that the reasons for moving towards co-management are also the benefits

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

Compliance exemptions for surveys (Fisheries Compliance)  
Industry is delegated responsibility to sign off on harvest strategies (Fisheries)  
Management Plan (input from PIRSA and public consultation) with industry rationalization  
Gazettal where required  
Transfer of licenses (check with Glenn for legal perspective)  
Invoicing and policy making (check with Glenn for legal perspective)  
Greater input into government processes – outside of PIRSA

- Development and planning
- Marine transport
- Recognition by other government departments (ie DEH, Transport etc)

Stock assessment and spot surveys (completely managed by industry)  
Data collection, database storage and validation (completely managed by industry)  
Amendments throughout fishing process  
Advice to PIRSA (industry perspective, including on changes to existing systems / legislation etc)  
Risk assessments – ie by-catch, horsepower etc  
Auditing of fishing reports – although should be done by independent body, industry should have a level of input as to the results / auditing process  
The ‘processes’ list will need to be reviewed as far as where industry believes it could take on more responsibility because the list was updated after the Industry Working Group workshop (by the PIRSA Working Group).

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

\$

Expertise – biologist (recognised and experienced)

- Report writing
- Data collection and analysis
- Harvest strategies

- Plan and organise surveys
- Gazettal of changes as advised by Committee At Sea
- Link to PIRSA – scientific input

Independent person / body

Fishery can be run without SARDI

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

Receive blame (taking on responsibility)

Make wrong decisions

No acceptance by licence holders

Costs more than 'expected'

Can't find appropriate staff

Not accepted by wider community

Takes longer – to go through government (currently they are doing it) of audits and checks

Historical data not provided to industry

Not trusted – to do the right thing, provide accurate information, collect correct information to drive decisions

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

Electronic capture of data – GPS, survey information provided to the fleet

Put suitable decision making processes in place and communicated to wider audience

Cost analysis

Tender for independent body to conduct work (lowest price for return / understanding of fishery)

Thorough reporting and independent assessment

Opening communication channels to PIRSA / wider community

Level of confidentiality to licence holders – contract / agreement

Management Committee taking on responsibility (rather than individuals)

Open communication with public – on compliance roles / auditing / independent review / input

Accepting public opinion and 'working on it'

PIRSA accepting our increased role and ensuring we are equipped to take on management responsibilities (ie receipt of data from SARDI currently collected on industry's behalf)

### **9. What fisheries management functions should remain with Government?**

Policy, Regulations, Act development and review, public consultation

Setting conditions for licenses

Issuing licenses

Demerit points – issuing and management

Management of the PIRSA public register

Auditing

Compliance activities need to be reviewed – is there a level of compliance that can be self managed, if so, what, and how can this be communicated / reflected to government and the public  
 Cost recovery to be reviewed (industry and Fisheries Council) – can industry take on invoicing for licence fees etc