

Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation 'Whole of Government' workshop

Phillip D Kerr



Australian Government

**Fisheries Research and
Development Corporation**

Project No. 2009/326

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Phillip D Kerr
ADDRESS: Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation
36 Pyke Street
Teesdale
VIC 3328
Telephone: 03 5281 5722
Email: admin@visc.org.au

Copyright Fisheries Research and Development Corporation and the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation, 2010.

ISBN 978-0646-5-3414-5

This work is copyright. Except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth), no part of this publication may be reproduced by any process, electronic or otherwise, without the specific written permission of the copyright owners. Information may not be stored electronically in any form whatsoever without such permission.

Disclaimer

The authors do not warrant that the information in this document is free from errors or omissions. The authors do not accept any form of liability, be it contractual, tortious, or otherwise, for the contents of this document or for any consequences arising from its use or any reliance placed upon it. The information, opinions and advice contained in this document may not relate, or be relevant, to a readers particular circumstances. Opinions expressed by the authors are the individual opinions expressed by those persons and are not necessarily those of the publisher, research provider or the FRDC.

The Fisheries Research and Development Corporation plans, invests in and manages fisheries research and development throughout Australia. It is a statutory authority within the portfolio of the federal Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, jointly funded by the Australian Government and the fishing industry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OBJECTIVES:4

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:7

BACKGROUND:7

NEED:8

OBJECTIVES:8

METHODS:9

RESULTS/DISCUSSION:11

BENEFITS:17

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT:17

PLANNED OUTCOMES:18

CONCLUSION:18

REFERENCES:18

APPENDIX 1:19

APPENDIX 2:22

APPENDIX 3:25

NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY:

2009/326

Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation 'Whole of Government' workshop

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Phillip D Kerr
ADDRESS: Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation
36 Pyke Street
Teesdale
VIC 3328
Telephone: 03 5281 5722
Email: admin@visc.org.au

OBJECTIVES:

1. Ensure adequate financial support is obtained in a 'whole of government' approach
2. Ensure programs are strategically administered to reach optimal outcomes

OUTCOMES ACHIEVED TO DATE

In January 2010, the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation (VISC) coordinated and administered a 'whole of government' workshop with 19 Government Departments identified as having an interest in Indigenous Affairs and Seafood Development. The purpose of the workshop was to outline the range of initiatives being pursued by VISC and to seek financial support for further developing these initiatives. Of the 19 departments identified and approached, 9 (47%) were able to attend the workshop.

The 'whole of government' process was designed to ensure that the VISC member projects were strategically administered to reach optimal outcomes and minimise risk. However, the inability of the workshop participants to commit to VISC either at the workshop or during follow up discussions has proved to be a major barrier to the development of the corporation's projects and Indigenous aquaculture in Victoria.

As of early June 2010, VISC has been able to secure support for approximately 2 days per week through the FRDC and will use retained earnings of the organisation to provide services to members until September 2010. At this point, VISC may be forced to remove staff and active involvement from representing and supporting Indigenous member interest in the Victorian Seafood Industry if further support is not obtained.

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation (VISC) is an Indigenous lead not for profit support organisation representing members and a network base of approximately 5000 Indigenous people (31%) from regional and rural Victoria.

Since September 2009, the VISC have actively promoted 3 project proposals from the VISC Business Plan 2009-13 to multiple Government agencies who have a responsibility under the 2009 Council of Australian Governments (COAG) "Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage" Report.

These project proposals and planned outcomes include;

1. Project 1 (Using Aquaponics to contribute to 'Bridging the gap')
 - Improving Indigenous Physical and Mental Health
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Ensuring activities on 'country' are Environmentally Sustainable
2. Project 2 (Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry)
 - Developing a mechanism to ensure that VISC is self funded.
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Developing partnerships with the Seafood Industry
3. Project 3 (Developing a large scale eel farm on Indigenous owned land)
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Developing a commercial partnership with the Eel industry
 - Development of Australias largest RAS.

VISC were advised by numerous departments during this process, that a 'whole of government' approach was required.

In January 2010, the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation (VISC) coordinated and administered a 'whole of government' workshop with 19 Government Departments identified as having an interest in Indigenous Affairs and Seafood Development. Of the 19 departments identified, 9 (47%) were able to attend and 2 (10.5%) were able to commit support for Indigenous Seafood Development.

All workshop participants were provided with the opportunity to question and discuss issues with the VISC Board and staff over a 2 day period, including a tour of a 'demonstration site' for project 1: Aquaponics. This demonstration site was constructed by VISC, Framlingham Aboriginal Trust and the seafood industry for government viewing to illustrate 'on ground' application of the proposed project.

Due to the high percentage of Government representatives who did not attend (53%) or attended but did not have the authority (77%) to commit support to VISC member projects, the action plan coming out of the workshop largely identified activities that are a repetition of the previous work conducted by VISC through its initial consultation with Government in late 2009.

The 'whole of government' process was designed to ensure that the VISC projects were strategically administered to reach optimal outcomes and minimise risk. However, the inability for government officers to commit to the 'whole of government process' has cost significant program management costs (approximately \$22,530 for Nov 09 to Jan 10) and put VISC 3 months behind its original schedule.

All participants from the workshop agreed that a priority is to secure sufficient support to ensure that VISC can continue with the government processes required to secure the necessary long term support for developing VISC member projects.

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation is now actively engaged with Government Departments identified in the individual project action plans to secure sufficient support past June 2010.

As of early June 2010, VISC has been able to secure support for approximately 2 days per week through the FRDC and will use retained earnings of the organisation to provide services to members until September 2010. At this point, VISC may be forced to remove staff and active involvement from representing and supporting Indigenous member interest in the Victorian Seafood Industry if further support is not obtained.

KEYWORDS: **Indigenous, Seafood development, Whole of Government, Aquaculture**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation would like to acknowledge the support received via the FRDC and Framlingham Aboriginal Trust in hosting this workshop.

BACKGROUND:

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation (VISC) was formed in 2004, by a group of Indigenous individuals and community organisations who believed that there was a lack of access to appropriate information and extension based services surrounding the Seafood industry within Victoria.

VISC supports its members in facets of the seafood sector by providing;

- Appropriate information to facilitate informed decision making
- Extension services as required
- Services to prepare and submit funding proposals where projects are in line with the strategic goals of the organisation
- Services to manage project/s from design through to implementation stages.
- Representation and lobbying for Indigenous interest in the Seafood sector where deemed appropriate

The Corporation was originally named the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Committee; however in late 2009, this was changed to the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation.

Between October 2005 and June 2008, VISC (operating without funding) focused on advising State Government on the implementation of the Indigenous Aquaculture Strategy 2005-2008.

In July 2008, VISC were able to secure 2 years of funding (ends June 2010) through the Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations. This funding was structured to provide for a project manager, trainee and creation of the corporations Business Plan (2009-13).

Since September 2009, the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation (VISC) have actively promoted 3 project proposals to Multiple Government Departments who have a responsibility under the Council of Australian Governments (COAG); 2009, Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage Report.

These project proposals* include;

- Project Proposal 1: Using Aquaponics to contribute to bridging the age gap between Indigenous and Non Indigenous people.
- Project Proposal 2: Supporting Indigenous Commercial and Economic Development Opportunities in the Victorian Seafood Sector.
- Project Proposal 3: Development of a large scale eel farm on Indigenous owned land

* A more detailed overview of project proposals are provided in appendices 1-3.

NEED:

It is essential that the visions of Indigenous communities are accepted in holistic terms. It is also important to note that while the visions of Indigenous communities could be the same or similar, they will also be independent due to the inherent cultural diversity of each community in relation to traditions, sites, stories and cultural practices.

Distinct rights exist for Indigenous people as part of their rights to self-determination.

These rights should be recognised as inherent and holistic. They are:

- Customary fishing rights of Indigenous communities along the coastal and river systems; and
- Human rights to maintain a cultural economy

Customary rights relate to cultural self-determination and the preservation of distinctive cultural identities.

Human rights to maintain a 'cultural economy' relate to Indigenous communities being able to undertake activities that secure sustainable capital from the natural resources that traditionally and historically belong to each community.

Indigenous people want to be actively involved at all levels of management of fisheries resources throughout their traditional lands, and are very proud that they have survived the onslaughts of colonisation, assimilation and different forms of indoctrination and discrimination.

Indigenous communities believe that economic, cultural, environmental and social values should be given equal status when policy and management decisions are made.

A strong level of interest and enthusiasm for Indigenous involvement in the seafood industry already exists within Victoria's Indigenous communities, but many communities are often unaware of the opportunities available or are unable to adequately assess them. There is also recognition that opportunities are not being made available within regions to retain Indigenous youth. Many groups believe that economic development (particularly in the seafood sector) may act as a logical pathway to retaining youth and achieving more healthy vibrant communities and futures for their families.

OBJECTIVES:

1. Ensure adequate financial support is obtained in a 'whole of government' approach
2. Ensure programs are strategically administered to reach optimal outcomes

METHODS:

The newly developed VISC Business Plan (2009-13) and 3 project proposals were sent to the following organisations in late September 2009;

1. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry (DAFF)
2. Department of Employment, Education & Workplace Relations (DEEWR)
3. Department of Health and Ageing (DHA)
4. Department of Sustainability and the Environment (DSE)
5. Fisheries Research & Development Corporation (FRDC)
6. Indigenous Business Australia (IBA)
7. Indigenous Land Corporation (ILC)
8. Department of Primary Industries (DPI)
9. Department of Innovation, Industry & Regional Development (DIIRD)
10. Department of Environment, Heritage and the Arts (DEHA)
11. Department of Planning & Community Development (DPCD)
12. National Aquaculture Council (NAC)
13. Seafood Industry Victoria (SIV)
14. VRFish

In October 2009 the following correspondence was received from this action

	Comments
1. DAFF	No Correspondence received
2. DEEWR	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
3. DHA	Advised that this is not part of their Ministers portfolio (referred to DAFF)
4. DSE	Advised that this is not part of their Ministers portfolio (referred to DPI)
5. FRDC	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
6. IBA	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
7. ILC	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
8. DPI	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
9. DIIRD	No Correspondence received
10. DEWHA	Advised that this is not part of their Ministers portfolio (referred to DAFF)
11. DPCD	Interested, willing to be part of a 'whole of government meeting'
12. NAC	No Correspondence received
13. SIV	No Correspondence received
14. VRFish	No Correspondence received

Following this correspondence VISC proceeded to coordinate the 'whole of government' workshop as the advised process to secure government investment in the identified project proposals.

In November 2009, VISC met individually with numerous organisations that also identified their interest in attending a 'whole of government meeting'. These organisations included;

1. Red Cross
2. Rotary
3. Australian Aquaculture Products (AAP)
4. Deakin University
5. Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
6. Wannon Water
7. Origin Energy
8. Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)
9. Warrnambool City Council
10. Moyne Shire
11. South Western Victorian Eel Growers Group (SWVEGG)
12. Warrnambool Cheese and Butter
13. Department of Health (formerly a part of the Department of Human Services)
14. Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA)
15. Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health (OATSIH)

On January 27th and 28th of 2010, VISC conducted the 'whole of Government' workshop at the Kirrae Health Centre, Framlingham Aboriginal Trust, Purnim, Victoria. This location was chosen as an Aquaponics 'demonstration site' (project proposal number 1) had been constructed at the Framlingham Aboriginal Trust.

This 'demonstration site' was developed with Industry support for viewing by potential funding providers for the proposed VISC program. If unable to secure funding for the program by June 2010, the demonstration site would have to be decommissioned and equipment returned to Industry suppliers.

Agendas and supporting documentation were sent out to stakeholders requesting that a maximum of 2 people per organisation attend and that those representatives be people in positions who could speak with authority surrounding support for each proposal presented.

RESULTS/DISCUSSION:

General Results

The following is a list of the correspondence received surrounding attendance to the workshop.

Attending:

	Comments
1. Windamara Aboriginal Cooperative	VISC Chair, (Denis Rose)
2. Framlingham Aboriginal Trust	VISC Board and VISC Members, (Neil Martin, Geoff Clark, Aaron Clark)
3. Wathaurong Aboriginal Corporation	VISC Board, (Trevor Edwards)
4. Koori Employment Enterprises	VISC Board, (Wayne Overall)
5. Ramahyuck District Aboriginal Corporation	VISC member, interest in Aquaponics project, (Joe Kiss)
6. DPI	Fisheries Victoria Branch, (Andrew Clarke, Alice McDonald, Craig Murdoch)
7. DPCD	Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (Kate Glennie)
8. Department of Health	Formerly part of DHS (Syd Fry)
9. DIIRD	Regional Development Victoria (Lindsay Ferguson)
10. ILC	Based in Adelaide (Adrian Stanley, Paul Jenkins)
11. Department of Infrastructure (DOI)	Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government (Karen Norris)
12. Deakin University	(Dr Paul Jones)
13. Rotary	(Olivia Sinclair)
14. Origin Energy	(Joseph Mazonne)
15. Moyne Shire	(Vicki Thornton)
16. Warrnambool Council	(Bruce Anson, Bill Millard)
17. Wannon Water	(Ben Pohlner)
18. Warrnambool Cheese and Butter Factory	(Alex Duplex)
19. SWVEGG	(Bill Allan, Ben and Ken Osbourne)
20. AAP	(Jon Breen)
21. EPA	(Michael Fitzgerald)

Declined to attend:

	Comments
1. RIRDC	No Correspondence received
2. OATSIH	Unavailable, Programs maybe out of scope for OATSIH funding
3. DIIRD	Koori Business Network. Interested in seeing report of outcomes
4. DSE	No Correspondence received
5. NAC	No Correspondence received
6. SIV	No Correspondence received
7. VRFish	No Correspondence received
8. DEWHA	No Correspondence received

Apologies:

	Comments
1. FaHCSIA	Short staffed
2. IBA	Short staffed. Interested in seeing report of outcomes and to meet afterwards for discussion of future support
3. DEEWR	Short staffed. Interested in seeing report of outcomes and to meet afterwards for discussion of future support
4. FRDC	Short staffed, 4 day commitment to onerous from Canberra. Approved sponsorship for meeting costs. Interested in seeing report of outcomes and to meet afterwards for discussion of future support
5. DAFF	Short staffed , new staff member just been employed

Over the 2 day period the projects were discussed in detail with actions developed as follows:

Project Proposal 1: Using Aquaponics to Contribute to 'bridging the gap'

Day 1; 27th of January 2010, started at 1:30pm

Attendees; VISC Board and members, Rotary, DOI, ILC, Wannon Water, Deakin University, DPCD, DPI, DIIRD, Moyne Shire, Department of Health

Apologies; Joseph Mazonne (Origin Energy), Paul Jenkins (ILC)

Meeting 1; Using Aquaponics to contribute to 'Bridging the gap'

- Presentation: Using Aquaponics to contribute to 'Bridging the Gap'. (Phillip Kerr, VISC Project Manager)
- Tour of Demonstration facility
- Implementation support
 - All participants were impressed with the Demonstration facility and thought the proposal was a good idea with outcomes covering a broad range of disciplines. All technical questions relating to the implementation of the program were discussed and answered to the satisfaction of the group.
 - DOI – explained the role of the Regional Local Infrastructure Fund and how this may be accessed through local Government
 - Moyne Shire- agreed to review what programs may be suitable for funding received through DOI, though explained that this would only be available to Aquaponic systems within their shire area. This would mean each Indigenous group wanting to access this potential funding would need to go through their own local shire.
 - A great level of discussion focussed around the economic viability of the system. VISC explained that the system was not designed as a commercial venture as they already had a commercial feasibility for this but experienced had shown that Indigenous groups were reluctant to invest over \$500,000 into a project unless they had community support, knowledge, skills and experience. The Aquaponics system designed is a pilot project which would be the impetus to potentially develop a commercial facility in the future.
 - Rotary – agreed to review their budget to see where they can support the program
 - DPI – were very supportive of the concept and discussed their interest in using Aquaponics as a way of encouraging more people into Aquaculture, DPI are unable to financially support the proposal as they do not have a program in place for this sort of venture. They have however agreed to lend in-kind support by attending meetings with VISC and funding agencies if required.
 - DPCD – Discussed a similar project happening with a group called C.E.R.E.S and suggested contacting them to see if the program could be incorporated into their existing program surrounding Aquaponics. AAV also suggested that Tourism could be a vehicle to increasing the commercial viability of this system.
 - ILC – stated that though the implementation support requested could potentially be funded as a Strategic Project through the ILC, It would have trouble funding all the Project management and Training costs. It was advised that an application to the ILC would have more weight if a

- partnership was able to be formed with someone like DEEWR, IBA or any other organisation who could possibly contribute to these areas.
- VISC – discussed that preliminary talks had occurred with the FRDC who may be able to contribute funding through project management and training related costs. VISC also noted that the FRDC may have an interest in contributing to costs if some research could be developed.
 - Deakin University – agreed to meet with VISC and develop a research proposal for FRDC consideration (*utilising fish waste water for Indigenous plants*)
 - Department of Health – Believed the proposal would not fall under any of their funding programs
 - It was agreed by all that at the minimum 1 system should be supported if departments are concerned about financially supporting 5 systems

Actions from Meeting 1: Using Aquaponics to contribute to ‘Bridging the gap’

Action	Outcome
1. VISC to meet with the Moyne Shire to discuss what funding program and application process will be required to access local government funds.	Via email, 01/02/2010. Community Assistance fund ‘Health and Wellbeing’ Program most suitable. Funding available of up to a maximum of \$5,000.
2. VISC to follow-up with Rotary and discuss potential support.	
3. VISC to contact C.E.R.E.S and arrange a meeting to discuss their project and any potential partnerships.	
4. VISC and DPI to meet with IBA, DEEWR and the FRDC to discuss a partnership with the ILC surrounding funding support	
5. VISC to meet with Deakin University to design a research proposal for FRDC consideration (<i>utilising fish waste for Indigenous plants</i>)	

Project Proposal 2: Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous Involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry.

Day 2; 28th of January 2010, started at 9am

Attendees; VISC Board and members, DOI, ILC, DPCD, DPI, SWVEGG, Warrnambool council

Apologies; Joseph Mazonne (Origin Energy), Paul Jenkins (ILC), Bruce Anson (Warrnambool Council), John Breen (AAP)

Meeting 2: Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry.

- Presentation: Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry. (Phillip Kerr, VISC Project Manager)
- Implementation support
 - All participants agreed that a priority for VISC was to secure the ongoing position of an officer to continue the work of the Business Plan and continue the development of Indigenous seafood businesses and Indigenous representation in the seafood sector.
 - VISC - discussed that 1 year contractual arrangements with Government for funding were counterproductive and that the organisation was spending close to half their time sourcing funding to continue when they should be fulfilling their current contractual obligations. VISC explained their need for a long term supporting mechanism to help it establish its own mechanism for producing a sustainable income away from Government.
 - All participants agreed that a long term funding contract for the life of the business plan was needed though the ability to find a Department willing to fund a 4 year contract will be very difficult.
 - DPCD – Suggested that VISC possibly start selling Aquaponics systems now to the public and that this may help create some cashflow as well as consider the tourism opportunities from the current Aquaponics system at Framlingham.
 - ILC – explained that in previous proposals of this nature, they have directed people to DEEWR and IBA.
 - VISC –discussed that preliminary talks had occurred with the FRDC who may be able to contribute funding through their people development and or other programs.
 - DPI – Discussed that they are currently writing an Aboriginal Fishing Strategy that identifies economic development as a key theme. They are supportive of this proposal however have no access to funding. They have however agreed to lend in-kind support by attending meetings with VISC and funding agencies if required.

Actions from Meeting 2: Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry

Action	Outcome
1. VISC and DPI to meet with IBA, DEEWR, ILC and the FRDC to discuss a partnership surrounding funding support for an Officer and Economic Research projects over 4 years	

Project Proposal 3: Developing a large scale eel farm on indigenous owned land

Day 2; 28th of January 2010, started at 9am

Attendees; VISC Board and members, DOI, ILC, DPCD, DPI, SWVEGG, Warrnambool Council, EPA, Moyne Shire, Wannon Water, Deakin University, DIIRD

Apologies; Joseph Mazonne (Origin Energy), Paul Jenkins (ILC), Bruce Anson (Warrnambool Council), John Breen (AAP), Alex Duplex (Warrnambool Cheese and Butter)

Meeting 3; Feasibility for a large scale eel farm in South West Victoria

- Presentation: Feasibility for a large scale eel farm in South West Victoria (Phillip Kerr, VISC Project Manager)
- Implementation support
 - DPI – discussed that the Eel fishery management plan had moved up into a priority area of the Department and a steering committee would be formed shortly.
 - DPI – the department is currently looking at a joint project with SARDI to develop a paper investigating whether Australia should be getting involved in the race to close the eel lifecycle.
 - DPI – Committed \$25,000 towards the Marketing study. VISC noted that the Study is budgeted at \$35,000 but the DPI funding could be used in a partnership with another funding provider (possibly DEEWR). DPI agreed.
 - Deakin University – agreed to meet with VISC and develop a research proposal for FRDC consideration surrounding research priorities in the feasibility.
 - DIIRD – discussed the need to view this document as a working document as currently the financials included did not represent a worthwhile investment. VISC agreed and outlined the need for the Marketing study to firm up the assumptions in the model.
 - DPI – expressed an interest under the Aquaculture Initiative program with DIIRD to discuss the potential to fund a delegation to visit 500 tonne farms.
 - Warrnambool Council – left the meeting just prior to the discussion surrounding the planned location of the eel farm relative to an opportunity to use waste water from the Warrnambool Cheese and Butter Factory. VISC discussed the need for a cost/benefit analysis to be undertaken. All participants agreed that this was a good idea and that VISC would meet with the Moyne Shire and Warrnambool council to progress further.

Actions from Meeting 3: Developing a large scale eel farm on Indigenous owned land

Action	Outcome
1. VISC and DPI to meet with IBA, DEEWR, ILC and the FRDC to discuss a partnership surrounding funding support.	DPI Committed \$25,000 towards a \$35,000 Marketing study.
2. VISC to meet with Deakin University to design a research proposal for FRDC consideration surrounding research priorities identified.	
3. VISC to contact Warrnambool Cheese and Butter to investigate their interest in approaching the Warrnambool Council and Moyne Shire to conduct a cost/benefit analysis.	

BENEFITS:

The workshop provided the following benefits;

1. Stakeholders were given an opportunity to meet collectively and discuss their concerns and have any issues addressed while providing input into the process to optimise the planned outcomes
2. VISC were able to evaluate the effectiveness of a 'whole of government' approach in development of the Victorian Indigenous Seafood Sector.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT:

Subject to VISC securing support past June 2010

VISC is actively engaged with Government Departments identified in the action plan as individual Departments to secure support past June 2010. If support is not found before then, VISC may be forced to remove staff and active involvement from representing and supporting Indigenous member interest in the Victorian Seafood Industry.

PLANNED OUTCOMES:

The planned outcomes from each project if supported include;

1. Project 1 (Using Aquaponics to contribute to 'Bridging the gap')
 - Improving Indigenous Health Outcomes
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Ensuring activities on 'country' are Environmentally Sustainable

2. Project 2 (Supporting Commercial and Economic Opportunities for Indigenous involvement in the Victorian Seafood Industry)
 - Developing a mechanism to ensure that VISC is self funded.
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Developing partnerships with the Seafood Industry

3. Project 3 (Developing a large scale eel farm on Indigenous owned land)
 - Building capacity within Indigenous Communities
 - Increasing Economic Development Opportunities
 - Developing a commercial partnership with the Eel industry
 - Development of Australia's largest RAS.

CONCLUSION:

The use of a 'whole of government' process is a significant barrier to developing the Indigenous seafood sector within Victoria.

Government does not have sufficient resources and processes in place to commit to development and implementation of a 'whole of government' approach in Indigenous Seafood Development within Victoria.

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Corporation has incurred a cost of \$22,530 and a loss of 3 months in its current workplan. This may result in removal of staff and active involvement from representing Indigenous member interest in the Victorian Seafood Industry if unable to secure support past June 2010.

REFERENCES:

The Victorian Indigenous Seafood Committee Business Plan (2009-2013)

APPENDIX 1:

Project Proposal 1: Using Aquaponics to contribute to bridging the age gap between Indigenous and Non Indigenous people.

Developed from a commercial feasibility on Aquaponics in early 2008, the VISC have developed a program that will provide the following outcomes to contribute towards 'bridging the gap'.

Indigenous Health

- Providing fresh fish and plants for Indigenous community consumption.
- Providing an opportunity to alleviate the effects of surrounding mental health contributing factors.
- Dependent upon the project success, more systems may be developed for family groups or a larger system for the whole community
- Provides an opportunity for Indigenous communities to grow fish and plant species both nutritious and culturally appropriate.
- May be targeted to future Indigenous Youth or Justice Program's
- Opportunity to have health benefits measured through the World Health Organisation by Professor Yuki Yamori

Building capacity

- Training of Indigenous people in fish and plant production for further employment within the community, the seafood and/or horticulture sectors.
- Employing 10 Indigenous people

Economic Development

- Excess plants produced may be made available for sale.
- The VISC Aquaponics Feasibility may be implemented by a community group on a commercial scale.
- An efficient system suitable for the development of local hydroponic bushfood products
- A potential business that will fit in with Indigenous customs and culture

Environmental benefits

- Caring for 'country' through the use of a water and energy efficient system for food production.
- Achieving 2 products produced from 1 water source

The program involves 5 Indigenous Communities each operating an Aquaponics system over a 2 year period with training for 2 Indigenous participants (10 in total) in a certificate 3 in Aquaculture (Aquaponics), 5 community gatherings, a project manager and mentor, all fish and plant seedlings, producing 135 kilos of fish and 13,500 plants (per system) over the trial period.

Cost per group

- Year 1; \$134,052 Year 2; \$101,578.

Please note that the above prices for training and project management would change if less than 5 groups were supported. .

Breakdown of costs (excluding gst)

Item	\$ Component cost	\$ Total per locatio n	\$ Year 1 Total for 5 location s	\$ Year 2 Total for 5 location s
<u>Aquaponics System (Year 1)</u>				
- 10m x 6m greenhouse	6,350	33,613	168,065	0
- Aquaculture System	13,260			
- 3 x hydroponic trays	6,180			
- Freight	1,410			
- Installation	6,413			
<u>Project Manager/Trainer (Year 1, 2)</u>				
- Salary (\$55 per hr @ 38 hrs p/week, includes oncosts, office expenses)	83,480	27,036	135,180	135,180
o Salary for Project Management	25,200			
o Salary for Training	18,250			
- Travel (lease, fuel, insurance, service)	8,250			
- Accommodation (55 days @ \$150)				
<u>Trainee Costs (Year 1)</u>				
- Salary (21 k + 20% oncosts, less subsidies of \$5,500)	19,700	39,400 2 trainee s	197,000	0
<u>Trainee Costs (Year 2)</u>				
- Salary (21k + 20% oncosts, less subsidies of \$2,500)	22,700	45,400 2 trainee s	0	227,000
<u>Fish (Year 1)</u>				
- Initial stocking (10 size classes)	1,500	3,298	16,490	0
- 8 mths stocking (50 fish per mth)	400			
- Fish food (1mm, 30 kilos)	190			
- Fish food (2mm, 60 kilos)	357			
- Fish food (3mm, 90 kilos)	526			
- Freight (ex Brisbane)	325			
<u>Fish (Year 2)</u>				
- 10 mths stocking (50 fish per mth)	1,000	2,398	0	11,990
- Fish Food (1mm, 30 kilos)	190			
- Fish Food (2mm, 60 kilos)	357			
- Fish Food (3mm, 90 kilos)	526			
- Freight (ex Brisbane)	325			
<u>Plants (Year 1)</u>				
Seedling cost \$0.18, Seedling holder \$0.12	135	2,945	14,725	0
- Initial stocking of 750 plants	1,080			
- 8 mths stocking (6000 plants)	1,215			
- 9 mths seedling holders (6750)	315			

- 9 mths coconut fibre (\$35 per bag) - Water buffer (calcium carbonate)	200			
<u>Plants (Year 2)</u> Seedling cost \$0.18, Seedling holder \$0.12 - 10 mths stocking (7500 plants) - 10 mths seedling holders (7500) - 10 mths coconut fibre (\$35 per bag) - Water buffer (calcium carbonate)	1,350 900 350 200	2,800	0	14,000
<u>Community Meetings (Year 1)</u> - 3 per location at \$500 per meeting	1,500	1,500	7,500	0
<u>Community Meetings (Year 2)</u> - 2 per location at \$500 per meeting	1,000	1,000	0	5,000
<u>Mentoring (Year 1,2)</u> - Dr Wilson Lennard (Hydroponics) \$500 per location per annum	500	500	2,500	2,500
Training (Years 1, 2) 10 cert 3 trainees, 5 locations, 21 units - Training and Assessment (\$98,250) - Less \$25,200 for Project manager to do the training - Less \$7,000 from EG Tafe for 2 workshops.	66,050	13,210	66,050	66,050
Administration charge (10% of yearly total) (public liability, accountant, audit, Governance, etc) - Year 1 - Year 2		12,150 9,234	60,750	46,170
Total for Year 1		134,052	668,260	
Total for Year 2		101,578		507,890

APPENDIX 2:

Project Proposal 2: Supporting Indigenous Commercial and Economic Development Opportunities in the Victorian Seafood Sector.

This proposal was developed out of action 1, key issue 2 (Commercial and Economic Opportunities) of the VISC Business Plan 2009-13;

Action 1: Lobby and negotiate with Government to fund the appointment of an Economic Development Officer over the current life of this business plan to support VISC and its members through the development of sustainable and viable seafood related ventures.

In July 2008, the VISC Board identified that the organisations human resources would be limited relative to the number of VISC members registered for support.

The VISC Board developed a work plan directing the project manager to concentrate on a major project that would provide the greatest opportunity for success. After an evaluation of registered projects, it was unanimously decided that the majority of staff time should be directed towards developing the Framlingham Aboriginal Trust project for eel aquaculture.

The VISC Project managers remaining time was spent conducting the following;

- Sourcing funds to conduct feasibilities on;
 - Ornamental fish culture (Major wholesaler wants 2.5 million goldfish per annum)
 - Mussel Culture (Release of new culture waters in Port Phillip Bay)
 - Framlingham Eel Project (500 tonne eel farm)
- Evaluating Aquaculture potential using reclamation water (Wannon Water, South West Victoria)
- A Business plan review for a VISC Member (long-line fishing in Lakes Entrance)
- Aquaponics demonstration site development and project proposal
- Multispecies learning facility in Aquaculture (Shepparton)
- Yabby and native fish farming (Echuca)
- Eel processing facility internal design for purging, preparation and smoking (Heywood)

The VISC Board is dedicated to developing the organisation to a level in which it is financially sustainable and can provide support services to its members without Government support.

The organisation not only requires an economic development officer over the life of the business plan but has also evaluated and agreed on the following economic research requirements;

- An investigation into securing a VISC management office that supports members with access to;
 - Extension and education services
 - Livestock and equipment for projects

- Business advisory services
- An investigation into the development of an Indigenous Fish Farmers Cooperative focussed on increasing profitability of fish and other Indigenous produce.
- An investigation into the acquisition of the Indigenous Business Australia (IBA) owned Western Zone Abalone Licence
- Investigation and development of a business to sell and support Aquaponic systems primarily through Department of Justice Indigenous specific facilities and programs.
- An investigation into developing the right partnerships with corporate investors to encourage investment of commercial scale Indigenous Seafood Businesses.

Cost per year over 4 years

- \$176,440; (Salary*\$128,440, Travel \$22,750; Economic research average per year \$25,250)

* Salary figures represent a wage of \$77,500 per year plus 20% in oncosts and all related office expenses.

Breakdown of costs for 4 years support (excluding gst & inflation)

Item	\$\$ Breakdown	\$\$ Total
Staff		
<u>Project Manager (per annum)</u>		151,190 per annum
- Salary and all office related costs (\$65 per hr @ 38 hrs per week)	128,440	
- Travel (lease, fuel, insurance, service)	18,250	
- Accommodation (30 days @ \$150)	4,500	
Investment research		
<u>VISC Management Office</u>		8,000
- Consultant (Location, Structure, Operation, SOPs)	5,000	
- Accounting	1,500	
- Legal	1,500	
		27,000
<u>Indigenous Fish Farmers Cooperative</u>	18,500	
- Consultant (Model development, Location, Structure, Operation, Outcomes)	6,000	
- Accounting (3 models)	2,000	
- Legal	1,500	
- Audit		
		17,000
<u>Acquisition of the IBA Abalone Licence</u>	8,500	
- Consultant (Industry review, predicted recovery)	5,000	
	2,000	
	1,500	

- Accounting (numerous models for investment)		17,000
- Legal	10,000	
- Audit		
	3,500	
<u>Selling Aquaponics systems for Justice Programs</u>	2,000	
- Consultant (consolidate current materials and build business plan and develop a 'package' to sell)	1,500	
		32,000
- Accounting		
- Legal	23,500	
- Audit	5,000	
	2,000	
<u>Encouraging corporate investment into Indigenous Seafood Ventures</u>	1,500	
- Consultant (Model development, Business Plan)		
- Accounting (numerous models for investors)		
- Legal		
- Audit		

APPENDIX 3:

Project Proposal 3: Developing a large scale eel farm on Indigenous owned land

As previously mentioned in project proposal 2 above, The Framlingham Eel Project was evaluated as the most likely project to deliver the best outcome for the organisation.

The presentation delivered at the 'whole of government' meeting was focussed on the activities taken to reach the findings of a feasibility completed in August 2009. The following is a summary breakdown of the presentation

- Framlingham Aboriginal Trust has extensive evidence of involvement with Eels though have been burdened by red tape since 1984 surrounding lobbying for Indigenous involvement in the eel sector.
- A Commercial relationship exists with eel fishermen from the South West Victorian Eel Growers Group (SWVEGG)
 - Initial discussions focussed on development of a 50 tonne extensive eel growing system using established waterways and purpose built dams
 - VISC internal economic review showed this option as financially unviable.
- VISC coordinated a meeting with all of SWVEGG and Australian Aquaculture Products (AAP)
 - Meeting focused on forming a partnership to establish an eel enterprise that was financially viable using all the expertise in the group.
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between FAT, SWVEGG and AAP was developed and signed.
 - MOU participants hold approximately 90% of the Victorian Eel industry licences
- Numerous meetings with Commonwealth, State and local government.
- Numerous meetings with Industry experts and suppliers.
- Numerous meetings with other interested parties (e.g., Deakin University, Origin Energy, Wannon Water, Southern Rural Water)
- Sourced funding and contributed to the development of an eel feasibility for a 500 tonne intensive eel farm (\$16 million investment)
- Researched and developed supporting documentation for;
 - Cultural considerations relating to eel licences
 - Government 'buy back' of unfishable waters
 - Access to suitable quantities of seedstock
 - Internal financial documents and research for MOU partners
- Coordination of Indigenous Business Australia Acquisitions team to evaluate potential investment.

The main findings of the Feasibility include;

- Biological
 - A need to secure access to sustainable quantities of seedstock
- Environment
 - Evaluating water quantity and quality at site location

- Incorporating biosecurity and waste management into facility design
- Economic
 - Delegation required to 500 tonne RAS farms
 - Marketing study required to firm up financial model
- Research
 - Meet with Research providers to address research priorities identified.
- Location
 - Cost benefit analysis required between WCB and Boona location

Breakdown of costs (excluding gst & inflation)

Item referred to in power point presentation	\$\$ Breakdown	\$\$ Total
<u>Biological</u> <u>Seedstock access and security</u> Section 3.12 of the Eel Feasibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a major priority investigate and secure suitable quantities of seedstock (in depth report) • Consider lobbying for a stock assessment and research to be conducted on the sustainability of glass eels in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria (already occurring) and Tasmania for sustainable future seedstock security 	5,000 FRDC?	5,000
<u>Environment</u> <u>Water quantity and quality</u> Section 3.7 of the Eel Feasibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate current and future water required by the Dairy operation on 'Boona' • Commission a report on bore number 10662 to include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the current condition, water quality and performance ○ the cost to sink a bore capable of producing at minimum 0.545 mega litres per day • If investigating the use of geothermal water further, conduct a cost benefit analysis between the use of Subsurface Groundwater from the Yangery Water Supply Protection Area and Geothermal Groundwater from the Portland GMA. • Commission a report on the identified Geothermal 'Party Bore' adjacent to the Boona property to include; 	5,000 10,000 10,000	45,000

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the current condition, water quality and performance ○ the cost and legality of refurbishing the existing bore versus construction of a new bore capable of producing at a minimum 0.545 mega litres per day at 26°C under artesian flow. 	PTO	
<p><u>Environment</u></p> <p><u>Water quantity and quality</u></p> <p>Section 3.7 of the Eel Feasibility continued.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact Wannan Water and Southern Rural Water to be included on their 'Sensitive Water Users List' • Investigate methods to minimise water usage to less than 120 Megalitres per annum and avoid EPA 'Scheduled Premises' and 'Environmental and Resource Efficiency' triggers. 	20,000	
<p><u>Environment</u></p> <p><u>Incorporating biosecurity and waste management into facility design</u></p> <p>Section 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and cost a suitable RAS design (including engineering plans and water/waste minimisation options). <p>Section 3.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the RAS building meets the highest biosecurity standards as per requirements of Government. <p>Section 3.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAT consider that there be some thought put into the design of the current facility to possibly cater for tourism. <p>Section 3.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct soil tests on the identified site for future construction works • Conduct a heritage survey to ensure the identified site is not disturbing historical Indigenous remains • Commission the design, engineered drawings and costing for a suitably insulated building to house the 500 tonne RAS and supporting infrastructure <p>Section 3.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve AQIS during the design phase of the facility 	<p>30,000</p> <p>1,000</p> <p>15,000</p> <p>10,000</p>	56,000

<p>Economic</p> <p>Delegation to 500 tonne eel farms</p> <p>Section 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAT and relevant stakeholders to visit RAS farms greater than >500 tonne per annum which focus on freshwater eels to familiarise themselves with the issues to consider when building this type of system. (see appendix 6.5 for suggested RAS providers) 	<p>?</p>	<p>?</p>
<p>Economic</p> <p>Marketing study to firm up financial model</p> <p>Section 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate market demand and requirements more thoroughly (this may be combined as an activity with RAS farm visits above) <p>Section 3.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct a marketing strategy, including but not limited to; identification of target market, competition, consumer attitudes and preferences, product positioning and price-quality considerations. 	<p>35,000</p>	<p>35,000</p>
<p>Research</p> <p>Meet with Research providers to address research priorities</p> <p>Commercial priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stocking density relationships affecting eel gender in RAS compared to outdoor ponds Nutritional requirements and alternative feed options for large scale eel production Research to evaluate the sustainable commercial harvesting of glass eels from Victorian waterways (currently under way, DPI) <p>Cultural priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to design a method to measure the sustainable eel harvest available to Framlingham Aboriginal Trust from the Hopkins River. The health properties of eels and their effects on traditional and future Indigenous Health. 	<p>?</p> <p>?</p> <p>?</p> <p>?</p> <p>?</p>	<p>?</p>
<p>Location</p>		

Cost benefit analysis on Warrnambool Cheese and Butter versus the 'Boona' site. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant (need a steering group)	25,000	25,000
--	--------	--------



Australian Government

**Fisheries Research and
Development Corporation**

Fisheries Research House
25 Geils Court, Deakin ACT
Postal address: PO Box 222, Deakin West ACT 2600, Australia
Tel: (02) 6285 0400 International: 61 2 6285 0400 Fax: (02) 62854421 International: 61 2 6285 4421
Email: frdc@frdc.com.au