

7 July 2017

Mr R Graham  
Hawke's Bay Regional Council  
159 Dalton Street,  
Napier  
4110

Dear Mr Graham

## **COMMENTS ON THE HAWKES BAY REGIONAL PEST MANGEMENT PLAN REVIEW**

1. These comments are provided by Fisheries Inshore NZ Limited on behalf of the Area 2 Committee in respect of the Regional Pest Management Plan Review released for consultation on 16 June 2017. These comments are specific to the Marine Pests section of the discussion document.
2. Fisheries Inshore NZ Limited (FINZ) has a mandate from the Area 2 Committee to work directly with and on behalf of its quota owners for the management of fisheries within the region. The Area 2 Committee is a committee representing the interests of Area 2 quota owners and fishers. The focus is on stock-specific and regional issues that impact on the local fisheries they represent.

### **Regional Pest Management Plan Review**

3. We support the inclusion of Marine Pests as part of the development of a 2018 – 2028 Regional Pest Management Plan.
4. The key to implementing an effective marine pest strategy would appear to be premised on the ability to build on existing regional and national standards and work collaboratively with neighbouring councils to provide a consistent effective approach.
5. Where adjoining regions face the same risks from marine pests there should be a significant level of coordination and potential standardisation of management strategies.
6. The Regional Pest Management Plan should emphasise the value of developing collaborative relationships that can empower stakeholders and provide them with the skills to positively change behaviour.
7. Existing marine biosecurity partnerships such as the Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership and the Fiordland marine Biosecurity partnership should be contacted to provide input with the Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC) able to leverage from their experiences. A review of New Zealand's approach to invasive species noted the positive development of regionally focussed groups. We would encourage HBRC to look at this approach and review the potential benefits of such a group for marine pests.
8. We consider that the identification of the importance of mitigating marine pest risks should be reflected by the HBRC committing resources to achieve tangible benefits for improving the Hawke's Bay marine environment.
9. There is no guidance as to the prioritisation and allocation of funding for the proposed management options. Funding for pest management plans is a hotly debated issue as demonstrated by the recent Northland Marine Pest Management Strategy. We would

welcome further information on how HBRC intends funding the proposed marine pest management options.

## MARINE PEST MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

10. We provide comments on the marine pest management options outlined in the discussion document.

[Declare Mediterranean fanworm and clubbed tunicate as pests under the Exclusion category](#)

11. We support this management option.

[Add a level of foul rule for hulls \(Craft Risk Management Standards\)](#)

12. Craft Risk Management Standards developed under the Biosecurity Act 1993 are applicable to vessels entering the New Zealand territory.

13. Further details of the scope of this management option are required as a key concern is to how to respond to vessels already within New Zealand's territory moving between ports.

[Develop risk analysis to detect and respond to high risk vessels entering Hawke's Bay waters](#)

14. We support the use of risk based management approach and a risk framework may enable effective timely management of marine pest risks posed by vessels entering Hawke's Bay waters.

15. The development and implementation of a risk based management framework requires substantial collaboration with other regional bodies. Existing marine biosecurity partnerships should be contacted to provide advice on how they have looked to address these issues.

16. Further details of the scope and implementation of this risk based framework is required.

[Run a marine pest education and awareness programme to promote best practice and minimise their spread](#)

17. We support this initiative, noting that HBRC should collaborate with both MPI and other councils to provide a coordinated education and awareness programme.

18. Any programmes developed by the HBRC should complement the existing national education and awareness programmes to ensure a consistent message is provided.

[Undertake marine pest surveys at Ahuriri Harbour](#)

19. We support this management option.

20. It is rationale that marine pest surveys are conducted at both Ahuriri Harbour and Port of Napier. There may be potential to conduct marine pest surveys at Ahuriri Harbour and the Port of Napier at similar times to provide cost efficiencies.

[Advocate to MPI to undertake marine pest surveys at the Port of Napier](#)

21. MPI have a targeted marine surveillance programme targeting high-risk ports of which currently Napier is not included.

22. Given Napier is an approved place of first arrival in New Zealand (Schedule 8 of the Biosecurity Act 1993), we believe that Port of Napier warrants consideration to be included in the marine surveillance programme.
23. We support this management option.