

## Chair Report on ISP Meeting 26

**1<sup>st</sup> of March 2018**

### Projects

Almost all 2017 projects have been completed, and almost all of the teams required to complete the 2018 report card have been contracted or are close to contracted, with the following exceptions:

- The Indigenous Cultural Heritage indicator has been reviewed, and arrangements for 2018 are still to be finalised.
- Arrangements with CSIRO for the Gladstone Harbour Model and Connectivity, which are not included in the Report Card, are still to be finalised.
- Stewardship is still to be arranged
- A tender for Mangroves has been called, and 3 proposals are currently being evaluated.

	<b>Project ID</b>	<b>Status for 2018</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>1</b>	ISP005-2018: SCE indicators	Ready to start	CQU team engaged
<b>2</b>	ISP006-2017: Gladstone Harbour Model maintenance	In progress	No current project for 2018 with CSIRO yet
<b>3</b>	ISP007–2018: Connectivity indicators	-	No current project with CSIRO yet
<b>4</b>	ISP009-2018: DIMS maintenance	Awaiting a proposal	AIMS continuing, but fine tuning the tasks
<b>5</b>	ISP011–2018: Seagrass Indicators	In progress	JCU team contracted
<b>6</b>	ISP012-2017: Cultural Heritage Indicators	completed	2017 project completed and review completed.
<b>7</b>	ISP013-2017: Fish Recruitment Indicators	In progress	InfoFish contracted and surveys underway
<b>8</b>	ISP014–2017: Coral Indicators	In progress	AIMS contracted
<b>9</b>	ISP015-2018: Mud Crab Indicators	In progress	CQU contracted
<b>10</b>	ISP016c: Fish Health Case Study -CQU project -InfoFish Australia project	In progress	Both CQU and InfoFish contracted
<b>11</b>	ISP018: Development of Mangrove Indicators	In progress	3 tenders received and being assessed
<b>12</b>	ISP019: Coral coring	In progress	AIMS doing final analysis
<b>13</b>	ISP020-2017: Scripts for cultural heritage indicators	About to close	Waiting for CSIRO to invoice
<b>14</b>	Stewardship 2018	-	No current project

## Internal review

The ISP considered the Internal Review of the GHHP Report Card that was conducted in 2017. The ISP welcomed the key findings that:

- the Gladstone Harbour Report Card provides a comprehensive and robust assessment of the condition of Gladstone Harbour
- the report card largely meets the original GHHP Vision and early recommendations
- the Report Card compares positively to emerging literature, demonstrating its continuing relevance in a global setting
- the Report Card also performs well when compared to the Outcomes Framework and 2020 Targets of the Reef 2050 Long Term Sustainability Plan.
- the development and implementation of Indigenous cultural heritage indicators should be recognised and commended as a first in Queensland.

A number of specific recommendations for changes were considered, with the ISP identifying some areas for potential action or improvement:

- There is some scope to improve the linkages between the Report Card objectives and indicator groups to the original GHHP Vision Statement.
- There are some aspects of the report card design that can be explained better
- The issue of whether toxicants in water quality should be assessed at the 'lowest worst score' will be examined further
- A desktop analysis of water quality data should be conducted to assess the extent of variability within quarters and over the zones
- The application of Water Quality Objectives to assess water quality data will be revised.
- Review the approach used to assess the three economic performance indicators (shipping, commercial fishing, tourism)
- Review the stewardship reporting to better align this as a measure of the effectiveness of management in the harbour.

## Water quality issues

Additional information on the importance of including Ammonia as a water quality parameter is being sought.

The application of the water quality guidelines (from the *Environmental Values and Water Quality Objectives for Curtis Island, Calliope River and Boyne River Basin*) can be adjusted, following verbal advice from the Department of Environment and Science, depending on whether a zone is classified as Slightly Disturbed (SD), Moderately Disturbed (MD) or High Ecological Value (HEV). Effectively, this will mean that in many zones an 80% percentile can be used as the benchmark for water quality guidelines instead of the more stringent 50% that is currently being applied.

It is recommended that a project be developed to improve understanding of temporal variability in water quality parameters (particularly within sampling periods) to identify the level of confidence that can be assigned to current measures. This can be a desktop study that draws on available data from PCIMP, the Gladstone Ports Corporation and other sources. As a first step the ISP will identify if the data can be made available.

## **Social, Cultural and Economic Indicators**

The ISP reviewed a number of recommendations provided in the 2017 report for the Social, Cultural and Economic indicators. Recommendations that were supported were:

- (a) Remove the Line Fishing measure from the assessment of the Commercial Fishing sector.  
This was accepted on the basis that:
- (b) Line fishing is only one of four components (the others are pot, net and trawl), and accounts for only 2% of the value of the catch
  - a. There are significant gaps in the data for Line fishing (57% of the data gaps over the past 10 years)
  - b. Most Line fishing is likely to be occurring outside the harbour.
- (c) A new indicator of Aesthetic Value be considered for the Liveability and Well-Being group in the Social Component. This was on the basis that:
  - a. Over the past four years, 'Beautiful' has been the dominant word nominated by the community in the word cloud analysis about the harbour, yet no assessment captures this for the report card.
  - b. Aesthetic values are included in the SELTMP system, where they are rated as one of the important aspects to the community
  - c. It is relatively simple to add additional questions to the CATI survey and include the new indicator.
- (d) A new indicator of water-based recreation be added to the Economic Value (Recreation) indicator group, alongside the existing measures of recreation of Land Based, Beach and Recreational Fishing values. This was on the basis that:
  - a. Water based recreation is an important component of harbour recreation
  - b. It is relatively easy to include as information about water based recreation is already collected in the CATI survey.
- (e) A recruitment process to build a representative internet panel for the community survey be continued and run in parallel to the CATI survey. This was supported on the basis that:
  - a. The web-based survey was developed in 2017 and can be run again at very little cost
  - b. This guards against current trends of increasing difficulty of collecting telephone surveys

## **Review of Indigenous Cultural Heritage**

The ISP discussed the external review of the Indigenous Cultural Heritage indicator that was provided by Dr Ro Hill, and made the following recommendations:

1. Largely adopt the changes in methodology recommended by Terra Rosa, as these will help to simplify the indicator. Note: the 2016 and 2017 grades may not then be fully comparable to 2018 grades.
2. Narrow the focus and perhaps the title of the indicator to reflect the emphasis on Archaeological Significance and Condition, rather than broaden the scope of the indicator. (This will maintain the focus on the original Report Card objective 'registered cultural heritage sites associated with the harbour and waterways are protected').
3. Speed up the engagement with and transfer of work to traditional owners in the GHHP area, consistent with the original vision of the indicator.
4. Gain agreement with traditional owners about support for the indicator to be assessed before the next consultancy is called. A process may be required to ensure appropriate engagement across traditional owner groups, such as (from less to more formal):

- a. Holding a workshop with all traditional owner groups to discuss their involvement with the GHHP Report Card and future consultants,
  - b. Establishing a MOU/agreement between GHHP and indigenous groups, or
  - c. Establishing a technical reference group with members from the traditional owner groups.
5. Consider less frequent or staggered assessment, particularly across zones (A delay for the next assessment to 2019 may be required if it takes time to gain consistent agreement with the traditional owner groups).
6. Work with the indigenous groups to identify if Terra Rosa should be invited to conduct the next assessment (it is standard procedure for consultants to be recontracted for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year of assessment), or whether an open call for the cultural heritage assessment should be made. The advantage of recontracting Terra Rosa is that the final changes in methodology can be confirmed.

### **Mangroves**

The three tenders for the development of the Mangrove indicator were reviewed. The tender from JCE TropWATER was judged to be the only tender that was technically suitable. The ISP decided to request more clarification from the TropWATER team about:

- Reducing the number of indicators to only two for 2018
- How assessment scores will be converted to indicators
- Whether data is already available in digital form
- If the relevant data streams will continue once the ERMP program is finished
- Any issues about on-time delivery
- An updated budget.

### **Connectivity Model and Gladstone Harbour Model**

The ISP recommended that the Connectivity model (CONNIE) and the Gladstone Harbour Model be both limited to maintenance of an on-demand model, to limit expenditure on activities not directly related to the report card. Quotes will be sought from CSIRO for this.

### **Budget for the Science Program for the 2019 Report Card.**

A draft operational budget for the science program in 2019 was developed. The operational budget continues to get very tight as allowance is made to fund Fish Health and Mangroves on an ongoing basis without any increase in funding. This has been achieved through trimming the budget in other areas.

As well, a draft development budget to continue improving the program was also developed.

### **Other issues**

The next ISP meeting will be a teleconference in late May.

Associate Professor Eva Abal offered to stand in for Professor John Rolfe at the next MC meeting.