



N Z RECREATIONAL FISHING COUNCIL

P.O. BOX 276,
MOTUEKA.

Phone: 035287511,
Cell Phone: 0211193296,
Email: NZRFC@kinect.co.nz
Website: www.recfish.co.nz

25th June 2013
Minister of Primary Industries
Hon Nathan Guy.

Re; Decisions in CRA3, 7 and 8
Decision in PAU5D
Implications of above.

Dear Sir,

To say we are disappointed in your decision prohibiting public access to the same minimum legal size as that enjoyed by commercial fishers in CRA 3, 7 & 8 is a gross understatement. We are gutted. In a quick flick of the pen you have dismissed over ten years of work. The NZRFC has taken part in numerous multi-stakeholder groups in an effort to resolve access inequities that exist in these fisheries. In particular, our participation at the NRLMG has seen many tricky issues steered through with us convincing much of the public fishing sector of the advantages of change.

But now, in spite of a unanimous recommendation from the NRLMG you chose to deny public fishers a feed. We thought this was a perfect fit with your stated policy of wanting to implement multi-stakeholder agreements that give benefits to all sectors. In reality your policy appears to be one that does the above, but only if the benefit is for commercial fishers. It is hugely disappointing for the NZRFC who have spent many years encouraging responsible participation in fisheries management. The use of management Procedures is another example of NZRFC cooperation.

Since National came to office it is extremely difficult to see any major decisions that have positive results for the fishing public. It appears that those who take a reasonable approach are ignored, treated with scorn and tossed back for those within recreational fishing circles who advocate terrorism to chew on.

The rationale behind your CRA decisions denying us access doesn't stand scrutiny. Even a casual observer would note there is a greatly increased risk of black market activity being encouraged by the much less regulated sale of commercial concession sized fish on the local market.

- Did MPI compliance warn you of this?
- Did they not inform you of an expected increase in cost to them of administering this?

Would you reconsider your decision to be more in line with the recommendations of the NRLMG?

Why not apply the same rationale to the Marlborough Sounds blue cod regulations. The stupidity of the draconian and irrational regulations pertaining to the slot and transit rules result in MPI incurring significant administration cost. Retaining them most certainly can't be justified under your decision letter policy of, "...cannot be justified under the Governments current agenda to support initiatives that encourage business growth".

Why not simply remove them and once again allow the many Marlborough businesses that have been negatively affected to once again flourish?

This brings us to PAU5D.

There seems to be a total contradiction between your stated policy and what actually happens. On the one hand you want us to engage in developing multi-stakeholder positions but once arrived at you ignore them. (unless they benefit commercial) Given the results in the CRA fisheries where you ignored the advice from the only statutorily recognized multi-stakeholder advisory group, we are at a loss as to the rationale you could apply to any advice from a temporary group such as that you propose for PAU5D. We cannot see how an “agreement” acceptable to you can be made that will deliver a positive result for public fishers.

The only positive result public fishers want is the retention of the status quo, with no increase in any area available to commercial fishers. This appears to be one that you have already signaled isn't acceptable to you by not accepting that option in the first place. In order for us to advise those we represent we request answers to the following.

- What are the terms of reference for the multi stakeholder group?
- Who is being invited to be on the group?
- Who is meeting the participants' costs?
- What information is being sought?
- What is the timeframe for gathering, analysis and verification of information?
- What is the timeframe for any recommendations from the group?
- Will recommendations be binding on MPI and the minister?
- Will the group be supplied with copies of all submissions and a sample of any form submissions?

In order for us to provide timely advice we would appreciate your answers as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

Geoff Rowling,
President.

Cc