[Not relevant to request]

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitory and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☒
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

The current system has not kept up with technology, too many are involved and they are too frightened to make a decision based on the information before their eyes.

We know that any scientific discovery made by a NIWA scientist has to pass through managers who if threatened by the discovery will not publish it. We even saw a NIWA weather man dismissed because he expressed his view recently as if forecasting the weather is perfect anyway.

The delay from when a fish stock is threatened to the time where there is talk about a decision is far too long.

Fishery management either does not want to know or do not know how advanced the electronics are on high seas trawlers. Even the electronics on coastal trawlers must not be understood by fishery managers. Even on my boat the Furuno 588 can identify the sea bed material, the fish length and where it is in the water column tells me the species.

MPI has to obtain a high level of understanding in regard to fishery management as commercial and NIWA scientists will provide you with rubbish to hide the impact on fish stocks.

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☒
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

Mfish has the information but does not know how to use it. The information currently being obtained from NIWA is no better than the information they supplied thirty years ago and they will not accept informal marine knowledge yet they admit never researching our coastal waters.

Waste water pipes are sent out into water less that fifty meters deep often into harbours twenty metres deep. Road run off and endocrine chemicals kill algae the food source at the beginning of the marine food chain yet all MPI, DOC MofE and NIWA management have not a clue as to what the impact is.

To refer back to your question "Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting" the answer would have to be no as there is nowhere where there is any description of the environment that these fish live in and how man has impacted on them. Without this knowledge it would be impossible to increase catch ratios or more importantly improve the quality of the fish presented for export.

With our new technology we are fishing down our resources to a size that is far too small and many species are disappearing.

The purpose of the IEMRS states **"to provide information to support sustainability certification and traceability for market development"** but it is only looking at the end result and not how we have arrived at this point in time but it infers quality as the product will be traceable.

MPI must take responsibility for ensuring our fish stocks are not contaminated, deformed or are growing cysts as experienced overseas. Obtaining fish around waste water outfalls must stop and if this certificate is going to provide information that is traceable and the environment from which the fish were gathered must also be part of the certificate. The general media will not report the truth but the chemical run off from orchards and high cropping is having a serious impact on the health of our fisheries. I wrote a story in the NZ Fishing Coast to Coast story which I called **"Silent killers.. Natural Colours of the Sea?"** This story describes how we are poisoning our fish with photos of deformed fish we have caught. A section of the story is below.

"Gone are the days where every outfall had a lush growth of seaweed around the pipe, as wastewater today not only contains the usual but now as the population increases so do the quantities of human diseases, petroleum and endocrine chemicals. Endocrine chemicals are those pharmaceuticals such as analgesics, antibiotics, antidepressants, antihistamines, anti-hypertension drugs, steroids and anti-seizure medications that all end up in wastewater.

In Pakistan in 2004 they found a common vulture virtually disappeared after the birds began eating the carcases of cows that had been treated with an anti-inflammatory drug. They found the birds kidneys were failing. In another test they found zooplankton, a major component of the marine food chain died when exposed to these drugs. Already over thirty science papers a year are published overseas detailing the discoveries.

Other papers are describing that the products in soap are upsetting the natural instinct of fish to school for protection. Where 180 million gallons of waste water empties into Las Vegas Bay there is another plant extracting water for a drinking water plant unfortunately as in London, where a similar operation takes place, authorities have yet to find a way of removing the endocrine chemicals, so the cycle begins all over again. Garden fertiliser made from human waste also has the endocrine chemicals to begin the cycle again. In some Scandinavia countries they are now filleting their fish on glass tables so that they can see the cysts and cut them out.

A number of regional councils are using the wrong guideline. The MfE 2003 Microbiological Water Quality Guidelines fails to protect the intertidal zone from wastewater as the guidelines specifically state that they "cannot be directly used to determine water quality criteria for wastewater discharges", and that they "should not be directly applied to assess the microbiological quality of water that is impacted by a nearby point course discharge of treated effluent without first confirming that they are appropriate". The WCC took full advantage of this useless guideline as did other supporters of the consent application. Then to prove DOC have no marine knowledge they failed to raise a concern that the wastewater would flow through the Taputeranga Marine Reserve in such quantities that Island Bay beach in the middle of the reserve would be closed after it rains.

When the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment John Morgan Williams in his publication Missing Links described there was a problem through the resource consent process he only knew half of the problem when he described what this report does not cover:

"As we examined the relationship between science and environmental policy it became clear that it involved a broader range of issues than we could adequately address in a single report, for example:

There are questions about whether science used in some adversarial approaches to environmental policy and decision making contribute to sustainability. For example there is the potential for scientific evidence to be selectively used in resource consent hearings for the purpose of gaining or maintaining a particular interest or position, which could be to the detriment of the broader principles of sustainability.

There are issues around the roles and influence of science and expert scientific witnesses in legal proceedings on environmental issues (S1.3.1, p16)."

Human diseases, petroleum and endocrine chemicals are not the only silent killers of marine life and since 1970 and the introduction of intensive farming with its extra water requirements has seen streams and rivers flows lowered to a point where the cyanobacteria commonly known as blue-green algae has been multiplying out of control fed by the chemicals draining into them. Now the chemically enriched algae are taken out to sea only when there is heavy rain. In calm conditions it develops into full blown toxic algae bloom that is making aquaculture projects an extremely difficult proposition. In Australia chemical contamination from farm runoff has been blamed after millions of fish larvae found in the Noosa River had grown two heads. A few years back a huge algae bloom was seen passing Great Barrier Island with many fish feeding on it and it was only days later that over a hundred pilot whales beached themselves near Coromandel.

MofE is says that since 1970 there has been an increasing number of cyanobacteria specie developing into toxic strains and they are describing them as threats to humans and animals. The symptoms are skin rashes, nausea, tummy upset and tingling and numbness around the mouth or tips of the fingers. These algae are serious as boiling water will not remove the toxins. The information on this subject by MofE perfectly describes their lack of marine knowledge as not once do they mention that toxic algae blooms have been known to kill fish and whales overseas. I attended a recent environmental reporting meeting run by MofE and they made a big thing about monitoring and building databases that link other databases in their hyperspace world but shut down any discussion when the impact of chemicals on marine life or in the intertidal zone was raised, as I guess it would require them to do something in the real world."

Objectives

Do you agree with objectives of IEMRS (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Would you like to comment?

It's just the same old system and instead of a pen a button is pushed. IEMRS will never on its own improve fish stocks. At present it's just a job for the boys as changes in fish stocks are dependent on understanding what causes them to fluctuate. There is information at DOC, NIWA, Metrological Service, Maritime NZ and LINZ but no one in Government knows how to use it as a fishery management tool. For example there marine knowledge is terrible as at least twenty four hours warning could have been given to the owners of the salmon farm at the top of the Marlborough Sounds before it ripped out its anchors when very strong currents went through the Cook Strait. At least twenty fours warning could have been given to Police and the WRC of an approaching storm surge before it came into Wellington Harbour. Industry along Port Road Seaview would have been warned and millions of dollars could have been saved in compensation. Kiwi Rail could have been warned that a storm surge was approaching and stopped the trains. Instead one almost went into the sea. IEMRS is not a golden bullet but should be seen as part of fisheries plan that takes all factors into consideration.

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Would you like to comment?

As charter fishing boats are almost taking a commercial catch they should all be made to comply with the same rules.

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

Stat areas are too big. Make smaller areas inside a stat area and take an active management role. At present one operator can take most of the stock out of one area and seriously deplete the fishery. At present cod potting is having too big an impact on recreational fishers and this must be addressed today not tomorrow as Mfish did with blue cod in the Sounds. By then they had failed to identify the cause and then failed to minimise the cause through the resource consent process.

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

There will be no benefit to the commercial industry as MPI are now restricted by the Privacy Act which will make disclosing what was caught, how much, where and by whom almost impossible to pass on.

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

Select a date when MPI will be organised inform the operators select a person in MPI as the main contact person, make sure he has the management skills.

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

Rough seas, time and money

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

Develop a system that both parties are happy with. Terminology could be similar to what we are introducing to waste water resource consent conditions and the WRC Natural Resources plan where we have or are asking that the term “Reasonable mixing zone” be changed to “Agreed mixing zone” which removes the interpretation of individuals out of the system. It will be communication not dictation.

We have nothing to add to the other questions and they have been deleted

Yours sincerely

Jim Mikoz

President

Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association

Although not submitting on their behalf I am also

Honorary Vice President New Zealand Angling Association

Member of the MPI FMA 2 &8 Recreational Advisory Forum

s 9(2)(a)

The Future of our Fisheries
Te Huapae Mataora mo Tangaroa

Submission to rebuild abundance and diversity in New Zealand's inshore marine environment

To: The Ministry for Primary Industries

From: New Zealand Sport Fishing Council and affiliated members, the New Zealand Angling and Casting Association, and LegaSea supporters.

Phil Appleyard
President
NZ Sport Fishing Council
s 9(2)(a)
secretary@nzsportfishing.org.nz

s 9(2)(a)
Manager Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy
Sector Policy
Ministry for Primary Industries
PO Box 2526
Wellington 6140
fisheries.review@mpi.govt.nz

23 December 2016

Table of Contents

MPI vision and strategic proposals

The Future Of Our Fisheries (FOOF) Vision is –

> Abundant fisheries and a healthy aquatic environment that provide for all our people, now and in the future.

There are three strategic proposals in FOOF:

a. Maximising value from our fisheries;
b. Better fisheries information; and
c. Agile and responsive decision-making.

Quick summary of FOOF proposals –

a. MPI want to solve the problem of discards and dumping with new rules and cameras.

[Not relevant to request]

d. Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS) for commercial fishing.

[Not relevant to request]

Executive summary

Positive potential from real reforms

This Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) led review of our fisheries management system – the Future Of Our Fisheries (FOOF) Te Huapae Mataora mo Tangaroa - has been rather superficial in that it focuses on the commercial fishery, and the amendments to address three urgent shortcomings, two systemic failures and one future facing issue dogging the Quota Management System (QMS). Fish dumping, electronic reporting/monitoring and the Precision Seafood Harvesting net – these are the pressing issues in the commercial industry and occupy 90% of this Review.

[Not relevant to request]

[Not relevant to request]

[redacted]

Should MPI implement IEMRS?

MPI has proposed to introduce to commercial fishing a mandatory electronic monitoring and reporting system referred to as Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS). Its purpose is to gather more information with a focus on-

a. Monitoring and verification of catch reporting;
b. Automated geospatial position reporting; and
c. Electronic monitoring using on-vessel cameras.

The value of IEMRS must be measured against its purpose and the cost of achieving success. The paper is vague on specifying exactly what success will look like for IEMRS.

There is an obvious need for the activities on board fishing vessels to be monitored in a more transparent way. However, it is unclear how IEMRS will achieve verification of catch when it is unable to verify catch weights and species identification; these continue to be determined by fisher self-reporting.

The geospatial reporting is obvious. Less obvious is how this will be recorded and what this information will be used for. Being able to identify vessels in close proximity to oil spills, floating fish, etc is clearly of short term benefit, but how this data will be used, if at all, in stock assessments remains problematical.

The on-board camera technology is under development. Initial trials have been unsatisfactory. The FOOF aspirations for increased public confidence in management will never be generated while the camera data is treated as confidential, known only to industry and kept in-house.

So far it looks like another case of overreach, where claims being made about the benefits of IEMRS are aspirational and unlikely to ever eventuate, while serving in the short term as an answer to discarding and transparency.

[Not relevant to request]

[Not relevant to request]

MPI - Do you think it should be permissible to discard some dead fish, as long as they are balanced against ACE?

[Not relevant to request]

3.12 Furthermore, IEMRS is unproven at fine scale species identification and weight estimation so more reliance is placed on self-reported data from fishers.

[Not relevant to request]

Part 4. Should MPI implement IEMRS?

4.1 MPI has proposed to introduce to commercial fishing a mandatory electronic monitoring and reporting system referred to as Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS). Its purpose is to gather more information to support decision-making and value-adding, by focusing on-

a. Monitoring and verification of catch reporting;
b. Automated geospatial position reporting; and
c. Electronic monitoring using on-vessel cameras.

4.2 The value of IEMRS must be measured against its purpose and the cost of achieving success. The FOOF paper is vague on specifying what exactly success will look like for IEMRS.

4.3 It is unclear how IEMRS will achieve verification of catch reporting. The monitoring is unable to verify catch weights and species identification, these continue to be determined by fisher self reporting. No doubt with sufficient investment analysts could be trained to reconcile self-reported data with video data within useful bounds, but this would require hundreds of trained employees and is certain not to happen.

4.4 The geospatial reporting is obvious. Less obvious is how this will be recorded and what this information will be used for. Being able to identify vessels in close proximity to oil

spills, floating fish, etc is clearly of short term benefit, but how this data will be used, if at all, in stock assessments remains problematical.

4.5 The on-board camera technology is under development. Initial trials have been unsatisfactory. The FOOF aspirations for increased public confidence in management will never be generated while the camera data is treated as confidential, known only to industry and kept in-house. So far it looks like another case of overreach, where claims being made about the benefits of IEMRS are aspirational and unlikely to ever eventuate, while serving in the short term as an answer to discarding and transparency.

4.6 There is an obvious need for the activities onboard fishing vessels to be monitored in a more transparent way. Perhaps IEMRS can take us to that level, but with the benefits largely tailored for companies (catch reporting by event, control of discards for MSC certification, etc), the benefits for fisheries management purposes are not clearly laid out.

4.7 It appears as if IEMRS suffers from the same overreach that claims around the Precision Seafood Harvesting (PSH) net suffered. PSH was promoted by the PR firms as the answer to all selectivity issues; it would be possible to sort the catch on the sea floor, making all concerns about juvenile catch and discarding redundant. Look no further, the solution is at hand.

4.8 We are hearing similar rhetoric around IEMRS. It is revolutionary and will be able to bridge the knowledge and compliance gaps. It is a one-size-fits-all solution to discarding and filing false statutory returns – all will be revealed and verified once IEMRS is operational. It has that ho hum ring to it – heard it all before. The truth will not be known for several more years.

4.9 The public will not have any confidence in IEMRS unless there is vastly more transparency around the information that is produced. Treating the public as if they are not a shareholder in commercial fishing continues to undermine public confidence.

4.10 Data collection and analysis behind closed doors with summary reports released periodically simply begs the question what secrets are being hidden? What is going on that the public shouldn't see? Such operational secrecy has weakened MPI and the fishing industry's credibility, and largely destroys any merit for IEMRS.

4.11 Historic changes to the catch effort forms has led to difficulties interpreting CPUE trends. The benefits of detailed IEMRS data will not be immediate, and it may be five years before there is a sufficient time series to show trends in abundance rather than behavioural changes by fishers.

4.12 There is no demonstrated ability of reducing waste, managing the environmental impacts of fishing, verifying catch, supporting compliance interventions and restoring public confidence.

4.13 MPI's opening bid for this aspect is that, "*we provide the public with open access to all research data and findings, and support the usability of our research and science information".* This is patently untrue. Below we provide a case study from our last submission.

4.14 Public access to some IEMRS data and recreational harvest survey data is essential for a more transparent fisheries management system. Hiding behind the cloak of commercial sensitivity is no longer acceptable.

4.15 The Declaration on Open and Transparent Government**,** which was approved by Cabinet on 8 August 2011, states that government data and information should be open, readily available, well managed, reasonably priced and re-usable unless there are necessary reasons for its protection. Personal and classified information will remain protected. Government data and information should also be trusted and authoritative.

4.16 Active public data supply is becoming business as usual for most central government departments with open data programmes. The 32 central government departments are increasingly seeking and responding to user and stakeholder demand for open data in accordance with the Declaration on Open and Transparent Government.

4.17 Data must be released in a re-usable, machine-readable format, preferably in their original state. The current 'Guidelines for the Release of Information from Fisheries Databases' were developed in the 1990s and last reviewed in 2005. The world, our Government and public policy have moved on, but not so in fisheries.

[Not relevant to request]

Monitoring fisheries at finer spatial scale: Effective fisheries management takes place at a sub-QMA level.

[Not relevant to request]

Who should contribute to the additional costs associated with monitoring and managing at finer geographical scales?

MPI. THE GPS AND CAMERAS ON COMMERCIAL VESSELS DO THAT.

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	✓

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

LOTS OF INSHORE NIGHTLY TRAWLERS OPERATING ALONG N.I. EAST COAST. ONE BOAT EVEN HIT ROCKS RECENTLY WHILE TRAWLING INSIDE OF 2 MILE LINE.

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	✓	○

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

SPEND MORE TIME CHECKING CAMERAS IN MORE POACHED INSHORE AREAS.

RE. HECTORS DOLPHINS AREA – PIECE OF CAKE BUT OFF EAST COAST THE PROBLEM IS BAD.

ROCK LOBSTER ILLEGAL TAKE AT 89 TONNES.

HOLDING POTS FULL OF UNDER SIZED CRAYS COMMON PRACTICE

Objectives

Do you agree with the objectives of IEMRS?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	✓

Would you like to comment?

THERE HAS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR EASY COAST MPI.
NO PHONE COVERAGE & MPI STAFF AT ONE STAGE PUT IN GISBORNE HERALD THEY NEEDED HAND-CUFFS AND BATTENS.
SO CAMERA/GPS IS THE ANSWER

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option?

- [x] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly agree

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither
- [ ] Agree
- [x] Strongly agree

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option?

- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither
- [ ] Agree
- [x] Strongly agree

Would you like to comment?

THIS IS WHAT WILL GIVE MPI RESPECT.
SILENCE THE PEOPLE THAT CRITICISE MPI STAFF.

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

AT THE DROP-IN MEETING COMPLIANCE SUGGESTED TRAWLERS WERE NOT COMING IN MUCH INSIDE OF 2 MILE LINE. THEY DO.
SUGGEST PUBLIC BE ADVISED IN PAPERS OF BASIC REGULATIONS SO THAT THEY CAN ADVISE MPI COMPLIANCE.

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

DONT NEED VARIOUS MODELS OF EQUIPMENT.
MAYBE TO HAVE COMPETITION FOR PRICE BUT CHOOSE THE RIGHT ONE.

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

QUICK AS POSSIBLE.

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

ACCEPT IT, BECAUSE THEY HAVE A BAD TRACK RECORD.
IT WILL BE EASY TO TURN ON AND OFF AT THE RIGHT TIME WHICH IS WHEN THE GPS REGISTERS HOME BASE. THEY MAY HOWEVER GO OUT AND "FORGET" TO TURN IT ON.
HEAVY PENALTY NEEDED.

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

TURN UP AND BE OBSERVER. NO NOTICE.

Permit holders

What EM, ER or GPR technology/ies (if any) do you currently use in your operations?

N.A.

Do you operate this technology on your own behalf, or as an input into someone else's operations?

NA.

If so, is it linked to the electronic systems of a Commercial Stakeholder Organisation (the representative body for commercial fishers of a particular stock or group of stocks, such as the Paua Industry Council), or other similar management group?

What issues do you currently have with ER?

What sort of feedback do you want from ER? What sort of data from ER would be helpful to you?

NA.

If you do not currently utilise ER, EM and/or GPR technology, do you have any interest in being an "early adopter"?

NA.

Commercial stakeholder organisations (CSOs)

If you represent a CSO, would you be prepared to share your information standards for data collection on fishing activity with MPI on a confidential basis?

NA.

How might your existing systems used by you and your stakeholders deliver on IEMRS objectives?

NA

Would you be prepared to identify vessels that use types of GPR and ER amongst those represented by your organisation?

NA

Licensed fish receivers

What problems do you experience with landing data?

NA.

Implementation plan

Do you agree with the proposed implementation arrangements?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

Would you like to comment?

Do you see value in a MPI, commercial sector and service provider working group to work on implementation issues?

YES.

What other issues does MPI need to consider to facilitate the commercial fleet's transition to IEMRS?

Monitoring, evaluation and review

Do you agree with the proposed monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

Would you like to comment?

What do you think should be monitored? To whom should the results be reported?

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitory and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☐
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☑

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

I think the current system works fine and I think if just a few mistakes on the paper forms is your only problem then you are just being lazy

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☑
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

we do not have a problem only with you.

Objectives

Do you agree with objectives of IEMRS (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☒
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

I will not be putting IEMRS on my boat.

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☐
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☑

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

- Strongly disagree ☑
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☐

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☑
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☐

Would you like to comment?

It is not practical for us as a CRA 8 fisher and how do we maintain all this electronic equiptment with a limited power supply (Battery power)

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

None

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

why do we need to verify our catch effort are you saying we are just lieing

Permit holders

What EM, ER or GPR technology/ies (if any) do you currently use in your operations?

None

Do you operate this technology on your own behalf, or as an input into someone else's operations?

No

If so, is it linked to the electronic systems of a Commercial Stakeholder Organisation (the representative body for commercial fishers of a particular stock or group of stocks, such as the Paua Industry Council), or other similar management group?

What issues do you currently have with ER?

What sort of feedback do you want from ER? What sort of data from ER would be helpful to you?

If you do not currently utilise ER, EM and/or GPR technology, do you have any interest in being an "early adopter"?

No

Commercial stakeholder organisations (CSOs)

If you represent a CSO, would you be prepared to share your information standards for data collection on fishing activity with MPI on a confidential basis?

No

How might your existing systems used by you and your stakeholders deliver on IEMRS objectives?

Would you be prepared to identify vessels that use types of GPR and ER amongst those represented by your organisation?

Licensed fish receivers

Would problems do you experience with landing data?

Implementation plan

Do you agree with the proposed implementation arrangements (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☐
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☐

Would you like to comment?

Do you see value in a MPI, commercial sector and service provider working group to work on implementation issues?

What other issues does MPI need to consider to facilitate the commercial fleet's transition to IEMRS?

Monitoring, evaluation and review

Do you agree with the proposed monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements (please tick only one box)?

- Strongly disagree ☑
- Disagree ☐
- Neither ☐
- Agree ☐
- Strongly Agree ☐

Would you like to comment?

What do you think should be monitored? To whom should the results be reported?

Nothing should be monitored and the information collected should belong to the permit holder not anyone ~~else~~ else

[Not relevant to request]

8.2 Implement Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS) (Strategic Proposal 2, Option 1**)**

- This proposal is pitched a high level and so issues of practicality are not covered. It is hard to envisage how a mounted camera could work in a marine context, and even where it was operating, what level of information it would provide. It would clearly introduce considerable costs into fisheries management and harvesting. It would seem that a substantive cost benefit analysis is required and that should include the opportunity for fishers to critique the assessment of analysts who may have little regard for or knowledge of the practical implications. The data collection and storage side also needs to be rigourously assessed.

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitoring and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	●

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	○	○

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

Objectives

Do you agree with the objectives of IEMRS?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	●	○	○

Would you like to comment?

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
○	○	○	●	○

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
●	○	○	○	○

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
●	○	○	○	○

Would you like to comment?

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

Permit holders

What EM, ER or GPR technology/ies (if any) do you currently use in your operations?

Do you operate this technology on your own behalf, or as an input into someone else's operations?

If so, is it linked to the electronic systems of a Commercial Stakeholder Organisation (the representative body for commercial fishers of a particular stock or group of stocks, such as the Paua Industry Council), or other similar management group?

What issues do you currently have with ER?

What sort of feedback do you want from ER? What sort of data from ER would be helpful to you?

If you do not currently utilise ER, EM and/or GPR technology, do you have any interest in being an "early adopter"?

Commercial stakeholder organisations (CSOs)

If you represent a CSO, would you be prepared to share your information standards for data collection on fishing activity with MPI on a confidential basis?

How might your existing systems used by you and your stakeholders deliver on IEMRS objectives?

Would you be prepared to identify vessels that use types of GPR and ER amongst those represented by your organisation?

Licensed fish receivers

What problems do you experience with landing data?

Implementation plan

Do you agree with the proposed implementation arrangements?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree
●	○	○	○	○

Would you like to comment?

Do you see value in a MPI, commercial sector and service provider working group to work on implementation issues?

What other issues does MPI need to consider to facilitate the commercial fleet's transition to IEMRS?

Monitoring, evaluation and review

Do you agree with the proposed monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements?

- ● Strongly disagree
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Neither
- ○ Agree
- ○ Strongly agree

Would you like to comment?

What do you think should be monitored? To whom should the results be reported?

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitory and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐x
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

I struggle with the belief that this will work. The scale of incoming data does not bring one any confidence on the ability of an underfunded Ministry to cope.

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

Objectives

Do you agree with objectives of IEMRS (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐x
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

While I do agree with the proposals here, I believe the information gathered should not be classed as commercially sensitive. The public should have this information available.

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐x

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

This would give the ability to recognise areas that are being overfished or put under pressure.

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

There must be some form of catch landed monitoring by MPI. Be it by a Fisheries Officer at the point of Landing and monitoring all that is on board a vessel or by Camera. I do not support a camera as it will not note bins of catch not removed from the vessel.

Permit holders

What EM, ER or GPR technology/ies (if any) do you currently use in your operations?

Do you operate this technology on your own behalf, or as an input into someone else's operations?

If so, is it linked to the electronic systems of a Commercial Stakeholder Organisation (the representative body for commercial fishers of a particular stock or group of stocks, such as the Paua Industry Council), or other similar management group?

What issues do you currently have with ER?

What sort of feedback do you want from ER? What sort of data from ER would be helpful to you?

If you do not currently utilise ER, EM and/or GPR technology, do you have any interest in being an "early adopter"?

Commercial stakeholder organisations (CSOs)

If you represent a CSO, would you be prepared to share your information standards for data collection on fishing activity with MPI on a confidential basis?

How might your existing systems used by you and your stakeholders deliver on IEMRS objectives?

Would you be prepared to identify vessels that use types of GPR and ER amongst those represented by your organisation?

Licensed fish receivers

Would problems do you experience with landing data?

There appears to be no monitoring of what is actually landed, the quantity of and what is turned away.

Implementation plan

Do you agree with the proposed implementation arrangements (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

Do you see value in a MPI, commercial sector and service provider working group to work on implementation issues?

What other issues does MPI need to consider to facilitate the commercial fleet's transition to IEMRS?

Monitoring, evaluation and review

Do you agree with the proposed monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

What do you think should be monitored? To whom should the results be reported?

As above. Landed catch must be monitored from the vessel to the shed. Results should be available to the public.

Volume III: Integrated Electronic Monitory and Reporting System (IEMRS)

Current state

Do you agree with how we have defined the current state in relation to monitoring and reporting (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☒
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, how would you describe the current system? What other factors should be considered?

Please make data available (anonymised and if necessary with coarsened spatial data) in a web application such as a Shiny app like MBIE have for tourism https://mbienz.shinyapps.io/tourism_dashboard_prod/ .

Problem definition

Do you agree with how we have defined the problem (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☒
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment? For instance, what evidence should we examine to inform further analysis of the problem?

Objectives

Do you agree with objectives of IEMRS (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☒
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

Option 1: Current state

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☒
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Option 2: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017

Do you agree with this option?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Option 3: Electronic reporting and geospatial position reporting for all permit holders from 1 October 2017, and introduction of electronic monitoring on commercial fishing vessels beginning 1 October 2018

Do you agree with this option (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☒

Would you like to comment?

General questions

Are there other options, not described in this section, which should be considered? If so, what are the potential disadvantages and benefits of those options?

Do you have any suggestions on how IEMRS and its components (EM, ER, GPR) could deliver benefits to the commercial sector generally and to you particularly?

Given that the introduction of IEMRS technologies would occur in stages across the commercial fishing fleet, do you have any suggestions on how that phase-in period should be rolled out?

What do you consider are particular difficulties that vessel operators may encounter in implementing EM?

If you do not consider EM practical on some vessels, how else would you propose MPI verifies catch-effort reporting?

Permit holders

What EM, ER or GPR technology/ies (if any) do you currently use in your operations?

Do you operate this technology on your own behalf, or as an input into someone else's operations?

If so, is it linked to the electronic systems of a Commercial Stakeholder Organisation (the representative body for commercial fishers of a particular stock or group of stocks, such as the Paua Industry Council), or other similar management group?

What issues do you currently have with ER?

What sort of feedback do you want from ER? What sort of data from ER would be helpful to you?

If you do not currently utilise ER, EM and/or GPR technology, do you have any interest in being an "early adopter"?

Commercial stakeholder organisations (CSOs)

If you represent a CSO, would you be prepared to share your information standards for data collection on fishing activity with MPI on a confidential basis?

How might your existing systems used by you and your stakeholders deliver on IEMRS objectives?

Would you be prepared to identify vessels that use types of GPR and ER amongst those represented by your organisation?

Licensed fish receivers

Would problems do you experience with landing data?

Implementation plan

Do you agree with the proposed implementation arrangements (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

Do you see value in a MPI, commercial sector and service provider working group to work on implementation issues?

What other issues does MPI need to consider to facilitate the commercial fleet's transition to IEMRS?

Monitoring, evaluation and review

Do you agree with the proposed monitoring, evaluation and review arrangements (please tick only one box)?

Strongly disagree	☐
Disagree	☐
Neither	☐
Agree	☐
Strongly Agree	☐

Would you like to comment?

What do you think should be monitored? To whom should the results be reported?