

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 01

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Staffing Levels

**Hansard Page:** 165 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

**Senator COLBECK**—What percentage of those staff are based in corporate or administrative roles? The next question is: what are inspection duties? So just do a comparison of whether there has been a fluctuation in those numbers or whether they have stayed relatively—

**Mr Perrott**—We do not have that data with us, but we can take it on notice.

**Answer:**

Please refer to the answer for Question SRM/AFMA 10.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 02

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Frozen holdings of tuna in Japan

**Hansard Pages:** 168 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

**Senator COLBECK**—You mentioned the frozen holding. What sort of stockpile do they have? That was one of the issues that was raised in the film actually. How significant is that stockpile?

**Prof. Hurry**—There is a publication that comes out monthly—*Seafood International*, I think it is—that reports the frozen tuna holdings in Japan and it reports frozen squid and mightfish holdings. It normally sits around 100,000 tonnes as the frozen inventory, and there has always been a question as to whether that frozen inventory was the total amount of frozen fish in Japan or whether the fish that is held in bond is a separate block of frozen fish—because it has not actually entered into Japan as an imported product; it is held in bond stores waiting to come in—and we will never be quite sure just what the total is, but the published total is always around 100,000 tonnes.

**Senator COLBECK**—How much has that reduced?

**Prof. Hurry**—Last time I looked I think it was down to around 90,000 tonnes, and I have not had a look at it for the last couple of—

**Senator COLBECK**—About 10 per cent.

**Prof. Hurry**—Yes. But let me check that and I will come back to you. The word from industry is that the frozen holdings are down.

**Answer:**

Frozen holdings information is published in the magazine Infofish (released bimonthly). The latest information (for December 2009), published in the March/April 2010 issue, shows the stockpile at approximately 83,000 metric tonnes.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 03

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** IUU take of Patagonian Toothfish

**Hansard Page:** 171 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

**Senator COLBECK**—What is the impact that they are having on the fishery? Do we have any sense of what they are taking out?

**Prof. Hurry**—I do not know whether James would have a comment on this. We estimate the catch and we factor that into the stock assessment that we do for the toothfish stocks in the Southern Ocean, but I do not know how much we actually factor in. We could probably take that on notice and come back to you.

**Answer:**

The Heard Island and McDonald Islands Fishery (HIMIF) stock assessment does take into account the estimated illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) catch of Patagonian Toothfish. In 2008-09 the IUU catch estimate for the HIMI fishery was 0 to 146.4 tonnes. 146 tonnes represents approximately 6 per cent of the total allowable catch of Patagonian Toothfish for the fishery for the season. At the estimated level of catch there is no significant impact on the stock.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 04

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Number of Boats in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery

**Hansard Page:** 174 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—I have a couple of questions about the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery.

How many boats are operating in the ETBF at the moment?

**Prof. Hurry**—I will get Dr Findlay to talk you through these ETBF issues.

**Dr Findlay**—The ETBF boats are down. I can check the exact number for you, but it is down to about 79 boats, from memory. The operational number of boats varies according to market conditions—price, weather and things like that.

**Answer:**

Sixty-five boats recorded fishing in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery in 2009.

Forty-eight boats have recorded catch to date in 2010.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 05

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery Levies

**Hansard Page:** 174-175 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Is the fishery large enough for you to tell me on notice, unless you have it there, what every owner of any statutory fishing right pays up there? Can you give me the details of all of those, without their names of course?

**Dr Findlay**—We could probably tell you the range of levy fees by company or something like that.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Yes. Notwithstanding the answer you will give me on notice, it does seem, if it is about \$50,000, to be an enormously high figure for management of an area with so few boats in it. The question is: what makes up the \$1.9 million?

**Dr Findlay**—Those are the recovered costs for management of the fishery. It includes the costs of observers in the fishery and the industry contribution to the management. There also is a contribution by government to management action undertaken in the fishery—things like development of management plans, running the fishery on a day-to-day basis, issuing rights, collection of data, processing data, undertaking stock assessments, issuing statutory fishing rights, maintaining our systems for the trading of those rights and enforcing them with either the input or the output control arrangements that have been placed with the fishery.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Would I find how the \$1.9 million is made up somewhere else or, if not, can you give it to me on notice?

**Dr Findlay**—The costs that are calculated are part of a management advisory committee discussion, so those calculations are provided through the management advisory committees to the industry and other stakeholders. I do not see that there is any reason why we could not provide you with that breakdown

**Answer:**

The Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF) is managed under an effort-controlled system, where each fisher or company holds a certain number of entitlements allowing them to fish in the fishery. The amount of levy paid is directly related to the access rights that they hold in the fishery. Most operators hold an ETBF boat permit and/or an ETBF minor line Statutory Fishing Right (SFR) along with several thousand longline Statutory Fishing Rights.

Each Longline SFR, of which there are 1,000,041 currently in the fishery, allows a fisher to use a set number of hooks on a longline. A minor line SFR (154 currently in

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 05 (continued)

the fishery) allows a fisher to use a minor line in the fishery. In addition to these, each boat must have a corresponding boat permit. There are currently 110 boat permits.

Under the *Fishing Levy Regulations 2009* AFMA charged the following amounts for the above described ETBF entitlements;

- ETBF boat permit \$2 325.41
- Longline Statutory Fishing Right \$1.45
- ETBF minor line Statutory Fishing Right \$2 325.41

The breakdown of the 2009-10 budget for the ETBF, upon which current levies are based, is outlined below

Item	Cost (\$)	Explanation
Fisheries Management	437,650	Includes AFMA staff salaries, cost of plan amendments, and cost of development and implementation of management arrangements.
Research projects	177,036	Contributions to research projects conducted on Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery related topics
Management Advisory Committee	153,829	Costs associated with meetings of the Tropical Tuna Management Advisory Committee, associated travel costs and secretariat support.
Resource Assessment Group	20,892	Costs associated with meetings of the Eastern Tuna Resource Assessment Group, associated travel costs and secretariat support.
Logbooks	84,429	Costs of producing and distributing logbooks as well as the collection and data entry.
Data Management	100,569	Costs of maintaining AFMA databases and responding to the data needs of the fishery.
Licensing and associated Information Technology systems	247,651	Costs of conducting licensing function in respect to the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery, such as granting of Statutory Fishing Right, issue of permits, collection of levies, performing transfers and the depreciation on the licensing information technology systems.
Observers	465,099	The observer program is a long running AFMA program to validate

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

		the logbook data that is collected by industry. The costs associated with the salary, travel, training and equipment costs associated with placing scientific observers on vessels for 650 sea days.
Domestic Compliance	325,493	Costs associated with AFMA conducting compliance operations to ensure that operators are abiding by rules set out in permits, Management Plans and the Fisheries Management Act. This includes port inspections, the collection and collation of intelligence and running the Vessel Monitoring System to track Commonwealth fishing vessels.
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,012,648</b>	
Carry-over of unspent funds	28,335	
<b>Total levy to be collected</b>	<b>1,984,313</b>	

In addition Fisheries Research and Development Corporation levies of \$93,403 are collected.

The breakdown of the amount of levy paid by each company is provided below, of the 120 companies, 44 companies pay the minimum amount.

Table 1 Breakdown by company of levies payable by industry to the ETBF levy base.

<b>Company</b>	<b>Total levy</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Total levy</b>
Company 1	\$ 122,091.90	Company 29	\$ 26,613.97
Company 2	\$ 93,022.41	Company 30	\$ 26,613.97
Company 3	\$ 80,812.35	Company 31	\$ 26,613.97
Company 4	\$ 79,841.91	Company 32	\$ 26,613.97
Company 5	\$ 73,513.33	Company 33	\$ 26,613.97
Company 6	\$ 68,861.06	Company 34	\$ 26,613.97
Company 7	\$ 57,880.21	Company 35	\$ 26,613.97
Company 8	\$ 53,227.94	Company 36	\$ 26,613.97
Company 9	\$ 53,227.94	Company 37	\$ 24,547.33
Company 10	\$ 53,227.94	Company 38	\$ 24,288.56
Company 11	\$ 53,227.94	Company 39	\$ 22,221.92
Company 12	\$ 42,247.09	Company 40	\$ 22,221.92
Company 13	\$ 39,921.68	Company 41	\$ 20,283.94
Company 14	\$ 37,855.04	Company 42	\$ 16,164.21
Company 15	\$ 35,736.48	Company 43	\$ 15,633.12
Company 16	\$ 32,751.32	Company 44	\$ 15,633.12
Company 17	\$ 28,939.38	Company 45	\$ 15,633.12
Company 18	\$ 28,270.43	Company 46	\$ 15,633.12

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

Company 19	\$ 26,613.97	Company 47	\$ 15,633.12
Company 20	\$ 26,613.97	Company 48	\$ 15,633.12
Company 21	\$ 26,613.97	Company 49	\$ 15,633.12
Company 22	\$ 26,613.97	Company 50	\$ 15,633.12
Company 23	\$ 26,613.97	Company 51	\$ 15,633.12
Company 24	\$ 26,613.97	Company 52	\$ 15,633.12
Company 25	\$ 26,613.97	Company 53	\$ 10,141.97
Company 26	\$ 26,613.97	Company 54	\$ 10,141.97
Company 27	\$ 26,613.97	Company 55	\$ 10,141.97
Company 28	\$ 26,613.97	Company 56	\$ 10,141.97
Company 57	\$ 7,507.32	Company 85	\$ 2,325.41
Company 58	\$ 7,507.32	Company 86	\$ 2,325.41
Company 59	\$ 7,507.32	Company 87	\$ 2,325.41
Company 60	\$ 6,976.23	Company 88	\$ 2,325.41
Company 61	\$ 5,310.57	Company 89	\$ 2,325.41
Company 62	\$ 5,310.57	Company 90	\$ 2,325.41
Company 63	\$ 5,310.57	Company 91	\$ 2,325.41
Company 64	\$ 5,310.57	Company 92	\$ 2,325.41
Company 65	\$ 5,310.57	Company 93	\$ 2,325.41
Company 66	\$ 5,310.57	Company 94	\$ 2,325.41
Company 67	\$ 5,310.57	Company 95	\$ 2,325.41
Company 68	\$ 5,310.57	Company 96	\$ 2,325.41
Company 69	\$ 5,310.57	Company 97	\$ 2,325.41
Company 70	\$ 5,310.57	Company 98	\$ 2,325.41
Company 71	\$ 5,310.57	Company 99	\$ 2,325.41
Company 72	\$ 5,310.57	Company 100	\$ 2,325.41
Company 73	\$ 5,310.57	Company 101	\$ 2,325.41
Company 74	\$ 5,310.57	Company 102	\$ 2,325.41
Company 75	\$ 5,310.57	Company 103	\$ 2,325.41
Company 76	\$ 5,181.91	Company 104	\$ 2,325.41
Company 77	\$ 2,325.41	Company 105	\$ 2,325.41
Company 78	\$ 2,325.41	Company 106	\$ 2,325.41
Company 79	\$ 2,325.41	Company 107	\$ 2,325.41
Company 80	\$ 2,325.41	Company 108	\$ 2,325.41
Company 81	\$ 2,325.41	Company 109	\$ 2,325.41
Company 82	\$ 2,325.41	Company 110	\$ 2,325.41
Company 83	\$ 2,325.41	Company 111	\$ 2,325.41
Company 84	\$ 2,325.41	Company 112	\$ 2,325.41



**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**  
**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**  
**Budget Estimates May 2010**  
**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 05 (continued)

<b>Company</b>	<b>Total levy</b>
Company 113	\$ 2,325.41
Company 114	\$ 2,325.41
Company 115	\$ 2,325.41
Company 116	\$ 2,325.41
Company 117	\$ 2,325.41
Company 118	\$ 2,325.41
Company 119	\$ 2,325.41
Company 120	\$ 2,325.41

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 06

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Profitability of the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery

**Hansard Page:** 175-176 (24/05/2010)

**Senator IAN MACDONALD asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Would you have any idea of the profitability of the fishery?

**Dr Findlay**—The profitability of the fishery is assessed through the ABARE statistics. I am not sure how recent their data would be, but we can certainly give you on notice the current information on the profitability of the fishery

**Answer:**

The latest ABARE economic survey data for the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery is for 2007-08. Fishing revenue at that time was estimated at \$44 million and operating costs (e.g. fuel, labour, gear) were estimated at \$38.7 million. However, once other costs such as depreciation, the opportunity cost of capital and total management costs were taken into account, net economic returns were estimated at minus \$1.1 million which is around minus 3 per cent of fishing revenue. The net economic return figure was minus \$10.5 million in 2006-07 and minus \$10.2 million in 2005-06.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 07

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Impact that trawl fishing may be having on albatross

**Hansard Page:** 177-178 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Siewert asked:**

**Senator SIEWERT**—Yes, I do. Can I please ask about albatross? I am going to anyway!

**CHAIR**—Is there an animal we have missed in your questions, Senator Siewert? Sorry.

**Senator SIEWERT**—I refrained from doing SBT, because Senator Colbeck covered that. We have talked in the past about longlines, and I am just following up on the trawl issues. With the BRS report talking about the cumulative impact and now looking at issues around trawl, I am wondering what you are doing about updating plans to deal with the issues that have now been raised about the impact that trawl fishing may be having on albatross.

**Dr Findlay**—We have had our bycatch and discards group down on the [inaudible] is now developing vessel operational plans to deal with issues, in particular, in relation to warp strikes from seabirds. Learning from some of the experiences in New Zealand, we think there are some fairly practical measures we can put in place on those boats, although it is important to actually go and talk to each of the operators about how they run their boat, to understand what those operational plans might mean for them. Essentially, it comes down to keeping birds away from trawl lines, and that looks mostly at how you discharge offal or other discards from the boat. The response from skippers has been pretty positive and they are quite keen to get these vessel operational plans rolled out right throughout our trawl fleet.

**Senator SIEWERT**—What is the timetable for rolling the measures out?

**Dr Findlay**—I will have to come back to you on the exact time frames for that program.

**Answer:**

The Vessel Management Plan (VMP) implementation to mitigate seabird interactions in the South Eastern Scale fish and Shark Fishery (SESSF) has been completed for all vessels in the Great Australian Bight Fishery (GAB). It is expected that 25 per cent of the South East Trawl (SET) fleet will have their VMPs implemented before 30 June

2010, another 50 per cent will be completed within the following 12 months, with the remainder of vessels completed by the end of 2011.

The implementation of the VMPs by 31 December 2011 is a recommendation of the Wildlife Trade Operation for the SESSF.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 08

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic: Observer Coverage Sea Lions**

**Hansard Page:** 125 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Siewert asked:**

**Senator SIEWERT**—We have already talked about observer coverage and that has increased to 120 days, hasn't it? So you are already working on observer coverage in general.

**Dr Findlay**—That is 120 days in relation to sea lions. We have a broader observer program for the entire South East Fishery, which has a larger amount of coverage; obviously it involves more effort. I can get you the exact numbers on that.

**Answer:**

As at May 2010, 123 observer sea days had been allocated in South Australia in the 2010-11 year for sea lion observations.

The level of observer coverage was reviewed in line with the final Sea Lion Management Strategy following the AFMA Commission meeting on 21-22 June 2010. The revised number of observer sea days in South Australia in the 2010-11 year for sea lion observations is projected to be 227, based on the coverage outlined in the Australian Sea Lion Management Strategy of 29 June 2010.

AFMA has projected a total of 701 observer sea days across the Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery in the 2010-11 financial year, including the coverage under the Sea Lion Management Strategy of 29 June 2010.

All projections are based on forecast fishing activity, which can change in the course of the year.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 09

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Southern Ocean Patrols – Budget Reductions

**Hansard Page:** 181-182 (24/05/2010)

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

**Senator COLBECK**—Going to the southern ocean vessel surveillance days, you mentioned that you would have had four patrols in this year. You obviously have issues with that, given the timing of the ship coming on. Funding has been reduced from \$280 million in 2009-10 to \$200 million in 2010-11 and then down to \$120 million in the forward years. How does that fit in with what you would see as the patrol program? Obviously you are not going to do four patrols when you are cutting the budget from \$280 million to \$120 million.

**Prof. Hurry**—Are they the Customs figures?

**Senator COLBECK**—Yes, they are.

**Prof. Hurry**—I am sure we budgeted on four, didn't we?

**Senator COLBECK**—So someone is not telling you what is going on?

**Prof. Hurry**—No, hang on.

**Senator COLBECK**—I am sorry to break it to you that way.

**Prof. Hurry**—No, that is okay. Peter might have some better information than I have on it anyway.

**Mr Venslovas**—The resources that we would normally have sent on that fourth patrol would be redirected towards the capacity-building initiatives that I was referring to earlier. It relates to what is happening not only in northern waters but also in southern waters in terms of providing assistance for countries like Malaysia in training on catch documentation schemes, how to identify toothfish to enhance their port state control measures. That will provide us with resources to focus a greater effort in that area in the forthcoming years.

**Senator COLBECK**—It is a significant reduction in presence. I am wondering how that matched up with—

**Prof. Hurry**—I have not seen those figures, and we were just assuming that we had a rolling program of four patrols a year down there. I would need to take that on notice and see what I can do with it.

**Answer:**

Funding for Southern Ocean Patrols/vessels is provided to the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service (ACBP). ACBP received funding of \$45.906 million in 2009-2010, and expects to receive funding of \$56.087 million in 2010-2011, \$52.332 million in 2011-2012, \$52.981 million in 2012-13 and \$52.981 million in 2013-2014 for the Southern Ocean vessel.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 09 (continued)

ACBP advises that the figures to which Senator Colbeck referred in his question probably relate to the number of funded sea days. The average number of funded sea days for Southern Ocean patrol days had been 200 days per annum, from 2005-2006 until 2008-2009. The 2009-2010 Budget made allowance for a short term increase of an additional 80 patrol days in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 for the use of the ACV *Oceanic Viking* in northern waters, resulting in a total of 280 patrol days for those years. The 2010-2011 Portfolio Budget Statement provided for 200 patrol days per year for 2010-2011 and 120 days from 2011-2012 onwards.

ACBP advises that the patrol program for 2010-2011 will involve three rather than four patrols to the southern ocean. As a result of the reduction in patrol days, AFMA will be able to refocus some of its resources to other initiatives to combat illegal unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing in the Southern Ocean, including capacity building in port states.

Since 2005, no fish poachers have been detected fishing illegally in Australia's Southern Ocean Exclusive Economic Zones (Heard and McDonald Islands and Macquarie Island). Successful operations in the Southern Ocean have reduced the risk from illegal fishing, allowing a return of some patrol days funding to budget.

The Treaty on Cooperation in the Maritime Areas adjacent to the French Southern and Antarctic Territories with France will continue to allow ACBP and AFMA officers to embark on co-operative Southern Ocean patrols with the French navy. Under this arrangement, patrols will be planned in conjunction with the French navy to provide an unpredictable deterrence presence. Support from commercial satellite surveillance will also continue throughout the year. These arrangements will ensure effective management of the risk of illegal fishing in the Southern Ocean.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 10

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Staffing levels

**Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

1. What is the level of personnel at AFMA now?
2. How does that compare to previous years?
3. What percentage of these staff are based in corporate or administrative duties?
4. What proportion of staff are employed for inspection duties or similar?
5. How does this compare to previous years?
6. Please provide a financial year breakdown since 2007/08.

**Answer:**

Average staffing levels in AFMA during the period 2007-08 to 2009-10, including the proportion of administrative and inspection staff, are shown in the table below:

	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>As at 30/08/2010</b>
ASL	211	215	214	216
Corp/Admin	15.6%	15.8%	16.3%	16.6%
Inspection	29.4%	25.6%	25.7%	25%

- ASL = average staffing level
- Corporate/administrative staffing includes finance, HR, legal, executive, communications, secretariat
- Inspection duties or similar relate to AFMA domestic & foreign compliance sections.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 11

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Southern Ocean Patrols – *Ocean Protector*

**Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

The Minister for Home Affairs issued a media release on 28 April announcing the Australian Government had entered into a contract for a new Southern Ocean patrol vessel – to be named the Ocean Protector.

1. Will this vessel replace the *Oceanic Viking*?
2. What discussions did AFMA have with Customs in the lead up to this announcement?
3. What specification requirements for a new ship did AFMA submit to Customs, if any?
4. Is AFMA aware of the progress in refitting that ship in Newcastle?
5. Will it be ready by August as suggested by the Minister?

**Answer:**

1. Yes.
2. As the vessel contract is administered by the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service, AFMA was not included in discussions concerning the media release issued on 28 April. AFMA had extensive discussions with the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service on AFMA's operational requirements.
3. AFMA specified that the replacement vessel should have the capability to recover fishing equipment such as long lines and gill nets, launch crew to board vessels engaged in illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing activities and conduct fisheries surveillance.
4. The Australian and Customs Border Protection Service advises that the *MV Skandi Bergen* arrived in Newcastle on 27 June 2010, where it has been modified before being renamed. The modifications include the addition of a module to allow the launch and recovery of response tenders, a kitting and preparation area for Fisheries and Customs and Border Protection boarding officers, a medical facility and accommodation for Potential Irregular Immigrants. AFMA staff attended the renaming of the vessel in Newcastle on 20 September 2010.
5. The Australian Customs and Border Protection Service advised that the *ACV Ocean Protector* was expected to be ready for operations in August 2010. However, the travel restrictions cause by the eruptions of the Eyjafjallajökul volcano in Iceland delayed the arrival of equipment and key staff for the vessel.



**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Budget Estimates May 2010**

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 11 (continued)

Vessel modifications also took longer than expected. The vessel commenced operations on 8 October 2010.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 12

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Illegal Foreign Fishing – Decline in Budget

**Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

The Government has indicated there will be savings of \$18.182m as a result of a decline in illegal foreign fishing, which has in turn resulted in reduced activity relating to apprehensions and detention of illegal foreign fishers as well as a reduction in the cost associated with the towing and destruction of their vessels.

1. Can AFMA provide further detail on the reason for this cutback?
2. What will the efficiencies involve? Less personnel? Less patrols?

**Answers:**

As these matters relate to the budget administered by the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service, Australian Fisheries Management Authority is unable to answer these questions. They have been referred to Customs to provide responses

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 13

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Southern Ocean Patrols – Decline in Budget

**Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

A saving of \$7.250m related to a reduced number of patrol days to be undertaken by the Southern Oceans Patrol. This is due to a focus on a risk-based approach to patrol activity.

AND

Southern Ocean vessel surveillance (patrol days). Funding reduced from \$280 million in 2009-10 to \$200 million in 2010-11 and then to \$120 million in following forward estimates years.

1. Why is the Government leasing a new patrol vessel at the same time it is also drastically cutting back the budget for Southern Ocean patrols?
2. Can AFMA please provide detail on these budget cuts and how they will impact on Southern Ocean patrols?
3. How many Southern Ocean patrol days are budgeted for in each of the forward estimates years?
4. Are you aware of how many northern waters patrol days are to be undertaken by the Southern Ocean patrol boat in the coming financial years?
5. Was industry consulted about these budget cuts prior to their announcement?
6. What feedback has been received since the Budget was announced?

**Answers:**

As questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 relate to the budget and program administered by the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service, Australian Fisheries Management Authority is unable to answer these questions. They have been referred to Customs to provide responses.

**Question:** AFMA 13 (continued)

5. No consultation with the commercial fishing industry was undertaken in relation to the changes to Southern Ocean patrol program.
6. No feedback has been received by AFMA since the Budget was announced.

**Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2010

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** AFMA 14

**Division/Agency:** Australian Fisheries Management Authority

**Topic:** Advice to DAFF regarding IOTC meeting in Korea

**Hansard Page:** Written

**Senator Colbeck asked:**

1. What advice did AFMA provide to DAFF regarding the IOTC meeting in Korea in March with respect to thresher sharks both in advance of the meeting and then since?

**Answer:**

In the lead up to the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) meeting Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) participated in the development of the Australian government negotiating positions for the meeting. AFMA also provided catch data on the take of hammerhead and thresher sharks by the Commonwealth fleet.

Following the IOTC meeting, AFMA and DAFF discussed the impact of the outcomes relating to the take of thresher shark and consultation occurred with other stakeholders. For meeting details see SRM 06 – Question 14. For other outcomes see SRM 06 – Questions 15-18.