

Multi-stakeholder *Fisheries 2030* Meeting

ASB House, Wellington, 9 February 2010

A report for the NZ Sport Fishing Council, the Hokianga Accord and other non-commercial interests
By Trish Rea and Barry Torkington
15 February 2010

Attendees

- Facilitator: Debbie Francis (PricewaterhouseCoopers)
- MFish: Wayne McNee (Chief Executive), Cathy Scott (Deputy CE, Strategy), Ben Dalton (Deputy CE, Treaty Partnership and Obligations to Maori, Peter Murray (DCE, Organisation Services), John Beaglehole, Manager Office of CE), Josh Masson (Team Leader, Evaluation and Risk Management), Jonathan Rudge (Manager, Framework Development), Marianne Lukkien, Ray Voller.
- Stakeholders: Peter Douglas (CE Te Ohu Kaimoana, first hour), Kirstie Knowles (Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ), Laws Lawson (TOKM), Tom McClurg (SeaFIC/commercial) Mike Noho (customary), Trish Rea (Hokianga Accord/option4), Geoff Rowling (NZ Recreational Fishing Council), Cath Wallace (Environmental Conservation Organisations of Aotearoa New Zealand, first 3 hours), Barry Webber (Environmental Conservation Organisations of Aotearoa New Zealand), Allan Wihongi (Te Runanga A Iwi O Ngapuhi), Barry Torkington (NZ Sport Fishing Council, formerly NZBGFC).
- Apologies: Mike Britton, Karli Thomas, Kim Walshe, Mike Burrell, Owen Symmans, Richard Baker, Vaughan Wilkinson, Tom Paku, Bruce Chapman, Nici Gibbs.
- Duration: 5.5 hours.

Background

In mid 2008 the Ministry of Fisheries (MFish) initiated a project, *Vision 2030*, that sought to develop new institutional arrangements and tools to unlock the potential of the New Zealand fisheries sector and generate a significantly greater contribution to the economy¹. Non-commercial fishing and environmental organisations were initially supportive and hopeful the project would help deliver “more fish in the water/kia maha atu nga ika ki roto i te wai”.

In March 2009 MFish released a report compiled by PricewaterhouseCoopers, *Fisheries 2030 – Vision, result areas and action plan*² (*Fisheries 2030*). Non-commercial fishing and environmental interests expressed concerns about the strategy’s focus on commercial outcomes seeking to maximise the use and benefits from the marine environment, to the detriment of all New Zealander’s social, economic and cultural well-being. These concerns were reiterated at two multi-stakeholder meetings held with MFish in May and at the June Hokianga Accord hui. The Minister of Fisheries, Phil Heatley, attended part of that hui and heard the concerns from non-commercial interests.

Following the hui a joint letter from an Alliance of non-commercial fishing and environmental organisations was sent to the Minister advising that the combined groups did not support the *Fisheries 2030* strategy. The Alliance requested a meeting to discuss the concerns. A series of correspondence preceded and followed the early August meeting with the Minister. A draft, alternative management strategy was also presented to the Minister. http://www.option4.co.nz/Fisheries_Mgmt/documents/More_fish_in_the_water_2.pdf

MFish released the final *2030* document in September 2009, a virtual reiteration of their earlier drafts. In December 2009 stakeholders were invited to a joint workshop to be held in early February 2010, to discuss how MFish would measure the successful implementation of *Fisheries 2030*.

¹ http://option4.co.nz/Fisheries_Mgmt/2030.htm

² http://option4.co.nz/Fisheries_Mgmt/documents/PWC_2030_Report_19_02_09.pdf

Discussion

This report covers the February 9th joint stakeholder workshop with the Ministry of Fisheries team in Wellington. This workshop was focused on developing criteria (indicators) to measure the success of the *Fisheries 2030* strategic direction, described in the final report as being based on two outcomes and sound governance.

Introductions

Following a mihi (welcome) Wayne McNee acknowledged that not all interest groups had agreed on the final outcome of the 2030 project. MFish was “*still thinking if there is more to this process*” and this workshop was also “*part of the development of the Ministry’s Statement of Intent*” document.

Fisheries 2030 would be adjusted “*as required in the future*”. It was important to monitor the performance of MFish and define sector roles and responsibilities.

Wayne introduced the new management team of Peter Murray, Ben Dalton, Cathy Scott and John Beaglehole. After a brief introduction from each executive they left the meeting.

Facilitator of this workshop was Debbie Francis, a public sector advisor and partner in PricewaterhouseCoopers, and one of two authors of the original November 2008 *Fisheries 2030* report.

The workshop was corporate-like, in that the facilitator managed the conversation and gave an outline of the process to date then participants were split into three working groups to discuss nominated topics and that was followed by a wrap-up session and final comments from participants.

General discussion

Debbie Francis explained six rules of engagement, which included “no relitigation of 2030” and that “consensus was not required”. Each workshop needed to agree on the next steps and communicate those to the group at the end of the day.

Participants expressed concerns about the timeframe, expectations, difficulty of engaging again when previous advice had been ignored, the absence of an agreed basis for 2030 and that this ad-hoc process ought to be abandoned until expert advice had been obtained. There is a vast amount of scientific, environmental and economic literature and expertise available that could inform discussions on how indicators are developed.

MFish needs to explain how these 2030 indicators will align with existing indicators developed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)³ and PCE (Parliamentary Commission for the Environment)⁴.

Using indicators and a ‘self-evaluation’ process by MFish has debatable value. Consideration ought to be given to having an independent party assess whether *Fisheries 2030* has been implemented successfully and to measure whether the objectives have been achieved.

Moreover, it was erroneous to talk of amateur fisheries, customary fisheries and commercial fisheries because they did not exist. There is one fishery, which all have access to. Achieving success from this fishery will require measurements that describe fish abundance, people’s satisfaction and whether their social, economic and cultural wellbeing is being met.

MFish acknowledged that their immediate need was to develop, by mid-March, some indicators to use in the Ministry’s Statement of Intent (SOI). While these initial indicators may not be perfect MFish wanted the group’s feedback and there would be ongoing discussions to develop these further. Jonathan Rudge of MFish emphasised that “*Cabinet has agreed on the outcomes, we need to work with these outcomes*”.

³ http://www.oecd.org/departement/0,3355,en_2649_34283_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

⁴ http://www.pce.parliament.nz/search?queries_searchfield_query=indicators

Fisheries 2030

Use outcomes – Fisheries resources are used in a manner that provides greatest overall economic, social, and cultural benefit, including:

- ⇒ An internationally competitive and profitable seafood industry that makes a significant contribution to our economy
- ⇒ High-quality amateur fisheries that contribute to the social, cultural and economic well-being of all New Zealanders
- ⇒ Thriving customary fisheries, managed in accordance with kaitiakitanga, supporting the cultural well-being of iwi and hapu
- ⇒ Healthy fisheries resources in their aquatic environment that reflect and provide for intrinsic and amenity value.

Environment outcomes – the capacity and integrity of the aquatic environment, habitats and species are sustained at levels that provide for current and future use, including:

- ⇒ Biodiversity and the function of ecological systems, including trophic linkages are conserved
- ⇒ Habitats of special significance to fisheries are protected
- ⇒ Adverse effects on protected species are reduced or avoided
- ⇒ Impacts, including cumulative impacts, of activities on land, air or water on aquatic ecosystems are addressed.

Governance conditions – sound governance arrangements that are well specified, transparent, and which support cost-effective and accountable decision-making.

- ⇒ The Treaty partnership is realised through the Crown and Maori clearly defining their respective rights and responsibilities in terms of governance and management of fisheries resources.
- ⇒ The public have confidence and trust in the effectiveness and integrity of the fisheries and aquaculture management regimes.
- ⇒ All stakeholders have rights and responsibilities related to the use and management of fisheries resources that are understood and for which people can be held individually and collectively accountable.
- ⇒ We have an enabling framework that allows stakeholders to create optimal economic, social, and cultural value from their rights and interests.
- ⇒ We have an accountable, responsive, dynamic, and transparent system of management.

Working groups

The working groups were to be comprised of a representative from MFish, environmental, customary, commercial and amateur fishing interests. However, only one group had all interests present.

Each group was assigned the task of developing indicators for one cluster of the use outcomes, environmental outcomes or the governance conditions. There was some lively discussion amongst each group during this hour-long session and consensus was not reached on all bullet points. A nominated spokesperson addressed the wider group to explain the rationale for their results.

MFish will record all the notes made during these workshops and distribute that information to the participants.

Priorities

Each working group was given an exercise to develop a priority list of six indicators related to any of the outcomes or governance conditions in the *2030* document.

Surveys was a common theme raised by all three groups. This varied in terms of type, but there is a clear need for a perception/satisfaction survey related to governance, the quota management system, abundance and catch rates.

MFish will collate and distribute these priority lists along with the earlier working group bullet points. MFish advised they would use these priority lists as a basis when developing the indicators for the MFish Statement of Intent.

Summary session

Feedback from participants included the following:

- ⇒ Concerns that MFish will use the day's workshop as a 'tick-the-box exercise' and not necessarily take the input seriously. It was frustrating that this behaviour had occurred in earlier 2030 discussions, where MFish had proceeded irrespective of the feedback received;
- ⇒ Many agreed that the 2030 workshops had been useful for the various sector representatives to share their views;
- ⇒ The effectiveness of this workshop would be measured in the outcome of MFish advice to the Minister and their ongoing plans;
- ⇒ Success will be achieved when fisheries management decisions are based on the principle of kaitiakitanga [guardianship] of the resource and people;
- ⇒ MFish must acknowledge the gaps in this process and ask for expert advice to guide ongoing development of the indicators, which describe how success will be measured;
- ⇒ Industry were supportive of developing objective measures that could be used on an annual basis, as opposed to subjective measures such as perception/satisfaction surveys;
- ⇒ Some groups already have information that MFish could use when developing these indicators/measures of success;
- ⇒ Indicators must be useful and must address existing issues in fisheries management, irrespective if the required information is currently available, otherwise this process would merely serve a political purpose as opposed to achieving successful outcomes for the fisheries and people involved;
- ⇒ True value of measurements will be a long time-series; not much value in having 3-years of data;
- ⇒ Indicators must be measured against the goal of achieving higher abundance;
- ⇒ Indicators must reflect the principles outlined in the 2030 document;
- ⇒ Many issues had been raised during the workshop that MFish had previously not wanted to address, these need to be addressed to achieve success;
- ⇒ Concern that resources were being used in the 2030 project that could be better used to achieve greater abundance and fishing success for amateur fishers;
- ⇒ Fisheries 2030 document is not coherent and contains many flaws;
- ⇒ Fisheries 2030 does not define if it seeks to manage fisheries, fishers' behaviour or both;
- ⇒ Maximum abundance is not a good objective, it ought to be seeking the right level of abundance to achieve maximum value; and
- ⇒ MFish need to be precise about the outcomes it seeks to achieve.

MFish response and next steps

This was the first phase in the next steps to achieve implementation of the *Fisheries 2030* project. MFish advised that there will be ongoing discussions with interest groups. The Statement of Intent needs to be developed by mid-March so they will email the information gathered from this workshop and will ask for immediate feedback on the priority lists, to inform the SOI development.

Comment

This meeting was a worthwhile opportunity to meet and talk with other sector representatives. Ongoing discussions amongst the groups ought to be encouraged. It will be a pleasant surprise if stakeholder feedback to MFish is incorporated into the next phase of 2030. Given the evidence to date, their resolution to not "re-litigate" 2030, and their comments during the workshop it is doubtful that such a mind-shift has occurred within the Ministry.