

DRAFT – FOR INDUSTRY CONSIDERATION/COMMENT

Annexure AA – Key for table submission

The table below provides an overview to readers on how to interpret the table submission on the following page.

KEY – HOW TO READ TABLE SUBMISSION						
REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
Title reference within the Discussion Paper	The feedback request from DPIRD sought (noting feedback was not specifically sought on every issue)	The DPIRD proposal for the updated harvest strategy (that is being proposed to be implemented in mid- 2024).	This is a traffic light system indicating WRL’s response to the harvest strategy proposal Red: disagree Orange: concern raised Green: No objection	The DPIRD proposal(s) for when the resource transitions under ARMA (to be a ‘managed aquatic resource’).	This is a traffic light system indicating WRL’s response to the proposal under the ARMA framework Red: disagree Orange: concern raised Green: No objection	This is WRL’s general comments towards DPIRD’s feedback request (second column), the proposal for the updated harvest strategy (fourth column) and future ARMA proposal (fifth column).

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
1. Purpose						<p>Whilst this section notes that the Discussion Paper is presented to ‘begin the process to align the harvest strategy for this resource with the legislative principles and procedures specified within [ARMA] as outlined within the ARMA-Based Harvest Strategy Policy...’ it is concerning that Discussion Paper is being presented before the finalisation of the ‘ARMA-Based Harvest Strategy Policy’ (HS Policy) or ‘Objective Setting and Allocations for Aquatic Resources Under ARMA’ (OSA for ARs Policy). The Discussion Paper relies on these policies, yet we do not have access to them. Prior to further progress being made on the Discussion Paper, industry should be able to have both the HS Policy and the OSA for ARs Policy.</p> <p>With reference to the following sentence: <i>‘a review of all the components including, the main objectives and sectoral allocations, required within an [ARMS] will be undertaken when it becomes a formally managed resource sometime after ARMA has been fully proclaimed in November 2023’</i> [emphasis added], it is</p>

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
						<p>difficult for industry to prioritise its resources towards an ARMA transition when there is no definitive answer on when the resource will transition. The opaqueness of this information is similar to the first point raised, and similarly also relates to the 'Four Transition Pathways' that are also not in final form yet and out for industry consultation. Together, these issues create a lot of uncertainty and confusion for industry.</p>
<p>2.1 Harvest Strategies</p>						<p>The following sentence does not make sense “<i>The new ARMA-Based Harvest Strategy Policy replaces the existing 2015 Policy has been developed to ensure future harvest strategies align with ARMA</i>”. Suggest it is re-worded as follows: “The new ARMA-Based Harvest Strategy Policy has been developed to ensure future harvest strategies align with ARMA. Once finalised, it will replace the existing 2015 policy.”</p> <p>WRL requests that after the sentence “Importantly, most of the key principles remain the same, but a number of the elements that were optional under the Fish Resources Management Act 1994</p>

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
						(FRMA) will become mandatory”, there is a dot-point summary of these elements that will become mandatory.
3.1 Scope						As noted under point one above, it is difficult for industry to fully appreciate that the harvest strategy needs to be ‘consistent with the ARMA principles and processes as outlined within the [HS Policy] (DPIRD, 2023a)’ or the [OSA for ARs Policy] when no such policies have been provided to industry (just discussion papers).
3.2 Harvest Strategy issues						The following sentence does not make sense “ <i>It is also recognised that there are associated issues and ideas that may be raised during discussions can be captured for use in future processes associated with completing the full transition of this resource to be managed under the ARMA framework.</i> ” It is

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
						suggested that it be broken into two sentences.
3.3 Next steps and timeframes						<p>Remove reference to 'WAFIC' as they are not a part of the working group.</p> <p>Again, the HS Policy and ARs Policy is referenced as 'key documents considered in the development of this discussion paper and the proposed options', yet WRL is yet to receive these documents. WRL requests copies of these documents to review prior to this Discussion Document being progressed.</p>
4. Definition and scope of the resource	<i>Feedback is sought on the potential benefits or issues associated with maintaining or changing the definition and scope of the resource when it moves under a formal MAR framework.</i>	Maintain the current scope of the WRLHS i.e., the waters of the WCRLMF for the commercial sector		Maintain the current scope of the WRLHS.		WRL recommends that the definition and scope of the resource remains the same when the resource moves under a formal MAR framework. The reason for this approach is because the south coast crustacean lobsters do not contribute to the western rock lobster breeding stock. Further, the take of western rock lobsters within the South Coast Rock Lobster is controlled within the existing South Coast Crustacean Managed Fishery Management Plan.

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
		Consider aligning the monitoring of the recreational take to be within the boundaries of the WCRLMF.		Expand the scope of the harvest strategy to define the resource as all western rock lobsters in WA waters (i.e., incorporate the take of western rock lobsters by the SCCMF).		WRL opposed to these suggestions.
5. Main Objective		The proposed 'Interim Main Objective' Is: <i>Deliver predictable, ecologically sustainable harvest levels and allocations of western rock lobsters that maintains the stock near an MEY-based target level that optimises the opportunities for fishers to generate overall, long term economic returns to the state from commercial lobster fishing, processing,</i>		When the resource fully transitions to be under the MAR framework, each of these elements will be reviewed in a formal manner using the ARMA-Based Objective and Allocation Policy		<p>In the interim period, the industry should maintain the two objectives listed in the current 2015 Harvest Strategy covering Sustainability and Harvest Objectives. The Working Group should further develop the main objective that will come into effect under ARMA in due course.</p> <p>Further, this section is set out in a confusing manner. For instance, it is stated that “Based on the current uses and indicative value propositions, an interim main objective has been drafted for use during the transition period”. It then goes to states that “the western rock lobster is a formally shared resource that...” It is unclear if the latter is suppose to define the ‘current use’ or ‘indicative value proposition’ or the ‘main objective’. The sentence ‘the western rock lobster is a</p>

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
		<i>and ancillary activities, while optimising experiences for recreational and charter sectors'</i>				formally shared resource' requires a subheading to explain the purpose of its presence.
7.2.1 Intrasectoral commercial allocations between zones	<i>Initial feedback is sought on potential future options for allocating the TACC when it moves under a formal MAR framework</i>	Maintain current intrasectoral allocation process		Maintain fixed allocations of quota.		This needs to be subject to extensive industry consultation that is unable to be carried out within the timeframe of feedback for this Discussion Draft. Industry will need to be presented with the evidence in favour (and against) for moving to a biologically based allocation (BBA), considering the existing level of industry investment and cost associated with implementing the BBA in order to justify a change long term.
				Adopt biologically based proportions when moving to formal ARMS		
7.2.2 Intrasectoral recreational allocations	<i>Feedback is sought on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the potential re-alignment of the boundary for monitoring the TARC and;</i> • <i>the options for allocating the TARC among the zones when it moves under a formal MAR framework.</i> 	Align the boundary of the recreational catches used to monitor the TARC to mirror the boundary of the resource (TACC) i.e., use catches from both sectors within the boundary of WCRLMF, or state-wide catches from both.		Maintain a single TARC.		WRL recommends that TARC monitoring should stay within state boundaries. Any decision concerning managing TARCs amongst the zones is linked to the broader justification. There is no justification or evidence to warrant managing TARCs by zones at this stage.
				Allocation of the TARC among zones.		
7.2.3 Intrasectoral	<i>Feedback is sought on the options and timing for a</i>	Identify/allocate a specific		Consider methods for		The charter trial should be fully assessed before any implementation of proposed

ANNEXURE A – WRL SUBMISSION

REF	DPIRD Feedback Requests	DPIRD proposal for Updated Harvest Strategy (HS Proposal)	WRL response to the HS Proposal	Proposal for future options under ARMA Framework (ARMA Proposal)	WRL response to ARMA Proposal	WRL COMMENT
allocation for charter	<i>separate intrasectoral allocation of the TARC to the charter sector.</i>	charter catch (expressed as a percentage or in tonnes), as a subset of the recreational allocation.		allocating and trading quota amongst charter operators as part of the transition to full MAR framework.		changes takes place. In principle, WRL does not oppose charter having its own allocation to the limit of 20 tonnes, as proposed by the Minister.
8.1 AHL setting process	<i>Feedback is sought on the use of 0.39 as the target harvest rate during the transition period.</i>	The AHL will be generated from the zonal level AHLs by multiplying the estimated biomass of legal lobsters in each zone that is available for the next five-year period by the target harvest rate.		The future target harvest rate will consider the outcomes of the MEY modelling project		As above. There needs to be a clearer understanding of industry's position on MEY. DPIRD's suggested approach, which is more akin to sub-MSY harvest rate, provides no persuasive supporting evidence or justification that a 39% take maximises overall economic benefits based on inputs and outputs (costs and revenues). The industry has developed a world's best practice TACC setting process with an expert TACC Committee considering a MEY model and annual global trade report in its recommendation for each season. Industry does not support a structured (inflexible) TACC determination without consideration of market factors and in unusual circumstances an ability to recommend an alternative TACC to the stock assessment model output.

8.2 TACC / TARC setting process		TACC / TARC setting process will be undertaken based on the long-term (5-year) estimate of the AHL.				See above comment at 8.1.
		No additional quota for 'water loss / drip loss'.				Removal of 'water loss' quota, will likely result in reduce quality and consequential loss of product value.
		Noting there is a significant difference between the current TAC (~7100 t) and the long-term AHL (~8500 t), transitional measures are proposed in Section 8.4 to move towards use of the long-term harvest rate to set the AHL and TACC/TARC in a structured manner.				See above comment at 8.1. Despite the China market remaining closed, the industry recommended TACC will increase 10% in the 2023/24 annual season. This demonstrates industry's commitment to increase the TACC to MEY. It would be irresponsible to increase TACC in a structured manner without consideration of market factors such as price and elasticity.
8.3 TACC / TARC setting period				Under ARMA, the TAC setting process will be undertaken for the resource on annual basis but as the AHL will be based on what can be taken for the next five years, an indicative TAC for the following year and the likely five-year trajectory will also be generated as part of the assessment process to provide all sectors with strong		WRL does not have an issue with the basis on which AHL will be calculated and therefore the indicative TAC, however, WRL questions the use of the phrasing 'an indicative TAC for thelikely five-year trajectory will also be generated...to provide all the sectors with strong ability to plan for the future'. The proposed TAC setting model would not have been able to project COVID nor the China market closure and would have produced TACCs that would have flooded markets with lobster causing damage longer term to the value of the resource.

				ability to plan for the future.		
8.4 Transitioning to full capture of the AHL	<i>Feedback is sought on the transitional options for setting of the TACC and TARC to achieve full capture of the AHL.</i>	Adopt a three or four year transition period to achieve full capture of the AHL				There is a need to review 0.39 in light of the harvest strategy hardwiring the TACC from model outputs and not sufficiently taking into account the economic analysis of MEY. The TACC Committee has proved incredibly valuable over the past 5 years, therefore we propose that the TACC Committee maintains an annual review function of the TACC, with the ability to make a different recommendation to the Minister under unusual circumstances. A similar review structure is provided for under the NSW Harvest Strategy. In support of this proposition, it should be noted that ARMA provides the ability of the Minister to create advisory committees that can provide information and advice to the Minister or CEO on matters related to the management of an aquatic resource or fishing activity (s 224).
	[During transitional phase]	Increase the TACC annually by a maximum of 300 or 400 tonnes				WRL disagrees with a set percentage (or tonnage) increase until the combined TARC/TACC is close to the AHL without the ability for the TACC Committee to make an alternative recommendation. See comment under 8.4.
	[During transitional phase]	Continue to set the TARC at 5% of the single-year AHL				No evidence or justification has been presented to industry to warrant a change. WRL strongly advocates for real-time recreational catch accounting.
		Once the transitional period is over or				Disagree. See comment under 8.4.

		when the combined commercial and recreational catch is close to the long-term AHL, shift the annual calculation of the TARC and TACCs to be based on the longer term AHL				
9.1.1 Measuring the recreational catch	<i>Feedback is sought on the option and timing for recreational catch monitoring.</i>	Consider the timing for adoption of alternative options to directly measure the recreational catch, such as compulsory catch reporting.				<p>The recreational sector should not be exempt from meeting the TARC. It's reasonable during the transitional period for the averaging over 5 years to be reduced to 3 years (maximum) as an interim step to implementation of real time annual assessment.</p> <p>There should be mandatory accurate recording of the recreational catch and that this should be used to manage the recreational regulations in closer to real-time compared to the current averaging (5-year rolling average).</p>
9.1.2 Comparing the recreational catch the TARC	<i>Feedback is sought on the option for assessing recreational catch against the TARC.</i>	During the transitional period outlined under section 8.4, recreational catches will continue to be monitored but it is proposed to exempt the		Align the boundary of the recreational catches used to monitor the TARC to mirror the boundary of the commercial resource (TACC) i.e. use catches from both sectors within the boundary of WCRLMF, or statewide catches from both.		As above.

		recreational sector from meeting the TARC		[Options for Assessment period] Maintain the existing arrangements using a five-year rolling average		If annual assessments can be undertaken, they should be.
				[Options for Assessment period] Consider adopting a three-year rolling average		If annual assessments can be undertaken, they should be.
				[Options for Assessment period] Consider utilising annual assessment		WRL would be in favour for annual assessments once the TARC moves to mandatory real-time recreational catch recording.