

2007/102

Agenda
Spatial Management – conservation and sustainable fisheries
25-26 February 2004
Hyatt Hotel Canberra, ACT – Centenary Room

Day 1: Wednesday 25 February 2004

9:30am to 5:00pm

6:30pm for 7:00pm Workshop Dinner at Vie Restaurant, Griffin Centre, Kingston

Day 2: Thursday 26 February 2004

9:00am to 3:30pm

Workshop Convenor – John Kalish (BRS)

Workshop Facilitator – Donna Petrachenko (DEH)

Workshop Introduction

Peter O'Brien
BRS 9:30-9:45

1. Major issues re spatial processes.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------|
| a. Conservation – issues relevant to marine biodiversity conservation (National Representative System of Marine Protected Areas). | Peter Taylor
DEH | 9:45-10:05 |
| b. Conservation – issues relevant to marine biodiversity conservation (Regional Marine Planning). | Sean Sullivan
NOO | 10:05-10:25 |
| c. Conservation/Fisheries – issues relevant to EPBC Act, strategic assessment and legal issues. | Margaret Tailby
DEH | 10:25- 10:45 |
| d. Morning Break | | 10:45-11:15 |
| e. Fisheries – issues relevant to MPAs and spatial management, Commonwealth perspective. | Katrina
Maguire AFMA | 11:15-11:35 |
| f. Fisheries – issues relevant to MPAs and spatial management, State perspective – evidence of integration? | Peter Neville
QDPI | 11:35-11:55 |
| g. Fishing Industry – position and processes with respect to MPAs and spatial management. | Russ Neal ASIC | 11:55-12:15 |
| h. Question period? | Donna
Petrachenko
DEH | 12:15-12:30 |
| i. Lunch | | 12:30-1:30 |
| j. Developing an R&D response to ecosystem based management with an emphasis on spatial management | Colin Buxton
TAFI | 1:30-1:50 |
| k. Summary and Synthesis Report.
Discussion. Identification of major issues. | Wes Ford
DPIWE | 1:50-2:30 |

2. Introduction to case studies.

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| a. Case study one overview: Victorian Rock Lobster | David Hobday
MAFRI | 2:30-2:50 |
| b. Case study two overview: Bass Strait Scallop. | Dave Johnson
AFMA | 2:50-3:10 |
| c. Case study three overview: Southeast fishery species (school shark) | Margot Sachse
AFMA | 3:10-3:30 |
| d. Afternoon break | | 3:30-4:00 |

3. Major issues summary.

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|
| a. Summary and Synthesis Working Groups on major issues. | Break out into 5 groups. | 4:00-5:00 |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|

Workshop Dinner at Vie Restaurant, Griffin Centre, Kingston

**6.30pm for
7.00pm**

DAY 2

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|
| b. Reports from Summary and Synthesis working groups on issues identified by the synthesis. | 20 minutes per group (5 groups) | 9:00-10:30 |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|

- | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| c. Morning break | | 10:30-11:00 |
|------------------|--|-------------|

4. Cross issue synthesis

- | | | |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| a. Discussion | | 11:00-12:30 |
|---------------|--|-------------|

- | | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| b. Lunch | | 12:30-1:30 |
|----------|--|------------|

5. Outputs and Outcomes

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| a. Plan the next steps to resolve these issues including identification of follow-up group to complete actions | | 1:30-2:30 |
|--|--|-----------|

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| b. Form outline of advice to the Oceans Board of Management (OBOM) and other bodies on the steps required to identify and align processes for integration of spatial measures for marine conservation and fisheries management. | | 2:30-3:30 |
|---|--|-----------|

Participants

Spatial Management – conservation and sustainable fisheries

Participant	Affiliation
Bennison, Simon	National Aquaculture Council
Bohm, Craig	Australian Marine Conservation Society
Buxton, Colin	Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute
Caton, Albert	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Cooper, Leonie	Northern Territory DBIRD
Craik, Wendy	AFMA Board
Curley, Fiona	Australian Seafood Industry Council / Oceanwatch
Davies, Campbell	Australian Antarctic Division
Diver, Geoff	Commonwealth Fisheries Association
Drenkhahn, Fritz	South East Trawl Fishing Industry Association
Dunn, Steve	NSW Fisheries
Ferguson, Robert	Department of Environment & Heritage
Ford, Wes	Tasmanian Dept. of Primary Industries, Water and Environment
Gleeson, Matt	Department of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries
Hobday, David	Department of Primary Industries Victoria (PIR Vic)
Hone, Patrick	FRDC
Johnson, Dave	AFMA
Kalish, John	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Larcombe, James	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Maguire, Katrina	AFMA
McDonald, David	CSIRO Marine Research
McLoughlin, Richard	Victorian Dept. of Natural Resources & Environment
McLoughlin, Kevin	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Millington, Peter	WA Fisheries
Moore, Margaret	World Wide Fund for Nature
Neal, Russ	Australian Seafood Industry Council
Neville, Peter	AFMF – Qld Fisheries
O'Brien, Peter	Bureau of Rural Sciences
O'Neil, Bernadette	National Oceans Office (Canberra)
Paulsen, Kylie	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Petrachenko, Donna	Department of Environment & Heritage
Prokop, Frank	RecFish Australia
Riseley, Peter	Wild Field Harvesters
Roberts, Les	AFMA
Sachse, Margot	AFMA
Sullivan, Sean	National Oceans Office
Tailby, Margaret	Department of Environment and Heritage
Tanzer, John	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority
Taylor, Peter	Department of Environment & Heritage
Troy, Sally	National Oceans Office
Wilks, Leanne	Department of Environment & Heritage
Wilson, Mike	Department of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries
Zacharin, Will	Department of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia

Report of the Workshop “Spatial management – conservation and sustainable fisheries”

25-26 February 2004, Canberra

Introduction

A workshop on “Spatial management – conservation and sustainable fisheries” (25-26 February 2004) was convened to identify changes to current arrangements and processes that would facilitate integration of conservation and fisheries management activities. The workshop agenda is attached (Attachment 1). The workshop was attended by 43 participants representing the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD), Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA), Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF), Department of Environment and Heritage (DEH), National Oceans Office (NOO), fisheries departments of all states and the Northern Territory, the fishing industry, conservation groups and the recreational fishing sector (Attachment 2).

The recently released Australian Government policy on marine protected areas (MPAs) and displaced fishing indicates a commitment to marine biodiversity conservation, secure fisheries access and minimisation of the impacts of MPAs on existing fishing activities.

Spatial measures including MPAs have been used for hundreds of years as a means of managing harvested natural resources and, more recently, for conservation of heritage values including biodiversity. In Australia there are currently at least five processes that involve the implementation of spatial measures for management of marine resources:

- Establishment of the National Representative System of Marine Protected Areas (NRSMPAs)
- Establishment of Marine Protected Areas for conservation purposes by Australian Government and State agencies
- Spatial management requirements for fisheries identified in Strategic Assessments under the EPBC Act 1999
- Measures initiated by AFMA and State/Territory fisheries management to effect management of target and bycatch species and habitat protection
- Spatial management established through industry groups (e.g. codes of conduct) and informal stakeholder agreements

Integration of these conservation and fisheries management processes would result in reduced costs, a streamlined process, more effective stakeholder participation and facilitation of processes to achieve the Australian Government objectives in relation to MPAs and displaced fishing.

Government and stakeholder participation and engagement

Inclusion of representatives from each jurisdiction and the various stakeholder groups is central to ensuring success of the spatial management planning process.

Government agencies involved in planning should include AFMA, DAFF, DEH, NOO, and State/Territory agencies with responsibility for fisheries and state protected areas.

Stakeholder groups involved should include representatives from the fishing industry (Australian Government-managed and state fisheries), non-government organizations (e.g. conservation groups) and recreational fishing interests. To maintain participation in forums at a reasonable level, it will be important to ensure that various groups identify individual

representatives (e.g. a single representative from the Commonwealth Fisheries Association) and that central contact points are clearly identified.

Integration will depend on engagement of a full complement of potentially affected parties at the earliest stages of the process, timely sharing of information, joint development of outcomes through consultation, and education and engagement with communities (i.e. social acceptance).

Identification and roles of the lead agency

The key roles of the lead agency in relation to spatial management are to facilitate activities, ensure the process adheres to agreed timelines and ensure effective dissemination of information and outputs to all parties. The NOO was identified as the most appropriate lead agency in relation to the development of integrated spatial management. Responsibilities of the NOO should include:

- Confirmation of the objectives of the integration process
- Clarification and confirmation of the roles and responsibilities of other agencies in the process
- Confirmation of tasks and timelines agreed by all groups
- Confirmation of communication mechanisms and the nature of the decision making process
- Confirmation of consultation between and among groups
- Confirmation of the principles and mechanisms for the allocation of resources

The workshop identified the need to further clarify the nature of interaction between jurisdictions (e.g. Australian Government to State or State to State) and highlighted the need for effective communication among jurisdictions. Due to the multi-jurisdictional nature of spatial management, some workshop participants concluded that COAG, existing ministerial councils and PM&C should play a role in ensuring effective running of the overall MPA process.

Cost sharing and resourcing

Workshop participants agreed that inadequate resourcing and tight timelines have been an impediment to the wider introduction of spatial management. Integration will reduce the costs associated with the MPA process by creating efficiencies such as in consultation and evaluation of available research information.

Development of an agreed cost-sharing approach early in the process will allow for more effective participation by States/Territories and key stakeholder groups. This will allow a more equitable sharing of costs across sectors and stakeholders whereas the current arrangements do not address this issue early enough in the planning process.

Determination of government and stakeholder roles and responsibilities

Different agencies are responsible for the carriage of legislation that requires consideration in relation to Regional Marine Planning and each of these agencies must provide a clear indication of their legislated requirements. Government and stakeholders must agree on clearly defined objectives for individual spatial management measures with this information as a minimum requirement.

An important first step to improve integration is to review existing Commonwealth and State initiatives for spatial management and develop a more coordinated schedule. There should be a stock take of existing protection regimes and an examination of potential crossover between these and future spatial management needs. It will be important to have the National Bioregionalisation framework in place before the identification of MPAs proceeds to other regional marine planning areas.

Alignment of key processes

There should be a clear definition and sharing of objectives across groups engaged in the development of spatial management for whatever purpose. Strategic assessments of fisheries by DEH and recommendations for various forms of spatial management have proceeded without direct reference to processes associated with identification of MPAs under the NRSMPA. There are benefits to be gained through the coordination of these two activities. An examination of when biodiversity conservation goals and fisheries management goals can be met simultaneously is required.

Performance assessment systems must be in place to provide a method to determine if objectives are being achieved through spatial management. If the assessment determines that the spatial management outcomes are not being achieved, an adaptive approach should be taken. This provides further confidence in the process by ensuring that spatial measures are implemented to achieve clearly defined outcomes.

The form of spatial management (e.g. no-take areas, seasonal closures) employed within a region must satisfy the objectives agreed by governments and stakeholders. For example, do the closures of seagrass beds in the Northern Prawn Fishery meet conservation goals as well as assist in sustaining the fishery resources.

Consultation and negotiation will be required on a region-by-region basis. The interests and aspirations of stakeholders may vary from region to region and this can impact on the nature of spatial management that is desired in a particular region.

Improved communication and awareness of spatial management issues will ensure that groups can identify common activities and focus their efforts for increased efficiency.

The way forward

The workshop identified the principal issues that would require resolution to facilitate integration of spatial management processes for biodiversity conservation and fisheries management.

1. The lead agency (NOO) should develop a full understanding of the requirements of different agencies and the needs (e.g. objectives, timeframes, stakeholders) associated with alignment of these requirements. This information includes identification of stakeholder interests and aspirations. This integrated information base should form the starting point for the consultation process and be available to all participants.
2. There should be a clear identification of the existing information base and other relevant sources, such as the almost completed National Bioregionalisation organised by the NOO. This information should include a stock take of existing spatial management measures across jurisdictions. Stakeholders should be engaged early in the process and presented with these resources, as well as details of Strategic Assessment requirements and RMP objectives. After identification of available information, a gap analysis should be completed to clarify weaknesses of

the existing information base available to support consultation on proposed spatial management initiatives.

3. Further efforts must be made to ensure participation by States/Territories in Oceans Policy particularly as it relates to Regional Marine Planning and spatial management.
4. As a matter of priority the timelines for the Northern Region Regional Marine Plan should be examined and discussed among governments and stakeholders to allow different groups to commence planning and ensure resources can be efficiently mobilised in the future.
5. Strategic assessments under the EPBC Act 1999 are planned for completion by December 2004. While this will allow consideration of fisheries spatial management recommendations as part of the NRSMPA process in the Northern Planning Area, this is unlikely to result in ideal integration of the two processes. Ideally, these processes should be investigated simultaneously.
6. Development of an agreed cost-sharing approach early in the process will allow for more effective participation by States/Territories and key stakeholder groups. Temporal alignment of activities will not ensure that different jurisdictions and stakeholders can engage in the process as required by the proposed timetable due to a mismatch of resources. This cost sharing approach should take all relevant sectors (e.g. governments, oil and gas, fishing, tourism) into account.
7. Baseline socio-economic data should be collected to allow determination of the impacts of RMPs on individuals and communities. Early collection of this information will reinforce the fact that the outcomes of RMP should be assessed against ecological, economic and social indicators (i.e. 'triple bottom-line').
8. Resources should be planned for the purposes of monitoring performance, ensuring compliance and consideration of future needs associated with adaptive management and the acquisition of new information.

Agenda

Spatial Management – conservation and sustainable fisheries

25-26 February 2004

Hyatt Hotel Canberra, ACT – Centenary Room

Day 1: Wednesday 25 February 2004

9:30am to 5:00pm

6:30pm for 7:00pm Workshop Dinner at Vie Restaurant, Griffin Centre, Kingston

Day 2: Thursday 26 February 2004

9:00am to 3:30pm

Workshop Convenor – John Kalish (BRS)

Workshop Facilitator – Donna Petrachenko (DEH)

Workshop Introduction

Peter O'Brien
BRS 9:30-9:45

1. Major issues re spatial processes.

- | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------|--------------|
| a. | Conservation – issues relevant to marine biodiversity conservation (National Representative System of Marine Protected Areas). | Peter Taylor
DEH | 9:45-10:05 |
| b. | Conservation – issues relevant to marine biodiversity conservation (Regional Marine Planning). | Sean Sullivan
NOO | 10:05-10:25 |
| c. | Conservation/Fisheries – issues relevant to EPBC Act, strategic assessment and legal issues. | Margaret Tailby
DEH | 10:25- 10:45 |
| d. | Morning Break | | 10:45-11:15 |
| e. | Fisheries – issues relevant to MPAs and spatial management, Commonwealth perspective. | Katrina
Maguire AFMA | 11:15-11:35 |
| f. | Fisheries – issues relevant to MPAs and spatial management, State perspective – evidence of integration? | Peter Neville
QDPI | 11:35-11:55 |
| g. | Fishing Industry – position and processes with respect to MPAs and spatial management. | Russ Neal ASIC | 11:55-12:15 |
| h. | Question period? | Donna
Petrachenko
DEH | 12:15-12:30 |
| i. | Lunch | | 12:30-1:30 |
| j. | Developing an R&D response to ecosystem based management with an emphasis on spatial management | Colin Buxton
TAFI | 1:30-1:50 |
| k. | Summary and Synthesis Report.
Discussion. Identification of major issues. | Wes Ford
DPIWE | 1:50-2:30 |

2. Introduction to case studies.

- | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|-----------|
| a. | Case study one overview: Victorian Rock Lobster | David Hobday
MAFRI | 2:30-2:50 |
| b. | Case study two overview: Bass Strait Scallop. | Dave Johnson
AFMA | 2:50-3:10 |
| c. | Case study three overview: Southeast fishery species (school shark) | Margot Sachse
AFMA | 3:10-3:30 |
| d. | Afternoon break | | 3:30-4:00 |

3. Major issues summary.

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| a. | Summary and Synthesis Working Groups on major issues. | Break out into 5 groups. | 4:00-5:00 |
|----|---|--------------------------|-----------|

Workshop Dinner at Vie Restaurant, Griffin Centre, Kingston

**6.30pm for
7.00pm**

DAY 2

- | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------|-------------|
| b. | Reports from Summary and Synthesis working groups on issues identified by the synthesis. | 20 minutes per group (5 groups) | 9:00-10:30 |
| c. | Morning break | | 10:30-11:00 |

4. Cross issue synthesis

- | | | | |
|----|------------|--|-------------|
| a. | Discussion | | 11:00-12:30 |
| b. | Lunch | | 12:30-1:30 |

5. Outputs and Outcomes

- | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----------|
| a. | Plan the next steps to resolve these issues including identification of follow-up group to complete actions | | 1:30-2:30 |
| b. | Form outline of advice to the Oceans Board of Management (OBOM) and other bodies on the steps required to identify and align processes for integration of spatial measures for marine conservation and fisheries management. | | 2:30-3:30 |

Participant	Affiliation
Bennison, Simon	National Aquaculture Council
Bohm, Craig	Australian Marine Conservation Society
Buxton, Colin	Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute
Caton, Albert	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Cooper, Leonie	Northern Territory DBIRD
Craik, Wendy	AFMA Board
Curley, Fiona	Australian Seafood Industry Council / Oceanwatch
Davies, Campbell	Australian Antarctic Division
Diver, Geoff	Commonwealth Fisheries Association
Drenkhahn, Fritz	South East Trawl Fishing Industry Association
Dunn, Steve	NSW Fisheries
Ferguson, Robert	Department of Environment & Heritage
Ford, Wes	Tasmanian Dept. of Primary Industries, Water and Environment
Gleeson, Matt	Department of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries
Hobday, David	Department of Primary Industries Victoria (PIR Vic)
Hone, Patrick	FRDC
Johnson, Dave	AFMA
Kalish, John	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Larcombe, James	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Maguire, Katrina	AFMA
McDonald, David	CSIRO Marine Research
McLoughlin, Richard	Victorian Dept. of Natural Resources & Environment
McLoughlin, Kevin	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Millington, Peter	WA Fisheries
Moore, Margaret	World Wide Fund for Nature
Neal, Russ	Australian Seafood Industry Council
Neville, Peter	AFMF – Qld Fisheries
O'Brien, Peter	Bureau of Rural Sciences
O'Neil, Bernadette	National Oceans Office (Canberra)
Paulsen, Kylie	Bureau of Rural Sciences
Petrachenko, Donna	Department of Environment & Heritage
Prokop, Frank	RecFish Australia
Riseley, Peter	Wild Field Harvesters
Roberts, Les	AFMA
Sachse, Margot	AFMA
Sullivan, Sean	National Oceans Office
Tailby, Margaret	Department of Environment and Heritage
Tanzer, John	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority
Taylor, Peter	Department of Environment & Heritage
Troy, Sally	National Oceans Office
Wilks, Leanne	Department of Environment & Heritage
Wilson, Mike	Department of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries
Zacharin, Will	Department of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia

Background

- November National Oceans Ministerial Board requested advice on how integration of spatial management measures and MPA's could proceed.
- Workshop "*Spatial management – conservation and sustainable fisheries*" held 25-26 February 2004.
- 43 participants from AAD, AFMA, DAFF, DEH, NOO, State and NT Fisheries departments, representatives of the fishing industry, recreational fishing and conservation groups.

Workshop Objectives

- identify the major issues requiring resolution for integration between MPA's for conservation purposes and spatial management for fisheries purposes.
- identify options to progress integration.
- agree on implementation and next steps.

Workshop Results 1

1. NOO identified as lead agency to facilitate activities to integrate measures amongst agencies
2. Within context of regional marine planning, agreed on the need to:
 - review existing and planned spatial management measures with regard to overlap, scheduling and future spatial management needs.
 - identify where compatible objectives exist and pursue integration when conditions are met.

Workshop Results 2

- recognize that existing processes, timelines and resources may require realigning.
- recognize the potential for one measure to meet both fisheries and conservation requirements.
- recognise the need for participation by States/Territories in Regional Marine Planning and spatial management.
- recognise the importance of adequate resources to monitor the performance and effectiveness.
- Recognize the potential to broaden the resource base for research/monitoring/maintenance of spatial measures (beyond the commercial fisheries sector).

Workshop Results 3

3. For the southeast regional marine plan, NOO to lead a process that will:
 - Gather information from agencies on existing and proposed spatial management measures and any proposed stakeholder engagement.
 - Have Agencies meet to identify overlap and potential for coordination.
 - Identify legal, administrative and process implications of proposed integration.

Workshop Results 4

- Provide recommendations to OBOM on potential and methods for integration.
 - Have Agencies implement decisions of OBOM on integration for the South-east Region.
4. NOO will facilitate developing an agreed national approach for future regional marine plans.

A Way Forward

- Based on the outcomes of the workshop and endorsement by Board Agencies, NOO will facilitate developing an agreed national approach for future regional marine plans.
- Integration process will be implemented for the southeast plan.
- Development of northern and future regional planning processes will incorporate an integrated approach at the outset.

Mcloughlin, Kevin - BRS

From: Chris O'Brien [chris.obrien@iotc.org]
Sent: Monday, 20 June 2005 3:00 PM
To: Kevin.Mcloughlin@brs.gov.au
Subject: FW: Notice: IOTC Working Party on Bycatch

-----Original Message-----

From: Jack Frazier [mailto:kurma@shentel.net]
Sent: 18 June 2005 04:19
To: Chris O'Brien; Maura@vscan02.westnet.com.au
Cc: driss.meski@iccat.es; victor.restrepo@iccat.es; rallen@iattc.org; 'Brian Macdonald'; johnh@spc.int; contact@wcpfc.org; cleo.small@rspb.org.uk; iosea@un.org; burgener@sani.org; mas@iucnearo.org; cara.miller@wdcs.org.au; paul.gamblin@wwf.org.au; nelr@kznwildlife.com; aubrey.harris@fao.org; jmbendo@wwf.tz; Mr.Bundit Chokesanguan
Subject: Re: Notice: IOTC Working Party on Bycatch

Date: Fri, 17 Jun 2005 19:16:21 -0400
From: "Jack Frazier" <frazierja@crc.si.edu>
To: <kurma@shentel.net>
Subject: IOTC
Mime-Version: 1.0

Greetings Chris,

Thank you for the draft agenda for the IOTC Working Party on Bycatch, scheduled for 20 July 2005 in Phuket, Thailand. It is indeed heartening to see that the IOTC is going to be dealing with this critical issue. In regard to the draft agenda, I would like to make several suggestions:

- 1) At the beginning, put the meeting into context with a BRIEF review of the legal framework and history of bycatch mitigation issues in relation to Regional Fisheries Management Organisations. This could be accomplished in five minutes, and might touch quickly on the measures already stipulated in major instruments such as UNCLOS and the 1995 UN Straddling Stocks Agreement; it could quickly review recent advances in FAO in regard to multi-lateral accords for bycatch reduction, as well as advances in other RFMOs (the IATTC immediately comes to mind, as being well advanced and actively working on bycatch reduction in several fisheries), etc. The point is, this issue has been given considerable importance for over a decade, and it would be a pity if the IOTC did not take the fullest advantage of all the work that has been done in related organisations.
- 2) Within the recommendations at the end of the meeting include:
 - a. The building of effective partnerships with other RMFOs, IOSEA, the fishing industry, NGOs, and other related organisations;
 - b. Promote on-board observer programmes with adequate coverage of fishing effort;
 - c. Establish clear tasks, timetables, and responsibilities.

Finally, I am taking the liberty of coping this message to Mr.Bundit Chokesanguan, who is a SEAFDEC specialist in fisheries gear and bycatch issues. If he had time, I am sure that he could provide valuable insights.

Good luck with the meeting!
Best wishes

Jack

P.S. You may know that next week, the 73rd Meeting of the IATTC will take place; there they will be discussing various issues related to their ongoing work on bycatch reduction, in particular, that related to marine turtles.

At 18:45 +0800 6/17/5, Chris O'Brien wrote:

>
>
>
>
>
>
>Dear interested Working Party on Bycatch participants

>
>
>
>
>
>
>Attached is a meeting notice and draft agenda for the upcoming Working
>Party on Bycatch to be held in Phuket on 20 July.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>Comments on the WPB agenda are welcome. Also please advise me if you
>intend to make a presentation.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>Sincerely

>
>
>
>
>-----Chris O'BrienDeputy
>SecretaryIndian Ocean Tuna CommissionCommission des Thons de l'Océan
>IndienPO Box 1011VictoriaSeychellesPh. +248 225494Mob. +248 521740Fax.
>+248 224364chris.obrien@iotc.org

>
>