

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 69

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Statutory Fishing Rights

Proof Hansard page: 7 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: So how many would you categorise of those? Of the licences handed back, how many would you categorise in that respect?

Dr Findlay: I take you back to the table in response to a question on notice 72. The scalefish boat SFRs with the number 19 next to it are all boat SFRs. From memory, I think just about everything in that table—Nick has probably got it in front of him faster than I have—is various forms of boat statutory fishing rights or other permits to put a boat into a fishery. I do not think from memory there is too much quota on there at all.

Dr Rayns: There is a very small amount of quota. I think your question is about how many of those 19, for example, were active fishing vessels as opposed to those that were not.

Senator COLBECK: That is correct.

Dr Rayns: I would have to take that on notice. I could not give you an absolute number in each case. We can find that out for you.

Answer:

Of the 19 Scalefish Hook Boat Statutory Fishing Rights (SFRs) surrendered, 11 had a boat nominated to the concession at the time of surrender. Having a boat nominated is required to use the fishing concession.

Of the 11 boats, 10 had catch recorded in 2011–12. Nine of these had catch recorded in the Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery in 2011-12, while the remaining boat had catch recorded in the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery only.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 70

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Details about process of managing a quota managed fishery

Proof Hansard page: 7 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: I understand that. Can you, then, for me on notice get me the detail of how that process is managed and regulated or stipulated, if you like? I think you understand what I am asking.

Dr Findlay: Yes.

Answer:

The process for surrendering statutory fishing rights (SFR) is set out in the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* (the Act) section 22(6). It states that a fishing right ceases to be in force if the holder of the fishing right surrenders it by written notice given to the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA).

In following this process AFMA has no discretion to refuse a written notice to surrender a fishing right. There is no procedure for additional rights to be re-allocated under the Act or in any of AFMA's management plans.

In a quota managed fishery if a quota statutory fishing right (SFR) is surrendered it means the determined total allowable catch for the fishing season will be allocated between the remaining statutory fishing rights in the fishery. This is because under the management plan the quota allocated to an individual SFR each fishing season is the total allowable catch for the season divided by the total number of SFRs.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 71

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Dates of licence surrender

Proof Hansard page: 8 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: So of the 54 that surrendered their licences this year, how many would have done that prior to that first payment date?

Dr Findlay: I am not sure I have those details, but maybe the CFO does. No. We can take that on notice. We do not have those in front of us, I am sorry.

Answer:

Of the 54 concessions surrendered this financial year as at 22 May 2012, 16 were surrendered before levy invoices were issued and 34 were surrendered after invoices were issued, but prior to the first instalment falling due. The remaining four concessions were surrendered after the first levy instalment became due.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 72

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Number of boats in fishery

Proof Hansard page: 10 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Dr Rayns: Yes, Senator. Whenever we have a situation like that, as James has described, it flows into the next set of levies and is distributed in that particular fishery. So it will be distributed. For those 19 boat SFRs that were removed from that fishery or surrendered from that fishery, that \$300,000 goes back into that fishery for the next levy season.

Senator COLBECK: So how many boats will remain in that sector?

Dr Rayns: I will take that on notice. My recollection is somewhere between 50 and 60, but I would have to check.

Answer:

As at 12 June 2012, there were 37 Scalefish Hook Boat Statutory Fishing Rights in force. Seventeen of these had a boat nominated to the concession which is required to commence fishing.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 73

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Cost recovered versus government funding in Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Proof Hansard page: 12 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Mr Venslovas: The Fisheries Operations Branch covers the functions of foreign and domestic compliance and data management. We are also involved in the capacity building aspects of AFMA's responsibilities. There are 68.75 FTEs involved in operations within the branch. I will need to take it on notice in terms of exact numbers, but about 42 would be direct operational officers involved in field inspections and so forth.

Senator COLBECK: Put that in cost recovered versus government funded terms for me?

Answer:

Currently the Fisheries Operations Branch has 68.75 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions. Of these 2.7 are cost recovered through industry levies and 66.05 are funded through government appropriation.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 74

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Proportion of survey costs charged back to fishery as part of the fishery management process

Proof Hansard page: 17 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: Is there a proportion of that that is charged back to the fishery as part of the fishery management process?

Dr Findlay: Yes.

Senator COLBECK: And that is 20 to 25?

Dr Rayns: We would probably take that on notice. Some of our fisheries now run their fishery independent surveys outside the levy base. Again, some are in the levy base. As Dr Findlay has said, part are the research costs and others are outside of it. We would have to take that on notice in terms of an overall figure and what is in and what is out.

Answer:

Independent surveys can attract Government funding of up to 20 per cent where a public benefit can be demonstrated and agreed to by the Australian Fisheries Management Authority Research Committee. Therefore, industry pays at least 80 per cent of the cost of an independent survey, but it can be up to 100 per cent, depending upon the assessment of public benefit.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 75

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Information Australian Fisheries Management Authority provides to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

Proof Hansard page: 20 (22/05/2012)

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Dr Rayns: We have. We provide technical information to SEWPaC on our fisheries, but that is the extent of our involvement. They might ask us questions about, for example, the area of the fishery, its levels of activity, catches and those sort of things. We generally provide that sort of information, as we would, to assist SEWPaC with its considerations about bioregional marine planning.

Senator SIEWERT: Could you take on notice all the categories of information that you provide to SEWPaC?

Dr Rayns: Certainly, yes.

Answer:

The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) provides to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPAC) information on wildlife interactions involving AFMA-licensed fishing vessels. It also, through a service level agreement, provides data from vessel monitoring systems so that SEWPAC can monitor vessel activity within marine reserves. On request, AFMA also provides vessel specific information to support compliance action within those reserves. AFMA has also provided occasional advice to SEWPAC on matters of fact associated with its fisheries such as the number of vessels, areas fished, quota held and catch trends.

AFMA does not routinely provide information to SEWPAC in relation to Marine Bioregional Planning (MBP). Logbook and observer data is provided to the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences (ABARES). ABARES provides information to SEWPAC based on that data which may be used in the MBP process.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 76

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Adjustment packages for Australia's fishery industry

Proof Hansard page: 20 (22/05/2012)

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Senator SIEWERT: You do not provide advice on how adjustment packages could be structured and on what basis those decisions are made?

Dr Rayns: We have not been asked those sort of questions, no.

Senator SIEWERT: If you could take on notice that detail.

Answer:

No, the Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) has not provided any such advice to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities yet. AFMA understands that the design of any adjustment package is still being finalised.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 77

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Employment in Australia's fishing industry

Proof Hansard page: 22 (22/05/2012)

Senator STERLE (CHAIR) asked:

CHAIR: I have a couple of questions before I go back to Senator Colbeck. I will ask you, Dr Findlay. You can point me in the right direction. What is the net value of the Commonwealth fishery?

Dr Findlay: It is about \$300 million-odd at the moment. We can give you an exact figure out of ABARES's work. ABARES produces this document every year. The fisheries status report 2010 would have the most current figures.

CHAIR: Tremendous. How many people does it support and employ?

Dr Findlay: We do not collect that information directly. It is probably one of multiple jurisdictions around the country. A lot of our fishers work in multiple jurisdictions. I would have to go and look at what information we have. I could not give you a figure here today, I am sorry.

CHAIR: Take it on notice and come back and provide us with what you can tell us about how many people are supported or employed in this industry. If the disallowance motion is successful, what could be the potential impacts?

Answer:

While a net value is not available, the latest gross value of production (GVP) data produced by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences (ABARES) shows that the GVP of Commonwealth fisheries in 2009–10 was \$316.7 million.

ABARES also collates Australian Bureau of Statistics information on employment in the Australian fishing industry, but the data does not differentiate as to whether the employment is based on a State, Territory or Commonwealth fishery. In total, the available data shows that in 2006, 15 939 people were employed in commercial fishing, wholesaling and processing. It is not possible to ascertain what proportion of this is directly attributable to Commonwealth fisheries.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 78

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Additional information about use of cameras for monitoring

Proof Hansard page: 24-25 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Dr Findlay: We have run three trials across a number of fisheries to look at the cost and benefits of camera work. In addition, we have the gillnet work that we have already mentioned. The outcome of those suggests that there are real benefits. The cost-benefit analysis takes into account all the upfront and behind the curtain costs. Providing them might be a better way to go. I should point out too that when we quote the number of 10 per cent, that is based on the current costs of technology. This technology is coming down very quickly, like all technology is around the world. In fact, Australia is not a leader in this at all. Around the world, most other fisheries in first world countries have actually gone to the major use of cameras. So this is actually us playing catch-up. The resistance from industry is not around costs. It is actually about what else the cameras might see. It is actually working through in terms of privacy and other concerns they would have. At the moment they are supportive of the idea. They understand there are cost savings and it is a matter of getting the other things sorted out in terms of privacy and other issues. The commission has already made a decision that from 1 July 2013 the eastern tuna and billfish fishery will be going to cameras. So that decision has already been taken by the commission.

Senator COLBECK: If you can provide us with that other information, that would be good. There is a 200-metre isobar from the Western Australian government.

Dr Findlay: Yes, we can.

Answer:

In-shop costs include hardware for the storage of imagery, software for analysis of imagery, administrative costs and staff time to coordinate the program. The Australian Fisheries Management Authority has budgeted direct costs of \$526 007 for the 2012–13 financial year to support the rollout of electronic technologies including electronic log books and electronic monitoring.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 79

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: North West Slope Trawl Fishery

Proof Hansard page: 25-26 (22/05/2012)

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Dr Rayns: We do consult with stakeholders on what arrangements would apply next year, for the coming season. So there is an opportunity there for stakeholders to say what they think. We will provide in some very aggregated way the sorts of issues that we are contemplating that have happened. But we cannot really provide individual observer reports and shot-by-shot information in this case. So there will be some discussion with stakeholders, but I think if you are after a lot of detail or they are after a lot of detail on what has happened on each voyage and on each trip in this particular vessel, it will not be exposed.

Senator SIEWERT: It is more the overall impact rather than voyage by voyage. They have made several trips in.

Dr Rayns: I think in a broader sense, Senator, probably yes, that information can be provided. But we would have to be very careful about how it was provided in terms of making sure we did not disclose any, I guess, specific information about the vessel, if you like, and its catch.

Answer:

The Australian Fisheries Management Authority has recently finalised a review of the 2011 season against the *North West Slope Trawl Fishery and Western Deepwater Trawl Fishery Harvest Strategy (2011)*.

A draft report is currently being prepared for the Western Australian Department of Fisheries and other stakeholders outlining the key outcomes from the review, noting the sensitivities around releasing specific detail about catches and the vessel as only one boat operated in the North West Slope Trawl Fishery during 2011. A final report will be made public before the end of the calendar year.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 89

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Incidents of illegal fishing in Australia's southern waters

Proof Hansard page: 48 (22/05/2012)

Senator IAN MACDONALD asked:

Senator IAN MACDONALD: I am not sure if Senator Colbeck raised this when we were dealing with AFMA. If he did not, could you take on notice whether there have been any reported incidents of illegal fishing in Australia's waters around Heard and McDonald Islands, Macquarie Island and the Australian coastline in the last 12 months?

Mr Neil: Certainly.

Senator COLBECK: No, I did not ask specifically about that. I was going to ask some questions about the number of trips that are programmed for this year and what the surveillance of that area is at the moment.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Again, would that be you?

Mr Thompson: We would have to take on notice questions about the number of trips to the Antarctic and the number proposed. They are matters for AFMA.

Answer:

Over the past 12 months (23 May 2011 to 22 May 2012) whilst there have been no incidents of illegal fishing detected around Heard and McDonald Islands and Macquarie Island (southern ocean), there has been 14 incidents of illegal fishing in Australia's northern waters.

The Australian Customs and Border Protection Service (ACBPS) patrol vessel "Ocean Protector" had three (3) trips programmed for the southern ocean for 2011–12.

Details in relation to current surveillance efforts and patrol deployments for the southern ocean are usually not released for operational reasons. However, surveillance of the southern ocean is provided through a combination of commercially available satellite imagery employed by the ACBPS, patrol activity conducted by the "Ocean Protector" and French authorities. The program involves scheduling the three (3) Australian patrol deployments in coordination with those scheduled by the French authorities, usually five (5) patrols per year, to ensure that maximum coverage is obtained and it is expected that this will continue into the future.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 125

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Cost of observers and overheads

Proof Hansard page: 12-13 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: So your direct costs are about \$665?

Dr Rayns: Nearly \$700 a day in round terms, yes.

Senator COLBECK: Then you have \$400 to \$500 for overheads on top?

Dr Rayns: We have about \$500 for FTEs who have to manage and oversee the program, organise training and so forth and deploy the observers et cetera. They come on top of that, and then we have corporate overheads on top of that again.

Senator COLBECK: So if we say about \$700 a day direct costs and about \$400 to \$500 a day overheads?

Dr Rayns: But they are very different types, because some of that is the oversight of the program—deploying observers and so forth. The other part of the overheads are the overheads as described by Mr Bridge.

Senator COLBECK: So some direct management and some overhead?

Dr Rayns: Yes. That is correct. The exact split of that, unfortunately, I do not have in front of me but I can get for you, if you wish.

Senator COLBECK: I would be interested to see how that is made up.

Answer:

As at the end of May 2012, the average sea day cost of an Australian Fisheries Management Authority provided Observer is \$1300 per day. The cost is broken down as follows:

Program Administration	\$345 per sea day
Direct Costs	\$607 per sea day
Overhead	\$348 per sea day

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 126

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Survey costs investigating the impacts of seismic testing on scallops

Proof Hansard page: 26 (22/05/2012)

Senator COLBECK asked:

Senator COLBECK: Well, the figure gives us about \$16 000.

Dr Findlay: That is right. Industry was levied for about \$10½ thousand of that. In addition to that, there was additional AFMA time and CSIRO time, which we have tried to put estimates on.

Senator COLBECK: So that is the total cost of the project? There were no other costs?

Dr Findlay: That is our estimate, yes. In round numbers, they put in \$10½ thousand and we put in the rest of about \$20 000. You were saying that industry paid the entire bill for that work. I was disputing that.

Senator COLBECK: Well, I am now disputing the fact that that was the total cost for the work. So there was not any other cost incurred as part of the process? No-one else put anything in?

Dr Findlay: Industry may well have put additional costs in. We do not collect that information directly from industry. So some industry vessels participate in some of those surveys. They may well have had costs which we are not aware of. This information is about the costs we are aware of.

Senator COLBECK: In the context of those, you do not actually make a calculation or an allocation of costs that industry might put in to that. So this is not the total cost for the work. There is an acknowledgement that there may be other industry costs, but you do not calculate that. How many days of boat time might there have been that is not included in this, for example?

Dr Findlay: I cannot remember off the top of my head, but we can get that information for you.

Senator COLBECK: If you could, that would be fine.

Answer:

One vessel completed 4 days surveying as part of the 2010 research project 'Before-after-control-impact study investigating the effects of seismic surveys on scallops', coordinated by the Tasmanian Aquaculture and Fisheries Institute.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 244

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Duty Statement for AFMA Commissioners

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. The AFMA website indicates Commissioners are responsible for “domestic fisheries management”, provide a copy of the duty statement or similar for all AFMA Commissioners.
2. Does the recent High Court decision regarding James Hardie and the duty of care requirements for Directors have relevance to the AFMA Commissioners, particularly with relation to the statement made by Dr Findlay at Budget Estimates 22 May 2012 regarding over spending:

“We have monthly accounts whereby we compare expenditure versus budget every month. We explained last estimates that the commission does not have a direct role. They have an interest in the AFMA budget but do not have a direct role in decision-making. That sits with me as CEO.”

Answer:

1. Requirements of Australia’s Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) Commissioners are detailed in AFMA’s objectives, functions and powers as set out in the *Fisheries Administration Act 1991*.
2. No the James Hardie decision does not have relevance to AFMA as Commissioners are not subject to the requirements of the *Corporations Act 2001*. In relation to financial management, the Chief Executive Officer is not subject to direction by the Commission, as prescribed in section 10B (4) of the *Fisheries Administration Act 1991*.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 245

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Levy refund

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

Do fisheries that are underspent in any given year receive a refund or reduction of levies in the following year?

Answer:

If a fishery spends less than the budget for a financial year, the levy for the following year is reduced by the full amount not spent.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 246

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Fisheries Status Report

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. Provide details of all fisheries where the level of management has reduced.
2. What have been the associated cost savings related to this reduction in management intensity?

Answer:

The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) manages Commonwealth fisheries to achieve sustainable harvesting of fisheries resources in accordance with the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* and prevailing government policies, such as the Commonwealth Harvest Strategy Policy and the Commonwealth Policy on Fisheries Bycatch. Within that overarching framework, however, management action is tailored to what is appropriate to achieve the Act's objectives and so may fluctuate over time.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 246 (continued)

Details of Commonwealth fisheries where AFMA management costs have reduced over the last 2 – 3 financial years are set out in the table below:

Fishery	Reduction in AFMA management intensity	Cost/Efficiency Impact
Northern Prawn Fishery (NPF)	Under co-management arrangements, the NPF Industry Association conducts data collection and carries out the crew member observer program. It is expected that Management Advisory Committee (MAC) meetings will reduce by one per year	The co-management arrangements have led to increased management effectiveness, improved communications with industry and improved relations with industry. Expected reduction in MAC costs are in the range of \$10,000 to \$15,000 per year.
Great Australian Bight Trawl Fishery (GABTF)	Under co-management arrangements, the GAB Industry Association conducts data collection. MAC meetings have reduced from three to one per year.	The co-management arrangements have led to increased management effectiveness, improved communications with industry and improved relations with industry. Reduction in MAC costs estimated at \$20,000 p.a.
Coral Sea Fishery (CSF)	On average, there is now one less consultative committee meeting each year.	Savings in 2011-12 of \$8,000 compared with 2010-11. Anticipated similar savings in 2012-13.
Bass Strait Central Zone Scallop Fishery (BSCZSF)	Industry now conducts scallop surveys which are used to set Total Allowable Catch and to identify areas for harvest.	For 2012-13, the recovered budget for the fishery has decreased by 31% or \$143,072 compared to 2011-12.
Small Pelagic Fishery (SPF)	The grant of Statutory Fishing Rights has been finalised. A reduction in fishing has led to less licensing & log book activity.	For 2012-13, the recovered budget for the fishery has decreased by 33% or \$135,624 compared to 2011-12.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2012

Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 247

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Orange Roughy

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. Provide dates for the commencement and completion of the review of the Orange Roughy Conservation Program
2. What will be the process for the review?
3. Who will be consulted?
4. What is the status of the discussions regarding adjusting the boundaries of the 700m closure of waters to fishing to allow improved access to deepwater species?

Answer:

1. The review of the Orange Roughy Conservation Program commenced early 2012 and a draft is scheduled to be sent to the relevant Government Departments for comment by the end of 2012.
2. Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) will draft the Orange Roughy Conservation Program review document to be sent to the relevant Australian Government Departments for their comment. After receiving this comment the document will be updated and circulated for comment to Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Resource Assessment Group, the South East Management Advisory Committee and relevant industry associations. Input from these bodies will be considered and may be incorporated into a final draft that will be sent to the AFMA Commission for decision. Following this the Minister for the Environment will be asked to approve the revised Orange Roughy Conservation Program.
3. Relevant Australian Government Departments to be consulted include the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Community. AFMA's Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Resource Assessment Group, the South East Management Advisory Committee, the South East Trawl Fishing industry Association and the Great Australian Bight Fishing Industry Association will also be consulted in the development of the review.
4. AFMA has developed a paper regarding options for modification of the 700m closure. This paper is currently under consideration by the Slope Resource Assessment Group and CSIRO scientists. Their advice will be considered by the South East Management Advisory Committee prior to a recommendation being made to the AFMA Commission for decision.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 248

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Credit Cards QON 179 February 2012

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. The information provided in response to QON 179 February 2012 indicates that AFMA had the most instances of credit card misuse, both by number and as a percentage of the number of cards issues, and amongst the most lenient actions taken if misuse is discovered.
2. Does this indicate that a review of credit card use guidelines, penalties for misuse and staff training is warranted?

Answer:

The Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA) removes the credit card if there are more than two instances of misuse, including accidental private use. If the misuse was of a serious nature the staff member is bound by the Australian Public Service Code of Conduct – and there are relevant penalties for breaching the code ranging from a reprimand to termination of employment. AFMA provides regular training on financial delegations and responsibilities, and new starters and managers must sign off that they are aware of their obligations within a week of starting employment with AFMA. A review of the use of credit cards in AFMA has been scheduled for early 2012–13.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates May 2012
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 249

Division/Agency: Sustainable Resource Management Division/Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Topic: Government Payment of Accounts

Proof Hansard page: Written

Senator COLBECK asked:

1. Does AFMA charge interest on overdue levies?
2. If so, what rate of interest is charged?
3. Is this interest handled as levy income?

Answer:

1. Yes.
2. Interest is charged at the rate prescribed by section 112 of the *Fisheries Management Act 1991* as 'Penalty for non-payment'.
3. No.