

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600 Emeryville, CA 94608 USA +1.510.452.8000 main +1.510.452.8001 fax www.SCSglobalServices.com

Lakes and Coorong Pipi Fishery

2017 Surveillance Audit Report

F-SCS-0097

Authors Dr. Sabine Daume Ms. Sascha Brand-Gardner

1 December 2017

Table of Contents

Tał	ole List	t	2
Glo	ossary.		3
1	Gen	eral Information	4
2	Exec	cutive Summary & Conclusion	5
3	Back	‹ground	6
2	3.1	Stock Status Update	6
3	3.2	Updates on information related to ecosystem and new scientific projects	8
3	3.3	Updates on the management system and regulations	9
3	3.4	Updates on Personnel involved in science, management or industry	. 10
3	3.5	Changes to the fishing operations and traceability systems	. 10
4	Asse	essment Process	. 11
4	1.1	Assessment Methodologies	. 11
2	1.2	MSC Certification and Conditions for Continued Compliance	. 12
4	1.3	Consequences for Non-Compliance	. 12
4	1.4	Consultations	. 13
4	1.5	Harmonization Considerations	. 13
4	1.6	Assessment Team	. 14
5	Resu	ults	. 15
6	Refe	erences	. 18
7	App	endices	. 19
-	7.1	Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables	. 19
	PI 3.	2.5	. 25
-	7.2	Appendix 3. Response to Stakeholder submissions (if any)	. 27
-	7.3	Appendix 4. Surveillance audit information – The Lakes & Coorong Management Advisory	
(Comm	ittee Terms of Reference	. 28
7	7.4	Appendix 6. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)	. 32

Table List

Table 1 . TAC and Catch Data	5
Table 2. Summary of Assessment Conditions	5
Table 3. Scheme Documents	11
Table 4. Schedule of surveillance audits	12
Table 6. Key Meeting and Attendees	
Table 9. Surveillance level rationale	32

Glossary

CAB	Conformity Assessment Body
ERA	Environmental Risk Assessment
ETP	Endangered, Threatened or Protected species
FCR	Fisheries Certification Requirements
FIS	Fishery independent survey
Kg	kilogram
LCCC	Lakes and Coorong Consultative Committee
LCFMAC	Lakes and Coorong Fishery Ministerial Advisory Committee
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
nm	nautical mile
PIRSA	Primary Industries and Regions South Australia
SARDI	South Australian Research and Development Institute
SCS	SCS Global Services
SFA	Southern Fishermen's Association
t	metric ton
TAC	Total Allowable Catch
TACC	Total Allowable Commercial Catch
UoA	Unit of Assessment
UoC	Unit of Certification

1 General Information

Fishery name	Lakes and Coorong Pipi Fishery			
Unit(s) of assessment	Pipi (<i>Donax deltoides</i>) collected by rake in the Coorong in South			
	Australia			
Date certified	25 August 2016 Date of e	xpiry	24 August 2021	
Surveillance level and type	1st Annual Surveillance Audit - O	nsite		
	Surveillance frequency score: 1 -	remote (secc	ond audit will be	
	remote).			
Date of surveillance audit	9th of October 2017			
Justification	No deviation.			
Surveillance stage (tick one)	1st Surveillance	Х		
	2nd Surveillance			
	3rd Surveillance			
	4th Surveillance			
	Other (expedited etc)			
Surveillance team	Lead assessor: Dr. Sabine Daume			
	Assessor(s): Ms. Sascha Brand-Gardner			
CAB name	SCS Global Services			
CAB contact details	Address	Fitzroy No	rth, 3068 Victoria,	
		Australia		
	Phone/Fax	+61 (0)4979943304		
	Email	msc@scsglobalservices.com		
	Contact name(s) Dr. Sabine Daume			
Client contact details	Address PO Box 1062, Cl		62, Clearview South	
		Australia 5	085	
	Phone/Fax	+61 (0)8 83	3679782	
	Email	<u>neil@nma</u>	c.com.au	
	Contact name(s)	Neil Mc Do	onald	

2 Executive Summary & Conclusion

The Lakes and Coorong Pipi Fishery was certified on 25th of August 2016 by SCS Global Services. The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) requires that each certified fishery undergo regular surveillance audits to ensure the basis of certification is maintained and that the fishery continues to address any conditional requirements identified during the full assessment process. This fishery is on a remote surveillance cycle. The surveillance audit was conducted by the Lead assessor, Dr. Sabine Daume and one team member, Ms. Sascha Brand-Gardner. The meetings with representatives of the fishery and the management agency (PIRSA) took place in Adelaide on the 9th of October 2017.

This first surveillance audit focused on changes since certification in 2016 and on monitoring continued compliance with the MSC Principles and Criteria. Three conditions were raised during the certification of the fishery. One condition was in Principle 2, for Performance Indicator 2.5.3, the other two conditions were under Principle 3, PI 3.2.2 and PI 3.2.5. Only the second condition (3.2.2) is due to be closed out at this surveillance audit. Two conditions (3.2.2 and 3.2.5) were closed out during this surveillance audit and rescored. Progress to meet condition 2.5.3 will be assessed at the second surveillance audit in 2018.

It is SCS' view that the fishery continues to meet the standard of the MSC and to comply with the 'Requirements for Continued Certification'. SCS recommends the continued use of the MSC certificate through to the next surveillance audit in 2018.

TAC	Year	2016/17	Amount	650 t
UoA share of TAC	Year	2016/17	Amount	650 t
UoC share of TAC	Year	2016/17	Amount	650 t
Total green weight catch by UoC Year (most		2016/17	Amount	650 t
	recent)			
	Year (second	2015/16	Amount	492 t
	most recent)			

Table 1 . TAC and Catch Data

Table 2. Summary of Assessment Conditions

Condition number	Performance indicator (PI)	Status	PI original score	PI revised score
1	2.5.3	On target	75	N/A
2	3.2.2	Closed (1 st surveillance audit)	75	85
3	3.2.5	Closed (1 st surveillance audit)	70	80

3 Background

3.1 Stock Status Update

Annual relative biomass remained stable from 2009/10 to 2014/15 (mean 11.4 \pm 0.28 kg/ 4.5 m²). In 2015/16, annual relative biomass increased to 20.3 and to 21.5 \pm 1.43 kg/ 4.5 m² in 2016/17 (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Fishery-independent estimates of mean (±se) annual relative biomass of Pipi during development of the harvest strategy (blue) and recent estimates (orange) from 2007/08 to 2016/17. RP = reference point (from Ferguson and Hooper, 2017).

The estimated mean annual relative biomass in 2015/16 and 2016/17 were 85% and 95% above the target reference point, respectively (Ferguson and Hooper, 2017). There was however, a reduction in maximum size of pipi noted during 2014/15 and 2015/16 (i.e. large Pipi (>45 mm) were not present in size structures) most likely due to fishing (Figure 2) although depression of growth rates due to high densities of pipi may have contributed also (Ferguson and Hooper 2017). However, declining contributions of larger pipi to size structures suggested that growth overfishing may be occurring in the fishery (Ferguson and Hooper, 2017). It should be noted that the maximum sizes of pipi present in size structures during 2016/17, increased throughout the season.

The presence of 12-25 mm individuals in size structures since 2011 suggest consistent recruitment (Ferguson and Hooper, 2017). Pre-recruits were present in more than 30% of the samples from 2011 onwards including in the most recent 2016/17 season and comprised 52% of the sample (Figure 2). It is difficult to understand the relative contribution from recruits and pre-recruits in surveys because a higher proportion of sub-legal sized Pipi in the size frequency distribution may either represent recruitment to the fishery or loss of older, larger individuals (from Ferguson and Hooper, 2017). Therefore, the development of time-series of relative abundance of pre-recruits (collaboration between PIRSA, SARDI and industry) is important. Early attempts to develop an index of relative abundance using transects, quadrats and sieves on the pipi fishing ground on Younghusband Peninsula beach were challenged by the steep beach slopes, highly aggregated pipi, and exposure to strong surf. From 2015, pre-recruit relative abundance has been estimated using a research rake with 20 mm mesh, with the catch separated into adults and pre-recruits using a 22 mm diameter sieve. To date, pre-recruit surveys, using this new method, have been done in May and October of 2015, 2016 and 2017. The overall aim is to include results of the project in a future revision of the harvest strategy (Ferguson and Hooper, 2017).

Using the harvest strategy for Pipi and the results of mean annual relative biomass of 21.5kg/ 4.5 m2 and prerecruits present in 2016/17, a TACC of 650 t was deemed acceptable in 2017/18. In conclusion, the Pipi resource in 2016/17 is assessed as "sustainably fished" (Ferguson and Hooper, 2017).



Figure 2. Length-frequency distributions of pipi from three sections of Younghusband Peninsula: 0 to <20 km (left), 20 to < 40 km (centre) and 40 to <60 km (right) from the mouth of the Murray River (2007/08 to 2016/17) (from Ferguson & McPhail 2017). Red vertical line indicates the minimum legal shell size (from Ferguson and Hooper, 2017).

3.2 Updates on information related to ecosystem and new scientific projects

Ecosystem

The Coorong and Lower Lakes were designated as a Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention in 1985 based upon its unique ecological character and its importance to migratory wader birds. The Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth with its diversity of ecological features, provides a wide range of habitats — a unique mosaic of 23 wetland types that provides habitat for nationally threatened species such as the fairy tern, orange bellied parrot, Southern Mount Lofty Ranges emu wren and the Murray cod. Waders and waterfowl are the predominant bird species, including the curlew sandpiper, banded stilt, red-capped plover, masked lapwing, red-kneed dotterel, black swan, Cape Barren goose, musk duck, straw-necked ibis, royal spoonbill, rufus night heron and Australian pelican.

The shore-line marine system near the Murray Mouth is characterised by the high-energy ocean beaches of the Younghusband Peninsula dune system. It also has extensive linear open-ocean beach (about 200 km) adjacent to shallow marine waters. This beach zone ecosystem is included within the Coorong Ramsar area, and has been recognised for protection within various habitat and protection management zones of the recently (2014) established Encounter and Upper South East Marine Parks, including the Coorong Beach North Sanctuary Zone (no-fishing) established along a 4km interface of the seaward boundary of the commercial pipi fishery.

The barrages now isolate the Lower Lakes from ocean water influence, and the lakes are only fed by water from the Murray River and local sources, which varies from fresh to brackish, depending on location and climatic factors. The Coorong is now the estuary for the Murray River, where water discharged from Lake Alexandrina across the barrages can mix with ocean water, depending on inflows from the ocean of marine water driven by wind, wave and tidal forces.

New Projects

While the area of the commercial fishery is monitored through a fishery independent sampling (FIS) program, there is limited information on the recreational take of pipis besides the 5 or more yearly PIRSA recreational survey which included some catch sampling in the most recent survey. In recognition of the need to better understand the status of the recreational fishery a consultancy firm has recently received a small Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources Recreational Fishing Grant for a project that involves tagging cockles and getting recreational fishers to recapture them to help understand movement in the species as well as raise awareness of the species. This will largely be achieved through a community day in early January 2018.

A monitoring strategy has also been developed (through consultation with industry, SARDI and researchers from interstate) to assess spatial and temporal patterns in key parameters (adult and pre-recruit density and length structure) across the recreational fishery. The strategy has six sites from

Middleton to the Murray Mouth, at which 6 replicate samples are taken over four days during each of three periods ('before', 'mid' and 'late/end' season). The 'before' season sampling has been completed and further sampling is scheduled for February and May/June 2018 (although this monitoring is largely unfunded). The length structure data will be compared throughout the season. The design of the recreational monitoring strategy will enable a comparison with the FIS of the commercial fishery.

This study will provide a snapshot of how the recreational fishery is going over the current season. Establishment of a long-term monitoring strategy to account for multi-year trends (similar to what has been achieved for the commercial fishery) that would provide PIRSA with more information is anticipated.

A project on time-series of relative abundance of pre-recruits is in development in collaboration between PIRSA, SARDI and industry. Pre-recruit relative biomass based on research rake catches (20 mm mesh), and the same transect size and locations as in the main fishery-independent surveys have been conducted in May and October of 2015, 2016 and 2017. In these surveys the catch is separated into adults and pre-recruits using a 22 mm sieve, providing an estimate of relative biomass of pre-recruits. Estimates of relative adult biomass from the pre-recruit surveys can be validated against estimates of relative harvestable biomass from the main fishery-independent surveys. The potential to back calculate relative abundance of pre-recruits from existing data will be explored.

3.3 Updates on the management system and regulations

There have been several changes to the management system since May 2016. Specifically, there have been several amendments to the *Fisheries Management (Lakes and Coorong Fishery) Regulations 2009* which includes:

- The number of permitted cockle rakes increased from 3 to 6.
- The number of onshore agents (crew members) has increased from 4 to 8.
- In Dec 2016, the recreational pipi bag limit on the west coast was reduced to 100.
- As of 1 January 2017, registered masters in the pipi fishery can now operate the licence rather than the licence holder.
- As of 1 July 2017, species names for shellfish were simplified cockles of any species can now be retained.
- As of 15 January 2018, provision for the corporate ownership of licences will come into effect, as will the provision for acceptance of electronic reporting.

Licence conditions have changed so that fishing may only occur for either pips or net fishing (i.e. not at the same time, unless it is the licence holder). This amendment has resulted in more simplified paperwork.

The fishery specific compliance program for the year ending June 2018 and the 2016/17 compliance activity report was provided to the assessment team. The compliance program remains comprehensive, sanctions continue to be applied and only a few offences were detected.

PIRSA are in the process of amending the harvest strategy to include decision rules for high relative biomass estimates that are above what has historically been available.

The Lakes and Coorong Fishery Management Advisory Committee (LCFMAC) has been established and three meetings have been held to date. The purpose of the LCFMAC is to develop strategies, policies and practices that support the sustainable management of the Fishery and deliver on the obligations established under the management plan including an annual review of the performance of the fishery and TACC settings.

The terms of reference for the LCFMAC were provided to the assessment team (Appendix 4). The assessment team noted the membership requirements and that there was no provision for a recreational, indigenous or conservation member. Consideration of these sectors was given during the development of the terms of reference, however, it was noted that there is a conservation representative on the Lakes and Coorong Consultative Committee (LCCC) and that the LCFMAC will invite other representatives to the meetings as required. The LCCC continues to meet and focuses on operational aspects of the fishery.

3.4 Updates on Personnel involved in science, management or industry

A new fishery manager was appointed approximately 12 months ago.

3.5 Changes to the fishing operations and traceability systems

There are currently 16 licences with pipi entitlement, 13 licences that have pipi quota (after transfers) and approximately 10 licences that are actively fishing their quota.

Operational changes include more mechanical grading on the beach to remove undersize pips and postharvest grading is at a finer scale. For example, approximately 60% of the catch is graded into 5 different size grades. All pips except for undersize animals are now retained following a new market for small animals.

Electronic reporting is currently being trialled.

4 Assessment Process

4.1 Assessment Methodologies

The surveillance audit was carried out in accordance with the default assessment tree of the MSC Certification Requirements v1.3 (January 2013), under which the fishery was originally certified. Following the MSC guidelines for implementation timeframes, the surveillance was conducted in accordance with the new process requirements in FCR v2.0.

The issues for the certifier, in addition to checking progress against conditions to close out, is to determine whether a random check on the performance of the fishery verifies continued compliance with the MSC standards and to document the most recent research, landings, and survey trends relating to the fishery.

Table 3. Scheme Documents

MSC Scheme Document	Issue Date
MSC FCR and Guidance v2.0	October 1, 2014
General Certification Requirements v.2.1	February 20, 2015
Surveillance Reporting Template v2.0	

The annual surveillance audit process is comprised of five general parts:

- 1. The certification body provides questions around areas of inquiry to determine if the fishery is maintaining the level of management observed during the original certification.
- The certification body informs stakeholders that they have the opportunity to contribute to the surveillance audit by participating in a face-to-face interview process or by submitting comments in writing. The certification body must inform stakeholders of the opportunity to provide comment at least 30 days before the onsite meeting.
- 3. The surveillance assessment team meets with the fishery client in an opening meeting to allow the client to present the information gathered and to answer questions asked by the surveillance team. The surveillance team can then ask questions about the information provided to ensure full understanding of how well the fishery management system is functioning and if the fishery management system is continuing to meet the MSC standards. Additional interviews are conducted of fishery management and science personnel as well as stakeholders.
- 4. The surveillance team determines if any PIs should be re-scored and presents its findings to the client fishery at the end of the site visit in a closing meeting. The results outline the assessment team's understanding of the information presented and its conclusion regarding the fishery management system's continued compliance with MSC standards.
- 5. The surveillance team submits a draft report to the fishery client and a subsequent final report to the MSC for posting on the MSC website. If there are continued compliance concerns, these

are presented as non-conformances that require further action and audits as specified in the surveillance report.

4.2 MSC Certification and Conditions for Continued Compliance

An MSC certificate is valid for a period of 5 years. During the certification three conditions were identified (see final report on MSC website).

Each of the conditions were addressed with the client action plan. The action plan includes the actions to be undertaken, responsible parties and timeframe for meeting milestone goals. During this and each surveillance audit, the audit team will check progress against these milestones. The surveillance team will also "spot check" other performance indicators from the original assessment to verify that the fishery is still in compliance with the MSC requirements. Results from the audit are published in the form of a report to the MSC website 60 days after the onsite visit. The client has an opportunity to review the report and respond before publication.

The audit team evaluates progress toward closing conditions as "ahead of target", "on target," or "behind target." This is based on whether there is enough evidence that sufficient progress is being made relative to the client action plan timeframe for milestones. If a "spot check" of Performance Indicators (PIs) reveals that a PI no longer meets all scoring elements of the Scoring Guidepost 80 (SG80), an additional "condition" will be raised that must be addressed within the life of the certificate. In this surveillance audit, no deficiencies were evident and no new conditions raised.

4.3 Consequences for Non-Compliance

Where a fishery is determined to be "behind target" for a condition, the surveillance team will work with the client representatives to determine a new timeframe for closing of the condition within the original certification period and will include interim milestones for completion. The client must provide evidence that the fishery is working toward compliance and identify the reason that the condition timelines are not met. SCS reserves the right to enact 7.4 of the MSC Certification Requirements where a fishery certificate may be revoked or suspended if a condition is not back "on target" within 12 months of falling "behind target" following the MSC certification requirements 27.22.9.

Table 4. Schedule of surveillance audits.

Using Table 5 in CR v 2.0, the overall surveillance level of 2 was determined based on 2 of the 3 conditions being closed out now. Accordingly, a remote surveillance audit frequency will be in place for this fishery. The first year's surveillance audit was conducted onsite. The second surveillance audit will be conducted remotely by conference call.

Surveillance Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
ſ	Domoto	On-site	Off-site	Review of
Z	Remote	surveillance audit	surveillance audit	information

4.4 Consultations

SCS identified relevant stakeholders for this fishery through professional networks and knowledge of the organizations working in the area. A list of individuals from different organizations was compiled including representatives from the government, private sector and non-profit sectors working at regional and national levels. The main form of communication to stakeholders has been via email to personal or organizational email addresses.

An announcement of the surveillance audit onsite meeting to take place in Adelaide, South Australia was published on the MSC website on the 31 August 2017. Stakeholders were informed of the announcements through the MSC website and through email. An audit plan was provided to the client, management and scientists by SCS before the meeting.

No stakeholders requested a private meeting with the team and no stakeholders submitted any comments before the closing of the 30 day consultation period or after the onsite audit.

At the onsite audit the assessment team met with client representatives and a fishery manager from PIRSA (see Table 5).

Table 5. Key Meeting and Attendees

	Meeting Date	Location	Торіс	Attendees
1	9 th October 2017	Adelaide South	Updates about the fishery since re-	Client
		Australia	certification in 2016.	representatives and
			Progress against the three conditions.	representatives of
			Reporting requirements and timelines.	the management
			Consideration for next surveillance audit.	agency.

Name of Attendee	Role	Organisation
Sabine Daume	Lead Auditor, P2 Expert	SCS Global Services/ AquaMeer Pty
		Ltd
Sascha Brand-Gardner	P3 Expert	Consultant, SCS/ AquaMeer Pty Ltd
Neil MacDonald	Client Representative	Southern Fishermen's Association
Tom Robinson	Client	Goolwa PipiCo
Jonathan McPhail	Management	PIRSA

4.5 Harmonization Considerations

There is no fishery in the Lakes and Coorong area that overlaps with this fishery. In South Australia and under the same management regime as this fishery, only the Spencer Gulf King Prawn Fishery is

certified. However, the prawn fishery operates in the Spencer Gulf of South Australia with a very different gear type.

4.6 Assessment Team

The surveillance team consisted of Dr. Sabine Daume and Ms. Sascha Brand-Gardner. Dr. Sabine Daume was the lead auditor during the full re-assessment. Assessment team experience and qualification summaries were provided in the assessment announcement and below.

Dr. Sabine Daume, SCS Global Services (SCS), Sustainable Seafood Program, Regional Representative Australia and New Zealand

Dr. Daume is the Regional Representative for the SCS Sustainable Seafood Program in Australia and New Zealand, which covers MSC, ASC and Fisheries Improvement programs. Since 2009, Dr. Daume has led numerous MSC evaluation audits on behalf of SCS, including several large and controversial assessments, and many in Australia. Dr. Daume is a marine biologist with special expertise in the biology and ecology of exploited marine resources with a particular emphasis on invertebrates. Dr. Daume has more than 20 years' experience working with the Invertebrate fishing and aquaculture industry in Australia and international. Prior to joining SCS, Dr. Daume worked as a Senior Research Scientist at the Research Division of the Department of Fisheries in Western Australia. Dr. Daume led the Western Australian rock lobster, Heard Island and McDonald Islands (HIMI) icefish and toothfish as well as Macquarie Island toothfish assessments, annual surveillances and re-assessments. She also led the Lakes and Coorong re-assessment in 2013 and previous surveillance audits. In 2015 and 2016 she led four new full assessments in Western Australia. Dr. Daume has been trained by the MSC to use the Risk Based Framework (RBF) and the most recent MSC Certification Requirements (v2.0 Oct. 2015). She is a certified lead auditor under the ISO 9001:2008 standard.

Ms. Sascha Brand-Gardner, Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development - Fisheries Division, Western Australia

Ms. Brand-Gardner is a senior fishery manager at the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development - Fisheries Division in Western Australia (WA). She holds an Honours degree in Marine Zoology from the University of Queensland and has more than 15 years of experience in fisheries policy, project management and liaison with the fishing and aquaculture industries in Australia. Prior to this, she worked on several marine research projects related to endangered, threatened and protected species, fishery habitats and aquaculture. Sascha was part of the Western Rock Lobster Fishery management team which was the first fishery in the world to gain MSC sustainability certification. She worked in WA's Fisheries Certification Project team that supported MSC pre-assessments of 50 commercial fisheries and certification of two prawn trawl fisheries and several other invertebrate fisheries. Ms Brand-Gardner completed MSC fishery assessment training in Perth and was the Principle 3 expert for the MSC certification assessment of the Australia Blue Grenadier Fishery in 2015 and the Heard and McDonald Islands and Macquarie Island toothfish re-assessments in 2016.

5 Results

Table 3: Conditions

Condition 1:

	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring	Score	
Performance Indicator(s) & Score(s)	2.5.3	Main impacts of the fishery on these key ecosystem elements can be inferred from existing information and some have been investigated in detail.	75	
Condition	By the fourth surveillance audit the client should provide evidence to the CAB that sufficient data continue to be collected to detect any increase in risk level specifically related to trophic interactions resulting from fishing operations and capture of target and bycatch species.			
Milestones	 By the first surveillance audit the client shall provide evidence to the CAB that an agreement has been reached for the recording of main species taken as bycatch in the routine fishery independent stock monitoring program, from a sampling program designed for at least 3 consecutive years. By the second surveillance audit evidence shall be provided to the CAB that funding has been secured and the work program has been commenced. By the third surveillance audit provide evidence that the work has been conducted, with initial findings. By the fourth surveillance audit a report shall be submitted to the CAB including an assessment of the findings in relation to the trophic risks from the fishery and a plan (including resourcing) for continuing monitoring that may be required of the bycatch taken in fishery-independent surveys. 			
Client action plan	 By the first surveillance audit the client will seek an agreement with SARDI to include by-catch monitoring within the fishery independent assessment surveys. By the second surveillance audit the client will provide by-catch monitoring within the SARDI cost recovered research services. By the third surveillance audit the y-catch information will be incorporated into the fishery survey reporting process. By the fourth surveillance audit an assessment of the by-catch monitoring program will be included into the tri-annual fishery stock assessment report. 			
Progress on Condition [Year 1]	Annual fishery-independe Surveys are conducted thr November, February, Apri In the April 2017 a small n commercial rakes and retu During the November 201	nt surveys have been conducted since 20 ee times during the spring-summer perio I-May. umber of bycatch specimens were collec urned to SARDI for identification (results 7 fishery-independent survey, no bycatc	07/08. od: October- cted from pending). h was	

	observed. By-catch species caught in commercial nets will continue to be recorded during fishery-independent surveys. SFA provided a copy of an email from SARDI (Dr. Ferguson) agreeing to recording bycatch in November 2017, Feb and April 2018 as part of the annual fishery independent surveys. Due to low levels of bycatch, there is currently no specific recording sheet and bycatch data are recorded in the "Comments" column of the main fishery- independent survey data sheet The team discussed the potential to assess the change in risk as part of the ERA review which is scheduled around the fourth year to fully meet the SG 80 of the PI 2.5.3 by that time. Further updates will be provided at the next surveillance audit.
Status of condition	On target

Condition 2

Performance Indicator(s) &	Insert relevant PI number(s)	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring guidepost text	Score		
Score(s)	3.2.2		75		
Condition 2	By the first surveillance audit the client shall demonstrate that processes are in place to ensure that explanations are provided for any actions or lack of action associated with findings and relevant recommendations emerging from research, monitoring, evaluation and review activity.				
Milestones	NA				
Client action plan	By the first surveillance audit the Lakes & Coorong Management Advisory Committee (L&CMAC) will be established. Negotiate with PIRSA / SARDI to provide for recommendations and decisions on TACC setting and fishery performance are published together with fishery management plans and the SARDI Stock Assessment reports on the PIRSA / SARDI website.				
Progress on Condition [Year x]	The LFCMAC has been establ provides a forum whereby al minutes of these meetings to provide documented evidence actions and would be made a The PIRSA/SARDI website has user guide for the fishery tog notice to fishers such as a che explanation for the change. Of facilitates stakeholder under The establishment of the LCF consolidated presentation of stakeholders understanding a	ished and three meetings have been held. I issues can be considered in a timely many ogether with correspondence between the ce of the decision-making processes for ma available on request. Is a section that contains PIRSA's managem gether with SARDI's stock status report. In a ange in TACC, are published on the website Consolidation of information for this fisher standing of the fishery, its management ar "MAC and associated minutes, together with information on the website, fosters intere- as to how the resource is managed. Theref	This MAC ner. The MAC and PIRSA anagement ent plan and addition, any e with an y on the website nd performance. th a ested fore SG80 is met		

	for PI 3.2.2 scoring issue (d) and this performance indicator has been rescored at 85.				
Status of condition	Closed				
Performance	Insert relevant PI	Insert relevant scoring issue/ scoring	Score		
Indicator(s) &	number(s)	guidepost text			
Score(s)	3.2.5		70		
Condition 3	By the second surveillance au subject to regular internal an	ıdit the client shall ensure that the manage d occasional external review.	ement system is		
Milestones	NA				
	By the first surveillance audit	the Lakes & Coorong Management Adviso	ry Committee		
	(L&CMAC) will be established	l.			
Client action plan					
	By the second surveillance audit the L&CMAC TOR to provide for it to undertake an				
	performance targets				
	The LCFMAC has been establ	ished and three meetings have been held.	The LCFMAC		
terms of reference (TOR) explicitly provides for an annual assessment of the fi					
	management plan against its	objectives and performance targets (Appe	ndix 4- clause 4		
	(a) (ii)). Further, management plan obligations and review of the harvest strategy are a				
	standing agenda item that w	II be addressed at the MAC meetings which	h will occur at		
Progress on	least twice per year and ther	eby provide for a regular review of this par	t of the		
Condition [Year 1]	management system.				
	The establishment of the LCF	MAC and its associated TOR has strengtheir	ned the fishery		
	against this performance ind	icator. The management system is now sub	Ject to regular		
	review. Therefore SG80 is met for PI 3.2.5 scoring issue (b) and this performance				
		at 60.			
Status of condition	Closed				

6 References

EconSearch 2016. Lakes and Coorong Pipi Fishery Gross Margin Model: 2017/18.PIRSA pp. 21.

Ferguson, G.J. and Hooper, G.E (2017) Assessment of the South Australian Pipi (*Donax deltoides*) Fishery in 2016/17. Fishery Assessment Report for PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide. SARDI Publication No. F2007/000550-2. SARDI Research Report Series No. 957. 47pp.

Lakes & Coorong Management Advisory Committee Terms of Reference. PIRSA pp4 (see Appendix 4).

Letter from PIRSA to Southern Fishermen's Association re SARDI advice note on biological performance indicators used in the Pipi harvest strategy to inform the annual total allowable commercial catch for the Fishery for 2017/18. PIRSA 15 May 2017.

Pipi Fishery – 16/17 Compliance Update. PIRSA 2017.

Ferguson, G.J. and Ward, T.M. (2014) Support for harvesting strategy development for South Australia's Lakes and Coorong Fishery for pipi (Donax deltoides). Fisheries Research and Development Corporation Final Report, 2008/008, SARDI Aquatic Sciences, Adelaide, 121

McLachlan, A., Dugan, J.E. Defeo, O., Ansell, A.D., Hubbard, D.M., Jaramillo E. and Penchaszadeh P. E. (1996) "Beach clam fisheries." Oceanography Marine Biology Annual Review 34: 163-232.

7 Appendices

7.1 Appendix 1. Re-scoring evaluation tables

PI 3.2	.2	The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery under assessment.				
Scoring	g Issue	SG 60	SG 80	SG 100		
a	Cuidepost Met?	There are some decision-making processes in place that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives. Y As noted under 3.2.1 the management strategies strategy (PIRSA 2016) in catch (TACC) setting and timeline. An annual, fish relative biomass of legal Minister (or delegate) has quota unit on an annual <i>Management (Lakes and</i> formal management cor consultation with indust To date, the Lakes and C been central to this cons correspondence betwee rigor of this consultation processes.	There are established decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives. Y ere is a pipi harvest strateg to achieve the fishery spe cludes clear decision rules I sets out an annual TACC ery-independent survey, or -sized Pipi, underpins the as responsibility for deterr basis and setting the TACC d Coorong Fishery) Regular mmittee, PIRSA manages to ry. Coorong Fishery Managem sultation process. The assess in the Steering Committee in process and the effective	gy in place that specifies cific objectives. The harvest of or total allowable commercial decision making process and conducted to determine the harvest strategy for pipi. The mining the kilogram value of a C under the <i>Fisheries</i> <i>tions 2009</i> . In the absence of a he harvest strategy in ent Plan Steering Committee has essment team was provided with and PIRSA which confirms the eness of the decision-making		

PI 3.2	.2	The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery under assessment.			
	ustification	With the adoption of the new LCF Management Plan in March 2016, the Steering Committee's role has effectively been completed. The Management Plan proposes that a Lakes and Coorong Management Advisory Committee be established, to oversee management of the harvest strategy including engagement in the decision-making processes on the TACC. The Management Plan prescribes that, when established, the Committee will meet annually to consider the results of the fishery-independent survey and other information on biological and economic indicators. Following this meeting PIRSA will provide recommendation to the Minister or their delegate on the level of the TACC. The current decision-making processes, which will be enhanced by the proposed Management Advisory Committee expected to be established by May 2016, results in measures and strategies to achieve the fishery-specific objectives the			
b	Guidepost	Decision-making processes respond to serious issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take some account of the wider implications of decisions.	Decision-making processes respond to serious and other important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions.	Decision-making processes respond to all issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and take account of the wider implications of decisions.	
	Met?	Y	Y	N	

PI 3.2	.2	The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery under assessment.
		The pipi harvest strategy includes clear decision rules for TACC setting and sets out
		an annual TACC decision making process and timeline. It is clear how management
		will respond to serious stock issues in the pipi fishery.
		Industry have highlighted a lack of transparency in the development of the nature
		and level of services (policy, legal, licensing, compliance, stock assessment and
		monitoring) and therefore the industry costs associated with the LCF and with
		some of the processes involved in seeking Ministerial decision on key fisheries
		management issues (e.g. advice on pipi quota levels).
		Despite this, the management system has demonstrated that it is capable of
		responding to serious issues. The early development of a separate harvest strategy
		to protect pipi stocks from over-exploitation is a prime example of this. Further,
		the management system has demonstrated its capacity to respond to time-bound
		recommendations and conditions, including those relating to pipis, made on the
		fishery by the Commonwealth Department of the Environment as a result of the
		LCF's assessment sunder the EPBC Act.
		Decisions are taken in the context of the Management Plan for the LCF. This Plan
		requires consideration of a range of factors including the management objectives
		for the target species and the interests of fishers that depend on the fishery for a
		livelihood as well as other users of the resource, including recreational and
		Indigenous fishers. However, the absence of a formal management committee for
		the Pipi sector of the LCF does reduce confidence that the decision-making
		processes are responsive to all issues as they arise. The lack of documented
		records of the process by which decisions are arrived at, and the matters taken
		into account, means that it is difficult to determine how the requirements for
		decision making, the pipi harvest strategy are implemented in practice.
		The LCF's decision-making processes can and do respond to serious and other
		important issues identified in relevant research, monitoring, evaluation and
		consultation, in a transparent, timely and adaptive manner and they take account
		of the wider implications of decisions and SGs 60 and 80 are met. However, the
		absence of documentation on decision making means that it is not possible to
	ы	assess whether the fishery responds in such a way to all such issues. It is expected
	cati	that this issue will be addressed in large part by the establishment of the Lakes
	stifi	and Coorong Management Advisory Committee however until such time as this
	Ju	occurs it is considered that the fishery does not meet the requirements of SG 100.

		The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes				
PI 3.2	.2	that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate				
		approach to actual dispute	es in the fishery under asses	sment.		
с		Decision-making				
			processes use the			
	st		precautionary			
	oda		approach and are			
	uide		based on best available			
	Ū		information.			
	Met?		Y			
		The Management Plan f	or the LCF is made under t	he FMA 2007 which prescribes		
		the use of the precautio	nary approach. The pipi ha	arvest strategy promotes a		
		precautionary approach	to the management of pip	pis for example through the		
		adoption of a conservati	ve target reference point.			
		As input to the developr	ment of the new Managem	nent Plan an ESD risk assessment		
		of the LCF was conducte	d in 2011 using the Natior	nal ESD Reporting Framework for		
		Fisheries (Fletcher et al.	2002). The methodology	adopted, defaults to the highest		
		risk rating in the absence of information to inform an assessment of risk. This is				
		consistent with a precautionary approach.				
		The management system uses an annual fishery independent survey to undernin				
		the decision-making process for pipis. This ensures that management of target				
		stocks is based on the best available advice. Byproduct and bycatch species were				
	ç	assessed under the ESD risk assessment and no species were assessed as higher				
	atio	than a negligible or low	risk (PIRSA 2011).			
	tific	Decision-making process	ses use the precautionary	approach and are based on best		
	Sul	available information an	d SG 80 is met.			
d		Some information on	me information on Information on fishery Formal reporting to all			
		fishery performance	performance and	interested stakeholders		
		and management	management action is	provides comprehensive		
		action is generally	available on request,	information on fishery		
		available on request	performance and management			
		to stakeholders.	actions and describes how the			
		actions or lack of management system				
		action associated with responded to findings a findings and relevant responded to findings and relevant				
		Tindings and relevant recommendations emerging from research				
			emerging from	monitoring, evaluation and		
	energing nom		research. monitoring.	review activity.		
	ide		evaluation and review			
	Gu		activity.			
	Met?	Y	Y	Ν		

PI 3.2.2	The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery under assessment.			
	Information on fishery performance and management action in the LCF and the			
	pipi fishery is available from a number of sources. These include:			
	the website of the PIRSA/SARDI Fisheries Division which contains:			
	 the Management plan for the LCF 			
	 a register of entitlement holders in the LCF 			
	 the Cost Recovery Policy that applies to the LCF and other South Australian managed fisheries 			
	 links to the legislation applying to the LCF 			
	 copies of economic indicator reports for the LCF 			
	 Notices to fishers 			
	 Stock assessment reports for pipis 			
	 information and statistics reports on south Australian fisheries including the LCF 			
Justification	 the website of the SFA which contains information on the operation the LCF and details of initiatives and advice provided by the SFA to members; the website of the Commonwealth Department of the Environment whi contains PIRSA's reassessment submissions to the Department and findings including conditions and recommendations for improv performance under the EPBC Act. 			
	Consolidation of information for this fishery on the PIRSA/SARDI website facilitates stakeholder understanding of the fishery, its management and performance. Information on infringements of fishery rules and regulations is provided to the LCCC. While this information is not readily available to the general public there is broad stakeholder engagement on the LCCC and this information would be made available to others upon request. The LFCMAC provides a forum whereby all issues can be considered in a timely manner. It ensures that a process is in place to demonstrate in a transparent way how and why decisions are taken on the LCF. The minutes of these meetings together with correspondence between the LFCMAC and PIRSA provide documented evidence of the decision-making processes for management actions and would be made available on request. The LCFMAC together with a consolidated presentation of information on the website, fosters interested stakeholders understanding as to how the resource is managed. Therefore, SG60 and SG80 are met.			

PI 3.2	.2	The fishery-specific management system includes effective decision-making processes that result in measures and strategies to achieve the objectives, and has an appropriate approach to actual disputes in the fishery under assessment.			
e	Guidepost	Although the management authority or fishery may be subject to continuing court challenges, it is not indicating a disrespect or defiance of the law by repeatedly violating the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability for the fishery.	The management system or fishery is attempting to comply in a timely fashion with judicial decisions arising from any legal challenges.	The management syste fishery acts proactively avoid legal disputes or implements judicial dec arising from legal challe	m or to rapidly tisions enges.
	Met?	Y	Y	Y	
	Justification	The fishery is operated by the management authority, PIRSA Fisheries Division, within the legal framework described under Indicator 3.1.1. There is no evidence that there is a repeated violation of the same law or regulation necessary for the sustainability for the fishery. There are no legal challenges to the management system. PIRSA acts proactively to avoid disputes through the inclusion of the fishing industry in consultation on key management matters, promoting a co- management approach to management of the fishery and providing fishers, and particularly new entrants to the fishery with information on the responsibilities and obligations in respect of fishery rules and regulations. The management authority does not disrespect or defy the law and there are no legal challenges to the management system. The system acts proactively to avoid logal disputes. Sec 60, 80 and 100 are met			
Refere	nces	Fletcher <i>et al.,</i> 2002; PIR	SA, 2011; PIRSA, 2016.		
OVERA Overal	OVERALL PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SCORE: 85 Overall 85 (four scoring issues at SG80 and one at SG100) 85			85	

PI 3.2.5

		There is a system of monitoring and evaluating the performance of the fishery-specific					
PI 3.2	.5	management system against its objectives					
		There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system					
Scoring	g Issue	SG 60	SG 80	SG 100			
а		The fishery has in	The fishery has in place	The fishery has in place			
	st	place mechanisms to	mechanisms to	mechanisms to evaluate all			
	oda	evaluate some parts	evaluate key parts of	parts of the management			
	uide	of the management	the management	system.			
	ſ	system.	system				
	Met?	Y	Υ	Ν			
		Section 49 of the FMA 2	007 requires that new Ma	nagement Plans developed			
		under the Act must be s	ubject to review every five	e years and empowers the			
		Minister to review a mai	nagement plan at any time	e. The LCF Management Plan,			
		provides for a three-year review. The pipi Harvest Strategy is also subject to review					
		after three years.					
		Compliance risk assessm	ents are reviewed annual	y and new compliance plans			
		developed in response t	o those assessments.				
		Currently there is no for	mal process to review rese	earch needs in the fishery.			
		Similarly, while manager	ment changes are made in	response to identified problems			
		in the fishery this approach does not comprise an ongoing evaluation of the					
	uo	management system.					
	cati	There are mechanisms in	n place to evaluate key, bu	it not all, parts of the			
	stifi	management system, therefore SG 60 and 80 are met but SG100 is not.					
	nſ						
b		The fishery-specific	The fishery-specific	The fishery-specific			
	st	management system	management system is	management system is subject			
	oda	is subject to	subject to regular	to regular internal and external			
	uide	occasional internal	internal and occasional	review.			
	Ū	review.	external review.				
	Met?	Y	Y	Ν			

PI 3.2.5		There is a system of monitoring and evaluating the performance of the fishery-specific management system against its objectives			
		There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system			
	Justification	There is effective and timely review of the fishery-specific management system The LCFMAC was established in 2016 and the terms of reference (TOR) explicitly provide for an annual assessment of the fishery management plan against its objectives and performance targets (Appendix 4- clause 4 (a) (ii)). This ensures that the management system is subject to regular review. Further, review of the harvest strategy is a standing agenda item that will be addressed at the MAC meetings which will occur at least twice per year and thereby provide for a regular review of this part of the management system. Research is subject to internal review within SARDI. Occasional external review of some aspects of the management system occurs through the DEH assessments under the EPBC Act. These assessments address the effectiveness of the system in sustaining target and bycatch species and managing broader ecosystem impacts and interactions with ETP species. However, they do not review the research plan nor do they assess the effectiveness of the system in delivering against some of the objectives of the Management Plan e.g. optimum utilisation and equitable distribution of fisheries resources or cost-effective and participative governance of the fishery. There is no requirement in place for external peer review of research conducted for the LCF. The current harvest strategy for Pipis has not been externally reviewed. The fishery-specific management system is subject to regular internal review and some aspects are subject to occasional external review. Therefore SG 60 and SG 80 are met.			
Refere	nces				
OVERA	LL PERFOR	MANCE INDICATOR SCORE:	80		
Overal	l 80 (both s	scoring issue at SG80).	00		

7.2 Appendix 3. Response to Stakeholder submissions

No stakeholder submissions were received

7.3 Appendix 4. Surveillance audit information – The Lakes & Coorong Management Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

LAKES & COORONG FISHERY MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Primary Industries and Regions South Australia (PIRSA) has released its policy on *Co-management of fisheries in South Australia* and has commissioned advice from PJ Neville on an "Audit of Comanagement status of South Australian Commercial Fisheries". Based on both of those documents there is support for progressive devolution of co-management functions to industry bodies in South Australia.

The following outlines the approach adopted for the management of the Lakes & Coorong Fishery (the Fishery) by the PIRSA and the recognised co-management groups (the Industry Bodies). The recognised co-management groups are the Southern Fishermen's Association and the Goolwa Pipi Company or their recognised replacements. This model is based upon the Fishery having a management plan, approved by the Minister, together with approved harvest strategies for the net and pipi sectors that set out the rules for determining annual allocations.

1. PURPOSE

- a. To establish the Lakes & Coorong Fishery Management Advisory Committee (the Committee) to provide a forum for the development of fishery management strategies, policies and practices that supports the sustainable management of the Fishery, in keeping with the principles within the *Fisheries Management Act 2007* (the Act) and relevant subordinate legislation.
- b. The Committee will-
 - Oversee the performance of the Fishery against the obligations established under the Fishery's management plan;
 - Monitor the Fishery's performance against the agreed indicators within the Pipi and finfish harvest strategies;
 - Recommend the annual allocation of effort / catch for the Fishery relative to the decision rules established within the Pipi and finfish harvest strategies;
 - Recommend services, programs and the associated costs as part of the licence fee setting process;
 - Recommend administrative, policy or legislative changes to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the Fishery; and
 - vi. Recommend consultative approaches under co-management services.

2. MEMBERSHIP

- a. The Committee be comprised of-
 - Two (2) Industry members (voting) one from each of the Industry Representative Bodies
 - ii. One (1) PIRSA Fisheries representative (voting)
 - iii. One (1) SARDI representative (voting)
 - iv. One (1) Independent Chairman (non-voting)

Page 1 of 4

- v. Two (2) Industry support officers (e.g. Association EO or Independent Chair) (non voting)
- vi. Committee Services Officer (non-voting)

Members will be entitled to nominate a proxy.

Other members may be added to the Committee by agreement between the Industry Bodies and PIRSA.

It is intended that wherever possible the Committee reach decisions by consensus of all the members regardless of the voting rights.

3. SELECTION

- a. Other than in its first year, members of the Committee will be selected on the basis of their role as an expert rather than as a representative, as follows-
 - Industry Members These members will be selected following a call to all licence holders and owners to register an interest in being a member. Applicants will be evaluated against the following criteria-
 - Must be either a licence holder or shareholder in an company associated with a licence in the Fishery or a contractor / employee of the Industry Bodies;
 - Must have an understanding of current fisheries management processes;
 - Must have an understanding of the nature of fishing operations within the Fishery;
 - ii. Industry members will be appointed for a three year term;
 - iii. The applicants will be evaluated by a selection committee comprised of the Independent Chair a person appointed by each of the Industry Bodies with recommendations being made to the Industry Bodies before the end of May in each year (excluding the commencement year).
 - PIRSA and SARDI Members These members will be determined by nomination from the Director of Fisheries.
 - Independent Chair The position will be filled by agreement between the Industry Bodies and PIRSA.
 - vi. Committee Services Officer The position will be appointed by the Industry Bodies.

4. OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

- a. The Committee will meet at least twice per year:
 - It will consider advice on the Fishery's performance against the principles and decision rules in the harvest strategies and then make a recommendation in relation to the annual allocation for the following

season. This should be done by early May and no later than 31 May each year.

- ii. It will also consider any operational matters (e.g. policy, licence condition or legislative changes, including cost recovery). In addition it will monitor and review the performance standards for the Fishery within the management plan, at least annually;
- iii. The Committee will determine processes under the co-management extension services for effective consultation and communication with all the licence holders; or
- iv. Address as required the need for management reforms.
- b. The Committee should meet in person where practical, but may meet by electronic means as agreed by its members in order to progress matters of business.
- c. Where it meets electronically, the members should confirm the nature of any agreements or recommendations or dissenting decision by way of written (email) confirmation within 24 hours of such a meeting.
- d. Members should be provided with a notice of meeting at least two weeks prior to any meeting. The agenda papers are to be provided at least one week prior to the meeting.
- e. The agenda will be prepared by the Committee Support Officer in conjunction with the Chair. The inclusion of late agenda items will be subject to the approval of the Chair.
- f. Members should be provided with draft meeting outcomes and action list no later than two weeks after the meeting, except where the Chair agrees to vary that time.
- g. The Director of Fisheries shall be provided with a Chairman's Report no later than one week after the meeting, including details of the nature of any consideration of matters and any agreed outcomes from that meeting.
- h. Decisions of the Committee shall, wherever possible, be achieved by consensus. Where consensus is not possible the Chair shall advise the Director of Fisheries and seek to hold a further meeting to address any remaining matters within two weeks of the initial meeting. Where no consensus is possible then the majority view will be provided to the Director together with a summary of the views of the nonconsenting voting member(s) and the views of the non-voting members.
- Decisions must be made based upon the principles contained within the harvest strategy and decision rules. For other matters decisions must be made on the principles contained within the Act.
- j. Members will be required to abide by confidentiality provisions relating to the nature and details of any decisions or considerations of the Committee. Failure to comply with the confidentiality provisions will ultimately lead to removal of the member from the Committee where it is not possible to mitigate the adverse behaviour.
- Matters requiring the approval of the Minister or their delegate must remain confidential until they have been approved and agreed for release.
- The Industry and PIRSA/SARDI members will meet their own costs for attendance at meetings and associated costs. The Chair will have their costs covered by the

Industry based upon an agreed daily / meeting rate and agreed associated costs. The Committee Service Officer's costs shall be met by the Industry.

m. The Committee will determine the information that may be released to the Industry as a result of any decisions, recommendations and actions implemented by the Committee.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISION MAKING

a. The Committee will provide recommendations to the Director of Fisheries who will provide advice to the Committee on the acceptance or otherwise of recommendations in a timely manner.

6. IMPLEMENTATION

- a. In keeping with the Act's obligations for cost effective and efficient services all recommendations approved by the Director (where the Director holds the necessary rights or delegations) will be actioned immediately where practical or necessary for the good administration of the Fishery. Any action to be implemented should not be delayed beyond two months of such agreement without the Committee's endorsement.
- b. All service providers funded under the cost recovery process will provide an annual report to the Committee setting out the nature and extent of activities undertaken relative to the requirements of the service agreement, together with any documentation required under their service agreement.
- c. The Committee will work with the Industry Bodies and all licence holders under the co-management funded processes to ensure there is effective consultation and communication between it and the members of the industry. The Industry Bodies shall provide advice to the Committee on matters referred to the industry for comment or advice.
- d. The Committee will provide an annual report to the Director and the Industry summarising its activities for the year.

7.4 Appendix 6. Revised Surveillance Program (if necessary)

Table 6. Surveillance level rationale

Year	Surveillance activity	Number of auditors	Rationale
2	Remote audit	2 auditors	During the re-assessment using Table C3 in CR v1.3, the overall surveillance frequency score of 1 was assigned allowing for remote surveillance. The first audit was conducted onsite and 2 conditions were closed out. The last remaining condition is not due to be closed out until the fourth surveillance audit.

Table 10. Fishery Surveillance Program

Surveillance Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
Level 4	On-site	Off-site	Off-site	On-site surveillance
	surveillance	surveillance	surveillance	audit & re-certification
	audit	audit	audit	site visit.