



TO: Stuart Anderson
CC: § 9(2)(a)
Doug Loder
FROM: Andrew Talley
DATE: 2 July 2018
REF: Wednesday's Meeting - Cameras

Dear Stuart,

I thought I'd drop you some thoughts prior to Wednesday in the hope by identifying the issues in advance our meeting will be more productive.

I'm surprised that Fisheries NZ remain in "*the process of developing options for best use of onboard cameras*". As you know Talley's along with the majority of the NZ Seafood Industry have expressed real concerns about the use of cameras without understanding what their purpose is but in particular before addressing the policy issues faced.

Those policy issues are:

- i) The lack of a credible Discards Policy (including Schedule 6 and Minimum Economic Size).
- ii) The incorrect application of the Deemed Value regime.
- iii) The inflexibility and timeliness in adjusting TACC's.

On top of those there are the practical concerns with cameras of cost, privacy and technological constraints. I see those as surmountable however I'm concerned Fisheries NZ (as MPI did previously) seem to be predetermined on cameras without addressing those policy concerns first.

No doubt 'cameras' have been driven by a level of hysteria around discarding, allegations of dumping and the political / press involvement around that. As a result we run the risk of jumping straight to a heavy handed solution (cameras) without actually understanding the cause (policy settings).

Discarding is occurring illegally and legally - and it's not something I or the Industry hide from. I wrote to the Minister in 2013 outlining the very real problems of illegal discards

HEAD OFFICE
Phone: 64-3-528 2800
Email: inquiries@talleys.co.nz



EST 1936

TALLEY'S GROUP LTD PO Box 5, Motueka 7143, Nelson, NEW ZEALAND

Fax Numbers:
Head Office: 64-3-528 2802
Export: 64-3-528 2877
N.Z. Sales: 64-3-528 2805

and the need for urgent change. The discards problem was identified in 2007, 11 years ago, by MPI with the establishment of a Discards Working Group that they disbanded in 2012, due to, *inter alia*, a lack of technical capacity. This isn't new.

Discarding will continue to happen, cameras or no cameras, whilst the current policy settings remain unchanged. These settings are not providing the incentives that are inherent in the QMS (and on which the QMS is so reliant) to properly and sustainability manage our fisheries.

The existing policy settings are driving bad behavior simply because they provide the wrong incentives.

Cameras are but one tool to provide the right incentives. They are also the most expensive, technically complex, invasive and the most unnecessary. They don't recognize or address in any way why we are catching too many small fish (discards policy), why the bycatch of a particular species is so unavoidable (TACC) or for example, why fishers are discarding species at sea that landed are worth significant money (deemed value).

Cameras do nothing to improve fisheries management whereas a change in policy settings will. We aren't asking you to change the Act but simply adjust the policy settings as provided for and contemplated by the Act. Its simple fisheries management.

I don't mind continuing to put the case I've done so and Industry has done so now for the past decade consistently and ad nauseam since the idea of cameras was raised 2 years ago. But the frustrating thing is we've had no engagement or counterpoint to the view that we first have to address the policy issues before deciding the role of cameras. There's been meeting after meeting, paper after paper but we never see any challenge from MPI to the logic of getting the policy settings right first.

Your agenda for Wednesday puts cameras and 'exploring changing the rules' around discards as concurrent matters. I don't see that. Whether we have and the role of cameras should only ever be decided after we fix these policy settings. It's these policy settings that are leading to the discard issues we face nothing else.

In short, whether we have cameras must be a question left for after the policy settings are reviewed if the problem then exists and compliance remains an issue they may well have a key role to play. You will find the cost, type, coverage, and role of cameras will all change significantly once we've addressed the policy settings. In that environment you'd probably be surprised at the level of support you'll get for cameras from the Industry. But for now they're being pushed as a compliance response to a fisheries management problem and the lack of support reflects that. It's blatant that the driver for cameras is misplaced and until we get the incentives on fisher's right nothing will change. Continuing to ignore this as successive managers have presents a huge risk to New Zealand fisheries.

See you Wednesday.

Regards,


Andrew Talley