**DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, JOBS, TRANSPORT & RESOURCES**

# FISHERIES COST RECOVERY STANDING COMMITTEE

Meeting #44 – FINAL MINUTES

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting details: | Date: Thursday 6 April 2017From: 8:30am to 2:30pm **Location: Department of Economic Development, Room 15.8, 1 Spring Street, Melbourne, VIC.** |
| Members attending: | Ian Cartwright (Ind. Chair) | Johnathon Davey (SIV) | Allison Webb (DEDJTR) |
|  | Pauline Nolle (Industry) | Belinda Wilson (Industry) | Geoff Ellis (Industry) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Apologies: | Ed Meggitt (Industry) | Narelle Hardiman (DEDJTR) |  |
| Executive Support: | Megan Njoroge (DEDJTR) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Advisors/observers: | Dallas D’Silva (DEDJTR) Terry Truscott (DEDJTR) Sally Fensling (DEDJTR) Alex Krummel (DEDJTR)  |
| **◆ Paper provided 🞎 Paper to be Tabled at Meeting ▲Verbal Report** |
|  |  |  | TIME | WHO | ACTION |
|  |  | **FCRSC** |  |  |  |
| 1 | ▲ | Welcome and introductions | 8:30am | Ian Cartwright | Noting |
| 2 | ▲ | Apologies and guests | 8:45am | Ian Cartwright | Noting |
| 3 | ▲ | Acceptance of agenda | 8:50am | Ian Cartwright | Decision |
| 4 | ◆ | Register of Interest | 8:55am | Ian Cartwright | Decision |
| 5 | ◆ | Previous Minutes  | 9:00am | Ian Cartwright | Decision |
| 6 | ◆ | In-coming/out-going correspondence* Letter to Minister and response
 | 9:25am | Ian Cartwright | Noting |
| 7 | ◆ | Progress on Action Items from previous meeting/s* Includes transition to VFA
 | 9:25am | Megan NjorogeSally Fensling/Alex Krummel | Noting |
|  |  | **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/NOTING** | Indicative |  |  |
| 8 | ◆🞎◆ ◆◆ | 1. 2016/17 Service schedules
2. 2016/17 Cost recovery report
3. 2017/18 Regulatory amendments and offsets, industry issues raised at licence renewal

 *Morning tea break*1. 2017/18 Service schedules including FV pricing methodology and project management paper
2. Refund of levies for under-delivered services
3. Transparency of cost recovered services
4. Funding of quota managed fisheries mobile application
5. Oil and gas industry exploration costs
 | 9:55am*10:45pm*11:00am | SecFCRSCFCRSCFCRSCFCRSCJohnathon DaveyDallas D’SilvaPauline Nolle | NotingDiscussionDiscussionDiscussionDiscussionDiscussionNotingDiscussion |
| 9 | ▲ | Other Business* Meetings by teleconference
* Update on remake of Fisheries (Fees, Royalties and Levies) Regulations
 | 1:05pm | FCRSCTerry Truscott | DiscussionNoting |
| 10 |  | Meeting date FCRSC #45 | 1.20pm | Chair | Decision |
| 12 | ▲ | Wrap Up & Close | 1:25pm | Chair |  |

FISHERIES COST RECOVERY STANDING COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes

Meeting #44 – 6 April 2017

**1) Welcome**

The meeting commenced at 8.35am when the Chair welcomed committee members and advisors present. The Chair noted that industry had provided two papers for the meeting and thanked Ms Nolle for these contributions. It was noted that the teleconference of 28 Feb 17 was used to identify a date and further agenda items for the next FCRSC meeting. The Chair noted that it was difficult to deal adequately with matters of a significant nature in a teleconference meeting format and that face to face meetings would continue as the preferred FCRSC meeting format.

**2) Apologies and Guests:**

Mr Meggitt and Ms Hardiman were apologies for the meeting.

Mr D’Silva and Dr Truscott attended as advisors to the meeting.

Ms Fensling and Ms Krummel attended as advisors at Item 7 of the meeting.

**3) Acceptance of Agenda**

**BACKGROUND:** The Chair asked for any additions to the agenda.

**OUTCOME**:

1. Mr Ellis requested that a matter associated with the Mallacoota Lower Lake (Bait) fishery be added. This was included with other items raised through licence renewal at Item 8(c).

2. Mr Davey noted that SIV had received comments from members on a range of matters that should be discussed under the agenda item nominated by Mr Ellis.

**4) Register of Interest**

**BACKGROUND**: At meeting #34, FCRSC agreed to circulate a Register of Interest template at the commencement of each meeting. The Secretariat circulated the register at meeting #44 and interests were identified as necessary.

**OUTCOME:** Members present signed the Register.

**5) Previous Minutes**

**BACKGROUND**: The draft Minutes of FCRSC #43 and teleconference of 28 Feb 17 were circulated to members with the papers for FCRSC #44. The Chair called for further comments on the draft minutes before they are published on the website as FINAL.

**OUTCOME:**

Further comments were made regarding Item 6.3 in the Minutes of FCRSC#43. It was noted that there were differing views between industry and DEDJTR on how the costs of seismic testing could/should be treated in relation to cost recovery and it was agreed that these differing views would be included in the minutes for the teleconference. Industry has previously raised concerns regarding staff spending time on non-cost recovered items and the perception that staff are doing this under cost recovered resources. Without the acceptance of time recording, industry is of the view that there is an inherent lack of transparency on the use of industry funds. It was noted that the Cost Recovery Guidelines allow for specific requests for time recording for a period, for a service, to ascertain the time spent on an activity. Industry is free to initiate a request to address this concern. DEDJTR suggested that a science report might be a useful example.

**ACTIONS**:

1. Secretariat to include the additional comments to the Minutes of FCRSC#43 and publish on the web as FINAL.
2. Secretariat to update varying views in teleconference minutes.
3. Industry to identify a possible candidate activity for time recording analysis for FCRSC consideration.

**6) In-coming/out-going correspondence**

**BACKGROUND:** The Chair wrote to the Minister on 26 November 2016 following FCRSC#43. There were no issues requiring Ministerial decision, so no reply was forthcoming.

In advance of the licence renewal period of 1 April 17, both DEDJTR and SIV received questions and concerns regarding cost recovery services and levies.

**OUTCOME**:

1. The Committee noted the Chair’s letter.

2. The Committee deferred industry matters of concern at licence renewal to Agenda Item 8(c).

**7) Progress on Action Items from Meeting #42**

**BACKGROUND:**  Action items from FCRSC #43 were identified as “Complete”, “Pending” or “Agenda Item”. Where items were identified as pending, they were discussed at this point in the meeting.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. FCRSC noted the differences in research services and costs for Corner Inlet and Gippsland Lakes described by DEDJTR e.g. sampling and industry participation. A summary paper was provided and FCRSC agreed the matter would be addressed by SIV and DEDJTR outside of the Meeting.

2. Industry raised concern that lack of consultation during 2016 had left licence holders without an opportunity to comment on levies. The committee agreed that consultation should be proportionate and responsive to the needs of licence holders in support of the ongoing and efficient rollout of the new prospective cost recovery system. SIV noted that without formal cost recovery consultation, there was a high number of calls generated through the annual licence renewal process this year. This level of calls is not acceptable to industry. It was agreed that while for larger fisheries suitable existing mechanisms/forums exist for consultation on cost recovery without any formal cost recovery consultation. In the case of smaller fisheries SIV and DEDJTR would need to work together to achieve effective consultation. FCRSC agreed that where licence holders indicated no cost recovery meeting was required for a year none would be held. DEDJTR/FV noted that it was not financially appropriate to reengaged with industry through the ‘roadshow’ process.

3. The committee noted that current arrangements were focussed around fisheries where the licensing year commences 1 April and that greater recognition was needed for fisheries commencing the licensing year on 1 July and in particular, rock lobster and giant crab fisheries.

4. The committee discussed the most appropriate communication protocols for licence holders wanting to comment on or enquire about cost recovery matters in their fishery. It was agreed that the relevant fisheries manager should be the initial point of contact on fisheries-specific cost recovery matters. SIV noted that they had received feedback that licence holders are tending to call SIV rather than the Department, since they are more certain that their concerns will be responded to. DEDJTR noted that value of approaching SIV is limited to actions that need elevating and for many issues the fishery manager could answer questions or clarify services. It was also noted that fisheries licensing is already nominated as the first point of call on licence renewal notices.

5. Industry raised concern that the apportionment of costs for services to Westernport/Port Phillip Bay needed review and that the limited period for some operators to remain in the fishery should be factored in to levy values. DEDJTR noted that the situation would be reviewed when conditions changed. DEDJTR also noted that the current apportionment of levies was done primarily on the cost of services provided and these were not directly proportional to the catch levels.

6. Industry suggested FCRSC consider a policy position on cost recovery when a fishery is closing. DEDJTR commented that this was a rare situation but would prepare an information document for FCRSC to consider the matter at its next meeting.

**ACTIONS:**

1. DEDJTR to include the contact details of fisheries managers in licence renewal letters in future so that licence and quota holders can enquire directly with the service providers within DEDJTR.

2. DEDJTR to provide a draft paper on cost recovery during a fishery closure for consideration by FCRSC at Meeting #45.

**8) Items for discussion/noting**

**8(a) 2016/17 Service schedules**

**BACKGROUND:** Following discussion at FCRSC#43, the cost recovery services schedules for 2016/17 were amended and completed in January 2017. DEDJTR circulated the schedules to the aquaculture sector and received no comments requiring change. DEDJTR stated that schedules were discussed with the rock lobster and abalone sectors and minor changes were made. The final schedules were circulated to FCRSC in late January 2017 for noting.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. FCRSC did not provide further comment on the schedules at the time of circulation.

2. The committee noted areas of inconsistency in the service schedules for 2016/17, including incorrect referencing to fisheries, altered dates between versions, and discrepancies in costing values.

SIV noted that it had identified a number of questions, corrections and clarifications across the suite of schedules that need be considered. SIV will document these and provide them to DEDJTR, given that they are fishery specific and too time consuming to go through at the meeting.

3. DEDJTR undertook to correct the schedules for the inaccuracies identified internally and by SIV.

**ACTIONS:**

1. The Secretariat to update the 2016/17 service schedules and the corresponding sections of the mid-year and end-of-year cost recovery reports in line with comments provided by DEDJTR and SIV.

**Victorian Fisheries Authority (VFA)**

**BACKGROUND:** Two members of the Fisheries Transition Taskforce (Sally Fensling and Alex Krummel) joined the meeting at 9.30am. A handout detailing the transition to the Victorian Fisheries Authority (VFA) was circulated and the new arrangements were explained.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. FCRSC noted that the operational work of cost recovery would move to the VFA but the legislative work and other aspects which can only be performed by a government department would remain with DEDJTR.

2. FCRSC noted that arrangements for committees and other similar bodies would fall within the jurisdiction of the VFA.

3. FCRSC noted that limited changes would occur during the initial transition to the VFA but that it would be the responsibility of the Board to review and recommend/make changes to arrangements in future, including the role and function of the FCRSC. FCRSC would be provided further clarity on arrangements in due course.

4. FCRSC noted that under the Regulations, responsibilities of the Minister would remain with the Minister but that responsibilities of the Secretary would move to the Board.

**8(b) 2016/17 Cost recovery report**

**BACKGROUND:**  The 2016/17 cost recovery mid-year report was published on the FV website on 4 March 2017. The mid-year report covers the period 1 April 2016 – 30 September 2016. The end of year report is in preparation with expected release in early May. A final year report will be released in early August; this report will encompass all services for assessment, including compliance.

**OUTCOME:**

1. FCRSC discussed the criteria on which delivery of services would be assessed.

2. The Chair reminded FCRSC of the model developed by FCRSC which endeavoured to have meaningful and measurable KPIs in place that could be reported on in an efficient manner.

3. FCRSC noted the assessment of services had been considered previously and the outcome was included in the Guidelines.

4. It was again noted that the DEDJTR and the Minister did not support time reporting, although the provision exists in the Cost Recovery Guidelines for industry to request greater details on services. In this context, Industry requested that a research example be evaluated in detail so the committee could better understand how services were costed.

5. DEDJTR explained the difficulties of publishing reports noted in the service schedules on the website and circulated a paper identifying research reports that had been published over the past two years. Industry acknowledged the value of the information provided.

6. FCRSC noted that reporting requirements may change under the VFA, and that this may improve understanding of costings and expenditure against projects.

7. DEDJTR circulated a confidential paper showing the contribution of funding sources within the Fisheries Budget and the distributions of levy contributions under cost recovery.

8. FCRSC noted that cost recovery was effective in larger fisheries, which had the level of production and profitability to absorb a cost recovery system, but that given the costs of management and turnover in small fisheries, it was difficult to apply cost recovery is such fisheries. Industry requested that the Chair note the difficulty of applying cost recovery in small fisheries and suggested that there should be consideration of a different cost recovery model for small fisheries.

9. FCRSC noted with concern that there were discrepancies between the service schedules and the mid-year report and disputed that some services identified as “on-track” (green) had not been delivered and that dates had arbitrarily changes. SIV advised that it would provide further information to DEDJTR on specific items for out-of-session consideration. FCRSC noted improvements that would increase the standard of the report, including better version control, addressing data corruption, inclusion of the reporting period on each page, and review of services in a timelier manner.

**ACTIONS:**

1. SIV to provide further comments on services it considers not delivered.

2. DEDJTR to adjust the mid-year report consistent with comments received and changes to 216/17 schedules as at 8(a).

3. The Chair to note that alternative models of cost recovery may be more appropriate for small fisheries in his letter to the Minister.

**8(c) 2017/18 Regulatory amendments and offsets**

**BACKGROUND:**  Annual changes to levy values specified in Schedule 6 of the Fisheries (Fees, Royalties and Levies) Regulations are required for a variety of reasons, including change in cost of services, reduction in licences in a fishery, or changes to corporate structures. Each year FCRSC also considers the delivery of services from the previous year and assesses where under-delivery may have occurred. Advice from FCRSC then goes to the Minister who decides which services will receive an offset to their levies equivalent to the under-delivery for the following year. The Minister also decides on waivers for the forward year. A summary of offsets and waivers, and the regulatory amendments for 2017 were provided to FCRSC. DEDJTR noted that the offsets were provided at FCRSC#43 and confirmed in the email documents of late January (before teleconference). The waivers were applied after this time and the first opportunity for advising FCRSC was in the lead up to FCRSC#44.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. FCRSC noted the documents provided and clarified that the waiver for PPB Scallop Dive was for future service rather than past services. SIV questioned the need for further reductions in quota with a licence that is now heavily restricted and unlikely to be able to make any profit.

2. Industry questioned the levies for Bait fisheries, given their size and low level of risk associated with their management, including the public benefit they provide to the recreational sector. The Secretariat explained the calculation of levies and application of offsets to account for levies charged on the licence renewal notice. Industry suggested there needed to be a review of structure, fees and service delivered to Bait fisheries across the State.

3. FCRSC discussed if a risk based approach could be adopted for smaller fisheries to reduce the level of services and cost attributed to those fisheries.

4. FCRSC discussed the application of a waiver to Crown Land – Eels, SIV noted that while these most areas now have some water there remains no cashflow or ability for a number of operators to actually fish or purchase stock for their waters. DEDJTR indicated that the same process could apply as in the previous two year whereby fishers identify their intention to fish or not and levies would be re-calculated per the level of activity and services required.

**ACTIONS:**

1. DEDJTR to provide a list of levies identifying where increases were greater than CPI.

2. Chair to recommend the same process be used for levying CLE licences as was applied in 2016/17 when writing to the Minister.

**8(d) 2017/18 Service schedules**

**BACKGROUND:** Draft service schedules for services to be delivered in 2017/18 were provided in meeting papers.The schedules were based on 2016/17 Schedules with revised costs and dates.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. FCRSC considered the consultation process for seeking industry views on cost recoverable services and costs.

2. FCRSC supported Fishery Managers as being the first point of contact for licence holders with queries, with SIV providing backup on matters that were not resolved. Industry members noted that while this intention is great, industry will continue to contact the person that represents them as a general first point of call.

3. FCRSC noted discrepancies in the schedules for 2017/18 compared to 2016/17 and with some dates. The Secretariat will make the necessary adjustments and circulate the schedules with the intent of finalising by mid-June, noting that some industry consultation will occur outside this period.

SIV noted there had been an increase in licence fees for 2017/18 in the Scallop (Ocean) Fishery, and commented that this is not acceptable. There should be no operating costs, as there are no meetings held to discuss this fishery (as specified in the quota notice letter), and there is very little management undertaken on this fishery. The $600 odd charged in 2016/17 should be applied for this licence year, noting there will be very little change in the fishery with the significantly restrictive TACC.

**ACTIONS**:

1. DEDJTR to include adjustments identified by SIV and Fisheries Management before circulating the revised schedules to FCRSC.

2. DEDJTR to investigate total cost for Scallop (ocean) fishery in the service schedule.

**8(e) Refund of levies for under-delivered services**

BACKGROUND: In 2016/17, new arrangements for contracted research services in the rock lobster fishery led to a reduction in costs. At the teleconference of 28 Feb 17, FCRSC noted that discussion on the correct and most appropriate use of unused monies was warranted as policy implications may apply in such circumstances. Industry provided a paper relevant to this item that recognised the difference in project management requirements for operational activities compared with key initiative type projects.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. Industry presented a perspective on different project management approaches.

2. FCRSC noted that there were strict legal parameters under which DEDJTR could re-direct funds already collected for providing cost recoverable services.

3. DEDJTR noted that large reductions in service costs would be a rare occurrence. The default position would be to provide savings as an offset in future years. FCRSC noted the this by no means restricts industry discussions to collect resources through the licence renewal period for undertaking specific programs.. FCRSC noted there are significant legal matters that will need to be considered for government to be able to collect ‘non-cost recoverable’ levies.

4. Industry also noted that conditions around re-directed funding were likely to result in refund as an offset as the preferred option.

**ACTIONS:**

1. DEDJTR to prepare a short policy paper to guide re-direction of funds given a similar situation in the future and circulate to FCRSC for discussion at FCRSC#45.

**8(f) Transparency of cost recovery services**

**BACKGROUND:** This matter was raised as an agenda item at the teleconference of 28 Feb 17.

**OUTCOMES:**

**1.** SIV noted that through discussing issues and actions with the schedules and reporting mechanisms, a lot of the transparency questions had already been discussed.

2. FCRSC noted that the matter had been sufficiently addressed during discussions in previous agenda items, however welcomed future discussions on transparency as needed.

**ACTIONS:** No further action.

**8(g) Funding of quota managed fisheries mobile application**

**BACKGROUND:** DEDJTR and industry have been talking about the development of a smartphone application for recording catch and effort data for some time. The technology has only been applied to new fisheries but wider use is supported; DEDJTR is developing specifications to provide for wider application of this technology.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. DEDJTR advised that it was in the very early stage of developing specifications for a project to develop the technology, and would consult with industry further in the development and implementation of this technology. Industry noted that early consultation an engagement is essential.

2. DEDJTR advised that there may be concerns around user capability in implementing an application across all fisheries, and that resourcing was an issue that may limit the size of the project and its implementation.

3. Industry suggested that IT grants may be an additional source of funding for this project – DEDJTR undertook to consider this.

4. Industry sought advice on risk assessments that had been undertaken for the project – DEDJTR advised that the project was not at that point yet.

5. FCRSC noted that the role of cost recovery in the project required further consideration.

**ACTIONS:**

1. DEDJTR, with industry, to investigate options for funding of IT.

**8(h) Oil and gas exploration costs**

**BACKGROUND:** At the teleconference of 28 Feb 17 industry raised concern about the recovery of costs for providing services to commercial ventures other than commercial fishing licence holders. In relation to the current level of seismic exploration in Victorian waters and requests for catch data, Industry is of the view that it is funding catch and effort data entry and analysis, the results of which are subsequently being utilised to directly benefit the oil and gas sector without charge. Industry provided a paper on the role of Fisheries in providing advice to proponents of gas and oil exploration using seismic testing in rock lobster fishing grounds and the recovery of costs by Fisheries, as an example.

**OUTCOMES:**

1. Two key questions for discussion were distilled. Firstly, whether industry was being charged for the work done by Fisheries in providing advice on seismic testing, and secondly, whether Fisheries should be recovering costs from other (non-fishery based) industries when providing services to them.

2. Industry advised that SIV receives payment for providing services to outside ventures when such services are required as part of SIV consultative role.

3. DEDJTR noted that the services provided for consultation on seismic testing are funded from the non-recoverable work time of staff.

4. DEDJTR indicated that it was not the common practice for Fisheries to recover costs for ad-hoc services that benefit the State. ~~benefit the State~~..

5. Industry was strongly of the view that the costs associated with the management of seismic testing incurred by DEDJTR should be recovered from the oil and gas companies who would benefit from such testing.

6. DEDJTR is developing a policy that will guide the expectations and level of involvement that Fisheries would have in cases where seismic testing occurs. The policy will apply across all fisheries; the development of the policy is not cost recoverable.

7. The Chair noted that he would raise the concerns on this matter in his post-meeting letter to the Minister.

**ACTIONS:**

1. The Chair to raise industry’s concern in his letter to the Minister on the non-recovery of costs associated with provision of services to non-fishing commercial ventures, given that costs of management services are recovered from commercial fishing ventures.

**9) Other Business**

Teleconferences

1. This matter was raised at the teleconference of 28 Feb 17.

2. FCRSC agreed that teleconferences were not an appropriate method for meetings except in exceptional circumstances and as directed by the Chair.

Update on remake of Fisheries (Fees, Royalties and Levies) Regulations

1. DEDJTR advised that the remake of the FRL Regulations needed to be fully completed before 29 January 2018.

2. DEDJTR noted a RIS for the proposed Regulations would take place in July 2017 and FCRSC subsequently agreed that they should meet around that time to discuss the RIS.

3. The Committee noted DEDJTR proposed to use the remaking of Regulations process that which would apply for 2018/19 i.e. no further amendments would be made before 1 April 2018.

**ACTIONS:**

1. FCRSC to meet in July to discuss the RIS for the remaking of the Fisheries (FRL) Regulations as a priority with FCRSC to advise DEDJTR on its deliberations following the meeting.

**10) Next meeting**

**OUTCOME:** FCRSC Meeting #45 was scheduled for 3 July 2017.

The meeting closed at 2.30pm.

**ACTION ITEMS FROM FCRSC #44**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **ACTION** | **RESPONSIBILITY** | **DUE DATE** |
| Previous Minutes |
| **44-5** | 1. Secretariat to include the additional comments to the Minutes of FCRSC#43 and publish on the web as FINAL.2. Secretariat to update varying views in teleconference minutes. | SecSec | 2 May 20172 May 2017 |
| Progress on Action Items from FCRSC #43 |
| **44-7** | 1. DEDJTR to include the contact details of fisheries managers in licence renewal letters in future.2. DEDJTR to provide a draft paper on cost recovery during a fishery closure for consideration by FCRSC before #45. | DEDJTRDEDJTR | June 2017FCRSC#45 |
| 2016/17 Service schedules |
| **44-8a** | 1. The Secretariat to update the 2016/17 service schedules and the corresponding sections of the mid-year and end of year cost recovery reports in line with comments from DEDJTR and SIV.  | Sec | FCRSC #45 |
| 2016/17 Cost recovery report |
| **44-8b** | 1. SIV to provide further comments on services they consider not delivered.2. DEDJTR to adjust the mid-year report consistent with comments received and changes to 216/17 schedules as at 8(a).3. The Chair to note alternative models of cost recovery may be more appropriate for small fisheries in his letter to the Minister.4. The Chair to note industry support for increased resourcing of Fisheries in his letter to the Minister.DEDJTR to work with SIV to identify key representatives for distributing draft schedules for consultation.  | SIVDEDJTRChairChair | 2 May 201718 May 201729 Apr 201729 Apr 2017 |
| 2017/18 Regulatory amendments and offsets |
| **44-8c** | 1. DEDJTR to provide a list of levies identifying where increases were greater than CPI.2. Chair to recommend the same process be used for levying CLE licences as was applied in 216/17 when writing to the Minister. | DEDJTRChair | 18 May 201729 Apr 2017 |
| 2017/18 Service schedules |
| **44-8d** | 1. DEDJTR to include adjustments identified by SIV and Fisheries Management before circulating the revised schedules to FCRSC.2. DEDJTR to investigate total cost for Scallop (ocean) fishery in the service schedule. | DEDJTRDEDJTR | 30 May 201730 May 2017 |
| Refund of levies for under-delivered services  |
| **44-8e** | 1. 1. DEDJTR to prepare a short policy paper to guide re-direction of funds given a similar situation in the future and circulate to FCRSC for discussion at FCRSC#45.  | DEDJTR | FCRSC #45 |
| Oil and gas exploration costs  |
| **44-8h** | 1. The Chair to raise industry’s concern on the provision of services to non-fishing commercial ventures that were not being recovered in a consistent way to commercial fishing ventures in his letter to the Minister. | Chair | 29 Apr 2017 |
| Other Business |
| **44-9** | 1. FCRSC to meet in July to discuss the RIS for the remaking of the Fisheries (FRL) Regulations as a priority amongst other items on the agenda. FCRSC to advise DEDJTR on their deliberations following the meeting.  | DEDJTRDEDJTR | 15 Nov 20169 Nov 2016 |
| Next meeting |
| **44-10** | FCRSC #45 was scheduled for 3 July 2017. | Secretariat | July 2017 |