

Minutes

Line & Trap Harvest Strategy Working Group meeting 4

Details

Location: Surry Hills, NSW 2010
Date: 13-14 November 2023
Chairperson: Ian Cartwright

7. Mitchell Sanders, Commercial Fishing Member (day 2)
8. Stephen McGuire, Commercial Fishing Member (day 2)
9. John Stewart, DPI Fisheries Scientist Member
10. Darren Hale, DPI Fisheries Manager Member
11. Nicholas Giles, DPI Fisheries Harvest Strategy Manager Member
12. Aaron Puckeridge, Executive Officer
13. Rowan Chick, DPI Observer
14. Ashley Fowler, DPI Observer
15. Karen Astles, DPI Guest Presenter
16. Philip Bolton, DPI Guest Presenter (Agenda item 4)

Attendees

1. Tony Smith, Independent Scientist
2. Sevaly Sen, Independent Economist
3. Brad Gibson, Recreational Fishing Member (day 2)
4. Ian Puckeridge, Recreational Fishing Member (day 2)
5. James Norris, Recreational Fishing Member (day 2)
6. Daniel Stewart, Commercial Fishing Member (day 2)

Apologies

Chad Lunow, QLD DAF Observer

This Meeting:

No.	Issue	Action
1	Acknowledgement of country and introduction	The Chair opened the meeting with an Acknowledgment of Country, paying respect to the traditional owners of the land on which the Line & Trap Harvest Strategy Working Group (the Working Group) was meeting and paying respect to Elders past, present, and emerging. The Working Group also acknowledged that they would continue to consult with the <u>Aboriginal Fishing Advisory Council (AFAC)</u> while developing the harvest strategies, to ensure cultural fishing objectives are correctly incorporated.
2	Action items review	The Executive Officer (EO) updated the Working Group on the progress of the ongoing action items:

2.1 NSW DPI is to discuss with Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (QLD DAF) the capacity of completing Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) on behalf of the Working Group. NSW DPI will also explore any other viable options for completing MSE

As discussed at [meeting 3](#) (11–12 September 2023), NSW DPI has been discussing MSE with QLD DAF scientists who are creating an updated Snapper (*Chrysophrys auratus*) stock assessment for the east coast biological stock, which will not be available to use in MSE modelling until November 2024. To address stock assessment and MSE sooner, NSW DPI plan to develop a NSW Snapper stock assessment model which will be able to service the MSE needs of the Snapper harvest strategy. This may be available to update the Working Group in mid-2024. Yellowtail Kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*) will likely be more challenging to complete model based MSE for, as there is ongoing research into stock structure and stock assessment and MSE approaches are being discussed further. This action item will be closed, as Action item 3.3 covers the Working Group's MSE requirements.

3.1 The Chair is to write to the Deputy Director General (DDG) regarding meeting arrangements

The Chair sent the letter to the DDG on 29 September 2023. The DDG approved the approved hybrid meeting arrangements, and the Working Group was informed of the arrangements.

3.2 The EO is to provide each meeting's Chair's Summary to the [Aboriginal Fishing Advisory Council \(AFAC\)](#) for noting

Chair's Summaries will be distributed to AFAC through the DPI Aboriginal Fisheries Management team into the future. The [meeting 3 Chair's Summary](#) and a link to the [Working Group webpage](#) have been provided.

3.3 NSW DPI are to schedule an MSE discussion agenda item at a future Working Group meeting

An MSE agenda item will be better placed once assessment methods and operational objectives have been defined. This action item will remain open until then.

3.4 NSW DPI are to consider the FishPath results and develop a list of viable data collection and management options with comments on their feasibility and efficacy for consideration of the Working Group

NSW DPI have completed the internal results narrowing process. This will be discussed with the Working Group during Agenda items 6 and 9.

3.5 NSW DPI are to provide the Working Group with an update on the NSW Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) process and describe some key factors likely to influence the ERA, with respect to the harvest strategies being developed

NSW DPI scheduled an ERA update at Agenda item 3.

3.6 NSW DPI are to provide the Working Group with an update on the project *Developing a Recreational Fishing Management Strategy for Recreational Fishing in NSW guided by an Environmental Assessment*

NSW DPI scheduled an update on the project at Agenda item 4.

3.7 NSW DPI are to update the harvest strategy drafts based on Working Group comments

The harvest strategy drafts were updated and distributed in the meeting 4 briefing package.

- 3** NSW ERA process
- NSW DPI provided an overview of its approach to ERA's, and noted that while some jurisdictions assess unmitigated risk, NSW DPI incorporates management arrangements to assess the likelihood of not achieving management objectives. This approach is consistent with the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) 31000:2018 risk management guidelines.
- The developing ERA for the Snapper and Kingfish harvest strategies will focus on ecological objectives, and economic and social objectives may be incorporated in the future as information improves. Specifically, this will consider risk posed by and to the fishery caused by fishing activities and non-fishing human activities.
- For an ERA to be developed, NSW DPI and the Working Group will consider the following factors:
- The scope and objectives the ERA will analyse. These can include the broad objectives of relevant legislation and narrower objectives established by the harvest strategies
 - The ecological components that will be the focus of the analysis. This would include the Snapper and Kingfish stocks as a minimum
 - The risk tolerance that is deemed acceptable before intervention is required

- The expected outcome of management controls, existing and implemented by the harvest strategies, to mitigate risks and achieve objectives

Discussion:

The Working Group discussed the process for ERA development and additional factors that will need to be considered:

- Ongoing projects such as the Recreational Fishing Management Strategy for Recreational Fishing in NSW guided by an Environmental Assessment will likely identify risks but are at a high level and not entirely complementary to an ERA. An ERA may respond to this project if it recommends or implements any management changes
- Impacts from other jurisdictions are important for Snapper and Kingfish and should be incorporated, although these are beyond the direct control of NSW DPI, and they will likely be incorporated into the ERA as an unquantified consideration in the final risk profile
- While further information is needed to analyse social and cultural objectives in an ERA, the ERA may be able to examine ecological objectives which would broadly support social and cultural outcomes. For example, the NSW Lobster Fishery Harvest Strategy includes nearshore Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE) as a secondary indicator to monitor the stock's accessibility for recreational and Aboriginal cultural fishers
- If the ERA was to analyse fish stocks at a fishery level, there are currently no specific objectives for by-product and Ocean Trap and Line Fishery (OTLF) non-quota primary and secondary species. Further work would be required to develop these
- The NSW Government has previously completed environmental assessments for commercial fisheries, as well as broad risk assessments including the Marine Estate Management Authority's (MEMA) state-wide Threat and Risk Assessment (TARA). The ERA scope will be more specific (higher resolution) than that of the TARA and would complement those assessments
- The ERA develops the framework for an Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) risk assessment using ecological components in the first instance. An ERA, whilst complex, is less so than an ESD risk assessment, which would consider the full suite of ESD components including economic and social factors

4 Recreational Fishing Management Strategy for Recreational Fishing in NSW guided by an Environmental Assessment

NSW DPI introduced the agenda item and provided background on the Recreational Fishing Management Strategy for Recreational Fishing in NSW guided by an Environmental Assessment project.

Under the *Fisheries Management Act 1994* (the Act), ‘designated fishing activities’ are required to have a Fishery Management Strategy (FMS) and Environmental Assessment (EA). As a result, many fisheries and fisheries-based activities in NSW have been subject to an EA process which has then guided development of an FMS. This has promoted a focus on ensuring that fishing activities are ecologically sustainable and has provided a strategy to address and manage activities that present risk and impact on the aquatic environment.

While there are long established management policies, and a regulatory framework to manage the recreational fishery, the recreational fishery in NSW is not a ‘designated fishing activity’ and has therefore not had an EA and FMS developed. This project has proactively undertaken an EA to facilitate development of a recreational FMS, to ensure the recreational fishery operates sustainably.

The EA is being completed similarly to the MEMA’s state-wide TARA and is identifying how activities may affect 3 components: firstly, environmental assets, secondly social and economic benefits, and thirdly Aboriginal cultural impacts. The first 2 components have been developed to final draft stages and the Aboriginal cultural engagement phase is currently underway to gather additional evidence, better understand impacts, and ensure the EA risk scoring is appropriate. The EA is also being completed in 2 stages, and once the first saltwater stage is completed, a freshwater assessment will be carried out.

The EA has identified several key threats and while progressing the complete process, work on developing management responses to key threats has begun. This includes promoting responsible fishing practices and providing gear to reduce environmental impacts. The EA development process has also interacted with harvest strategy working groups to fill management gaps where needed.

Once the EA has been completed for the 3 components, the recreational FMS will be drafted.

Discussion:

The Working Group discussed the project’s relation to harvest strategy development:

- Any management actions included in the recreational management strategy may be relevant to the risk landscape of the harvest strategies, affecting the ERA output
- While the EA is assessing recreational fishing impacts in 3 broad components, the harvest strategy and ERA may break this down further. For example, the charter fishery component of the recreational sector has different economic drivers which pose different risks and may require tailored management

5 Fishery level harvest strategy discussion

NSW DPI introduced the agenda item and noted that the Working Group is considering complexities associated with managing multi species fisheries, and potentially developing a fishery level harvest strategy. Since meeting 3, NSW DPI has extensively discussed the fishery level harvest strategy development and acknowledged it could take 2 forms. The first, a simpler strategy outlining the high-level objectives of line and trap fishing activities. The second, a strategy which incorporates monitoring arrangements and operational objectives, to enact decision rules for multiple fish stocks captured by line and trap fishing activities.

NSW DPI requested the Working Group’s advice on whether developing a fishery level harvest strategy should be continued, postponed, or abandoned noting the following key points:

Benefits of a fishery level harvest strategy:

- Providing guidance for a cohesive harvest strategy framework to ensure individual strategies do not conflict
- Avoiding duplication and streamlining harvest strategy development
- Providing best practice fisheries management for more species
- Supporting sustainability certifications (such as from the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)) for the fishing industry and others
- Incorporating issues such as resource sharing into the policy framework

Alternatives to a fishery level harvest strategy:

- Modifying existing NSW policy could also support a cohesive harvest strategy framework, incorporate emerging fisheries issues, and support future harvest strategy development
- Broadening the scope of single species harvest strategies, to include companion species and positive or negative outcomes from target species harvest

- Waiting until there is more external research and examples to work from

Discussion:

The Working Group noted that many of the fishery level issues can be managed external to harvest strategies, as a harvest strategy’s purpose is to manage harvest, rather than broader issues surrounding fishery management. Furthermore, there are several available paths to consider fishery level issues and exploring these are a necessary component of the Working Group’s role and will help shape the direction of multi-species management in NSW.

An operational fishery level harvest strategy could be addressed by creating 2 method-based fishery level harvest strategies as an overarching component of the harvest strategy framework, one for line methods and one for trap methods. Alternately, species level harvest strategies could be developed to consider interactions between species taken by the same or similar methods, including decision rules that directly control harvest of each of the interacting species.

The Working Group noted that while fishery level issues need to be addressed, further consideration of how best to achieve this is needed. The Working Group recommended prioritising the development of the Snapper and Kingfish harvest strategies and while these develop, documenting options for fishery level management. The Working Group will ultimately produce a recommendation for the NSW DPI executive, identifying fishery level management options for the Line & Trap fishery and key considerations and trade-offs of those options. This may also include advice on existing policy documents.

Action items:

- 4.1 During the Working Group’s lifespan (before 12 February 2026), the Working Group is to create a document to brief the NSW DPI executive on fishery level management options for the broader Line & Trap fishery

<p>6 Technical review of FishPath results</p>	<p>NSW DPI provided the Working Group updates to the FishPath process. At <u>meeting 3</u> NSW DPI presented the shortlisted results for the Working Group to discuss, and NSW DPI have since documented their perspectives on the efficacy and feasibility of the shortlisted viable management controls and data collection options. This analysis is an extension of a typical FishPath process and likely one of the final outputs of the technical component of the FishPath process (noting NSW DPI will complete the assessment options later and update the Working Group). The</p>
--	---

shortlisted options for data collection and management measures provide the Working Group with a viable, documented list of options to inform the structure of the harvest strategy, supported by stakeholder input. Notes on the efficacy and feasibility of these options provided to the Working Group, provides the foundation for discussing and adopting complementary groups of options and incorporating these into the developing harvest strategies. NSW DPI may revisit, present, and further explore shortlisted management controls, to support the Working Group's adoption of controls into drafts of the harvest strategies.

A primary consideration of the Working Group will be whether the harvest strategies use catch or effort limits as the primary control of harvest, and how these are applied through decision rules. The use of other indirect controls such as bag and trip limits, spatial controls and temporal controls also needs to be considered.

Discussion:

The Working Group discussed harvest controls, recognising that management of harvest under all potential stock conditions, from depleted to above the target must be considered. The Working Group also noted this is a preliminary discussion of available management options which will be further explored in Agenda items 8–9 and in future meetings. The Working Group made the following points in initial discussion of catch controls:

- If a Total Allowable Catch (TAC) was implemented to limit total catch, catches could be managed through a competitive (Olympic) system or an Individual Transferrable Quota (ITQ), noting that commercial fishing members have expressed concern around ITQ's, as many small OTLF businesses faced financial strain during the 2019 Commercial Fisheries Business Adjustment Program
- If a competitive catch allowance was in place, measures to balance the progression of catch may be considered, although there are positives and negatives to managing this. This could be in the form of trip limits, or temporal controls on the TAC, phasing catch over time to prevent 'rushing'
- The Working Group discussed how the recreational sector may be integrated into a total catch allocation. Near time recreational data collection options are being examined for Eastern Rock Lobster (*Sagmariasus verreauxi*) and Mulloway (*Argyrosomus japonicus*), and additional species may be incorporated in the future. While Kingfish and Snapper cannot be immediately incorporated into near time data collection

programs, it may be possible in the future, and the harvest strategies should account for this. If opportunities for near time monitoring did arise, recreational catches could be monitored and managed on a finer scale

- In addition to monitoring and managing total catch, allocating portions of a TAC to the recreational and commercial sectors (resource sharing) will need to be considered to promote shared responsibility from each sector and to address resource sharing issues

Snapper discussion:

The Working Group further discussed harvest control options specific to the Snapper harvest strategy:

- Management options that do not directly control catch such as effort, spatial and temporal controls must be carefully considered as these may affect many species taken in the broader fishery
- Recognising that Snapper populations can have low movements and may be vulnerable to localised depletion in some circumstances, temporal or spatial management controls may complement other controls in some scenarios

Kingfish discussion:

The Working Group discussed data collection and harvest control options specific to the Kingfish harvest strategy:

- If additional monitoring programs were implemented, Kingfish would likely be a higher priority than Snapper, noting greater uncertainty around stock structure, movement, ecology, and stock status
- Kingfish catch controls may be a good management option as they are captured by selective line methods and are understood to have low discard mortality

Noting that the recreational and commercial fishing members were not present for day one, these points were reiterated to gain their perspectives in Agenda items 8–9.

7 Technical review of developing harvest strategy drafts

The Working Group reviewed the developing drafts of the harvest strategies and provided edits on the technical details of the introductory text, goals, objectives, and reference points. These components will be drafted iteratively as related components such as decision rules are yet to be considered.

		The Chair closed day one of the meeting, noting that the full membership would be present for day 2.
8	Day one update	<p>The Chair introduced day 2 of the meeting and noted that the full Working Group membership was now present, and the fishing members were updated on the first day.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The fishing members noted the previous day’s discussions surrounding catch limits and whether a competitive or quota allocated TAC would be more appropriate. To further understand the commercial impact of catch control options, the Working Group requested a catch and economic summary of the OTLF at a future meeting.</p> <p>Similarly for the recreational sector, quantifying the companion species catches for Snapper and Kingfish by recreational fishers would be valuable to better understand the full impact of any management changes.</p> <p>Action items:</p> <p>4.2 NSW DPI are to prepare a summary of commercial OTLF catches by gear type, and market value for the last 10 years to provide an overview of wider relationships associated with managing commercial catches of Snapper or Kingfish</p> <p>4.3 NSW DPI are to prepare a summary of recreational species caught alongside Snapper and Kingfish over the last 10 years to provide an overview of wider relationships associated with managing recreational catches of Snapper or Kingfish</p>
9	FishPath results update	<p>NSW DPI updated the Working Group on the FishPath outputs, as summarised in Agenda item 6.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The Working Group discussed new data collection initiatives, and it was noted that new programs may have high efficacy and provide valuable data but could also have low feasibility including where they may be costly to implement. Any proposed programs need to balance these considerations, with Snapper recruitment surveys being an example of a desirable, likely valuable, yet potentially expensive data collection program.</p> <p>There are opportunities for fisher led data collection programs, noting existing examples. New programs could include voluntary reporting of fish lengths, collecting environmental data, reporting discards, and collecting biological data.</p>

	<p>The Working Group discussed management options, and it was reiterated that the Working Group would need to decide upon a set of harvest controls. This could include a combination of static and dynamic measures, as highlighted in the shortlisted FishPath outputs.</p>
<p>10 Drafting objectives, indicators, and reference points</p>	<p>The Chair introduced the agenda item, and noted a limit reference point of 20% was proposed in <u>meeting 3</u>, and that a target reference point is needed. The Working Group proposed an initial target reference point of 50% of unfished biomass for both the Snapper and Kingfish harvest strategies, as it attempts to balance typical objectives of recreational and commercial sectors and acknowledges potential objectives of the Aboriginal cultural fishing sector. This target reference point will be further discussed throughout the harvest strategy development process.</p> <p>Action items:</p> <p>4.4 NSW DPI are to update the draft harvest strategies based on recommendations by the Working Group</p>
<p>11 Management options for the Snapper Harvest Strategy</p>	<p>The Working Group noted that the NSW regulatory framework allows for a breadth of static and dynamic harvest control options to be considered for the harvest strategies. These can directly control harvest (e.g., a catch limit) or indirectly control harvest by controlling fishing effort or establishing indirect limits (e.g., closed areas and bag limits) to total catch. It was also noted that exploring all potential management options is valuable at this point, even if some options are not desirable, and discussions do not indicate any preferred approach at this early stage.</p> <p>A harvest strategy's primary harvest controls are traditionally either effort or catch based although effort controls (including Individual Transferrable Efforts (ITE's)) are considered proxies for catch and are less direct than catch controls. Additional management options, such as spatial and temporal controls may be used to complement these primary options. Furthermore, the application of any controls will need to be considered for the full spectrum of fish stock health, from below the limit reference point, to above the target reference point. The Working Group commenced discussing harvest control options that could be included in the Snapper harvest strategy, focussing on options for the primary harvest controls for the commercial and recreational fishing sectors:</p>

Commercial harvest control discussion:

While commercial fishing members had expressed reservations around ITQ's (meeting 3), they will be kept amongst all available options for further discussion. ITQ management must be carefully considered following the recent Commercial Fisheries Business Adjustment Program and other management changes, as additional ITQ frameworks may not be considered desirable by some fishers. ITQ's also require a formal allocation process to be undertaken which can be complex. The Working Group discussed the complexities around allocation processes:

- Commercial fishing members noted that since the announcement of harvest strategy development for Snapper and Kingfish, some operators could have pre-empted a quota allocation process and intensified their fishing effort to build a stronger catch history. Quota allocation processes are typically considered by an Independent Allocation Panel, which would account for any such change in its recommendations and the reference periods it uses to examine catch histories
- Despite the complexities of quota allocation, an ITQ control may be preferred by industry, as it would allow businesses to plan their fishing operations through the year
- Hybrid approaches including both effort and catch controls could be considered, and this could see an ITQ only introduced if critical, such as if the NSW Snapper stock was in decline. However, if a quota allocation process was described in the harvest strategy, it could incentivise fishing activity changes for operators predicting the allocation trigger. This may make introducing quota at a trigger point unviable

Alternatives to ITQ allocated harvest controls include competitive TAC's (as previously discussed) and nominal TAC's, which operate similarly to competitive TAC's, but may cause additional management or management review if a catch limit is reached, rather than a hard catch limit. Competitive TAC's are used to manage Snapper in Queensland, whereby operators can fish as much or as little as wanted until the limit is reached. Under this approach, other measures can be considered to balance the catch progression if appropriate. All catch control frameworks can be applied as effort controls (i.e., a competitive effort limit instead of a competitive TAC) but are a less direct control of harvest.

Recreational harvest control discussion:

The Working Group discussed the harvest controls available for recreational Snapper catch, and noted many controls are enacted

to some extent, although these are understood to not effectively constrain catch in some scenarios:

- If catch reductions were required, current bag and size limits could be altered as well as considering slot and soft slot limits (i.e., a reduced bag limit over a larger size). The effect of changing bag limits requires further analysis by the Working Group, as these may not adequately limit recreational catch if bag limits are seldom reached
- If a recreational TAC was desired, new fine scale monitoring methods would be needed to support this

Other discussion:

The commercial and recreational fishing members noted that the Working Group may consider a combination of existing or new static and dynamic harvest controls, and discussed whether it was beneficial to make an interim management recommendation as a proactive risk reduction measure. As described in the [meeting 3 minutes](#), the [Recreational Fishing NSW Advisory Council \(RFNSW\)](#) previously discussed management changes for Kingfish and Snapper. These previously discussed changes could be considered as an interim management change if supported by the Working Group, noting that RFNSW's recommendations were deferred to allow the Working Group to examine Kingfish and Snapper management.

Recommending an interim management change should only occur if there are significant concerns with a stock status. Both Snapper and Kingfish are currently classified as 'sustainable' under the Status of Australian Fish Stocks (SAFS), and views on the requirement for immediate management changes vary. Whilst it is likely both stocks are below a target reference point the harvest strategies may implement, their management circumstances are not unusual or critical, and it is often the role of harvest strategies to guide gradual progression towards the desired level of stock biomass.

Noting concerns, the Working Group did not unanimously support interim changes without further discussion, although it will consider interim changes as further information is provided to the Working Group.

Action items:

- 4.5 NSW DPI are to analyse and present information on how different fishing businesses rely on Snapper catches

- 4.6 NSW DPI are to provide the Working Group with information around allocation processes
- 4.7 NSW DPI are to prepare an analysis of various management options for the Snapper and Kingfish harvest strategies
- 4.8 NSW DPI are to provide further analyses around modifying recreational harvest controls

12 Management options for the Yellowtail Kingfish Harvest Strategy

The Working Group discussed harvest control options that could be included in the Kingfish harvest strategy. Concepts regarding both the recreational and commercial fishing sectors were first discussed:

- Regional controls are less likely to be effective for Kingfish, as they are understood to be a highly mobile species, however there are some anecdotal concerns regarding fishers travelling to target short term Kingfish aggregations
- Large Kingfish are observed to increase in availability on the NSW coastline in late Spring and early summer, particularly in November and December. Anecdotally, this is thought to be associated with spawning activity. If protecting large spawning fish was a high priority a temporal closure could be considered, noting current scientific uncertainty on the timing and location of spawning activity or aggregations

Commercial harvest control discussion:

Similarly to Snapper, the Working Group must consider the suite of management options available for the harvest strategy. Members initially discussed options for the primary harvest control:

- Effort controls may not be effective as line fishing targets a broad range of species and Kingfish can be targeted or opportunistically caught amongst other species. Furthermore, Kingfish are an aggregating species and once they are targeted, large catches can be extracted on single days making the effect of input controls unpredictable. Despite this, it would be useful for NSW DPI to analyse data to provide some understanding around how an input control could operate
- Catch control options may be preferable to effort-based options, noting that Kingfish are typically targeted by selective line methods, and they are believed to have high post-release survival. OTLF wide analyses (Action item 4.2) will provide insight into possible effects of controlling Kingfish catch

- Kingfish can be taken adjacent to NSW waters and are known to travel large distances. The harvest strategy may consider cross jurisdictional management or monitoring arrangements

Recreational harvest control discussion:

The Working Group discussed potential recreational harvest controls and noted the sector’s ongoing concerns for Kingfish stocks, and recent low catch rates in recreational fishing competitions. Bag and size limits were discussed as an option for managing catch:

- Bag and size limits could be modified as a dynamic management lever. Recreational harvest control analyses (Action item 4.8) will provide an insight into the possible effects of dynamic recreational harvest controls to control Kingfish catch
- A maximum size limit was identified as less desirable than a soft slot limit which could allow limited harvest of larger size fish

Action items:

4.9 NSW DPI are to analyse and present information on the relationship between Kingfish daily catch and days fished per season to inform the efficacy of effort controls

13 Other business and next meeting admin

The Working Group acknowledged the first trial of the hybrid meeting approach proposed in meeting 3. It was agreed that the hybrid approach was an efficient way to proceed and was less time consuming for the fishing members, while still enabling them to contribute expertise to applied components of the harvest strategies. The Chair will write to the DDG to confirm support for this as an ongoing meeting structure.

Action items:

4.10 The Chair is to write to the NSW DPI DDG, confirming support to continue holding in-person meetings with hybrid attendance

Next Meeting:

The fifth meeting of the Working Group will be held on 27–28 February 2024.
