

APPROVED



MINUTES

MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING

13th MEETING – 20 March 2008

Regular meeting held at the St John Station, Hokitika beginning at 9.30am on 20 March 2008.

Present

Bruce Hamilton (Chair), Brad Stenhouse, Denis Shannahan, Stuart Thomson, Carol Scott, Bruce Watson, Eugenie Sage, Rick Barber, Richard Wallace and Carrol Browne.

No members of the public attended.

In Attendance

Campbell Robertson and Don Neale (Department of Conservation), Nicola Pindur and Scott Williamson (Ministry of Fisheries), Andrea Jackson (Minute Secretary), Sarah Wilson (facilitator).

1.0 Apologies

Apologies received from Emily Arthur, Geoff Rowling, Ian McKenzie and Kerry Eggeling. Apologies to be accepted.

Moved – Bruce Watson/Eugenie Sage

Apologies Accepted

Eugenie Sage notified the Forum that Emily Arthur had requested that some sessions be recorded, and the Forum members had no objections.

Rick Barber and Richard Wallace were welcomed by Bruce Hamilton at their first Forum meeting representing their runangas and asked to provide a brief background of their conservation interests. Rick Barber represents Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, and has been involved in a number of conservation organisations having served on the Tai Poutini Conservation Board, Federated Mountain Clubs and a marine conservation group. Richard Wallace is a representative and upoko of Te Runanga o Makaawhio. Richard has been involved in all facets of conservation including previous involvement in marine reserve work. He has upoko roles with the DHB and Kiwi Recovery Programme.

2.0 Agenda confirmation and Declarations of Conflict of Interest

The meeting agenda was confirmed and no conflicts of interest were declared. Carrol Browne asked that the Consultation Sub-committee topic be added to general business, and that for the next Forum meeting that it be included as a topic of discussion.

APPROVED

3.0 Adoption of Minutes of 12 September 2007

The minutes of the meeting of 12 September 2007 has previously been circulated and approved by Forum members. Accordingly it was proposed that the minutes be formally adopted.

Moved – Bruce Watson/Carrol Browne

Apologies Accepted

4.0 Matters Arising

Eugenie Sage asked about the progress on the NIWA recreational fishing research. Nicola Pindur will check about the delivery date but there is no date set at present.

Carrol Browne reminded the Forum that Bruce Watson had asked for the possibility of adjustments to the whitebait regulations to be re-addressed. Bruce Watson advised that there is no need for a detailed discussion at present, just as long as this possibility is kept in mind when the Forum undertakes their detailed selection work.

5.0 Correspondence

- 5.1 *Inwards* - A package of information material had been received from the Board of Inquiry for the Proposed NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2008 (received 11 March 2008).
- 5.2 *Outwards* - The Chair has written to the Hon. Jim Anderton, thanking him for his support through the MPA process (as requested at the last meeting).

Process for Correspondence – After discussion it was agreed that in future a schedule of correspondence (inwards and outwards) is to be included in the meeting agenda. Bruce Hamilton was requested to circulate the letter he wrote to Hon. Jim Anderton. Nikki asked that information be sent out to Forum members as it arrives so that if there is reading material Forum members can get familiar with the topic prior to the Forum meeting. This will also assist in the Forum being able to meet deadlines for responding to correspondence.

Proposed NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2008 – Eugenie Sage requested that a website link be provided and others requested hard copies of the discussion documents. These copies were provided in the afternoon. Bruce Watson thought that it would be useful for Forum members to check that the NZCPS does not impact unduly on the West Coast Coastal Plan.

General discussion was held about the necessity for the Forum to make a submission on the Proposed NZCPS. Eugenie Sage, Carol Scott, Bruce Watson and Bruce Hamilton thought that given the short timeframe and the differing views of Forum members that it would be unlikely for a submission to be agreed. Rick Barber took a different view, believing that the Forum should make a submission, even if it is only a basic submission supporting the work of the Board of Inquiry, plus any more detailed points that can be agreed. Rick offered to convene the sub-committee process, and he will accept submissions on the proposed NZCPS. He would then circulate a draft to a sub-committee group to gain a consensus view, then circulate around the full Forum prior to completion. This offer was accepted along with a request to the Department of Conservation to provide an information paper.

APPROVED

To summarise, the agreements reached were:

1. Hard copies of the discussion documents on the Proposed NZCPS to be provided to all Forum members;
2. DOC staff to provide an overview summary of the implications of the NZCPS for the Forum and its influences on the Forum process.
3. Rick Barber will convene a sub-committee process to develop a submission on behalf of the Forum (process as detailed above).

Bruce Hamilton then stood aside from chairing the meeting and handed the floor over to Sarah Wilson, as facilitator.

6.0 National Classification System - West Coast Maps

Don Neale opened this session with a brief overview of the key aspects of the national classification system, as follows:

- Depth, substrate and exposure are the key parameters.
- Two outer limits apply: the 200m-depth limit (classification) and the 12 nautical mile distance limit (implementation).
- Awarua Point is to be the southern boundary of the West Coast Region, as recommended by this Forum.
- The inshore limit extends into estuaries up to the regional coastal marine area boundaries.

Don further advised that he and Gary Eason have developed West Coast maps based on the West Coast Marine and Coastal Environment Report, interpreted using the national classification system. Don further advised that the national substrate-based classification system cannot be easily applied to West Coast estuaries, and so for estuaries the maps produced for the Forum have continued with the landform-based descriptions used in the Report.

This mapping work has now been peer reviewed by NIWA and this review report has been distributed to the Forum in the mail-out of material. The reviewer makes a number of recommendations to improve the work, including deleting habitats greater than 200m-depth, as these habitats "will fall under a different classification system".

Richard Wallace queried how accurate was the data such as depth lines. Don advised that new data had recently been released by NIWA that described the depths of the West Coast marine canyons. Carol Scott queried the possible use of either the maps or the electronic GIS files in the Forum's selection work (as recommended at point 7 of the NIWA report). Sarah Wilson wanted to know if this GIS data could be used live at the Forum meetings. Don Neale advised that while this option was possible, it is very time-consuming to manipulate the GIS data and the programme takes time to undertake tasks such as working out the percentage of a habitat chosen. Thus it may be too cumbersome to use live at meetings, and maybe it would be better to produce more detailed mapping. Don also noted that too many layers of information on any one map makes it unclear and that the Forum Report Sub-committee had already worked through the best way to show the various information layers.

Eugenie Sage expressed congratulations to both Don Neale and Gary Eason for their excellent work in producing the maps. Richard Wallace advised that the Makaawhio boundary extends further south of Awarua Point, and that he may need to discuss boundary issues with other

APPROVED

parties. Bruce Watson agreed that the Forum would need to discuss any boundary issues with the adjoining Forums.

Eugenie Sage noted that there would be tension between the two outer limits (200m-depth and 12 nm). Don Neale noted that he had not applied the 'interim' deep-water classification to the West Coast maps; he had only used the 200m-depth line.

Gary Eason offered to set up a sample map/s on a live screen. Rick Barber mentioned that Google Earth now shows seabed levels. Bruce Watson raised a query about bathymetric details (contour lines), and was advised that NIWA intended to have these details available later in the year. Bruce also queried about the classification of exposure, as he thinks this aspect should be identified, as it is quite relevant to the West Coast. Clarification is needed on what exposure means and how it could be added or mapped. Don Neale referred to page 46 of the MPA Implementation Guidelines, where a definition of 'exposure' had been added based on the submissions made and further discussions by the expert group.

Rick Barber asked whether fresh water aquifers have been identified and mapped, and Don Neale advised that all known details have been mapped but he has no details of fresh water aquifer sites.

There followed general discussion on how to manipulate maps to reveal information such as clusters of habitat sites. Queries were raised about the ability for maps to be placed on the Forum website, and Scott Williamson suggests that NABIS would be the best tool for users to be zoomed around, etc. Scott considers that the maps do currently provide a good opportunity to spot clusters of habitats.

Bruce Watson raised the issue of colour-blindness and the possible usefulness of adding small letters to the maps identifying everything contained in the legends on the maps themselves, in the same way that geological information is mapped. The colours were also discussed and whether less intense colours may assist to see the letters when added. **It was agreed** that Don Neale and Gary Eason will work over these possibility together with Bruce Watson to make sure that all the map markings and colours are apparent and useful.

Sarah Wilson queried whether the Forum could now agree that the maps can be discussed with interest groups. **This agreement was forthcoming**, although it was also agreed that the relevant explanatory sections of the West Coast Marine and Coastal Environment Report also be included (as suggested by Eugenie Sage). Don Neale noted that the key explanations about the maps and their information sources are to be found at pp. 99-102 of the Report.

6.1 MPA Implementation Guidelines

Don Neale read a relevant section from the MPA Implementation Guidelines (page 16, section 3.1, para 2), as follows: *"The MPA Policy specifies separate processes for the coastal environment and one for the deepwater environment. For the purpose of implementing the network of protected areas, the coastal/deepwater boundary will be the limit of the Territorial Sea (12 nautical miles)."*

Eugenie Sage queried how MPAs could be implemented in deep-water areas without additional details. Don Neale advised that it would become possible to add the additional depth information from the new NIWA data. Scott Williamson commented that it may not be

APPROVED

appropriate for this Forum, as currently constituted, to deal with deeper waters than 200 metres, as otherwise other stakeholders would need to be involved. Carol Scott asked for clarification about this matter, she had thought the Forum had previously debated and clarified that this Forum would only deal within the outer limits of 12nm and 200m, whichever is nearest to shore. Richard Wallace believes that there needs to be a dialogue, at least, as these limits are artificial and not recognised by Tangaroa. Eugenie Sage noted that in choosing inshore MPAs the Forum might choose some MPAs that can later be extended into marine canyons, in the future deep-sea habitat protection process. Campbell Robertson noted that the application of the 12nm/200m-depth limits might result in inshore canyons being missed. Bruce Watson considers that when MPAs are being considered near canyons then perhaps the Forum should consult wider. Brad Stenhouse commented that surely the canyons would be considered as a significant habitat in their own right.

Carol Scott proposed the involvement of the Deep Water Group (CEO is George Clements) which should be approached now. She noted that long lining and trawling are some of their methods. Stuart Thomson reported that the Deep Water Group represents the quota owner, and that inshore vessels also catch ling and hoki species. Scott Williamson advised that the government agencies had already committed to including the Deep Water Group and others with interests in deep water fisheries if these fisheries came into consideration in the Forum's deliberations. These groups include AFL, TOKM, SeaFIC, and the deep-water stakeholders. Scott will seek clarification of this information. Eugenie Sage commented that perhaps the 200m-depth areas and the canyons could be addressed towards the end of process.

Sarah Wilson noted that according to the consultation section of the Guidelines, at page 17, the Forum is to "*constructively involve and engage*" with stakeholders. So, it's a question of timing, of when that consultation would take place. Nicola Pindur suggested she could write to the potential parties notifying them of the Forum process and seeking their comment on when and how they wish to engage. Bruce Watson advised that generally the 12nm limit applies, but there may be cases where the Forum would wish to extend into the 200m-depth areas and the Forum should not let habitats slip through their selection process due to arbitrary boundaries. There followed a general discussion about writing to deep water rights holders, as a courtesy and to let them know where the Forum process has progressed and possibility of future engagement. This engagement may well stop short of attendance at Forum meetings, and one option tabled was the use of possible focus meetings.

The Forum reached provisional agreement that the regional boundary would be the 12nm limit (as described in the national implementation guidelines), and if this included canyons or deep-sea areas then other relevant stakeholders would be engaged with later in the process.

It was agreed that such a letter would be drafted by Andrea Jackson/Carol Scott/MinFish, and then reviewed by the Forum chair prior to circulation for approval by Forum members. The letter would notify stakeholders that the Forum will be including deep-sea canyons within the 12nm boundary in its MPA selection process, and would seek any information on the use of these canyons by these stakeholders.

Eugenie Sage and Stuart Thomson raised the matter of knowledge gaps in relation to substrates, as mentioned at point 4 of the NIWA review. Don Neale responded that NIWA was not planning to undertake any further identification or mapping work on the West Coast. Further information will likely be gained from the current exploratory seabed mining activities,

APPROVED

but this type of information takes some time to collect, collate and publish, so is likely to be a few years away. Don noted that the fishing industry might have additional information. Stuart Thomson responded that the production of detailed mapped information is time consuming and thus costly and he does not have the time or resources to undertake that work. However, he could bring relevant data to the Forum meetings when particular areas are being considered for protection.

Recapping at the end of this session, the facilitator checked whether the agenda 'outcomes' had been met, and members agreed that they had been. Outcomes are as follows:

1. All Forum members understand the classification system and what it means for the West Coast marine environment.
2. The Forum agree on any changes to the mapping, and acceptance of the mapping by the Forum so it can be discussed and shown to interest groups.

7.0 National Standards

Campbell Robertson introduced the Protection Standards document and noted that the standards have a degree of ambiguity that might provide useful flexibility in site selection. He noted that none of the officials present have been involved in the development of the document; so technical questions may need to be taken back to Head Office. Rather than providing interpretation of the document, he considers it more useful for the Forum to discuss the standards and develop their thinking.

Scott Williamson noted that table 2 on page 13 is an important table, as it shows the hierarchy of tools. The Forum needs to work their way through the standards and the outcome of implementation. Eugenie Sage had a query about MPAs and the Fisheries Act prohibitions, maybe marine reserves may be simpler and easier tool than the Fisheries Act prohibitions. Scott Williamson noted that both sets of regulations have complexity. Marine reserves need to pass a series of tests, and the Fisheries Act is prohibition based. The Marine Reserves Act is cleaner to implement while the Fisheries Act has constraints. Neither mechanism is perfect. The Forum needs to seek the best pragmatic solution.

Bruce Watson raised a query about how allowance can be made for limited use of marine reserves, e.g., for occasional shellfish gathering. On that topic, Richard Wallace noted that Ngai Tahu may well be opposed to any regulations that would totally close off shellfish gathering in any area. Eugenie Sage considers that marine reserves would be best to continue as 'no take' zones, as this is a much clearer situation for the public to understand and observe. Scott Williamson advised that this is why a hierarchy of tools has been proposed in the Protection Standards, and it's for the Forum to choose the best pragmatic solution. Rick Barber mentioned that various legislation does often allow exceptions and don't want the Forum to be unduly constrained. Marine reserves act as a 'kohanga' for species and therefore a good reason for marine reserves is the flow-on effect of restoration of stocks outside the reserve. He is unsure if the Protection Standards has enough relationship to Maori values, he is unsure about the degree of consultation with Maori undertaken. Scott Williamson noted that Head Office wants pragmatic solutions rather than rigid solutions stamped over wide areas.

Bruce Watson suggested that it would be useful for the Forum to work through the three pages commencing at section 3.3 of the Protection Standards. He noted that the advice from Head Office seems to be not to go with protecting huge areas, but rather to focus on the details of substrate. He noted that although the standards have an ecosystem focus rather than a

APPROVED

species focus, he considers that if an ecosystem has a major species missing (such as blue cod or kahawai) then this signals that the ecosystem needs protection in some manner. Bruce Watson and Carol Scott then debated the merits of designing MPAs to aid specific species rebuilding, or whether other species will instead establish themselves in the habitat niche currently vacated.

Eugenie Sage tabled a query from Emily Arthur, in relation to page 21, the goal of maximising connectivity. Would this lead to a series of MPAs touching each other? Don Neale advised that there is a lot of scientific debate about the complex topic of MPA design. Connectivity is only one factor. Bruce Watson noted that it is important to protect the whole cycle of species, nesting/spawning sites as well as living habitat. Don Neale commented that it would come down to what MPA design the Forum decides is best for the West Coast. Nicola Pindur noted that connectivity could also refer to groupings of habitats within MPAs (noting the statements made under the heading size of protected areas on page 20-21). She will check this point with Head Office.

The Forum requested links to the Marine Reserve Act be placed on the Forum's website. The Forum requested a tutorial on the Act at their next meeting, including the purpose and key aspects of the Act.

Carol Scott suggested it would be useful make a presentation on the fishing industry at a future meeting. She suggested that it would be useful for other sectors to provide background presentation on themselves and their constituencies. Bruce Watson requested that the Ngai Tahu representatives provide information on their current approach to marine protection. Rick Barber noted that he finds the Protection Standards to be rather a set of guidelines that what he would consider 'standards'. Sarah Wilson identified the 'standard' component as being table 2 and the policy document. Carol Scott noted the long time waiting for the Protection Standard, and considers that the Forum's use of the document will come down to the Forum's interpretation of it.

Eugenie Sage queried the matter of 10% of the New Zealand coastline to be protected, and what this means for the West Coast. Because of special features maybe more than 10 % will be required for the West Coast. Bruce Hamilton added that a national overview is also applicable. Nicola Pindur noted that there is no ruling at what level the 10% should apply (national/bio-geographic regions/individual habitats). Maybe the Forum needs to look at what MPAs are most logical, then size them and see what the impacts of those sites might be. Nicola quoted the Protection Standard introduction [forward from joint Ministers] reference to the 10%, which states .. " *We have responded to one of the most significant of these issues by reiterating the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy target of protection for 10% of the marine environment by 2010*".

Bruce Watson commented that some habitats may be easier to achieve 10% protection, e.g., estuaries adjacent to national parks, but other habitats may prove more difficult. Scott Williamson advised that selecting MPAs properly to get a good result is more important than seeking to achieve an arbitrary 10 % target. Different ways of choosing MPAs were then discussed. Bruce Watson noted that the Forum should split consideration of MPAs into three zones (northern, central and southern) so as to catch the impact of the coastal drift. Denis Shannahan proposed the Forum look at the 14 segments (as per the Report), then the three coastal zones, then the whole region. This discussion was deferred until the "process"

APPROVED

discussion later in the meeting. Nicola Pindur noted that practical boundaries might also dictate site selection, such as the natural size and shape of a reef. Richard Wallace noted that all stakeholders need to be mindful of other stakeholders' perspectives. The ability to monitor MPAs needs to be considered too. Sarah Wilson noted that all the Forum stakeholders were experts and need to be mindful of that. Carrol Browne noted that the consultation process has a role too.

7.1 Protection Gap Analysis

Don Neale advised the current state of the 'protection gap analysis'. Don noted that there are few if any controls on the West Coast at present; particularly that there are no marine reserves on the West Coast. The 'Existing Protection & Management Areas' maps in Part 5 of the Report show areas that might be relevant, but Don advised that the protection mechanisms contained in the Regional Coastal Plan do not meet the MPA standard. He noted that Table 2 of the Protection Standards lists the possible protection tools.

It is possible that only national parks and reserves meet the protection standard. Only four coastal areas are protected in national parks and reserves, being the Waitangirotto River mouth, Saltwater Lagoon (in South Westland), 5-mile Lagoon south of Okarito, and the Cook River mouth. Bruce Watson raised the possibility that these four areas are logically ones that could become marine reserves or have measures added to bring them to a high MPA standard. Campbell Robertson agreed that these places might be a good place to start; they are certainly 'least cost'.

Don Neale noted that even in coastal areas adjacent to conservation managed land that no fishing restrictions or controls apply. There followed discussion on the degree of protection that national parks apply to fishing. Campbell Robertson added that eels is one species that will likely acquire more protection in the future; in the current draft CMS it is proposed that no commercial eeling takes place on conservation managed land. Richard Wallace considers that generally DoC has been mindful of Ngai Tahu concerns. Scott Williamson advised that, in terms of meeting MPA protection standards, there are no relevant fishing regulations on the West Coast.

Bruce Watson requested a Protection Gap Analysis in writing, as it is an essential background tool for site selection. Don Neale suggested it might be better to undertake a case-by-case assessment of the existing protection, if any, once the Forum has selected some likely protection sites. Sarah Wilson noted that Don has a table of additional information, and it would be useful to assemble this information together with a summary, as given verbally today.

It was agreed that MinFish/DoC would produce a Protection Gaps Analysis with associated maps.

Recapping at the end of this session, the facilitator checked whether the agenda 'outcome' had been met, and members agreed that it had been, as far as possible at this time. Outcome is as follows; Forum members understand how protection standards will apply to the West Coast.

APPROVED

8.0 Forum Process and Timeline for 2008

A brainstorming session was held on how the Forum process might proceed from now on. The options discussed so far today were recapped and listed as being:

- 8.1 regional overview to selection;
- 8.2 three zones (northern, central, southern);
- 8.3 fourteen segments, (using the Report and working through one segment at a time);
- 8.4 special, unique or representative areas;
- 8.5 habitat classification types (probably 20 on the West Coast, not all 44);
- 8.6 each main classification type.

Bruce Watson observed that other factors also need to be considered, such as enforcement requirements, education and use opportunities, and adjacency to major protected areas on land. Brad Stenhouse noted that the areas also need to be of low or minimum impact on users (page 21/22 of the Guidelines). It was clarified that there is a hierarchy of considerations, the list of primary considerations on page 21 and secondary considerations on page 22.

Process starting points were revisited, the first step being to clarify West Coast classification habitat types, then to possibly consider ecological land information, then to consider the detail of the 14 segments. Carol Scott considers the best approach is to take a regional overview, then delve down into the three regional zones, and consider some classification types as well. Eugenie Sage thinks the 14 segments types are a good start, as everyone can read and refresh their knowledge on each segment and will thus be on the same wavelength. Bruce Watson considers the most obvious or easiest habitats could be considered first, such as estuaries including what may be adjacent to them. Carrol Browne and Don Neale discussed the highlighting of habitats to find clusters, using the large regional maps.

Don Neale recommended that the Forum look at the regional level first, then segments. He noted some regional material is contained in the Report on pages 46,49,53,60. Also at page 26 there is a discussion of the regional variations from north to south.

Finally the discussion was wrapped up with the agreement that the Forum selection process would follow these general steps:

1. Regional overview, using the maps and also the number and type of habitats. Part of the regional overview also includes Forum member's background, information and the context from each sector or member's constituency.
2. Identification of any possible obvious candidates:
 - a) estuaries (that might already have some form of protection) and their adjacent habitats;
 - b) clusters of habitats together;
 - c) any unique habitats.
3. Going to the information contained in the report (broken up into 14 segments, or the North/Central/South grouping – whichever is most useful) to provide additional information about habitats.

8.1 Meeting Process

Brad Stenhouse raised the issue of the Forum having an open or closed discussion. If Forum members are dealing with habitat type-by-type then members can inform themselves and consult with user groups. Bruce Watson advocates that because this process is new and Forum members don't know how long it will take to come to agreement or the nature of the

APPROVED

discussions and disagreements some closed session for brainstorming to get the most creativity out of the group, without concerns about public comments or perceptions. Bruce Watson noted concern that if the public and press only drop in for a short period and the Forum is "debating" sites that the actual conclusion of the Forum may not be reported, but instead the debate, which would not be useful for the Forum process.

Carol Scott reminded the Forum that commercial fishers cannot provide definitive latitudes and longitudes as is it commercially sensitive information, but they can comment on areas that are mooted for selection on a case-by-case basis.

The issue of lack of commercial fishers present today was raised and Carol suggested that linkage with Kerry Egging or Ian McKenzie might be made by telephone if they are unable to attend future meetings. Possibly video conferencing facilities may be available at WestReap or high school or polytechnic. Bruce Hamilton also advocated for initial negotiation sessions in-committee so that free and frank discussion can be held. He also noted that before each meeting the degree of public access needs to be decided so that the public is not wrongly advised about their access. Richard Wallace advised he was not opposed to in-committee sessions but would prefer that they be kept to a minimum. Rick Barber suggested that the next meeting could be held at Bruce Bay marae, but also noted that there are some practical difficulties with that venue; the offer is on the table for future meetings.

It was agreed that the next meeting should commence as an in-committee meeting and move into a public session as soon as the Forum deems appropriate.

It was agreed that the future meeting dates be set as follows:

- 7 and 8 April (Carol Scott noted she had other meetings on the 8th April)
- 2 May
- 20 and 21 May
- 23 and 24 June

[Carol Scott departed the meeting at this point due to prior business commitments]

8.2 Process Timeline

Bruce Hamilton advised that he will be absent for the months of June and July, and proposed that Denis Shannahan take his place as Deputy Chairman. **The Forum agreed** to this proposal. Carrol Browne advised that she will also be absent for two months mid-year, so the Consultation Sub-committee work will need to start soon or the Sub-committee will need a new chair.

Campbell Robertson advised that Ministers were keen to see the Forum's recommendations ready for public consultation by the beginning of August 2008. A general discussion followed, and it was thought that although draft recommendations may well be ready by then but it is unlikely that the consultation process will have been completed. Richard Wallace advised that the Forum needs to concentrate on producing a sound report and recommendations for public consultation, not work to arbitrary timelines. Campbell Robertson raised an idea for Forum members to consider, the possibility of an independent scientific review of the MPA design once site options have been selected. No definite feedback on this idea was tabled at this time.

APPROVED

Forum members requested that the Secretary prepare a timeline for the next meeting showing the Forum meeting dates, the consultation timeline, and any other useful dates/deadlines.

Recapping at the end of this session, the facilitator checked whether the agenda 'outcomes' had been met, and members agreed that they had been. Outcomes are as follows:

1. Forum has an agreed process for delivering MPA network recommendations.
2. Forum has an agreed timeline for delivering MPA network recommendations.

9.0 Consultation Process

Carrol Browne initiated discussion on the possible consultation process the Forum should follow. Rick Barber advised that his runanga will hold workshop hui to get feedback and to provide awareness of the process. Richard Wallace noted that there is also the ability to use the monthly runanga meetings to obtain feedback. Eugenie Sage noted that the Forum website needs to be up-to-date as this is the best way to provide information widely.

Sarah Wilson asked the Forum for ideas about how they propose to test selection options with their constituencies. Bruce Watson noted that he does not have a 'constituency' as such but can canvas the Hokitika community. Stuart Thomson thinks that constituents will want to get involved when lines are drawn on maps, also lots of cynicism about the degree fishers can have influence. He expects to take flack from his sector and that the commercial fishing sector will be giving away fishing opportunities, whereas other groups are not. Bruce Watson noted that the Forum would be seeking to minimise the adverse impacts on fishers. Brad Stenhouse advised that the dive community generally only dives regular areas but lots of potential MPA habitats will not affect divers. Carrol Browne advised that she was similar to Bruce Watson, as she did not have a sector constituency, but that she will canvas her community and is keen to hear from fishers, and to minimise impacts on them. Carrol would prefer the public consultation round to be in the model of the last roadshow round, wherein DOC staff gave an informative Powerpoint presentation. Denis Shannahan advised that he keeps staff involved in the Regional Coastal Plan and with marine farming informed, with a view to future planning especially the marine farms.

There followed a general discussion about the membership of the Consultation Sub-committee, which has been Eugenie Sage, Emily Arthur and Carrol Browne. Forum members were keen to include a Ngai Tahu representative; Rick Barber and Richard Wallace were requested to discuss this representation together and for one of them to be nominated to join the Sub-committee. **It was agreed** that the Consultation Sub-committee have a meeting or conference call to develop ideas on the public consultation process and in maximising the value of that process.

10.0 General business

Campbell Robertson asked the Forum whether representatives of DoC Otago Conservancy office or Otago MinFish could attend the next Forum meeting, to observe a Forum functioning. Forum members replied that the next meeting would not be appropriate as it is planned to be in-committee, but any scheduled open meeting after that would be fine.

Rick Barber advised that he was thinking of developing an Addendum about cultural issues to be added to the West Coast Marine and Coastal Environment Report. He intends to discuss

APPROVED

this matter with Richard Wallace and to further advise the Forum. Rick also raised the matter of possible funding for detailed iwi research and input. Scott Williamson responded that he would discuss this matter directly with Rick and Richard, as MinFish does have some funding for this type of expenditure.

Bruce Hamilton noted that the workload of Forum members will increase a lot over the next few months as the Forum has been held back over recent months due to waiting for the finalisation of the national standards. He would appreciate everyone making the Forum work a priority over the next few months.

Bruce Hamilton closed the meeting at 4pm, thanking Sarah Wilson for her great work as facilitator.

Confirmed
Bruce Hamilton
Chairperson

.....
Papers Tabled

1. Approved minutes of Forum meeting of 12 September 2007
2. Letter and package of material received from the Proposed NZCPS Board of Inquiry, dated 7 March 2007
3. West Coast classification maps (large regional versions)