

Notes from Fisheries 2030 breakout sessions

This note is to provide a record what was written on the big sheets of paper that we used to capture key points made during the breakout discussions.

Group 1

Mike Britton (Environment)
Geoff Rowling (Amateur fishing)
Vaughan Wilkinson (Commercial)
Tom Paku (Customary)
Phil Kirk (MFish)

Vision

- Why should the NZ vision need to be any different from the rest of the world?
- Support self-determination by individuals rather than by government - within some base framework
- Need to look at vision from the unique things that make up NZ e.g. tangata whenua; ability of amateurs to have access to fisheries; spiritual
- Consider benefits as being much more than economic - make this explicit
- Vision needs to provide for non-use
- Environmental aspects are needed to underpin use
- Agree with vision and think there is scope for all users within it
- Strategy is a start and beginning
- Value in beginning to look at these issues and sharing views
- No major problem with vision
- Vision provides scope for land-use impacts
- Some prefer “NZers maximising benefits from their fisheries within environmental limits” i.e. fisheries have been allocated to private use. vs. “others who support “.... use of fisheries....” i.e. fisheries belong to NZ society

Key elements

- Biodiversity needs to be recognised and provided for - perhaps “People are secure in the knowledge that biodiversity is maintained”
- Freshwater is included in vision
- Nordic model for fisheries management in which stakeholders/tangata whenua produce solutions and if required government assists with implementation
- Like the concept of sector trades/agreements but need to have some bottom line which cannot be traded away
- Tension between the enabling approach and the constraint of “Within the context of the Fisheries Settlement”. The Settlement’s construction is restrictive.

Values and principles

- Need to value the environment/ecosystems as an end in itself
- Need to value the maximising of economic performance - while acknowledging environmental constraints
- Cultural and spiritual values include Maori and non-Maori value sets
- The real value is being able to understand the value set of others
- Principles include “information”, “listening”, “transparency”, “Caution”
- Need certainty around pre-agreed responses to particular situations/actions

Result Areas

- They are good enough - work in progress
- Will need to be responsive to change
- Environment result area needs to be more ambitious/positive - not just maintained at current levels and not just so that fish can be ‘used’
- Others see scope within the result area to go beyond ‘maintain’
- Result areas do provide a useful framework - but change as needed in the future
- Note that utilisation is not limited to extraction only

Group 2

Kirstie Knowles (Environment)

Richard Baker (Amateur fishing)

Nici Gibbs (Commercial)

Mike Noho (Customary)

Greg White (TOKM)

Marianne Lukkien (MFish)

Vision

- Focus on future - management beyond our lifetime
- Remembering past
 - How history led to where we are now
 - Current process missed an important stage
- Overall vision = Agreed
- But use “People of Aotearoa”
- Importance of inter-generational/global actions/obligations. These are not captured in current draft of the vision

Key elements

- Last bullet point
 - Whose stake/right holders?
 - Yes to transparency and robust decisions
- Co-management with Maori
- Maori are across all sectors
- Settlement is only one aspect

- Need to take a holistic view of fisheries management – land, sea, freshwater, air
- Cumulative effects – wider activities and fisheries management impacts on/affected by

Values and principles

- How do identified values/principles influence to decision-making process?
- How operationalised?

Group 3

Barry Weeber (Environment)

Allen Wihongi (Customary)

Craig Lawson (TOKM)

Trish Rae (Amateur fishing)

Mike Burrell (Aquaculture)

Jonathan Rudge (MFish)

Vision

- Vision statement needs to be inspirational, inclusive and understandable
- Current statement is not inspirational, more like an objective, a goal
- Understanding the basis of the vision is important
- The term ‘maximise’ is offensive, prefer optimise/optimal
- Maximise in terms of enabling the user to maximise the benefits they derive from the fisheries is okay
- No problem definition so cannot answer whether the vision is right or wrong
- What is being sought from this process?
- What ‘potential’ needs to be unlocked?
- The purpose (s8) and principles (ss9 & 10) of the Fisheries Act 1996 would be a suitable vision statement.
- Need to determine principles and values before a vision can be arrived at
- PwC report very focussed on economic outcomes
- PwC report has missed the social and cultural aspects associated with our fisheries
- Aquaculture interests do seem to be included in the PwC report, which is more focussed on fisheries.

Is the current vision statement a uniquely New Zealand view of the future?

- Not uniquely New Zealand
- New statement, two variations –
 - All New Zealanders benefiting from environmentally sustainable utilisation of our fisheries
 - All New Zealanders benefiting from sustainable utilisation of our fisheries within environmental limits.
 - ‘Utilisation’ is preferred to just ‘use’ as utilisation, as per the Fisheries Act, encompasses using, enhancing, developing and conserving.

Values and Principles

- None in current vision document
- Environmentally sustainable
- Kaitiakitanga, manaakitanga, kotahitanga, mana – all important concepts
- Social, economic and cultural wellbeing important
- Abundant fisheries
- Transparency and the ability to influence management and decision-making
- Integrity
- Credible
- Tikanga, the right way of doing things.

Result Areas

- Each interest group to develop their own objectives and result areas and share them at the following meeting
- Outcomes will eventuate once the objectives are known.

Group 4

Cath Wallace (Environment)

Kim Walshe (Amateur fishing)

Tom McClurg (Commercial)

TOKM Board

Tim Persen (MFish)

Vision

- Values not always reflected
 - Customary fishers
 - Non-harvest views are not considered
 - Reference to the requirements of the Act
 - Focus of Fisheries Act should be wider than harvesters
 - Vision statements are hard to do
 - This one broadly in line with Fisheries Act
 - Nothing excluded – use is within environmental limits
 - A good start
 - “Maximising”
 - Attempt at perfection
 - No mention of balancing
 - Is outside the Fisheries Act
 - Possibly use “optimal”
 - What period of time?
 - International obligations?
 - Environmental limits – doesn’t relate to “sustainability”
 - Ecosystem maintenance should be referenced
-
- Element of time? – could it be included? i.e. future generations
 - Maximise opportunities but balance benefits
 - Are ecosystems issues “balanced” with others or are they limits
 - Balance is between competing interests – not all equal – can not trade off the environment

- Some balance between a range of uses
- Weak vs. strong sustainability
- Trade-offs between natural and human capital
- Greatest set of opportunities to get benefits
- But still subject to environmental limits
- Change “maximising” to “optimising”
- Also include consistent with international law, interests of future generations, and maintenance of ecosystems and processes

- The focus on “rights” is a downgrade of social interest in fisheries – should not be primacy of private right
- Are we involving people to improve the proposal or spoil the proposal? – e.g. are we saying customary fishers have no interest in non-harvest?
- ECO has abiding issue of protecting public involvement – not just around this proposal
- Kaitiaki are not users alone. They need to/do understand the wider impacts – sustainability including community values
- Maori fishing is all customary – including commercial. Is the current system that deficient that it doesn’t include these wider issues
- “Rights” language – see page 3
- Note there is a difference between “rights” and “interests (stakeholder) – look at legal responsibilities – this point was disputed

Key elements

- Pre-condition – 4th point
 - Too weak “Take account”
 - Also “Best available” statement is not supported
 - Look at “information sufficiency” approach - CCAMLR

- Governance
 - Wrongly organised – state control
 - Use recreational fishers as an example
 - Need to devolve management responsibilities
- Principle of public participation
 - Needs to be wider participation than just harvesters
 - Inclusive of society
 - Transparency
 - 12(1)(b) of Fisheries Act
- Need to have decisions affected/influenced by principles
- Accountable governance doesn’t mean endorsement of current
- Look at objectives to see what should determine governance e.g. page 6 roles

Result Areas

- Previous reports show that existing governance is poor
- Thus Ministry should change – little evidence of this
- Vision and result area statement suggests single objectives
- “efficiency” and “best value”
- What about “equity” and “fairness”

- Criteria should be used to evaluate objectives/tasks
- No reference to ecosystem-based management/precautionary
- Method controls
- Lack of incentives to lessen damage
- RMA reform not supported - will reduce public participation

- Accountable governance
 - Possibly not in the same box as the others
 - Both environment and utilisation are dealt with by MFish
 - Does accountable governance have to be under each of the two areas?
 - Also environmental issue - current inability for public to input to standards/decisions
 - Harvest strategies have environmental impacts
 - Others thought that governance could/should not be split

- Process issue - what to concentrate on
- General problem of lack of information - ongoing task
- What can we do better in processes and structure?- e.g. accountabilities
- Weakest area currently is accountable governance - but this is amenable to change