



Australian Government

Department of the Environment and Energy

Assessment of the
Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery

October 2016

© Copyright Commonwealth of Australia, 2016.



Assessment of the Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery October 2016 is licensed by the Commonwealth of Australia for use under a Creative Commons By Attribution 3.0 Australia licence with the exception of the Coat of Arms of the Commonwealth of Australia, the logo of the agency responsible for publishing the report, content supplied by third parties, and any images depicting people. For licence conditions see: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/>.

This report should be attributed as '*Assessment of the Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery October 2016*, Commonwealth of Australia 2016'.

Disclaimer

This document is an assessment carried out by the Department of the Environment and Energy of a commercial fishery against the Australian Government *Guidelines for the Ecologically Sustainable Management of Fisheries – 2nd Edition*. It forms part of the advice provided to the Minister for the Environment and Energy on the fishery in relation to decisions under Parts 13 and 13A of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Minister for the Environment and Energy or the Australian Government.

While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the contents of this report are factually correct, the Australian Government does not accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the contents, and shall not be liable for any loss or damage that may be occasioned directly or indirectly through the use of, or reliance on, the contents of this report. You should not rely solely on the information presented in the report when making a commercial or other decision.

CONTENTS

Section 1: Summary of the Assessment for the Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery Against the Guidelines for the Ecologically Sustainable Management of Fisheries (2nd Edition)	4
Section 2: Detailed Analysis of the Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery Against the Guidelines for the Ecologically Sustainable Management of Fisheries (2nd Edition).....	6
Section 3: Assessment of the Commonwealth Southern Squid Jig Fishery Against the Requirements of the EPBC Act	14

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF THE ASSESSMENT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH SOUTHERN SQUID JIG FISHERY AGAINST THE GUIDELINES FOR THE ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES (2ND EDITION)

Purpose: To enable transparent articulation of which commercial fisheries assessed under the EPBC Act clearly meet all legislative requirements and all Guidelines, and those which may require further investigation or assessment to demonstrate requirements are met.

Summary: Overview of Southern Squid Jig Fishery against the relevant requirements of the Guidelines and the EPBC Act.

Guidelines	Meets	Partially meets	Does not meet	Details
Management regime	9 of 9	0	0	The fishery is well managed with transparent management arrangements.
Principle 1 (target stocks)	8 of 9	1 of 9	0	Target stocks are effectively managed for the current scale of the fishery, are not overfished and not subject to overfishing.
Principle 2 (bycatch and TEPS)	9 of 9	0	0	Risks to bycatch and protected species, assessed through AFMA's ecological risk assessment processes, are likely to be low. There is generally low bycatch and no reported protected species interactions.
Principle 2 (ecosystem impacts)	4 of 4	0	0	Ecological risk is considered to be low and well managed.
EPBC requirements				
Part 12	1 of 1	0	0	The fishery spans three marine bioregions. Ecological risks have been assessed and are managed in accordance with AFMA's ecological risk management strategy. The fishery is not expected to compromise any of the values identified in the marine bioregional plans.
Part 13	11 of 11	0	0	No reported interactions with listed threatened species. AFMA has committed to reassess ecological risks in 2017.
Part 13A	2 of 3	1 of 3 (S303DC(3))	0	Limited consultation if LENS is amended, although sufficient for strict requirements, as per advice to Minister in MS14-002367.
Part 16	1 of 1	0	0	The precautionary principle has been considered by the Department when making its recommendation to include specimens in the list of exempt native specimens.
Conclusion: The fishery is well managed and considered to have a low ecological impact. Ecological risks are regularly reviewed and expected to be reassessed in 2017.				
Final recommendation for 2016 assessment of Southern Squid Jig Fishery: Low risk and recommended for ten year inclusion on the List of Exempt Native Specimens (2016 to 2026).				

Notes:**Assessment history:**

1st assessment finalised 1 November 2004 – LENS with 6 recommendations

2nd assessment finalised 24 November 2009 – LENS with 4 recommendations (extended 22 April 2010, 21 April 2015 and 9 March 2016).

Last amendment report (April 2010): Report not published online.

Current inclusion on the LENS until 14 October 2016.

Key links:

Annual report – last provided in August 2013.

AFMA annual (corporate) reports include a summary of fishery performance: <http://www.afma.gov.au/about/corporate-publications/>

Protected species interactions – none recorded for this fishery in available interaction reports (1 January 2012 – 31 December 2015).

Interactions for all AFMA fisheries are publicly reported at <http://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/protected-species-management/protected-species-interaction-reports/>

An overview of fishery information is available on the AFMA website: <http://www.afma.gov.au/fisheries/southern-squid-jig-fishery/>

Southern Squid Jig Fishery Management Plan 2005: <https://www.comlaw.gov.au/Series/F2005L00964>

Management arrangements booklet 2015: <http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/SSJF-Management-Arrangements-Booklet-2015.pdf>

Southern Squid Jig Fishery Harvest Strategy: <http://www.afma.gov.au/sustainability-environment/harvest-strategies/>

Ecological Risk Assessment for Effects of Fishing in the Southern Squid Jig Sub-fishery 2007:

http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/SSJF_ERA_Apr07.pdf

Ecological Risk Management Report for the Southern Squid Jig Fishery 2009: http://www.afma.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/SSJF_ERM_Apr09.pdf

ABARES Fishery Status Reports 2015: Not overfished or subject to overfishing.

http://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/publications/display?url=http://143.188.17.20/anrd/DAFFService/display.php?fid=pb_fsr15d9abm_20151030.xml

FRDC Status of Key Australian Fish Stocks 2014: Sustainable stock that is unlikely to be overfished or to become recruitment overfished.

http://www.fish.gov.au/Pages/SAFS_Report.aspx

SECTION 2: DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE COMMONWEALTH SOUTHERN SQUID JIG FISHERY AGAINST THE GUIDELINES FOR THE ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES (2ND EDITION)

Guidelines for the Ecologically Sustainable Management of Fisheries (2nd edition)	Comment
THE MANAGEMENT REGIME	
The management regime does not have to be a formal statutory fishery management plan as such, and may include non-statutory management arrangements or management policies and programs. The regime should:	
Be documented, publicly available and transparent	Management arrangements are well documented, publicly available and transparent.
Be developed through a consultative process providing opportunity to all interested and affected parties, including the general public	Management arrangements are developed and maintained through a range of consultative processes. Consultation is open, transparent and includes relevant stakeholders. Minutes of South East Management Advisory Committee (SEMAC) and Southern Squid Jig Resource Assessment Group (SquidRAG) meetings are published on the AFMA website.
Ensure that a range of expertise and community interests are involved in individual fishery management committees and during the stock assessment process	A range of expertise and interests are involved in fishery management committees and stock assessments. SquidRAG meetings involve industry, research, economics and management interests. SEMAC meetings also involve state management, recreational and environmental interests.
Be strategic, containing objectives and performance criteria by which the effectiveness of the management arrangements are measured	The management plan and harvest strategy contain strategic objectives and performance criteria.
Be capable of controlling the level of harvest in the fishery using input and/or output controls	Management arrangements provide effective precautionary controls. Input controls are established each year in accordance with the harvest strategy. Catch and effort triggers with associated control rules are also in place under the harvest strategy.
Contain the means of enforcing critical aspects of the management arrangements	Sufficient means exist to enforce critical aspects of the management arrangements. AFMA applies a risk based compliance program and monitors compliance using vessel monitoring systems (VMS), logbook and catch disposal records, observer coverage as well as other activities where necessary.
Provide for the periodic review of the performance of the fishery management arrangements and the management strategies, objectives and criteria	Management performance is reviewed annually through SquidRAG and SEMAC and also reported via AFMA annual reports.

Be capable of assessing, monitoring and avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse impacts on the wider marine ecosystem in which the target species lives and the fishery operates	The fishery is capable of assessing, monitoring and avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse impacts on the wider marine ecosystem. An ecological risk management report was completed in 2009, following completion of an ERA in 2007. This ecological risk management strategy, in conjunction with the harvest strategy, effectively mitigate risks to the wider marine ecosystem.
Requires compliance with relevant threat abatement plans, recovery plans, the National Policy on Fisheries Bycatch, and bycatch action strategies developed under the policy	The fishery is compliant with all relevant plans and policies.
PRINCIPLE 1 - A fishery must be conducted in a manner that does not lead to over-fishing, or for those stocks that are over-fished, the fishery must be conducted such that there is a high degree of probability the stock(s) will recover.	
Objective 1 - The fishery shall be conducted at catch levels that maintain ecologically viable stock levels at an agreed point or range, with acceptable levels of probability.	
Information requirements	
1.1.1 There is a reliable information collection system in place appropriate to the scale of the fishery. The level of data collection should be based upon an appropriate mix of fishery independent and dependent research and monitoring.	There is a reliable information collection system in place appropriate to the scale of the fishery. Detailed logbook records must be completed and submitted for all fishing activity. All retained catch must be unloaded and recorded by a licensed fish receiver using an approved catch disposal record. Observers must be carried on request, however there is no monitoring undertaken at this time. AFMA has reviewed its observer data and found it to be consistent with the logbook data provided by fishing operators.
Assessment	
1.1.2 There is a robust assessment of the dynamics and status of the species/fishery and periodic review of the process and the data collected. Assessment should include a process to identify any reduction in biological diversity and /or reproductive capacity. Review should take place at regular intervals but at least every three years.	Stock assessments are sufficient for the nature of the fishery. Estimating biomass prior to fishing is difficult due to the species' short life-span, fast growth, highly variable recruitment and strongly fluctuating stock sizes. The harvest strategy therefore relies on in-season monitoring of catch and effort of this fishery and related fisheries. The precautionary catch and effort triggers, based on historic catches, are considered annually by SquidRAG and SEMAC when recommending annual total allowable catch limits. Stock status is also considered annually by ABARES as part of the Fishery Status Reports .
1.1.3 The distribution and spatial structure of the stock(s) has been established and factored into management responses.	Management is appropriate for the current scale of the fishery but distribution and spatial structure are not considered. Although there is evidence to suggest a single stock throughout southern Australian waters, distribution and spatial structure is not factored into its

	management. While this could be addressed with depletion analyses, this would require better real-time fishery monitoring throughout the season, better understanding of regional growth rates, natural mortality, squid movements within the region, and whether there are multiple cohorts from multiple spawning events within the season. Given the small scale of the fishery, this additional analysis is considered unwarranted at this time.
1.1.4 There are reliable estimates of all removals, including commercial (landings and discards), recreational and indigenous, from the fished stock. These estimates have been factored into stock assessments and target species catch levels.	<p>There are reliable estimates of all removals. These estimates are factored into stock assessments and target species catch levels.</p> <p>Gould's squid (<i>Notodarus gouldi</i>) is a permitted species in Tasmanian, South Australian, New South Wales and Queensland state fisheries, and not regulated in Victorian state waters. It is also taken as bycatch in several Commonwealth fisheries. Commonwealth bycatch is generally much greater than that taken by the Southern Squid Jig Fishery (AFMA logbook records 2002-2014).</p> <p>Logbooks and catch disposal records give reliable estimates of commercial removals from Commonwealth fisheries, and catch from all Commonwealth sectors is considered when managing under the harvest strategy.</p> <p>When available, information on catches from adjacent state fisheries (Victoria and Tasmania) is considered by SquidRAG and AFMA in setting the Total Allowable Effort for the fishery.</p>
1.1.5 There is a sound estimate of the potential productivity of the fished stock(s) and the proportion that could be harvested.	While the biology of this species makes forecasting productivity difficult, the harvest strategy includes a precautionary approach for determining the proportion that can be harvested.
Management responses	
1.1.6 There are reference points (target and/or limit), that trigger management actions including a biological bottom line and/or a catch or effort upper limit beyond which the stock should not be taken.	<p>Precautionary reference points and decision rules are contained in the harvest strategy.</p> <p>These are based on historic catch data rather than biomass estimates (which are very difficult to achieve given the species' biology).</p>
1.1.7 There are management strategies in place capable of controlling the level of take.	<p>An annual total allowable effort limit (TAE) is set each year. This, coupled with precautionary catch and effort-based triggers in the harvest strategy, provides effective control of potential catches.</p> <p>Subject to approval, fishers can unload their catch at sea to a nominated boat. Given catch is limited by the gear that can be used rather than a TAC, there is little incentive to misreport.</p> <p>AFMA monitors risks in all Commonwealth fisheries when targeting its enforcement activities, and uses VMS and other intelligence to monitor and manage compliance.</p>

<p>1.1.8 Fishing is conducted in a manner that does not threaten stocks of byproduct species.</p>	<p>The fishery has a negligible impact on byproduct species.</p> <p>The fishery is highly selective with very little catch of non-target species (less than 1 tonne total reported since 2002, AFMA logbook records 2002-2014).</p> <p>Concession holders are limited to a maximum of 100 kilograms of fish (Super-class Pisces) per trip and are precluded from taking any tuna, tuna-like species, marlin, billfish, blue eye trevalla, pink ling, blue warehou or gemfish.</p>
<p>(Guidelines 1.1.1 to 1.1.7 should be applied to byproduct species to an appropriate level)</p>	
<p>1.1.9 The management response, considering uncertainties in the assessment and precautionary management actions, has a high chance of achieving the objective.</p>	<p>Management has a high chance of achieving the objectives.</p>
<p>If overfished, go to Objective 2: If not overfished, go to PRINCIPLE 2:</p>	
<p>Objective 2 - Where the fished stock(s) are below a defined reference point, the fishery will be managed to promote recovery to ecologically viable stock levels within nominated timeframes.</p>	
<p>Management responses</p>	
<p>1.2.1 A precautionary recovery strategy is in place specifying management actions, or staged management responses, which are linked to reference points. The recovery strategy should apply until the stock recovers, and should aim for recovery within a specific time period appropriate to the biology of the stock.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>1.2.2 If the stock is estimated as being at or below the biological and / or effort bottom line, management responses such as a zero targeted catch, temporary fishery closure or a 'whole of fishery' effort or quota reduction are implemented.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>PRINCIPLE 2 - Fishing operations should be managed to minimise their impact on the structure, productivity, function and biological diversity of the ecosystem.</p>	
<p>Objective 1 - The fishery is conducted in a manner that does not threaten bycatch species.</p>	
<p>Information requirements</p>	
<p>2.1.1 Reliable information, appropriate to the scale of the fishery, is collected on the composition and abundance of bycatch.</p>	<p>There is a reliable information collection system in place appropriate to the scale of the fishery.</p> <p>Fishers are required to record and submit detailed records of all fishing activity in approved daily fishing logbooks. This includes details of all target and bycatch species.</p> <p>AFMA has reviewed its observer data and found it consistent with the logbook data provided by fishing operators.</p>

	Bycatch reported by this fishery is negligible.
Assessments	
2.1.2 There is a risk analysis of the bycatch with respect to its vulnerability to fishing.	Ecological risk assessments (ERAs) have been completed and no species, habitats or communities were found to be at high risk. The next assessment for this fishery is expected to be completed during 2017.
Management responses	
2.1.3 Measures are in place to avoid capture and mortality of bycatch species unless it is determined that the level of catch is sustainable (except in relation to endangered, threatened or protected species). Steps must be taken to develop suitable technology if none is available.	No bycatch species were found to be at high risk in the ERA. AFMA's risk management report (ERM strategy) seeks to minimise interactions with protected species thought to occur in the fishery but does not outline any fishery-specific measures. Due to the low risk identified through the ERA, the low level of bycatch and lack of interactions with protected species, AFMA decided not to pursue development of a Bycatch and Discard Workplan or Bycatch Action Plan for this fishery. Risk management strategies will be reviewed following the next ERA assessment, which is expected to be completed in 2017.
2.1.4 An indicator group of bycatch species is monitored.	Not applicable. Information from logbooks, observer coverage and pre-season surveys is used to inform AFMA's ecological risk assessments.
2.1.5 There are decision rules that trigger additional management measures when there are significant perturbations in the indicator species numbers.	Not applicable. Bycatch rates have been negligible for this fishery; therefore management is focussed on target species only.
2.1.6 The management response, considering uncertainties in the assessment and precautionary management actions, has a high chance of achieving the objective.	Management has a high chance of achieving the objectives.
Objective 2 - The fishery is conducted in a manner that avoids mortality of, or injuries to, endangered, threatened or protected species and avoids or minimises impacts on threatened ecological communities.	
Information requirements	
2.2.1 Reliable information is collected on the interaction with endangered, threatened or protected species and threatened ecological communities.	There is a reliable information collection system in place appropriate to the scale of the fishery. Mandatory reporting of all fishing activity via approved logbooks. Observers must be carried if requested by AFMA, but no monitoring is currently undertaken. A small study undertaken in 2002 (Arnould, 2003) suggests interaction rates are relatively low.

Assessments	
<p>2.2.2 There is an assessment of the impact of the fishery on endangered, threatened or protected species.</p>	<p>Potential impact on protected species has been assessed and found to be low. No interactions have been recorded in available logbook or observer records (2012–15).</p> <p>The fishery encompasses waters off the coasts of South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, New South Wales and parts of southern Queensland; however fishing typically occurs out of Portland Victoria (ABARES 2015). The area fished overlaps an important foraging area for female Australian fur seals and is in close proximity to their largest breeding colony. Fishers have reported interactions with this species in the past however, a study undertaken in 2002 found no evidence of seals being hooked or entangled in the lines (Arnould 2003).</p> <p>Australian sea lions (ASLs, listed threatened species) also occur within the area of the fishery (as far north as the mid-north coast of New South Wales and around Tasmania) but are primarily off the coast of South Australia (86%, Goldsworthy et al. 2009). This, coupled with their benthic foraging habits, likely reduces the risk of interaction.</p> <p>Some fishers discard squid heads to divert the seals from the jig. While this practice may reduce seals hunting around the boats and targeting squid on the jigs, it may also condition them to attend more frequently than they would otherwise (Arnould 2003).</p> <p>Common dolphins, shy albatross and little penguins have also been observed to be attracted to squid fishing boats but no interactions were recorded in the 2002 study or in logbook or observer records. AFMA has committed to review its ERA and ERM strategies every five years and in this fishery during 2017.</p>
<p>2.2.3 There is an assessment of the impact of the fishery on threatened ecological communities.</p>	<p>ERA found no species, habitats or communities at risk from the fishery.</p> <p>The fishery includes areas of the Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia ecological community (EC). The major threats to this EC are climate change, sedimentation and removal of urchin predators through fishing. It is unclear if there is any relationship between the abundance of squid and that of sea urchins, but it is unlikely given the current effort and precautionary catch limits in the fishery, that the fishery will have any significant impact on this EC.</p> <p>The EC was listed in 2012 and was therefore not considered in the 2007 ERA. The ERAs are due to be reviewed in 2017 and it is expected that the next ERA will formally consider this EC.</p>
Management responses	

<p>2.2.4 There are measures in place to avoid capture and/or mortality of endangered, threatened or protected species.</p>	<p>Measures to avoid capture and/or mortality of endangered, threatened or protected species are considered adequate Due to the highly selective nature of squid jigging machines, interactions with EPBC Act protected species is considered minimal.</p> <p>The deliberate provisioning of seals (refer 2.2.2.) likely encourages these animals to attend the boats more frequently than they would otherwise (Arnould 2003).</p> <p>AFMA has committed to reassess ecological risks in 2017.</p>
<p>2.2.5 There are measures in place to avoid impact on threatened ecological communities.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p> <p>The fishery is not thought to impact on any threatened ecological communities.</p>
<p>2.2.6 The management response, considering uncertainties in the assessment and precautionary management actions, has a high chance of achieving the objective.</p>	<p>The management arrangements have a high chance of achieving the objective.</p>
<p>Objective 3 - The fishery is conducted, in a manner that minimises the impact of fishing operations on the ecosystem generally.</p>	
<p>Information requirements</p>	
<p>2.3.1 Information appropriate for the analysis in 2.3.2 is collated and/or collected covering the fisheries impact on the ecosystem and environment generally.</p>	<p>There is a reliable information collection system in place appropriate to the scale of the fishery.</p> <p>Detailed information on all fishing activity is reported via approved fishing logbooks. Where necessary, fishers are also required to carry scientific observers. However there are no prescribed rates for observer coverage in this fishery.</p>
<p>Assessment</p>	
<p>2.3.2 Information is collected and a risk analysis, appropriate to the scale of the fishery and its potential impacts, is conducted into the susceptibility of each of the following ecosystem components to the fishery.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on ecological communities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benthic communities Ecologically related, associated or dependent species Water column communities Impacts on food chains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure Productivity/flows Impacts on the physical environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical habitat 	<p>ERA found no species, habitats or communities at risk from the fishery.</p>

• Water quality	
Management responses	
2.3.3 Management actions are in place to ensure significant damage to ecosystems does not arise from the impacts described in 2.3.1.	ERA found no species, habitats or communities at risk from the fishery.
2.3.4 There are decision rules that trigger further management responses when monitoring detects impacts on selected ecosystem indicators beyond a predetermined level, or where action is indicated by application of the precautionary approach.	Not applicable. Considered low risk through ERA. No specific indicators of ecosystem impact.
2.3.5 The management response, considering uncertainties in the assessment and precautionary management actions, has a high chance of achieving the objective.	The management arrangements have a high chance of achieving the objective.

SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH SOUTHERN SQUID JIG FISHERY AGAINST THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE EPBC ACT

Please Note – the table below is not a complete or exact representation of the EPBC Act. It is intended as a checklist of relevant sections and components of the EPBC Act to provide advice on the fishery in relation to decisions under Part 13 and Part 13A.

Part 12

	Comment
Section 176 Bioregional Plans	
(5) Minister must have regard to relevant bioregional plans	<p>The fishery spans three marine bioregions. Ecological risks have been assessed and are managed in accordance with AFMA's ecological risk management strategy.</p> <p>The fishery is not expected to compromise any of the values identified in the marine bioregional plans.</p>

Part 13

	Comment
Accreditable plan, regime or policy (Division 1, Division 2, Division 3, Division 4)	
s. 208A (1) (a-e), s.222A (1) (a-e), s.245A (1) (a-e), s.265 (1) (a-e) Does the fishery have an accreditable plan of management, regime or policy?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The Southern Squid Jig Management Plan 2005 was last accredited under Part 13 of the EPBC Act on 22 April 2010.</p>
Division 1 Listed threatened species, Section 208A Minister may accredit plans or regimes	
(f) Will the plan, regime or policy require fishers to take all reasonable steps to ensure that members of listed threatened species (other than conservation dependent species) are not killed or injured as a result of the fishing?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Management arrangements require fishers to take all reasonable steps to avoid killing or injuring listed threatened species.</p>
(g) And, is the fishery likely to adversely affect the survival or recovery in nature of the species.	No high risks identified through ecological risk assessments and no record of interactions with listed threatened species.
Division 2 Migratory species, Section 222A Minister may accredit plans or regimes	
(f) Will the plan, regime or policy require fishers to take all reasonable steps to ensure that members of listed migratory species are not killed or injured as a result of the fishing?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Management arrangements require fishers to take all reasonable steps to avoid killing or injuring listed migratory species.</p>
(g) And, is the fishery likely to adversely affect the conservation status of a listed migratory species or a population of that species?	<p>No.</p> <p>No high risks identified through ecological risk assessments and no record of interactions with listed migratory species.</p>

Division 3 Whales and other cetaceans, Section 245 Minister may accredit plans or regimes	
(f) Will the plan, regime or policy require fishers to take all reasonable steps to ensure that cetaceans are not killed or injured as a result of the fishing?	Yes. Management arrangements require fishers to take all reasonable steps to avoid killing or injuring cetaceans.
(g) And is the fishery likely to adversely affect the conservation status of a species of cetacean or a population of that species?	No. No high risks identified through ecological risk assessments and no record of interactions with cetaceans.
Division 4 Listed marine species, Section 265 Minister may accredit plans or regimes	
(f) Will the plan, regime or policy require fishers to take all reasonable steps to ensure that members of listed marine species are not killed or injured as a result of the fishing?	Yes. Management arrangements require fishers to take all reasonable steps to avoid killing or injuring listed marine species.
(g) And is the fishery likely to adversely affect the conservation status of a listed marine species or a population of that species?	No. No high risks identified through ecological risk assessments and no record of interactions with listed marine species.
Section 303AA Conditions relating to accreditation of plans, regimes and policies	
(1) This section applies to an accreditation of a plan, regime or policy under section 208A, 222A, 245 or 265.	Accreditation is recommended. No history of interactions with protected species.
(2) The Minister may accredit a plan, regime or policy under that section even though he or she considers that the plan, regime or policy should be accredited only: (a) during a particular period; or (b) while certain circumstances exist; or (c) while a certain condition is complied with. In such a case, the instrument of accreditation is to specify the period, circumstances or condition.	No conditions required.
(7) The Minister must, in writing, revoke an accreditation if he or she is satisfied that a condition of the accreditation has been contravened.	Not applicable.

Part 13A

Section 303BA Objects of Part 13A
(1) The objects of this Part are as follows: (a) to ensure that Australia complies with its obligations under CITES and the Biodiversity Convention; (b) to protect wildlife that may be adversely affected by trade; (c) to promote the conservation of biodiversity in Australia and other countries;

(d) to ensure that any commercial utilisation of Australian native wildlife for the purposes of export is managed in an ecologically sustainable way; (e) to promote the humane treatment of wildlife; (f) to ensure ethical conduct during any research associated with the utilisation of wildlife; and (h) to ensure the precautionary principle is taken into account in making decisions relating to the utilisation of wildlife.	
	Comment
Section 303DC Minister may amend list (non CITES species)	
(1) The Minister may amend the LENS by: (a) doing any of the following: (i) including items in the list; (ii) deleting items from the list; (iii) imposing a condition or restriction to which the inclusion of a specimen in the list is subject; (iv) varying or revoking a condition or restriction to which the inclusion of a specimen in the list is subject	
(1A) In deciding to amend LENS, Minister must rely primarily on outcomes of Part 10, Div 1 or 2 assessment	Part 10 assessment completed in November 2004. Fishery not found to have an unacceptable or unsustainable impact.
(1C) The above does not limit matters that may be considered when deciding to amend LENS.	Fishery consistent with Objects of 13A.
(3) Before amending LENS, Minister must consult: (a) other Minister or Ministers as appropriate; and (b) other Minister or Ministers of each State and self-governing Territory as appropriate; and (c) other persons and organisations as appropriate.	General consultation with Commonwealth Fisheries Minister in October 2014 (MS14-002367)

Part 16

	Comment
Section 391 Minister must consider precautionary principle in making decisions	
(1) Minister must take account of precautionary principle (2) The precautionary principle is that lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing a measure to prevent degradation of the environment where there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage.	The precautionary principle has been considered by the Department when making its recommendation to include specimens in the list of exempt native specimens.