

# ROCK LOBSTER MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE

## RECORD OF MEETING (v2)

Meeting No 6, 1 May 2022

Queenscliff

**CHAIR:** Jill Briggs

**MEETING COMMENCED:** 9:30 AM

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

Present	
Jill Briggs	Chair (Affectus Pty Ltd)
Toby Jeavons	Victorian Fisheries Authority (Executive Officer)
Klaas Hartmann	Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS)
Rohan Henry	Independent coastal Indigenous representative
Ian Knuckey	Fishwell Consulting
Lawrence Moore	Recreational fishing representative/ VRFish
Ben Scullin	VRFish
Wayne Dredge	Industry Member (Eastern Zone)
Ross Bromley	Industry Member (EastRock)
Matthew Harry	Industry Member (Eastern Zone)
Alex Haberfield	Industry Member (Western Zone)
Gary Ryan	Industry Member (Western Zone)
Zeb Johnston	Industry Member (Western Zone)
Leslie Feast	Industry Member (Western Zone)
Jarrold Feast	Industry Member (Western Zone)
Adrian Meder	Australian Marine Conservation Society
Peter Galvin	Scuba Divers Federation Victoria (SDVF)
Steven Rust	Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS)
Lachlan Smith	Victorian Fisheries Authority
Guests	
John Hawkins	SDFV
Craig Starrit	SDFV
Apologies	
Joanne Butterworth-Gray	Seafood Industry Victoria
David Reilly	Victorian Fisheries Authority

### 1.1 Welcome and apologies

Jill Briggs, as Chair, stated an Acknowledgement of Country and paid her respect to elder's past, present and emerging. Jill welcomed members and observers to the meeting of the Victorian Rock Lobster Management Plan Review Steering Committee (RLMPSC) and noted the apologies.

## 1.2 Overview of meeting Adoption of agenda

Toby provided an overview of the meeting and agenda. The agenda was adopted with no changes made.

## 1.3 Review timelines and outstanding actions

Toby provided an outline of timelines highlighting what the group has already achieved.

### Timelines

Five meetings have taken place to date.

**Meeting 1** involved setting the context, establishing the vision and recognising risks.

**Meeting 2** involved developing a direction towards the vision through commencing the ESD risk assessment and undertaking an economic analysis of the fishery.

**Meeting 3** involved consolidating the vision and completing the risk assessment process to then inform development of objectives, strategies and actions.

**Meeting 4** involved reviewing existing objectives and strategies to ensure they are covering the risks and working towards achieving the vision.

**Meeting 5** involved working through each objective and associated strategy to identify actions to manage risks and achieve vision.

**Meeting 6** (current meeting) aims to focus on refining the tools to achieve the vision and manage risks. This will involve:

- Refining the objectives, strategies and actions table
- Review of existing reference points and target reference point advised by the RLRA
- Reviewing management controls to achieve the target within rebuild timeframe
- Review harvest strategy decision rules

Toby advised the next meeting will focus on inter-sectoral allocation, harvest strategy refinement and re-alignment of the Plan (reflecting on the vision, the new workplan and tools to achieve the vision). Following that, the intention is for the subsequent meeting to bring it all together into a draft document for presentation and review.

### Outstanding actions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Committee to incorporate an action into the plan for the VRLF to reflect wider VFA ITQ policy which is to be developed. <b>COMPLETE</b></li></ul>
<u>Risk Assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Toby to put ecological risks at the top of the list. However, emphasis must be placed on the fact that the ordering is not a reflection of importance. <b>COMPLETE</b></li><li>• Toby to combine the first two risks. <b>COMPLETE</b></li><li>• Toby to reword 'pandemic impact' to 'restricted market access'. <b>COMPLETE</b></li><li>• Ensure the risk relating to loss of kelp forests applies for the Eastern and Western Zones providing. <b>COMPLETE</b></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Toby to add updated objectives, strategies and actions table to Trello for the group to review actions <b>COMPLETE</b></li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Toby to discuss action relating to traditional ownership with Rohan Henry. <b>COMPLETE</b></li> </ul>
<p><u>Klaas actions to inform discussion at Meeting 6:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size limit variations (look at range of sizes, 110mm, 115mm opposed to 120mm); <b>COMPLETE</b></li> <li>Closed season variations (timing and duration). Investigate variations of closed seasons to assist achieving the B40 target easier. Sex specific closures, tie in with spawning. Look at open seasons for genders. Female closure to 1st of May <b>COMPLETE</b></li> <li>Pot numbers – Review variations of pot numbers to assist addressing mental health, workload and sustainability concerns. Klaas to provide an overview of pot numbers ie. How many are currently being used, average per operator, how has this changed through time. <b>COMPLETE</b></li> <li>Soak time – Klaas to investigate soak time. Soak time rule may assist to reduce predation of octopus. <b>COMPLETE</b></li> </ul>

All outstanding actions are complete in preparation for today's meeting.

#### 1.4 Project discussion platform – Trello

Toby noted there had not been too much activity by members on Trello recently and offered assistance if anyone needed help with access or using the platform. He thanked those who have contributed on Trello to date and reiterated that Trello is extremely useful for members to express their concerns or comments which Toby can raise at future meetings.

## 2. Catch-up: Reviewing objectives, Strategies and Actions table

### 2.1 Reviewing consolidated objectives/strategies and Actions table

Toby advised that the actions table should reflect the vision and address the risks identified under the Ecologically Sustainable Development risk assessment. He noted there was consensus at the last Committee meeting that the table is now on track to do this.

Toby ran through the latest set of revisions to the objectives, strategies and actions table (which has been available on Trello for members to review) and provided a further opportunity for the Committee to raise any comments.

There was lengthy discussion on various tweaks to the table. In summary, there was consensus from the Committee to change the following:

Item	Reasoning / summary of change discussed at meeting
Amend action 1 i), which relates to TACC setting	Remove "without exception" – there have been examples over the last 5 years where exceptions have been justified
Amend action 1 iii), which relates to review of the harvest strategy setting)	Change to " <i>Continually monitor the effectiveness of the Harvest Strategy. Identify areas for improvement each year and undertake a comprehensive review every 5 years.</i> "
Remove action 5iii), which relates to formalising rebuild targets and timeframes	Because that is what we are working on now and is part of the Plan itself.
Amend 6i), which relates to sectoral allocations	Change to " <i>Review existing notional and actual sector allocations and determine sectoral allocations.</i> "
Amend 6v), which relates to maximising flow of economic benefit to the community	Remove the word "economic"
Amend 6vii), which relates to the VFA developing a clear ITQ policy	Clarify it is relevant to commercial sector quota only.

Amend 7i), which relates to management arrangements to ensure the fishery is profitable and viable	Instead of “ensure” have a softer word – e.g. recognises, or “while considering”
Amend strategy 8, which relates to maximising cultural, recreational and lifestyle benefits within the constraints of ecological sustainability	Change wording from ‘maximise’ to ‘optimise’. Add “And access arrangements” at the end.
Amend objective 2, which is maximising community benefit of the rock lobster resource	Change wording from ‘maximise’ to ‘optimise’.

**Action** – Toby to revise the objectives, strategies and actions table in line with the table above.

Other key matters discussed included:

**Carbon neutral fisheries** - A member advised that that if the fishery is not looking at initiatives such as becoming carbon neutral in future, then it is possible it may not be able to maintain access to markets such as Singapore and China in future. Another member questioned the need for this if the fishery is already low carbon. Klaas advised he was aware of some work that has been done on this recently, which found fishery is actually pretty energy intensive when you factor in the low relative catch (in terms of weight) and the fact that product is flown overseas. There was consensus from the group that while the carbon neutral factor was worth considering, it is not a priority risk at present for inclusion in the management plan.

**Softening of language** – The Chair noted there has been previous commentary that the last Plan was worded softly in some areas which created difficulties. The Committee was reminded to keep this in mind as the review progresses.

**Document changes** - A member noted the importance of transparency relating to document changes, noting that management plan documents need to be formal version documents (not text that can be amended on the website). Toby advised the management plan will definitely be a formal document.

The Chair thanked the group for the lengthy but important discussion on the objectives, strategies and actions table.

Toby noted he will share the updates on Trello for all to review following the meeting.

**Action** – Toby to upload updated table on Trello.

**Morning tea – 10:30 – 10:45**

### 3. Reviewing Refining the tools to achieve the vision and manage the risks

#### 3.1 Overview: Existing harvest strategy

Klaas commenced by presenting an overview of the existing harvest strategy. The harvest strategy has two main operational objectives:

1. to rebuild the rock lobster population by setting appropriately conservative TACCs on an annual basis
2. maintain catch rates above 0.40 kg/pot lift (standardised).

He also covered the existing limit reference points, threshold reference point, and the fact that the existing harvest strategy does not have a target reference point explicitly defined (however it an objective of the existing management plan to develop this).

A member questioned where the current upper limit reference point (LRP) of 0.4 kg/pot lift came from. Another member advised it likely related to a previously agreed point where profitability is compromised. It was noted profitability based on CPUE has changed under current circumstances.

**Action** – Toby to investigate the existing upper and lower LRP of 0.25kg/potlift and 0.40kg/potlift.

A member questioned the need for including egg production in the Victorian harvest strategy given the dynamics of the stock. Klaas advised there is still significant self-recruitment in Victoria and that the best approach is to have good egg production everywhere.

Another member questioned why South Australia is still allowed to operate. Klaas confirmed that whilst we cannot change what is happening in other jurisdictions, it is prudent that we continue to maximise Victoria's egg production as we still have stock replenishment from Victoria's egg production. Toby advised that each state is responsible for egg production in their own jurisdiction and confirmed that South Australia have recently implemented an egg production rebuild strategy which it aims to achieve by 2030. It was also noted that the Victorian RLRAG has written to South Australia outlining its concerns.

A member advised there may be a need for dynamic reference points in context of climate change and changing productivity. They advised the harvest strategy should recognise we are at a low end and assume management change will help us rebuild, however noted in reality there are a lot of fisheries that have subsequently (following development of a harvest strategy) acknowledged it is too difficult to get their target.

### **3.2 Overview: Developing a target reference point, reviewing existing reference points and establishing a rebuilding timeframe**

Klaas provided an overview of the key reasons to pursue rebuilding. Klaas noted that a Target Reference Point (TRP) is not defined in the current harvest strategy and has been a gap (the notion of 'rebuilding', but at what rate?) and that the RAG had reached a recommended 30% TRP. He noted if this was reached then catch rates would be expected to go up 70-80%. That would likely lead to less effort and a shrinking fleet.

Klaas advised the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) standard is considered best-practice for providing guidance and benchmarks. He advised the Committee should consider harvest strategy reference points compatible with the MSC standard and noted these are actually very similar to the Commonwealth Government's EPBC Guidelines (relevant for export approval). He noted however that any future MSC certification would need to be considered at the stock level.

A member noted the European lobster export prices were typically not very reliable. Another member noted their concerns for potential future access to the Chinese market if the fishery did not meet such standards. Another member noted achieving such standards is not just about access to particular export markets (such as Europe) but may be important for obtaining actual export approval under Commonwealth EPBC guidelines in future. The Committee acknowledged that the Commonwealth Government can deny all export.

Klaas demonstrated how the existing Victorian RL harvest strategy performed against the MSC criteria. He advised that a rebuilding plan would be required to meet the standard. While the default target under the standard is 40% of unfished biomass, he noted that factors such as climate change and regime shifts are acceptable for adjusting reference points under the

criteria. He noted this region is a climate change hotspot and that there is evidence SRL across all jurisdictions has undergone a regime shift with significant reduction.

Klaas noted that rebuilding to the pre-fishing state of the fishery is unlikely to be attainable even with cessation of fishing altogether. For example, based on 2000-2015 recruitment levels, the maximum available rebuild for total biomass (if fishing stopped completely) would be up to a projected maximum of 70% and 72% of unfished levels for the Western Zone (WZ) and Eastern Zone (EZ), respectively. Klaas then demonstrated justification as to accounting for the loss in productivity due to a changing climate to a revised acceptable rebuild target reference point (TRP) of 28.8% (EZ) and 28% (WZ) of unfished levels.

A member questioned how the loss in productivity is modelled/calculated and whether, in the future, it will be a different number. Klaas noted the concerns regarding a potentially shifting baseline and confirmed that it is more data may impact the calculation. Another member advised there needs to be caution regarding productivity changes and did not want to see this used as a potential out when it may in fact be overfishing. There was consensus from the Committee that it needs to be explicit in the plan on how productivity loss is calculated.

**Action** – Toby to ensure the management plan details how productivity loss is calculated.

**Action** – Toby to ensure justification as to determining target reference point is included in the management plan.

A member noted they had seen numbers from the CSIRO indicating a further productivity drop pointing to 15% reduction to 2040 for southern rock lobster. They raised their concerns for reduced productivity leading to less large lobsters keeping reefs healthy. A member noted there is a lot of changing productivity in the south-east due to climate change and advised that it could actually be the same factors affecting the stock as is affecting the health of the reefs.

A member questioned the need for locking into a target reference point. Toby advised this is designed to meet the benchmarks and is best practice. One member noted that licence fee support would assist in gaining support for conservative rebuild decisions.

Klaas noted the rebuilding timeframe is the minimum of 20 years or two generations. For Southern Rock Lobster (SRL), the long generational time means that 20 years would meet this. A member noted that would be considered a slow rebuild and there should be a more credible rebuild up towards MSY level within 1 generation time i.e a more robust rebuild under shorter timeframe. Toby noted the concerns but advised the speed of the rebuild is directly related to the cost bared by industry.

### 3.3 Review of current harvest control rules

Klaas provided overview of existing harvest control rules. He presented modelling of each of the WZ and EZ biomass and catch projection under two recruitment assumptions (2000-2015 and 2008-2015) the latter of which is more conservative in the Eastern Zone given the lower recruitment.

Klaas noted current exploitation rates rely highly on stock recruitment – If you are taking 25% in a year, then you are really hoping you are getting strong recruitment coming in to replenish. With a fishery that does not have this nice recruitment relationship, this is a risk to the rebuild and modelling shows the biomass and annual catches flatten out.

For the WZ, the projection of the rebuild under current harvest strategy show that this will have some rebuild before flattening out at approx. 20% of unfished biomass. This is because the



TACC will increase, yet recruitment may not necessarily increase, and is likely to end up with a TACC of 270t. For the EZ, Klaas noted positive signs for PRI due to recent undersize recruitment. It would be expected to see a strong rebuild over next 5-6 years under current harvest control rules and then expect this to drop back to current levels as the TAC increased and is not matched by recruitment. The recruitment assumption is more relevant for the EZ with the more conservative (2008-2015) projected to see biomass eventually drop back and flatten out at ~20% unfished levels and a TACC of 50t biomass (2008 recruitment assumption).

A member noted that historically this was a 400-tonne commercial fishery. Klaas advised that with the shifted recruitment and productivity changes this may not necessarily be achievable.

Klaas noted the challenges with the current harvest strategy:

- the current harvest control rules only permit marginal further rebuilding
- constant exploitation rate strategy is inappropriate for rebuilding in the absence of a clear stock-recruitment relationship
- calculation of a representative PRI is challenging
- the lack of a clear target

Jill thanked Klaas for the detailed discussion and guiding everyone through the existing harvest strategy and control rules.

**Lunch (for some) – 12:50 – 13:25**

#### 4.1 Reviewing management controls to achieve the target within the rebuilding timeframe

Klaas ran through the various management controls that the Committee had expressed interest in reviewing to see how these may impact a rebuild timeframe. Toby noted the aim is for the Committee to provide advice and if possible reach consensus on options to pursue.

#### Altering the TACC cap under a recruitment assumption

Klaas presented modelling to show how the rebuild timeframe would be affected by various reduced TACC caps (noting there is already a cap in place) and under the two recruitment assumption scenarios. To achieve the TRP by 2043, key scenarios included those below:

Recruitment Assumption	TRP Level	WZ Cap	EZ Cap
2000-2015	28% (WZ) 28.8% (EZ)	232t	55t
2008-2015	28% (WZ) 28.8% (EZ)	240t	39t
2000-2015	30%	<223t	53t
2008-2015	30%	228t	37t

Klaas noted the economic impact of a TACC cap:

- the number of vessels and employment will decline – in both zones effort required is likely to decrease to 50-60% of the current level.
- Lease price / kg (and value of quota units) will rise due to increased demand for quota driven by lower TACC and higher CPUE.

For the Eastern Zone, most members were supportive of a TACC cap reduction from 70t to 37t. One member advised given the low beach price, the EZ sector is at breaking point.

For the Western Zone, most members were not supportive of cap at 228t at this time. Toby noted there is a bit to work through in that space today as some of the other management options are not that beneficial. He noted that if the TACC cap is not reduced to 228t, then the fishery likely won't reach 30% of unfished biomass.

A member noted 30% was above the minimum required of 28% for the WZ and if the latter were adopted this would mean the cap would go up to 240t which is much more palatable for industry. For the EZ to reach 28.8%, the cap would be 39t.

A member advised this would stray from the RAG recommendation. They noted the RAG knew it was being more precautionary but based on the concerns raised they would rather have a management plan that doesn't risk having people step away from and undermine. They noted the RAG does not look so much as the economic or political situation.

**There was general consensus among the group to adopt the 2008 – 2015 recruitment assumption (more precautionary) for both zones if the TRP is instead 28% (WZ) and 28.8% (EZ). There was consensus to adopt the following:**

Recruitment assumption	TRP Level	WZ Cap	EZ Cap
2008-2015	28% (WZ) 28.8% (EZ)	240t	39t

A member noted having a more precautionary harvest strategy with simple table provides options to run bi-annual assessment and reduce some costs for industry. Klaas noted the data collection would still need to occur which is a reasonable portion of the cost.

**Action** - Consider increasing the constant exploitation rate threshold from 0.4 kg/potlift to 0.5 or 0.6 kg/potlift for the EZ only.

**Action** - Review the current threshold level of PRI based on the adjusted recruitment average to reflect likely recruitment scenarios.

### **Altering the exploitation rate**

Klaas presented modelling which shows that dropping the exploitation rate is not viable as it results in overly aggressive TACC reductions that would significantly impact industry. Tweaking that part of the harvest control rule is not recommended. There was consensus from the Committee that this is not a strong option.

### **Altering the size limits**

Klaas presented modelling of various size limit changes and how that would alter the required TACC cap for each of the zones in meeting the rebuild target. It was noted the optimal size for harvesting male lobsters is above the current size limit and for females it is less clear (and may actually go the other way). The modelling demonstrated that is very limited benefit in adjusting the size limit. Even if the size limit for males was adjusted for a small gain, it could result in potential economic impacts:

- Reduced size availability will have unknown impact on beach price



- Reduced CPUE due to size limit increase coupled with minor TAC increase will result in higher effort required, and thus higher fishing costs, more vessels and employment, lower lease prices and lower quota value.

One member noted that larger lobsters preying on sea urchin is an important consideration and may be worth considering an upper LML. Klaas noted that work has shown the key to having large lobsters is to catch less lobsters.

There was consensus from the Committee that there is little benefit in changing size limits and that these do not need to be altered to support the rebuild.

A member asked whether the current size limits in Victoria are appropriate as they relate to sexual maturity. Klaas advised that growth rates and size of sexual maturity differ across the zones and jurisdictions and he will need to discuss this further with Dave Reilly soon.

**Action** - Klaas to discuss size of sexual maturity for Victorian RL with Dave Reilly when he gets back from leave.

### **Altering the closed seasons**

Klaas gave an overview of the benefits and risks of closed season changes. He noted that overall it is not going to change too much given it is an output-controlled fishery and it is difficult to predict effects due to uncertainty about fleet dynamics. He advised this is not a recommended consideration for reaching the rebuild target.

A member advised that the closed seasons should focus on mitigating whale entanglements, avoiding damage to moulted lobsters and achieving the best price.

A member noted that mitigation controls should be in a Code of Practice rather than regulations.

**Action** – Toby to add action to MP objectives, strategies and actions table to ensure management arrangements are reflective of best practice to mitigate risk of whale entanglement.

### **Implementing a soak time restriction**

Klaas advised the benefits of implementing a soak time restriction including reduction in octopus predation and ground holding. He noted there is no direct effect on vessel efficiency, but may be an impost.

A member questioned whether there was any info on optimal soak time for rock lobster pots. It was noted that there was no data on this, however extra days soaking will inevitably mean more predation from octopus. One member advised they believe approximately 36 hours is optimal soak time for yield of catch. A member advised that in their view limits on soak times was best dealt with through a code of conduct. Another member advised the concerns of excessive soak times has primarily been in the eastern zone and has partially sorted itself out given there are less part-time operators now.

Toby noted the concerns from industry around excessively long soak times and would be happy to work with industry on a practical solution. There was consensus to add an action in this regard to the management plan.

**Action** - include an action for the MAC to pursue development of a soak time restriction for EZ and to include measures for the WZ within industry Code of Practice.

### **Pot numbers**

A member advised that in their view there are benefits in reducing pots from a social licence perspective.

It was noted that if pot numbers are restricted, it will mean more fishing days and more boats. A member noted it was difficult enough to find crew at present.

It was noted that it is an output-controlled fishery and there are already size limitations on pot design. There was consensus from the Committee to leave pot numbers as is. EZ members agreed that if industry is pursuing soak time restrictions, this removes the need to pursue pot number reductions.

### **Afternoon Tea 3:15 – 4:00**

## **4.2 Considering a vessel efficiency factor**

Klaas noted this matter could be discussed next meeting given time constraints. Jill and Toby agreed.

**Action** – Toby to add Vessel efficiency factor to next meeting's agenda.

## **4.3: Shaping a new Harvest Strategy**

### **Summary of key outcomes from the meeting regarding a new harvest strategy**

There was general consensus among the group to adopt the 2008 – 2015 recruitment assumption (more precautionary) for both zones if the TRP is instead 28% (WZ) and 28.8% (EZ).

In relation to revision of harvest control rules to achieve target RP, there was consensus:

- **To retain the current form of harvest strategy including a TACC table**
- **To retain the PRI (at least for the life of the next management plan).**
- **To reduce the TACC cap (details in item 4.1 above)**
- **To not alter size limits**

**Action** – Klaas to consider at next meeting including a rule in the harvest strategy that when the PRI is decreasing, the TAC is decreased.

**Action** – Klaas to review the CPUE band increments in the TACC table.

In relation to revision of ancillary rules (which do not affect rebuilding or are hard to evaluate) there was consensus for:

- Not altering the closed season
- Not altering pot numbers
- the MAC to pursue development of a maximum soak time in consultation with industry – this may via a Code of Practice dependent on the zone.

## 5. Management considerations

It was agreed that item 5.1 (eastern rock lobsters) and 5.2 (over/under-catch) on the agenda be pushed to next meeting.

**Action** – Toby to add management of eastern rock lobsters and consideration over/under catch to next agenda.

## 6. Other business

### 6.1 Committee homework

Toby thanked members for joining and requested that all review the updated objectives, strategies and actions table prior to next meeting once he has shared with the group on Trello.

**Action** – Toby to share updated Objectives, Strategy and Actions table with group via Trello

The next meeting will focus on inter-sectoral allocation, harvest strategy refinement and re-alignment of the Plan (reflecting on the vision, the new workplan and tools to achieve the vision). Additional carry-over items that were not discussed at today's meeting will also be included for Meeting 7.

### 6.2 Closing Comments and next steps

Jill closed by thanking members for their efforts in coming from far and wide to join for this important discussion and assisting in the Committee, and concluded the 6<sup>th</sup> Rock Lobster management plan review steering committee meeting.

**Next meeting date – TBC.**

**Action** – Toby to send out invites for next meeting date.

### Actions:

#### Objectives / strategies / actions table

- Toby to make the following changes to the objectives, strategies and actions table:

Amend action 1i) to remove "without exception"
<i>Amend action 1iii) to "Continually monitor the effectiveness of the Harvest Strategy. Identify areas for improvement each year and undertake a comprehensive review every 5 years."</i>
Remove action 5iii)
Amend action 6i) to " <i>Review existing notional and actual sector allocations and determine sectoral allocations.</i> "
Amend action 6v) to remove the word "economic"
Amend action 6vii) to clarify it is relevant to commercial sector only.
Amend 7i) - instead of "ensure" have a softer word such as 'recognises' or 'while considering'
Amend strategy 8 - change wording from 'maximise' to 'optimise'. Also add "and access arrangements" at the end.
Amend objective 2 to also change wording from 'maximise' to 'optimise'.
Add action to ensure management arrangements are reflective of best practice to mitigate whale entanglement.
Add action for the MAC to pursue development of a soak time restriction for EZ and measures in the WZ for inclusion in a Code of Practice.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toby to upload the updates to Trello for the group to review.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toby to investigate the existing upper and lower LRP of 0.25kg/potlift and 0.40kg/potlift</li> <li>• Klaas to provide wording for Toby to include in the management plan that details how productivity loss is calculated</li> <li>• Klaas to provide wording for Toby to ensure justification as to determining target reference point is included in the management plan.</li> <li>• Klaas to consider increasing the constant exploitation rate threshold from 0.4 kg/potlift to 0.5 or 0.6 kg/potlift for the EZ only. .</li> <li>• Klaas to review the current threshold level of PRI based on the adjusted recruitment average to reflect likely recruitment scenarios.</li> <li>• Klaas to discuss size of sexual maturity for RL with Dave Reilly when he gets back from leave.</li> <li>• Toby to add Vessel efficiency factor to next meeting's agenda</li> <li>• Klaas to consider at next meeting including a rule in the harvest strategy that when the PRI is decreasing, the TAC is decreased.</li> <li>• Klaas to review the CPUE band increments in the TACC table.</li> <li>• Toby to add management of eastern rock lobsters and consideration over/under catch to next agenda.</li> <li>• Toby to send out invites for next meeting date.</li> </ul>