

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

### List of Submitters

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Shown in Comment Summary as:</b>
Simon Childerhouse (Blue Planet Marine)	BPM
Jim Roberts (NIWA)	NIWA
Deepwater Group Limited & Fisheries Inshore New Zealand jointly	DWG & FINZ
Sanford Limited	SL
West Coast <i>Te Tai o Poutini</i> Conservation Board	WCTPCB
Yellow-Eyed Penguin Trust	YEPT
Forest & Bird	F&B
NZ Rock Lobster Industry Council	NZ RLIC
World Wildlife Fund New Zealand	WWF

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

### PART A: General comments

Submitter	Submission	DOC response
WWF	<p>Due to the extremely vulnerable state of the Māui dolphin population, the government should be working to remove fishing related threats to Māui dolphins from their <u>entire</u> habitat. Express the importance of identifying effective pathways to support the fishing fleet on the West Coast North Island to either move out of Māui habitat, or transition to dolphin safe fishing methods. Consider that this work could fit within the Conservation Services programme.</p>	<p>DOC and MPI jointly administer the Hector's and Māui Dolphin Threat Management Plan which aims to holistically manage threats.</p>
DWG&FINZ	<p>CSP will be aware that wider fisheries services cost recovery is under review and CSP cost recovery will be included in that review.</p>	<p>CSP is engaged in supporting MPI undertake this review.</p>
DWG&FINZ & SL	<p>Any activities to be appropriate for protected species management, but that fall outside the Fisheries Act definition of "adverse effects" should be undertaken by DOC, and do not fall under Conservation services as defined in the Fisheries Act.</p> <p>Some services that DOC seeks to fund through cost recovery are not cost recoverable under section 262 of the Fisheries Act as they do not meet the definition of conservation service.</p> <p>The inclusion of an activity in conservation services does not automatically make the cost of that activity cost recoverable by the industry, in all instances, an adverse effect must be demonstrated and the decision must be consistent with section 262.</p>	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the relevant statutory definitions and criteria for a conservation service, with rationale further outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p> <p>DOC considers the application of cost recovery principles and rules on a project by project basis, and in some cases DOC does not seek cost recovery for some CSP projects.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

DWG&FINZ	<p>While adverse effect is not defined in the Fisheries Act, the term needs to be viewed in the context of the long-term viability of protected species. Industry concludes that an adverse effect occurs only when there is a decrease in, or a compromising of, the long-term viability of a protected species population. If DOC has an alternative position on this matter, they need to advise on the basis for that position.</p>	<p>DOC considers adverse effects to be as described in the CSP Strategic Statement which was developed as part of a multi stakeholder process over several years.</p> <p>For clarification the scope of the CSP includes actual and potential adverse effects on protected species arising from direct or indirect effects of commercial fishing and arising from activities associated with commercial fishing including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. any temporary or permanent effect;</li> <li>ii. any past, present, or future effect;</li> <li>iii. any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects -regardless of the scale, intensity, duration, or frequency of the effect;</li> <li>iv. any potential effect of high probability; and</li> <li>v. any potential effect of low probability which has a high potential impact.</li> </ul>
DWG&FINZ & SL	<p>Risk assessments are increasingly being used to assess the direct effects of fishing on various species. “Feeding the machine”, to address apparent data issues and achieve greater precision in assessments, has become more determinative of research programmes rather than the risk assessments contributing to an informed discussion of the real research needs.</p> <p>These conservative risk assessments often use historical data and were not intended to drive research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is necessary for L2 seabird risk assessments to be recognised as pessimistic and whilst giving a</li> </ul>	<p>While risk assessments provide a tool for the relative prioritisation of research and management, DOC does not use them to define adverse effect. DOC does not consider that it is appropriate to limit population research to those species designated very high and high risk in the Level-2 seabird risk assessment. Rather, DOC takes guidance from multiple information sources (including relevant level-3 risk assessments) as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p> <p>DOC also notes that current risk assessments have been based on the direct effects of a limited number of fisheries, and wider considerations, including potential indirect effects, inform</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

	<p>reasonable and useable hierarchy of risk and priority, overplays actual population impacts. A failure to consider and address these matters will impose unnecessary and unwarranted costs on commercial fishing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would expect CSP cost recovery to be applicable only to its activities in the top risk species class where adverse effect is demonstrable. Should CSP wish to undertake projects related to species with lesser risk status, the project should not be cost recovered.</li> <li>• Where level 3 risk assessments have been undertaken, and indicate that commercial fishing is not having an adverse effect on a protected species, there should be no cost recovery of further CSP activity on that species.</li> </ul>	research planning in CSP.
WCTPCB	<p>In general, support the Conservation Services Programme (CSP).</p> <p>Overall, the structure of the programme is significantly improved compared with previous CSP programmes and provides a clear and logical process.</p>	Noted.
SL & DWG&FINZ	<p>The plan ignores electronic monitoring (EM) as a cost effective alternative to human coverage.</p> <p>Industry recognises that electronic monitoring is not suitable for all monitoring and observer functions but should be employed where the focus is the recording of protected species interactions.</p>	<p>EM is advancing in a number of areas and DOC has funded projects investigating the effectiveness of EM for protected species interaction monitoring in the past which has shown that such systems show promise, however, are subject to limitations.</p> <p>DOC representatives remain closely involved in the scoping and development of EM systems for relevant monitoring tasks and while no EM projects are specifically mentioned, DOC remains open to the delivery of certain monitoring objectives through EM systems.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

DWG&FINZ	CSP is placing increasing reliance on indirect effects of commercial fishing to support its research activities and cost recovery.	The indirect effects of commercial fishing had always fallen within the scope of the CSP. All CSP projects are focussed on achieving the CSP objectives.
WWF	With regards to New Zealand Sea Lions – there are some very important research gaps that are not addressed in CSP plan. These include: 1) The need to improve our understanding of the efficacy of SLEDs, and 2) the need to improve understanding of the indirect effects of fishing on food availability and population demographics.	<p>The efficacy of SLEDs has been the subject of extensive investigation over time. Whilst DOC maintains an interest in the efficacy of any mitigation device, limited avenues for further testing of SLEDs were identified.</p> <p>The indirect effects of fishing and food availability on population demographics also remains an area of concern for DOC and the future investigation of such areas will be dependent upon the recommendations laid out in the sea lion TMP and advice received from the CSP Research Advisory Group.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

### PART B: Comments specific to INT2016-01 – Observing commercial fisheries

Submitter	Submission	DOC response
General Comments		
WCTPCB	The Board strongly supports observer coverage for the inshore fisheries as there is inadequate continuous data of by-catch from these fisheries.	Noted.
YEPT	This project is supported overall by the Trust. Recommended that the percentage of observer effort coverage be noted in the Annual Plan for each of the areas.	Noted, indicative percentages have been added.
YEPT	Recommended that all marine mammal and all seabird by-catch is recorded, not just the species set out in the objective for each of the areas.	Noted, all protected species interactions are fully documented as a priority in observer coverage.
WWF	Recommend that MPI improve vessel location reporting by requiring all fishing vessels working inside Māui habitat to install and operate a centralised Vessel Monitoring System in order to address the significant delay in the notification of vessel location on the WCNI. Although vessels are required to pro-actively report where they are planning to fish a week in advance, it is concluded that real-time automatic vessel location monitoring will more efficiently provide the information required to implement existing observer coverage commitments, and circumvent issues of human-error and accuracy.	As noted in the submission, vessel monitoring systems fall under the remit of MPI who are in the process of developing such options.
F&B	Conclude that observer rates are only of sufficient levels for very few fisheries to be able to detect changes in by-catch rate from one year to the next, or even over 3 years. Recommend cross checking with all very high, high and medium risk species to make sure observer coverage will be sufficient to detect changes in by-catch rates in those fisheries that contribute the most risk.	Planning of observer coverage levels always considers the ability to detect changes in bycatch rates. In part this is informed by an MPI commissioned sensitivity analysis to investigate appropriate levels of coverage. This work has previously been presented to the Aquatic Environment Working Group.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

		Ability to deliver against planned coverage has always been a complex issue and mechanisms to facilitate this are constantly being developed.
SL	Industry believes that projects aimed at the development of standards for implementation, ongoing monitoring of SNA1 and to review the efficacy of VMS are an excessive cost for something that has no clear end use on a group of quota owners who are already footing a hefty monitoring/research bill and who are expected to contribute at least 50% towards a major upcoming tagging programme.	Observer coverage is planned jointly between both MPI and CSP in order to maximise the utility of any observer coverage. For clarity the CSP primary focus of coverage in SNA1 is the quantification of black petrel and flesh-foot shearwater captures and the informing of effective mitigation strategies.
Setnet – East Coast South Island/Otago (EC SI), South Coast South Island (SC SI) and West Coast North Island (WC NI)		
F&B	Pleased to see increased proposed effort on setnets in Otago, Southland, Stewart Island and Fiordland to look for possible interactions with penguins. Concerned that a 65% coverage will not be sufficient to detect captures.	Noted, coverage levels have been planned specifically to achieve the objectives of quantification of bycatch levels.
WCTPCB	EC SI: Strong support. Concerned that this will only be for seabird mitigation and does not include marine mammals. In addition, there is no indication of monitoring for the white-flippered little blue penguin.	All protected species interactions are fully documented as a priority in observer coverage.  Any mitigation utilised by fishers vessel is also fully documented by observers.
DWG&FINZ	The observer projects for EC SI, SC SI and WC NI set net fisheries should be scheduled at a lower level of observing, consistent with the ability to deliver services. Conclude that the previous observer activity and risk assessments do not support a contention of adverse effect, thus industry does not support the programme.	Planning of observer coverage levels always considers the ability to detect changes in bycatch rates. In part, this is informed by an MPI commissioned sensitivity analysis to investigate appropriate levels of coverage. This work has previously been presented to

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

		<p>the Aquatic Environment Working Group.</p> <p>Ability to deliver against planned coverage has always been a complex issue and mechanisms to facilitate this are constantly being developed.</p>
Small inshore trawl – West Coast North Island (WC NI), West Coast South Island (WC SI), East /South Coast South Island (ESC SI) and North-east North Island (snapper target) (NE NI)		
SL	<p>NE NI: Trident systems have regularly reported on SNX by-catch, the move-on rule and VMS efficacy since the latter half of 2014. Unclear why observers need to go to sea to do this work, and what new information they can add to the Trident reports.</p>	<p>Observer coverage is planned jointly between both MPI and CSP in order to maximise the utility of any observer coverage. For clarity the CSP primary focus of coverage in SNA1 is the quantification of black petrel and flesh-foot shearwater captures and the informing of effective mitigation strategies.</p> <p>While EM options show potential for monitoring of certain factors, CSP is not currently confident that they are an effective tool for the monitoring of seabird bycatch in trawl fisheries.</p>
SL	<p>NE NI: Conclude that it is unclear why there is need for further coverage to estimate capture rates of black petrel as seabird and black petrel capture rates on trawl vessels are already well understood as they would have been reported over the last three years as part of the Minister's SNA1 directive.</p>	<p>Black petrels remain the most at-risk seabird species from commercial fisheries. Inshore trawl in NENI contributes significantly to this risk with ongoing captures occurring. Therefore ongoing and improving mitigation and monitoring efforts are needed to demonstrate a reduction in capture rates.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

SL	WC NI: Advocate for the use of cameras in this fishery as observer coverage has been difficult to achieve in the previous two years.	While EM options show potential for monitoring of certain factors, CSP is not currently confident that they are an effective tool for the monitoring of seabird bycatch in trawl fisheries.
WWF	Support the increase in proposed observer coverage for inshore trawl. Ideally there would be 100% coverage; however, the proposed increase to 75% coverage will be a significant improvement.	Noted.
DWG&FINZ	WC NI: No adverse effect is demonstrable but voluntarily supported if there will be camera coverage for MDO and protected species captures.	This project is delivered as a Ministerial directive driven out of the Māui Dolphin Threat Management Plan (TMP).
DWG&FINZ	The WC SI and EC SI Observer projects are supported as proposed, but would prefer camera coverage.	While EM options show potential for monitoring of certain factors, CSP is not currently confident that they are an effective tool for the monitoring of seabird bycatch in trawl fisheries.
DWG&FINZ	NE NI: Not supported. Conclude that MPI needs to discuss the need with the SNA1 commercial group	MPI and DOC consider the independent verification of the efficacy of EM for both commercial catch and protected species bycatch to be critical to the informing adequate fisheries management.
F&B	Query how the observer project for North East North Island snapper fisheries related to the current roll-out of cameras on inshore trawl vessels?	EM is advancing in a number of areas and DOC has funded projects investigating the effectiveness of EM for protected species interaction monitoring in the past which has shown that such systems show promise however are subject to limitations.  DOC representatives remain closely involved

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

		in the scoping and development of EM systems for relevant monitoring tasks and while no EM projects are specifically mentioned, DOC remains open to the delivery of certain monitoring objectives through EM systems.
Danish Seine – North-east North Island		
DWG&FINZ	Not supported. Conclude that MPI needs to discuss the need with the SNA1 commercial group	Internationally significant bycatch risks have been identified from seine fisheries and the collection of adequate baseline monitoring data remains a priority for CSP.
Bottom Longline – North-east North Island (Bluenose target) ( BLL-BNS) and North-east North Island (Snapper target) (BLL-SNA)		
SL	BLL-SNA: Unclear what additional information is required around the efficacy of mitigation methods as this is a problem that has been well researched and largely resolved.	<p>Black petrels remain the most at-risk seabird species from commercial fisheries. Longline fisheries NENI contributes the highest portion to this risk with ongoing captures occurring, with a number of multiple capture events.</p> <p>Therefore ongoing and improving mitigation and monitoring efforts are needed to demonstrate a reduction in capture rates.</p> <p>CSP strongly disagree that the issue of seabird bycatch has been resolved in the SNA BLL fishery.</p>
DWGFNZ	BLL-SNA & BLL-BNS: Supported as proposed, but camera coverage would be the preferred option.	Noted.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

F&B	BLL –BNS: Express the importance of including all vessel types and suggest that refusal to allow observers should result in some sort of penalty	Delivery of representative observer coverage has been an ongoing and complex issue and mechanisms to facilitate this are constantly being developed.
F&B	It is recommended that observers use colour banding to verify predictions of survivorship for birds released alive.	This has been investigated as an option pending adequate development of protocols which do not jeopardise animal welfare.
F&B	BLL-SNA: Suggest that there may need to be some adjustment to the objectives of the observers to monitor/compare the effectiveness of cameras with observers.	Noted.
Offshore Fisheries		
F&B	Concerns about if the proposed increase in observer coverage for scampi, southern blue whiting and squid trawl will be sufficient to detect changes in by-catch rate in subsequent years. Conclude that addressing the risk effectively may require much higher levels of observer coverage than proposed.	Planning of observer coverage levels always considers the ability to detect changes in bycatch rates.
F&B	Suggest that more resources must be put in to achieving levels of observer coverage that are going to enable us to meet our objectives under the NPOA-Seabirds.	Planning of observer coverage levels always considers the ability to detect changes in bycatch rates. The objectives of the NPOA are directly considered in the planning of coverage levels- particularly in fish risk fisheries.
WCTPCB	Strongly supported. However, it is noted that the recording of times of by-catch is still not a required output of this programme, which may help in by-catch mitigation for seabirds such as the little blue penguin.	Noted, as clarification, times of protected species captures are recorded by observers, though may not be reported on in all studies.
WCTPCB	Conclude that the increase in “total days” for West Coast deep water trawl fisheries is fully supported. On the other hand, it is disappointing that the West Coast middle depth trawl fisheries has had a reduction from 1500 “total days” in the 2015/16 CSP annual plan to 1200 in the 2016/17 CSP annual plan.	Noted, the reduction was part of resourcing trade-offs to maximise data collection across all fisheries.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

### PART C: Comments specific to other projects

Submitter	Submission	DOC response
2.2 Identification of marine mammals turtles and protected fish captures in New Zealand fisheries		
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
2.3 Identification and storage of cold-water coral bycatch specimens		
BPM	Concerns about where and how the genetic samples are being stored and if they are available to the public upon request.	Adequate storage facilities will be a requirement for the successful provider of these services. Genetic samples will be available upon arrangement. The project description has been clarified
YEPT	Continuation of this multi-year project is fully supported.	Noted.
2.4 Identification of seabirds captured in New Zealand fisheries		
DWG&FINZ	Voluntary support for the ongoing monitoring of the level of risk although notes that not all seabirds are at adverse risk from commercial fishing.	Only dead seabirds retrieved from commercial fishing vessels will be processed by this project.
F&B	Concerns about potential loss of important information, such as data on sex, age and breeding status, if not all seabirds are brought in for necropsy.	Concerns are noted and DOC continues to monitor the effectiveness of photographic identification versus necropsy in order to ensure that trade-offs are appropriate for management.
WCTPCB &	This project if fully supported.	Noted.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

YEPT		
2.5 Post release survival of white pointer sharks in New Zealand setnet fisheries		
DWG&FINZ	<p>Industry contends that there is no proof that it has an adverse effect on the white pointer shark population, a species that in addition, has very low risk assessment score. It is also noted that there is no description of what sample size or predicted effort is needed for robust results and even if described, low number of captures indicate that the research is not likely to yield reliable or indicative data.</p> <p>Contend that the project is not relevant to the management of marine protected species and does not support cost recovery, further research could possibly be support if adverse effect can be demonstrated.</p>	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p> <p>While risk assessments provide a tool for the relative prioritisation of research and management DOC does not use them to define adverse effect. DOC disagrees with the contention that the Level 1 chondrichthyan risk assessment identified white sharks as having a very low risk score as no such categories were used. Of protected fish, white-pointer sharks had a relatively high risk, which prioritises this work.</p> <p>As part of the re-scoping of the project following initial consultation, the scope of the project has been narrowed to provide characterisation of interactions and provide recommendations on appropriate sample size and feasibility of any SPAT tagging work.</p>
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
2.6 Indirect effects of commercial fishing on Buller's shearwater and red-billed gulls		
DWG&FINZ	<p>The absence of any demonstrated risk of adverse effect from the commercial fishing activity means this project should not be cost recovered. In addition, Buller's shearwater has a very low risk ratio and red-billed gulls are not a protected species, given that there are more pressing issues that need to be addressed this project should not be undertaken at all.</p>	<p>Project is crown funded and not cost recovered.</p> <p>Both Buller's shearwaters and red-billed gulls are absolutely protected under the Wildlife Act 1953.</p> <p>Current fisheries risk assessments only consider direct effects</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

		and thus not relevant to prioritising investigation of indirect effects.
F&B, WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
3.1 Flesh-footed shearwater: Various locations population project		
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
3.2 Seabird population research: Chatham Islands 2016-17		
DWG&FINZ	<p>Supported but adjust stocks to remove SQU1J. Need for a general review before the plan is finalised. General concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Population estimates for range of species but not all species are at high risk.</li> <li>Concerned that existing datasets, e.g. Chatham albatross, are not yet analysed and yet further field work is proposed to collect more information.</li> <li>Concern revolving anecdotal reports of ongoing harvesting of albatross pre-fledges chicks at sites in this region.</li> </ul>	<p>DOC agrees a meeting to discuss stock allocation will be productive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project is guided by the CSP Seabird Plan 2016. As defined in that plan, all species are at medium/moderate or higher risk. A multiple species approach provides substantial cost savings.</li> <li>Where possible existing data sources will be utilised</li> <li>Harvesting of pre-fledged chicks at sites is outside of the scope of the CSP Annual Plan</li> </ul>
NZ RLIC	Consider that objectives 5 and 6 do not meet the statutory definition of "conservation services" due to the absence of any demonstrated risk of adverse effect from the rock lobster industry on the populations of Pitt Island and Chatham Island shags. Consider these objectives should be removed from the CSP annual plan.	DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.
F&B	Good to see this work going ahead as previously planned. For the Chatham Island shag, it will be important for the researcher to also take the opportunity to assess what on-	Noted, land based threats are outside of the scope of CSP. Options for further researching will be considered through

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

	going risks there are to these populations from land-based causes.	other sources of funding.
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
3.3 Seabird population research: Auckland Islands 2016-17		
DWG&FINZ	<p>Consider that not all species in the project are at high risk. Question the motive for this work as there seems to be a lack of acknowledgement of information from other long-term demographic studies and other extant yet unanalysed data.</p> <p>Could voluntarily support the project, but not for the pursuit of more demographic data for white-capped albatross.</p>	This project is guided by the CSP Seabird Plan 2016. As defined in that plan, all species are at medium/moderate or higher risk. A multiple species approach provides substantial cost savings.
F&B, WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
3.4 Updated basking shark bycatch review		
DWG&FINZ	No adverse effect is demonstrable in respect to basking sharks, thus cost recovery is not possible. If an adverse effect is demonstrated, further research could be supported. Also noted that basking sharks have a lower risk assessment score than many QMS stocks.	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p> <p>As noted for white sharks while risk assessments provide a tool for the relative prioritisation of research and management the DOC does not use them to define adverse effect. In the Level 1 chondrichthyan risk assessment, of protected fish, basking sharks were identified as having the highest risk score which prioritises this work.</p>
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

3.5 Cetacean habitat suitability modelling		
BPM	Recommendation that it will be confirmed with NIWA that the output from the project will be 100% publically accessible.	Noted, this will be clarified.
DWG&FINZ	Industry contends that the project could be voluntarily supported, and further research could be supported if an adverse effect is demonstrated. However, concerned about the fact that no Marine Mammal Risk Assessment (MMRA) results or reports have yet been published.	DOC considers the development of spatial distribution a vital element of understanding, and thus informing measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate cetacean bycatch, and notes the concerns over delays in delivery of the planned MPI MMRA. DOC notes concerns over time-lines for delivery of this work and has therefore selected to solely crown fund the contributions for 2016/17. This contribution will ensure that data is developed into a suitable format for use in the habitat modelling and expedite outputs of the wider project.
YEPT	Fully support the project	Noted.
3.6 Yellow-eyed penguin foraging and indirect effects		
DWG&FINZ	No rationale that commercial fishing poses an adverse effect on the species. In the absence of that evidence, the project should not be cost recovered and in fact given more pressing issues, should not be undertaken at all.	DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015. In particular, a review of relevant information (Ellenburg and Mattern 2012, commissioned by CSP) is cited in the project description.
YEPT	Yellow-eyed penguins are currently in decline and facing a suite of threats. Penguins are also important as an indicator species, they are a top predator in the marine environment, and so can effectively represent the ecological health of the overall system. The Trust is keen to see research on yellow-eyed penguins funded, in particular work in the marine environment which is of current concern.  Our insight into the impacts of commercial fishing on yellow-	Noted.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

	<p>eyed penguins is also poorly understood. The direct impact of commercial fishing on penguin is somewhat easier to measure than indirect effects but this does not mean that we should ignore indirect impacts.</p> <p>Any research which sheds light on the foraging behaviour of penguins in the marine environment and the effects of fishing would be very well received and would increase the available knowledge critical for the management of this endangered and protected species.</p>	
F&B & YEPT	Fully support the project. Essential to inform our understanding of the multitude of issues which seem to be affecting YEPs to in order to inform conservation management of this protected species.	Noted.
WCTPCB	Fully support the project	Noted.
<b>3.7 Salvin's albatross Bounty Islands: methodology development</b>		
DWG&FINZ	As Salvin's are the highest risk albatross species and represented in incidental captures in a number of fisheries, developing and agreeing a long term practicable methodology to monitor this population is required. The industry supports DOC undertaking the work but it should not be cost recovered.	DOC notes the industry's support for the project. DOC considers this project meets the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP strategic statement 2015.
F&B	Conclude that it is important to know as soon as possible what the population trend is likely to be as this species is so highly bycaught. Express concerns that it will take another year to agree on the methodology used and suggest that it would be possible to exchange expert opinions and agree on the methodology to get the work done this summer.	Concerns over the delay are noted however re-scoping of this project was based on outcomes of Research Advisory Group discussion to ensure that any methodologies are robust and appropriate. In particular the breeding season of this species requires field work in October, which is very early in the financial year, and DOC considers it impracticable to develop a methodology and conduct the research in 2016/17.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.
3.8 New Zealand Sea Lion: Auckland Islands pup count		
BPM	<p>Concern is expressed as to the reduced budget (60%) for the coming year and the reduced field season length. Little rationale provided for the proposed reduction and not clearly detailed which parts of the programme will be dropped and which will be retained. Questions whether even a reduced field season may be possible for the proposed budget, as the major cost is vessel charter and these costs are unlikely to be reduced. In addition, this option might create a hole in the long-term data set, which could limit our understanding on the impacts of fisheries and other factors on NZSL.</p>	<p>Any sea lion research planned within the scope of the CSP Plan will draw synergies with other sea lion research priorities, such as disease monitoring that will come out of the TMP. Officials are cognisant of this and have designed a modular field season plan which can address the primary fisheries related data needs while remaining flexible enough to accept additional research components.</p> <p>Maintaining the integrity of the time series of data will be a major consideration to planning.</p>
BPM	<p>Is DOC considering funding any additional New Zealand sea lion research from internal or other sources?</p>	<p>As noted in the project proposal, supplementary objectives such as disease monitoring and pup survival estimates could be considered as part of the outputs of the sea lion Threat Management Plan. Any additional work on New Zealand sea lions will be coordinated to maximise logistical and funding synergies.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

BPM	<p>DOC decision on this project is the complete opposite approach to the agreement at the CSP RAG meeting on the 25 February 2016 that the pup count only was a low priority project that was inadequate to answer the questions that need to be answered. DOC has given little or no indication why this approach was chosen.</p> <p>Suggests that the status quo project should be at its previous funding levels, but the proportion paid by fishing industry should be modified due to recent modelling work providing indications that the cause of decline in NZSL is now more broadly attributed across a range of possible contributors rather than fisheries being solely responsible.</p>	<p>DOC believes that the pup count project will provide necessary information for fishery management, and appropriate cost recovery has been applied. Supplementary objectives such as disease monitoring and pup survival estimates could be considered as part of the outputs of the sea lion Threat Management Plan. All work on New Zealand sea lions will be coordinated to maximise logistical and funding synergies.</p>
BPM	<p>Recommends a multi-year contract is used to cover this project as the need for work is unlikely to change in the short to medium term. It would also reduce burdens of securing permitting of the research, which would also be multi-year, and would align with other work that DOC has already committed to through other internal funding (e.g. PhD funding on disease).</p>	<p>Noted, this will be considered for future years as part of wider monitoring plans for New Zealand sea lions driven by the Threat Management Plan.</p>
NIWA	<p>The plan states that additional non-CSP funds will be allocated to conduct additional research in accordance with science requirements identified by the TMP, but these are not described in the draft plan.</p>	<p>These additional, non-CSP, aspects elements will be refined as part of a wider sea lion research planning process once funding streams are confirmed.</p>
NIWA	<p>It is important to get some clarification as to the proposed start date of the project as it will influence the number of dead pups counted and hence the total count. Recommends keeping the pup count methodology consistent with previous years.</p>	<p>Confirmed start date for the field season will be dependent on any additional objectives which will be refined as part of a wider sea lion research planning process once funding streams are confirmed.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

		Maintaining the integrity of the time series of data will be a major consideration to planning.
DWG&FINZ	Industry contends that it does not have an adverse effect on the sea lion population and thus DOC should not levy industry for the project. Suggest that it is important to await the finalisation of the TMP before any decisions are made.	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p> <p>DOC has taken into consideration the pending release of the TMP for consultation. However, regardless of the actions that may be progressed by the TMP, pup count data is required for fisheries management.</p> <p>Awaiting the finalisation of the TMP will also jeopardise the time series of data and fisheries management.</p>
WCTPCB	This project is fully supported. However, no indication that there will be any investigation of potential disease processes in this population, which may contribute to the decrease in the under 2-year old population. Suggest that “mark and recapture” programme should include sampling for the future DNA analysis to establish if there are inbreeding populations, which will reduce the breeding capacity.	<p>Noted, this will be considered for future years as part of wider monitoring plans for New Zealand sea lions driven by the Threat Management Plan.</p> <p>Widening of project objectives to include mark recapture can be investigated as part of a wider sea lion research planning process once funding streams are confirmed.</p>
YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.
4.1 Seabird bycatch reduction (small vessel longline fisheries) – This project was consulted as part of the 2015-16 CSP plan		
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.
F&B	Fully support the project; however, concerns are expressed about the strategic offal discharge and “floaters” on the bluenose lines. Suggest that there should be a focus on retaining unused baits and reducing offal discharge and	Noted, these specific points can be discussed during the review of the previous year's outputs by the Technical Working Group, which will in turn direct refinement for the coming year's approach.

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

	consider if it would be possible to use weights on the floater hooks to resolve that issue.	
4.2 Small vessel seabird mitigation project – This project was consulted as part of the 2015-16 CSP plan		
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.
4.3 Protected species bycatch media		
DWG&FINZ	Industry supports the cost recovery of the reprint of identification tools, but does not support the cost recovery of the newsletter and believe that the newsletter is not valued as most fishers are unaware of its existence and not sufficiently interested to download it.	<p>DOC notes the support for the reprint of the identification tools. DOC has reviewed uptake by fishers and hard copy material is delivered to fishers.</p> <p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p>
WCTPCB	This project is fully supported. It is recommended that the circulation of the Newsletter be extended to Conservation Boards and conservation groups with an interest in sea mammal and seabird conservation.	Noted.
YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.
4.4 Entanglement of whales in pot/trap lines and setnets and a review of potential mitigation methods		
DWG&FINZ	Project is not supported as no adverse effect is demonstrable. As a consequence, no cost recovery is possible.	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p>
NZ RLIC	Conclude that the project rationale relies on flawed proxies for adverse effects as the adverse effect in question cannot be on an individual bird or mammal of a protected species, but must be an adverse effect at the level of a species or	<p>DOC considers that all projects in the Annual Plan meet the criteria of a conservation service, as outlined in the CSP Strategic Statement 2015.</p>

## CSP Annual Plan 2016/17 Summary of Submissions

	<p>population. Industry believes that the project does not meet the statutory definition of “conservation services” and does not qualify as a legally valid CSP project, and should therefore be removed from the CSP annual plan.</p>	
NZ RLIC	<p>Concern is expressed that the project description makes no mention of the whale mitigation programme that the rock lobster industry has been developing and implementing over many years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whale_Safe – comprises a booklet containing detailed information about cetacean movements and behaviour, species identification manual, and advice how to set gear to avoid entanglements.</li> <li>• Ocean_Snap – Warning protocol to alert lobster fishermen that whales are on the move. It is a generic electronic recording and reporting tool backed up by a data base which runs as an app on standard smartphone technology.</li> </ul> <p>Conclude that the rock lobster industry is already fully aware of the risk of whale entanglement, has commissioned and continues to seek internationally-respected expertise on managing cetacean interactions, and is actively avoiding and mitigating the risk of entanglement. The desktop study proposed is redundant.</p>	<p>The revised project makes specific mention of Ocean_Snap as a data resource which can be reviewed as part of the project along with any other relevant data sources.</p>
WCTPCB & YEPT	Fully support the project.	Noted.