

Discussion of Session 3

Chaired and recorded by Paul McShane

SARDI Aquatic Sciences
PO Box 120, Henley Beach SA 5022

Present Address: Faculty of Fisheries and the Marine Environment
Australian Maritime College, PO Box 986, Launceston TAS 7250

Following the presentation by *Darryl McPhee*, James Scandol (FRI Quantitative Training Unit for Fisheries) asked what opportunity industry saw to add value to product by reducing bycatch and accordingly altering their marketing strategy?

Darryl McPhee replied that they saw a lot of opportunity, for example, in the development of a fishery for live (export) product where there is a need to avoid juveniles of target species and to get as clean a catch as possible to increase its value. In prawn fisheries, catches taken with TEDS or BRDs are cleaner. They don't have turtles flopped on them to become instant prawn cutlets. These are positive benefits to reducing bycatch.

After *Duncan Leadbitter's* presentation Marc Wilson (AMC) said he was interested in the comments concerning the perception that fisheries agencies might be seen as being too close to the problem by some of the environmentalists. He asked how this would be resolved particularly in the light of further comments that one needed to get closer to the fishing industry to address some of these problems.

Duncan Leadbitter replied that he did not have a solution to that dilemma. Looking at how forestry and water management have been going, there is certainly a separation of what is

called regulator and operator philosophy. Policy is written by an agency or body completely separated from the resource management agency. The latter operates within that policy framework and then relates to industry. You could then become quite close to industry and work that way, but whether fisheries agencies are comfortable with having policy written by a separate body is something that they will have to confront in the future. There are probably some areas where that is already happening.

If one looks at how the Endangered Species Act operates and the way trade and wildlife legislation works, there is a separate body overlooking how things operate. How that gets played out in the future depends on how comfortable agencies and the stakeholders feel about yet another change. From industry's perspective, having yet another signature on final 'ye's or 'no' adds cost and becomes another bureaucratic minefield. Whether it adds value to the protection of the marine environment and the sustainability of the industry, he really didn't know.

Ian Poiner (CSIRO Marine Research) said he didn't think anyone would disagree about the role of other stakeholders, particularly environmental stakeholders from both the environmental groups and the environmental management agencies, becoming part of fisheries management. The model seems to be the Management Advisory Committee model

with an environmental agency represented on the MAC. He asked whether this was seen as an effective model and why? Also, were there any other terrestrial examples that were better or more effective?

Duncan Leadbitter replied that having other stakeholders on the MACs was a good thing. There is a better understanding of different points of view. In some respects the MAC model is ahead of what is going on in the water reform, which is only in the process of approving the establishment of multi-stakeholder management committees. It seems to be the model that people have faith in.