

## Digital Monitoring Implementation Advisory Group – Meeting Minutes

4 April 2018

Chair	Simon Watt (Bell Gully)
Members	Dan Bolger (MPI), Kevin McEvoy, Laws Lawson, Rob Domanski (Speciality and Emerging Fisheries Group), Josh Barclay (Blue Water Marine Research), Amanda Leathers (WWF), Jeremy Helson (Fisheries Inshore NZ Ltd), George Clement (Deepwater Group Ltd), Keith Ingram (NZ Recreational Fisheries Council), Geoff Keey for Karen Baird (Forest and Bird), Mark Edwards (Rock Lobster Industry Council), Michael Looker (The Nature Conservancy), Ian Angus (Dept of Conservation), Rosemary Hurst (NIWA), Lesley Campbell (FishServe)
In Attendance (MPI)	Matthew Perkins, Jamie Campbell, Elizabeth Cossar, Maria Hansard
Apologies	Jeremy Cooper (Paua Industry Council), Storm Stanley (Paua Industry Council), Karen Baird (Forest and Bird)
<b>Key discussion points</b>	
<b>1. Welcome</b>	<p>The Chair welcomed members to the meeting, quickly introducing Kevin McEvoy, the new Director, Digital Monitoring</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that no further comments were received by the Chair, the draft minutes from the IAG Meeting 28 February 2018 were accepted and approved.</li> <li>There were four action items from the last meeting.</li> </ol> <p><b>Action #68</b> - Michael Looker (The Nature Conservancy) to arrange a presentation regarding the overseas experience of ER/GPR (Amanda Leathers, WWF, to contribute to this too). Preparations are underway for a presentation to be included on the agenda at a future IAG meeting. <b>REMAIN OPEN.</b></p> <p><b>Action #67</b> - MPI to consider what information would be useful for the group regarding the overseas experience of digital monitoring implementation and what cameras can/can't do, and bring this to the group. An initial paper has been drafted and is currently under internal review. We will present this at a future meeting. <b>REMAIN OPEN.</b></p> <p><b>Action #66</b> - MPI to provide more detail at the next IAG meeting on the sequence of steps for implementation, including likely timing. Presentation by Jamie Campbell (Implementation Project Manager) given to IAG at 4<sup>th</sup> April 2018 meeting. <b>CLOSE.</b></p> <p><b>Action #65</b> - MPI to circulate indicative cost information for Digital Monitoring, noting cost information was provided some time ago and was not based on detailed requirements. Indicative costs updated and circulated to IAG via email prior to 4<sup>th</sup> April 2018 IAG Meeting. <b>CLOSE.</b></p>

	<p>c. In terms of the actions generally, a refresh of the actions list has been completed and will be distributed with the minutes of this meeting.</p>
<p><b>2. Update from MPI</b></p> <p>a. Introduce Kevin McEvoy</p> <p>b. Update on Fisheries NZ</p> <p>c. Update Regulatory Amendments/ Consultation Process</p> <p>d. Update on ER/GPR Timelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dan Bolger introduced Kevin McEvoy, Director of Digital Monitoring (on secondment from the NZ Defence Force).</li> <li>• A quick update was given in relation to the formation of Fisheries NZ. Consultation with staff has now closed and decisions are expected to be announced next week ahead of the planned 'stand-up' date of 30<sup>th</sup> April.</li> <li>• MPI has issued extensions to the exemptions to the regulations for ER and GPR for all commercial fishers. MPI is working to an assumed start date of not before 1 October 2018.</li> <li>• Regulations – a lot of feedback was received regarding the regulations during the consultation process for the circulars. MPI is working through the process in order to consult on amendments to those regulations.</li> <li>• Cameras – The Minister has deferred the roll-out of cameras to support the best implementation possible.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Review of DRAFT 12-month ER/GPR Implementation Roadmap</b></p>	<p>Jamie Campbell presented the Implementation Roadmap, seeking advice on sequencing and any key considerations in terms of inter-dependencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was discussion around whether technology providers would be ready for a 1 October 2018 commencement and indeed whether there would be enough solutions to cover the needs of the market.</li> <li>• Some members expressed concern around the impact to providers and their respective software development processes given the amendments to the regulations were happening concurrently. MPI was of the view that the technical amendments were unlikely to significantly impact the design of software.</li> <li>• MPI noted that some providers were well advanced in their development and were waiting on final circulars to complete their development work. FishServe noted that other providers were on pause until the regulations and circulars were finalised.</li> <li>• Members noted the information on a number of implementation steps, but requested that stages be set out as a complete sequence, with timeframes, that acknowledged the dependencies and precursors for different stages.</li> <li>• Members raised resolving the issues with landings and discards policy given the significant implications for reporting. ER will expose existing issues that need to be resolved before implementation.</li> <li>• Members noted the importance of avoiding multiple changes to reporting requirements because of the impacts on data series continuity.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members suggested it might be useful to note how other countries are dealing with technology issues and business continuity processes (refer to outstanding Action #67).</li> <li>• There was good discussion around considering a more graduated regime for implementation. The concerns raised were around timelines and industry preparedness – particularly the proposal of a rigid 6 month window for completion of the roll out. The group suggested allowing a longer time period to conclude the roll out and proposed the parallel run of paper based and electronic reporting for a period of time as an effective BCP strategy.</li> <li>• There was some discussion relating to the ‘workability’ of the Circulars and a question asked about a further consultation process. MPI confirmed there was no appetite to reopen consultation on the Circulars – noting there had already been a significant consultation and engagement process in their development. Members noted that the amendments to the regulations may lead to further adjustments to the circulars.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Based on the indicative costs of ER/GPR shared with the group (refer to Action #65), the Group requested more information including around capital and ongoing costs.</p>
<p><b>4. Roadshows</b></p>	<p>Jamie Campbell presented the Roadshow plan seeking advice from members on risks and considerations (i.e. timing of, content, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members felt that the level of information available to share in the Roadshows would not resonate with the audience</li> <li>• Members also felt that not having technical product, accurate cost information (capital and ongoing) and answers to issues such as IP and certification, would mean they were less likely to attend future workshops</li> <li>• Group feedback also suggested the audience would want to understand what was happening with cameras, and noted the need to ensure that decisions on cameras were informed by good information on costs given issues with the previous Regulatory Impact Statement.</li> <li>• A potential deferral of the Roadshow could be favourable in terms of being able to talk more specifically about certain items</li> <li>• It was suggested that Roadshow content could be presented at the Federation of Commercial Fisherman Conference held in Nelson in May (as a test). This deferral could also allow enough time for Technology providers to attend and use the conference to showcase their equipment/product.</li> <li>• An issue was raised about not engaging directly with the audience until after May 18, noting anecdotal feedback suggested fishers were ‘information starved’. It was agreed by the IAG that communication was important but that other channels be looked at to support early engagement and understanding (as opposed to Roadshows).</li> <li>• Members confirmed they supported using other channels such as SREs to convey new information from MPI and that they would own the recommendation to defer the Roadshows until there was more tangible content to present.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Note:</b> As a result of feedback from IAG, MPI has deferred the first set of external roadshows.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Contact Federation of Commercial Fisherman conference to request agenda time slot.</p>
<p><b>5. Update on ER/GPR Pre-Implementation Trials/Early Adoption Thinking</b></p>	<p>Jamie Campbell presented some thinking on early adoption, primarily seeking advice on the risks and opportunities regarding early adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Group noted that MPI had been looking at how to enable early adoption for those fishers interested (early adoption defined as reporting electronically in a live environment, under the new regulations)</li> <li>• The legal mechanism to enable early adoption is not straightforward and was likely to require the lifting of exemptions in a geographical area/sector that included fishers who might want to go early, and those that did not. It was agreed that requiring early adoption on fisher groups was not workable. FishServe noted that creating a UAT environment was not an issue.</li> <li>• It was generally agreed that pre go-live implementation testing is essential, however the issue around early adoption is that participants would be liable under the new electronic reporting regulations once the exemptions (for that class of fisher) were lifted. Again, this was not seen as workable unless we could enable a managed 'opt-in' process.</li> <li>• The Group favoured an approach whereby select fishers could trial equipment and processes ahead of phased implementation (noting this would not be a 'live' test, possibly desk based initially, moving to at sea testing with dual reporting requirements, which would ensure participants satisfied their legal obligations). This would support key objectives around testing the operationalisation of Circulars, building credibility and confidence in the new reporting regime.</li> <li>• Lesley Campbell noted that there were fishers who wanted to adopt early and would be comfortable operating early under the new regulations. The challenge would be creating a mechanism for <i>only</i> this select group of fishers to early adopt.</li> <li>• Action for the MPI team to consider what a narrower scope of an ER/GPR trial could look like that supports the achievement of the key objectives noted above.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> MPI to review the merits of an ER/GPR trial with a refined scope that supports the achievement of the key objectives noted in Item 5</p>

<p><b>6. Discussion on ER/GPR phased implementation approach and tranche composition</b></p>	<p>Jamie Campbell presented options to members, seeking feedback on the feasibility of the draft options and to capture key considerations for each option to support an evaluation process.</p> <p>MPI clarified the implementation roles they envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vendors – training on kit, support if kit malfunctions</li> <li>• MPI – guidance on rules, compliance</li> <li>• FishServe – registration of devices, process guidance, call centre</li> <li>• Marine technicians - installation</li> </ul> <p>Whilst each of the options were discussed, it was clear that one size would not fit all and that all options presented would have unique challenges. It was likely that whatever primary option was selected, it would require an overlay of another option to ensure it was viable against the criteria presented.</p> <p>FishServe noted they had been surprised by the level of support required by &lt;28m trawl operators even though they had been using ER already for an extended period.</p> <p>The agreed action is to create an ‘Option 8’, based on the parameters below (noting these were the summary outtakes from the discussion):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The option must have some flexibility</li> <li>• The roll out should avoid end of fishing year given this is the busiest time of the year for fishers (we would not look to commence roll out from 01 October, would have to be after 15 October at the earliest)</li> <li>• There will be a requirement to logically group ‘elements’ (i.e. fishers, regions, etc) to support roll out</li> <li>• The cut over should be multi-method (not singular method)</li> <li>• That where possible, we should look to avoid busy fishing periods</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Regarding tranche based design, MPI to create an “Option 8” – in line with the parameters agreed.</p>
<p><b>7. Any other business</b></p>	<p>The date of the next meeting has been scheduled for 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018.</p>

## Summary Actions

Action No	Date Raised	Action	Action Owner	Status	Action completed by
69	04/04/2018	Based on the indicative costs of ER/GPR shared with the group (refer to Action #65), the Group requested clarity around capital and ongoing costs (new Operating Cost Model) once fully developed.	MPI	Open	TBC (dependent on Circular release date)
70	04/04/2018	Regarding tranche based design, MPI to create an “Option 8” – in line with the parameters agreed.	MPI	Open	16 May 18
71	04/04/2018	MPI to review the merits of an ER/GPR trial with a refined scope that supports the achievement of the key objectives noted in Item 5	MPI	Open	16 May 18
72	04/04/2018	Contact Federation of Commercial Fisherman conference to request agenda time slot.	MPI	Open	13 <sup>th</sup> April 18