



Meeting: Conservation Services Programme Research Advisory Group

Date: 17 February 2025

Time: 10:00 am – 15:00 pm

Place: Conservation House, 18 Manners St, Te Aro, Wellington/Microsoft Teams Meeting

Chair: Kris Ramm, Manager Marine Bycatch and Threats team

Attendance: Kris Ramm, Katie Clemens-Seely, Hollie McGovern, Lyndsey Holland, Igor Debski, Erin Hewetson, Kat Manno, Jody Weir, Hendrik Schultz, Karen Middlemiss, Olivia Rowley, Steve Pilkington, Bruce McKinley (DOC) Ben Steele-Mortimer (SNZ Deepwater Council), Rosa Edwards (SNZ Inshore) Charles Heaphy (Sealord) Jaret Bilewich, Richard O'Driscoll, Britt Finucci, Diana Macpherson (NIWA), Phil Heath, William Gibson, Heather Benko, Lyla Tapusoa (FNZ), Amélie Augé (Wildcoast), Peter Frost (Science Support Service)

Apologies: James Bell, James Robertson

Introduction

Welcome

Overview of CSP - scope, research planning, timelines, and research prioritisation. Key stages of the CSP research planning timeline are as follows:

28 February 2025	End of RAG submission period
Mid March 2025	Release of draft Annual Plan for public consultation
Mid April 2025	Public consultation period closes
Early May 2025	Summary of public submissions and response to comments completed
Late May 2025	Revised plan progressed to DG/Minister of Conservation
Mid-late May 2025	Annual Plan approved
1 July 2025	Implementation of Annual Plan 2025/26

Discussion and scoring of projects

CSP RAG Proposal		Comments
INT-2	Species identification of camera-detected protected species captures in New Zealand fisheries	<p>PH – This aligns and overlaps with work currently being undertaken by cameras team. Need to discuss whether this would sit better with FNZ or DOC.</p> <p>KR – R&D and BAU component. Same way we have been training observers for years.</p> <p>RE – Supportive in principle in inshore space but contingent on outputs from the report. Will the report from pilot project be published prior to Annual Plan being issued for consultation so we can review effectiveness before commenting?</p> <p>PH – Believe the report is close to completion.</p> <p>JB – Would this pertain to all protected species, including coral?</p> <p>HM – Pilot looking at seabirds, but will expand to include other taxa.</p> <p>WG – Biz and Mike were able to get through all captured clips within 2.5 days and have finished in process of writing up report. Had good success with being able to get to species level of all captures, seems to be positive outcomes. Better streamlined if done through FNZ because we can use IT infrastructure to make sure confidentiality and privacy concerns are met.</p>
INT-3	Identification of seabirds captured in New Zealand fisheries	<p>BSM – How is this being affected by HPAI?</p> <p>HM – Hasn't had much of an impact at this stage, observers have been instructed not to collect deck strike specimens, however as HPAI not yet detected in NZ waters, instructions are to continue collecting most specimens.</p> <p>KR – Also taking every opportunity to test for HPAI, through necropsy programme and in the subantarctic.</p> <p>RE – How is the increase in cost per annum justified?</p> <p>HM – increase is due to costs for pilot for genetic testing of feather samples. We will explore contract options to ensure we maximise cost effectiveness e.g. cost per bird necropsied, rather than fixed fee.</p> <p>BSM – Why will port-based seabird collection continue when it looks like EM project seemed to show good results in terms of seabird identification down to a species level? At what point is it going to be an effective programme as a lot of operational costs etc to consider.</p> <p>KCS – Port-based project is helping to reduce observer costs (by around \$300k), we can request fewer observers days on inshore vessels in order to collect specimens. Port-based is cheaper than having an observer on board.</p>

		<p>RE – Concern with port-based project is it is currently lacking transparency over what data is being collected and how that is going to feed into fisheries risk assessments.</p> <p>KCS – Doing exactly what an observer would do except port-based rather than at-sea.</p> <p>ID – Main focus will be problem groups where the EM footage is not highly reliable e.g. greater albatross.</p> <p>PF – Is the PSC database still being maintained, as latest version only goes up to 2021.</p> <p>WG – Database is updated to 2022/23, but public facing website doesn't go up to that date at the moment, believe should be available soon. 2023/24 data currently being updated in the next few weeks and will also include first year of EM data too.</p>
INT-4	Identification, storage and genetics of cold-water coral bycatch specimens	<p>BSM – What taxonomic resolution are we getting to and what resolution is necessary for management purposes, in terms of how it feeds into risk assessments. What stage are we managing corals at?</p> <p>LH – As low taxonomic resolution as possible, based on expertise at NIWA and parataxonomists. In terms of risk assessments there are 12 – 16 taxa only that have been through just one risk assessment that's due soon. In terms of management, continual improvement of our knowledge of bycatch. Getting very few specimens coming back from observers, so a lot of the analysis has been based on imagery, which aren't as easy to identify to a lower taxonomic resolution as a physical specimen. Part of project also allows for observer resources to be updated, to try and increase messaging to bring back specimens for identification. Focusing on taxa that have been put through a risk assessment for targeted efforts.</p> <p>BSM – Huge diversity of coral species, at what point is it too resource intensive to identify at species level, compared to what we need for management purposes.</p> <p>LH – Without a clear idea of what the specific management purposes are, beyond what is in the Wildlife Act it's difficult to answer that question. We have to be pragmatic and can get through a years worth of samples for this project. Have had expert ID project to review those that couldn't be identified to species level.</p> <p>PH – How is this aligned with FNZ benthic identification work? Thinking about whether there is opportunity to better align on things like sample collection etc.</p> <p>LH – DOC looks at protected corals and FNZ looks at everything else. There is scope to align so not duplicating effort, although I believe the FNZ project does not include corals and hasn't been funded, is that correct?</p> <p>RO – If NIWA is undertaking the DOC and FNZ projects then there are synergies with process for processing and handling sampling. Hope lack of FNZ invertebrate identification project is one off, if ongoing trend then this could be a potential issue.</p>

		<p>PH – Invertebrate identification project is back on the research list this year.</p> <p>JB - Does FNZ project cover out of zone? DOC covers only in zone?</p> <p>LH – Occasionally get out of zone but don't know until looking at the specimen, but intentionally in zone</p> <p>DM – Hopefully FNZ invertebrate identification project is funded again soon, if these two projects aren't funded at the same time it causes a duplication of efforts. Usually all inzone with occasional out of zone specimens.</p>
INT-5	Port-based audit and protected species retention programme	<p>RE – Regarding data gaps, is that solely in relation to protected species or looking to do liaison programme or mitigation tool auditing as well? Action for SNZ, FNZ and DOC to catch up after results from current project are presented at TWG. At present hard to see what impact this will have so hard to support.</p> <p>KCS – With reduced observer coverage and increased EM coverage, how we receive data on PS captures is different. Trying to figure out what data is coming in and what cameras can do, how we can look at PSRMP's or collect specimens without observers onboard.</p> <p>BSM – In regard to DNA analysis of feather samples, how much of that is being looked at instead of collecting whole specimens? Feather samples is far more practical than collecting specimens.</p> <p>ID - Routine analysis hasn't started yet that would be year 1 of the new proposed project. Part funded PhD student who has already identified the genetic markers, so now just need to run samples against them. First stage in new proposed project is a proof of concept.</p> <p>BSM – Could be a significant change in logistics from what the proposed project is currently proposing.</p>
INT-6	Fishing operational factors influencing bycatch in trawl and set net fisheries	<p>PH – Massive amount of EM footage of protected species interactions with vessels available, would we be better off trying to find a process to work through that rather than a lit review and desktop study. Trying to leverage as much out of EM data as possible.</p> <p>ID – Maybe this could help inform how we develop a protocol to in real time continue on using EM data as it becomes available. Question of matching it to the correct operational and environmental variables, so to get the most out of EM would need a process for what to match it against.</p> <p>PH – Reviewing EM data would give both sides of that equation. Give the captures and what the vessels were doing at the time. Have a chat offline about how the EM resource might be leveraged. There may be funs within EM programme to stretch that out.</p> <p>WG – Information on spatial distribution of inshore seabirds is quite patchy which makes it difficult to undertake risk assessments. Would wager that most influential factor on trawl captures of shags is going to be proximity to colony. With nearing completion of analysing</p>

		<p>cell phone data to get recreational fishing effort, feel if we spent some time consolidating information on inshore seabirds and creating spatial maps we could then revisit this type of project once we have more EM data, and also being able to undertake recreational risk assessment, at least in FMA1 and potentially look at doing around the country as we look at expanding that mobile phone project.</p> <p>RO – Title suggests project is about all marine mammals and seabirds, however details are all primarily around dolphins. Some of connections that are made with factors that might mitigate Hector's dolphin bycatch may also have implications for other seabirds and marine mammals.</p> <p>ID – Was originally scoped to just look at Hector's dolphins but thought it would be holistically beneficial to broaden the scope.</p> <p>RO – Needs to leverage off other work going on, and need scope and budget to increase.</p> <p>BSM – data availability to interpret or understand these operational variables that will influence Hector's dolphin bycatch, have tried this for seabirds which are far more abundant in captures, very difficult to understand those operational variable. For Hector's dolphin there are far fewer data points to understand. Might be more benefit from further engagement with operators and skippers, or workshops, rather than looking outside the country.</p> <p>RE- Agree. Ultimate outcome would be understanding the risk factors then working with fishers to mitigate those risk factors. Have just completed the first year of implementing Bycatch Reduction Plan, a lot of learnings working through with the fishers to implement those outputs. Support seeing something more focussed on engagement with fishers and less focused on a literature review. Would be interesting to dive into data available, but only have 15 data points since cameras went live down south. Project would increase in value in a couple of years time. In that gap would be open to talking about more engagement with fishers, something like SMART seabird workshops, regional engagement.</p>
INT-7	Testing eDNA detection of protected species using passive samplers on trawl gear	<p>BSM – Did the similar project proposed through AEWG go through?</p> <p>JB – Not sure yet. Thought they could potentially be one project. AEWG proposal was more focussed at looking at non-target catch composition as well as bycatch, and this project was more focussed on protected corals in particular.</p> <p>BSM – Not sure this would be suitable under CSP. Has eDNA samplers been trialled before in NZ?</p> <p>JB – This would be first case of using in trawl gear in NZ, but have been used in other contexts such as inshore environments for biosecurity, freshwater monitoring looking at stream conditions. There is a large number of passive sampler projects that show they are</p>

		<p>as or more effective than traditional sampling methods.</p> <p>LH – Timeframes would be useful to clarify, believe there is a NIWA trawl survey early next year? In terms of catchability issues (ie damage underwater not shown by corals on deck, eDNA would be able to demonstrate presence/absence type record?</p> <p>JB – eDNA not good for absence data but is good for presence data.</p> <p>RO – NIWA is contracted to carry out Chatham Rise trawl survey in January 2026. Beyond that contract finishes, but would anticipate there would be Subantarctic trawl survey in Nov/Dec 2026. Opportunity to leverage off trawl surveys and potentially off commercial deployments of gear. Applications for protected species, target species, commercial species etc. Desirable thing to do and represents novel way of looking at methods that may be really good information. Happy to have a wider conversation with FNZ, SNZ, DOC and NIWA about how we could make this work.</p> <p>BSM – Interesting project but not appropriate under CSP.</p> <p>PH – Great for biodiversity but doesn't give much information about trawl contact with anything. Not telling us much about catchability.</p>
INT-8	Examining recruitment dynamics and recovery potential from disturbance of deep-sea corals using ROV image data collected by RV Sonne in the New Zealand region	<p>BSM – How will the analysis between this and previous growth rates in those other places be comparable??</p> <p>LH – That will be part of this project; DITAS was used last time, this time the data is in higher resolution. There will be a process to groom data and make them comparable. The recent survey of four seamounts should be considered to be the sixth time point in the data series.</p>
INT-9	Understanding fisheries overlap and interactions of protected gorgonians (order Alcyonacea), stony corals (order Scleractinia), and hydrocorals in the Fiordland Marine Area (FMA)	Written feedback received from NZRLIC.
INT-10	Understanding the extent and usage of coral rubble reporting codes by fisheries observers	<p>PH – In terms of use of code and size of landing, seems to be something the FNZ data analytics team could pull together relatively easily? Worth having a chat offline.</p> <p>LH – Agreed, although a lot of historical analysis is involved and if there is an element of identifying coral rubble through physical specimens and images that would probably need to be outsourced.</p>
INT-11	Fine-scale spatial analysis of fishing catch data in relation to New Zealand sea lion foraging areas and body condition	WG – As part of update to quantitative risk assessment of threats to NZSL there was an additional research component which is to use fisheries trawl effort data to estimate indices of annual prey availability to be trialled as covariate of annual pup survival and breeding rate. Seems to be little bit of overlap, would advocate for FNZ project to go forward first

		<p>before undertaking additional work. Outputs are expected by end of this year.</p> <p>KM – This is different, looking at it at a finer scale rather than overall fisheries catch and distribution.</p> <p>WG – Overlap for risk assessment is on event-by-event level.</p> <p>JR – If going to relate condition of sealions to where they are going, shouldn't narrow scope with assumption that whatever you're seeing is a result of overlap with fishing. Suggest expanding scope to include relative spatial availability of different prey species. Survey of NZSL prey species completed in 2018 that could be used.</p> <p>AA – We have used the results previously and it is great to have some data but the timing and spatial extents are limited in terms of overlap with sea lion foraging areas. Further prey surveys like this, in specific areas and including within the marine reserve, would be helpful to get a better picture indeed.</p> <p>AA – Have a wealth of historical data that has never been analysed in fine scale way to get a better understanding. Could also look at climate change impacts as well.</p> <p>BSM – Support William and Jim's comments. Need to be conscious of data access, potentially FNZ better from looking at fishing events and confidentiality of data, through FNZ seems more secure pathway and potentially already wrapped up in risk assessment some of outputs will be looking at fine scale stuff on nutrition.</p> <p>KR – In terms of data access, there are MOUs existing between the agencies for data sharing. Wouldn't want perception of that standing in way of getting work done.</p> <p>AA – FNZ has already shared data with us for tracking and we are very conscious of summarising data to a level that it can be shared.</p> <p>RE – It will be good to see the final report from this season before providing more feedback.</p> <p>Amelie – This work is complimentary to risk assessment.</p> <p>JR – This work is about identifying area where sealions go that have good or bad body condition, seems to be complimentary strands of research.</p>
POP-1	Southern Buller's albatross juvenile banding and tracking	RE - Support this project.
POP-2	Black Petrel and flesh-footed Shearwater demographic modelling	<p>WG – Request when estimating resight probabilities for adult and juvenile black petrels to look at splitting out RO monitoring from opportunistic at night captures, as seem to have different resight probabilities.</p> <p>GT – Model concept designed to look at factors on how birds are caught.</p>

		<p>PF – Request when recording birds present in burrows or at nest, to record whether they are breeding or not, in order to get a better handle on whether the phenomenon of skipped breeding in seabirds exists.</p> <p>GT – Breeding probability will be part of this calculation.</p>
POP-3	Black petrel monitoring	<p>WG – Is there possibility of doing this work every two years and doing full suite of research objectives by reducing the frequency?</p> <p>ID – Can test with the modelling what the consequence of doing work every second year would be.</p>
POP-4	Gibson's albatross research	No comments.
POP-5	Updated population assessment for New Zealand fur seals on Bounty Islands from drone footage	<p>BSM – When was last update on the Bounties population? And was it done using aerial footage? Thinking about limitations with using photographic imagery and ground truthing.</p> <p>JW – Last work was done in conjunction with albatross in 2019.</p> <p>ID – New drone imagery will be superior to aerial footage, in this case will have some good learnings</p>
POP-6	Salvin's albatross Western Chain research	No comments.
POP-7	Great white shark population estimate	<p>RO – Question around scope of project, is it about collecting samples and DNA and updating previous assessment done in Australia in 2018?</p> <p>KM – We will be combining samples but data will be used to update NZ risk assessment in the future. This project was widely discussed with FNZ and SNZ, and feedback has been included in project description. Outcome will be an updated population estimate.</p> <p>RO – The project is a population estimate, for the Australasian population which includes Australian samples. So will Australian partners be paying for the collection of material in Australia and then is population modelling jointly funded?</p> <p>KM – We will send our samples for inclusion with theirs and they will do the population estimates. Australians will cover collection of their own samples. This is a standalone project proposed by DOC for use for our own future risk assessments. The last population estimate done by CSIRO.</p> <p>RO – If this project is not funded, will the Australians still be able to provide a population estimate for Australasian great whites, and conversely, if they are not funded is this project still able to produce the suggested outputs.</p> <p>KM – CSIRO has funding to do analysis of samples they have.</p> <p>WG – Question around expected samples size, as something similar with CDD was tried with about 300 samples and were able to get an idea of population structure and</p>

		<p>interconnectedness between them but not population size. Has been done successfully with tuna but much greater magnitude of samples collected.</p> <p>KM – Hillary et al. 2018 paper that used close kin mark recapture method to update population estimates for the species with sample size of 240. This time will be bumped up over 1000, and hoping to get 100 samples from NZ sharks. Going to be much larger samples size.</p> <p>BSM – Has prioritisation of this project been affected by results of updated risk assessment?</p> <p>KR – Prioritisation was undertaken before risk assessment completed.</p> <p>RE – Main consideration we will be given to cost recovery, support in principle but based on recent results would not be supportive of this project being cost recovered to industry</p>
POP-8	White-capped albatross research	No comments.
POP-9	Updated population assessment for New Zealand fur seal in New Zealand	<p>BSM – Support intent of project, but need to understand where we’ve fallen short in the past in terms of getting population updates and resourcing to do it. Past projects quoted \$400,00 for population update, so need to work out what we will get from this. First objective looking at several important sites, however title talks about population estimate will this work be nationwide?</p> <p>JW – Both, some areas where you would do the full mark recapture, but other smaller sites, where we would be working with rangers or researchers on the ground to get an idea of smaller sites. Nationwide abundance estimates, looking into areas with significant numbers to achieve a more accurate estimate overall.</p> <p>KR – Leveraging internal capacity quite heavily which will help to keep costs down.</p> <p>BSM – Will be good to create framework and systems with regional DOC offices to help with abundance counts.</p> <p>KR – Fur seals being raised within internal prioritisation.</p> <p>GT – Many DOC staff now trained in using drones too.</p> <p>KR – There is potential for industry engagement as well if anyone is interested</p>
POP-10	Chatham albatross research	No comments.
POP-11	Antipodes albatross and white-chinned petrel research	No comments.
POP-12	Campbell Island seabird research	<p>GT – Surprised to see this project ranked so low in priority list. This is species we know is in trouble with a strong relation to domestic fisheries.</p> <p>ID – SRA sits lower down in domestic risk assessment, ranking it here is not very</p>

		<p>precautionary approach. Know that there is a large degree of out zone bycatch risk, its a species we have more growing concern.</p> <p>KR – That is why discussion at RAG of prioritisation is important.</p> <p>ID – FNZ previously and now DOC have invested additional resource into tracking which will be huge influence in informing international actions to compliment domestic work programme.</p> <p>PF – Have raised previously at CSP TWG meetings, a plea to take context happening out of zone into consideration when looking at what is happening in zone e.g. changing sea surface temperatures. Ought to have a database of sea surface temperatures available when writing up reports.</p> <p>ID – Have been ramping up international work, we got \$1.5 mil budget initiative in 2022 which we are now starting to fully implement and growing international seabird work to compliment domestic work. Fine balance to keep projects within CSP scope, but now we are ramping up international work there is more room to have cross fertilization between two work programmes. Very mindful of and working to achieve that balance.</p> <p>WG – Some work going on in international space to start addressing some of those out of zone problems e.g. Antipodean albatross multi threat assessment undertaken a couple of years ago looking at out of zone factors, ongoing work with CCSBT looking at impact of SLL fisheries to seabirds populations, and planned global assessment at end of year to look at global tuna long line fisheries including those from south American nations..</p>
POP-13	Campbell Island seabird winter research	<p>RE – When can we expect to see report for current project, as might be jumping gun still two years worth of tracking data to analyse.</p> <p>HS – Team currently collecting data on Campbell at the moment which will need to be analysed and turned into population estimate. Will aim for June.</p> <p>RE – Key winter fishery down there with potential to overlap with hoiho is SBW fishery which has had 100% observer coverage for the past 12 years and no reported captures of hoiho. Would not expect this project to be cost recovered to industry if it does go ahead.</p> <p>BSM – Rationale has fisheries interaction component so want to understand where that has come from, has there been any other info to suggest risk to hoiho from those fisheries? Fishery operates around 100km off coast of Campbell Island.</p> <p>HS – Other aspect to consider would be indirect effect on hoiho foraging habitat. Can tell from data currently being analysed can tell that during breeding, hoiho forage more than 100km from the island at times. During winter birds are expected to roam even further.</p>

POP-14	Population growth, distribution and demographics of New Zealand sea lions in northern Stewart Island	<p>RE – Is there any pup tagging happening around Otago as well, or are these standalone individual projects? Do they get done as a mainland population or not yet at that stage?</p> <p>JW – Rakiura increasing, tagging that happens there but not the same kind of numbers, helpful to show when individuals show up on mainland. Hasn't been any work done on tagging in northern Stewart island.</p> <p>KM – Was one year during covid where we did some tagging around Paterson inlet, but was limited where boats could go during that year. This is covering area a bit more.</p> <p>BSM – Wondering whether this could this be wrapped up in demographic update that FNZ going to be doing?</p> <p>JW – Think it's the other way around in terms of being able to give better demographic data of what's going on informing wider risk assessments.</p> <p>JR – It's updating demographic population model for Auckland Islands and mainland sea lions, assume don't have enough resights around Rakiura to inform demographic population model. Same can be said for Campbell Island. Got to have resighting as well as tagging.</p> <p>JW – Would be tagging pups, not dealing with big number. Area near Paterson inlet starting to see grouping happening. Needs follow up, start to tag while manageable amount.</p> <p>JR – Sounds good as long as resightings happens as follow on, which can be costly.</p> <p>JW – Much more highly trafficked area, possibility of getting resights from more than a dedicated team is relatively high in that area relative to other areas on Rakiura.</p> <p>BSM – Question aquaculture risk as not really in scope of CSP.</p> <p>JW – Can modify that.</p> <p>RO – Top three of population projects had a higher prioritisation score than the lowest in the interaction and mitigation categories.</p> <p>KCS – Projects are prioritised within each category, not across all three.</p>
MIT-1	Improving mitigation data streams to assess bycatch mitigation effectiveness in inshore and HMS fisheries	<p>PH – heaps of data coming in through EM programme so worth having a chat where the liberties lie there. Dan Kerrigan to talk through possibilities</p> <p>ID – EM is a big one but there's also things like being able to assess what weight is being used on a line, or sink rate gear, which EM will never be able to assess. So finding a way to compliment that in a way that sets us up.</p> <p>WG – Keen to explore with digital monitoring before putting through CSP because EM system isn't pigeonholed into just using cameras, could be things added on to yellow fin</p>

		<p>system which is already installed onboard to do things like line weighting, or RFIDs, tension sensors, deployment of tori lines etc.</p> <p>ID – Regardless of the mechanism, the intent is to make recommendations on how to improve. How to implement requires discussion.</p> <p>BSM – Be good to leverage some learnings from large vessel warp mitigation project.</p> <p>ID – This is the sister project for inshore and HMS, but different set of data collections.</p>
MIT-2	Seabird SMART Workshops	<p>RE – Supportive. Are in conversations occurring about whether this work will be kept in CSP, the intent is to contract Southern Seabirds rather than administer ourselves.</p>
MIT-3	Assessing views on the value of corals to inform current and potential ecosystem-based fisheries management approaches	<p>BSM – We covered a lot of this in the coral hui last year. Good to know what came out of that and the outcomes of that? Were able to collate views about coral risk management. Long string to draw between subjective values on coral and mitigation and management. International engagement and iwi engagement does seem like it should be core BAU.</p> <p>LH – Treaty engagement on corals not really BAU in practice, unfortunately and we didn't manage to do that at the coral symposium. The symposium didn't get to targets or approaches. Go back to principles of ecosystem-based fisheries management approach. Depending on contracting for this project there's a few approaches where you could qualify values and use them in a hypothetical management scenario. Needs a bit of scoping and builds a little on the coral symposium but what that looks like hasn't been defined. Quite stakeholder driven project.</p> <p>BSM – Looking at subjective views of limits on bycatch of corals and trying to pull that apart. Conversation will be dependent on who is in the room and be very individual to each person. Want to get views of stakeholders and partners, getting record of group values is pretty tricky. Don't want to move away from quantitative approaches for these assessments.</p> <p>LH - Ecosystem based fisheries management also needs qualitative views. In terms of shared views would like to engage through fisheries forums to get views on iwi thinking. Other options is something like structured decision making used in seabird space e.g. Whenua Hoa Diving Petrel, to incorporate multistakeholder views. Something like population management plans would also be within scope of CSP, but at this stage that hasn't been decided and it's a three year project as we anticipate needing time.</p> <p>RE – In inshore space seems like outside of scope of CSP. While its important to get views from multiple stakeholders to guide fisheries management approaches, seems like we haven't done that for other species groups within CSP. So why would we start with corals.</p>

		<p>Seems like a level above and its in discussions in strategic statement. For a mitigation project doesn't seem like it fits.</p> <p>Phil – Seems like whole lot more quantitative work to inform protected corals than the social science type work.</p> <p>LH – Understanding fisher barriers to uptake mitigation social science type projects have been done in CSP before so not outside of scope. At a point now with CSP coral research where quantitatively we have an idea of which corals are where and which risks they face, so time to start pulling that together and ecosystem-based fisheries management thinking to drive something forward. Otherwise will be stuck in the cycle of bettering understanding coral distribution with no outcomes or actions going forward.</p> <p>BSM – Brings into question a lot of the cross work between DOC and FNZ on corals vs biodiversity and habitats of significance, and what direction are we heading in, how do we bring all this information together in a useful way, and some core management. Seems like there are multiple programmes going on and all doing their own thing. Need to get to some direct approach and work more closely together on that.</p>
	Using thermal cameras to assess effectiveness of seabird mitigation	<p>RO – Will you use an observer? Or mount a thermal camera on boat alongside EM?</p> <p>ID – Idea is to have a dedicated technician for a trial (not an observer). Once feasibility and protocol has been established, then can think about incorporating alongside EM or as part of an observer protocol.</p> <p>RO – May be opportunities for platforms with existing technical people on board e.g. FNZ fisheries surveys, that may be a cost effective first step. Won't be associated with formal quantification mitigation project.</p> <p>ID – Have already had someone go out with thermal camera and they can see birds, but haven't had the time of someone to look into details e.g. risk zone, what can be achieved with thermal camera compared to what can be achieved during the day. Someone who is trained in that kind of data collection. Looking to keep costs down by adding a little extra work on to work we are already doing.</p> <p>JB – What kind of precision do you get for identification using thermal camera.</p> <p>ID – Low but this data is distinguishing between small and large petrels and albatross and that level is suitable. Many existing protocols are quite generic in that way and has to be quick to collect data rather than species level.</p> <p>RE – Is this approach the most effective to reduce captures going forward? Target fleets that we will get data from, but going into space of transparency of captures, do we need to</p>

		<p>specifically get this info for a few key very high risk vessels? Or is there the possibility to change the scope and it becomes more of a supportive project to Liaison Programme?</p> <p>ID – Not about assessing risk arising from a fishery, it's about the relative effectiveness of mitigation strategies. There is good monitoring now but birds are still being caught, and most setting happens at nights. So this project is to allow us to develop alternative mitigation strategies to use at night, to reduce bycatch further. To do that in a quick way you need to do in an experimental way so need to collect proxy data. About mechanism that will allow us to address residual risk once fishers are using best practice mitigations.</p> <p>RE - that will feed into reviews of best practice and regulations. E.g. handful of BLL FMA1 vessels that are high risk, so is it a matter of going onto any vessel to review that one practice to guide best practice mitigation reviews, or choosing the high risk vessels to look at what they aren't doing. Pool of problem vessels is now much smaller than originally thought. Wondering if this is best use of resources to lower overall capture rate or just target those high risk vessels.</p> <p>ID – Don't see it as either or. This allows us an opportunity to describe what is actually happening when setting at night. Being able to collect data is the key thing that allows us to have more certainty. Just about seeing if we can develop this as a tool then that could be applied in different ways.</p>
MIT-5	Supporting uptake of sink rate assessment by fishers in BLL	<p>BSM – Contribute funding to purchase gear?</p> <p>ID – Fishers may not want to pay for the device if they don't see it as being useful to them. See that as a barrier for uptake. So this provides an opportunity to use and test whether they want to invest for themselves.</p> <p>BSM – Similar to Hookpod project, when you run out of funding and there is still the demand there. Don't want to build dependence on DOC to provide gear.</p> <p>ID - View this as one-off project to support uptake.</p> <p>RO – Have TDR sensors been used to assess sink rate? Could be more cost effective to use existing tools.</p> <p>RE – Paper that hasn't been published, included Moana sensors.</p> <p>ID – Tool being developed to work across existing tags.</p> <p>RE – Keen to talk about how SNZ can support rollout e.g. engagement meetings.</p>

Phil Heath presented the FNZ research shortlist for 2025/26. Funding limited due to multiyear commitments and reduction in funding.

Discussion:

RO – Regarding BEN2025-01, is the idea to catch up or do with a years' delay.

PH – Not going to catch up, discussions to have about what gets identified, and where the priorities lie.

RE – How does this project relate to CSP INT2025-02?

PH – This project does not look at corals, but the rest of the invertebrate bycatch.

LH – Does this cycle through each type of fishery?

PH – No, samples are returned from all fisheries.

RO – Regarding RIS2025-02, is there potential overlap with DOC projects?

WG – Complimentary work, leveraging off DOC population projects, creating demographic population model and using projections from that to look at possible sources out of zone that may be affecting those key demographic parameters. Have fully quantified risk from domestic fisheries where we have data.

ID – Also use tracking data too.

PF – Strongly support MTRA. Great opportunity to begin to look at out of zone effects. Will you look at sea surface temperatures?

WG – For Antipodean albatross MTRA, we looked at sea surface temperature, wind speed, air temperature, potential for plastic ingestion, terrestrial effects.

PF – Those are datasets you have accumulated yourself, don't seem to have a centralised data base to bring all this information together so that others can view it.

WG – NOAA does this, suggest looking at package RERDDAP which gives access to a lot of climate datasets.

BSM – Regarding DAT2025-01, is this about going back to barebones of quantitative information rather than qualitative side of things which would take up quite a few resources.

WG – Currently have approval internally for publication of new data on existing structure. This website hosting not really dependent on which version, it's just to ensure that there is funding through to 2029 to keep that website online.

JW – Regarding AQU2025-01, this has come up in sea lion stakeholder meetings. How is this aligned between our agencies?

PH – Not an existing pathway currently but will keep DOC in the loop.

Next steps and Any Other Business

No further comments.

Further feedback

The Chair called for any additional feedback, in writing to be emailed through to csp@doc.govt.nz, by **5pm on 3rd March 2025**.