

Chair Report on ISP Meeting 39

24th of May 2021

The second ISP meeting for 2021 was conducted by Zoom on the 24th of May for 2.5 hours. A number of agenda items were dealt with.

Scheduling of projects

- MC has accepted the ISP proposed budget, with the staggered projects in place for the next year. The intensive Fish Health program, Mangroves and Social-Cultural indicators will not be collected in the 2022 report card, with Economics scheduled to be included. The current schedule is for the Social-Cultural (Sense of Place) indicator to be run in 2023 report card and Indigenous Cultural Heritage in the 2024 report card.
- Contractual requirements with the OGBR for a human dimensions indicator may require that the Social indicator is swapped with the Economic indicator for the 2022 report card. This will be clarified in the third quarter of 2021.
- The science budget for the 2022 report card is committed to the elements that will be reported. However there is a case to be made to the Management Committee that projects like Fish Health and the CONNIE model (for tracking particle movement in events) should be maintained so that the program can respond to major events.

Meeting with the GHHP Chair, Iain Gordon

- The ISP had a virtual meeting with Iain Gordon and discussed the different skill sets involved and the various strategic factors likely to be important to the GHHP report card in the future.

Followup discussion about the mudcrab indicators.

- There was discussion about the appropriateness of the current mud crab indicators and benchmarks to complete the followup from the March workshop. The ISP noted that the outcomes of the workshop showed that the indicators used were appropriate, and that benchmarks were defensible. As this is one of the only recurring monitoring programs in Australia, it was important to maintain annual sampling across both wet and dry seasons.
- There was some discussion about whether data from the commercial mud crab catch could be incorporated. It was decided that the commercial data may be useful for the technical report, however, at this stage should not be included in the report card because of differences in data sets (i.e catch reported in kilograms rather than number of mudcrabs).

Progress on new deliverables for the Office of the Great Barrier Reef

- It was noted that several new additional measures were being developed to meet the requirements of the Office of the Great Barrier Reef (OGBR):
 - Stewardship
 - Urban Water Stewardship
 - Human Dimensions
 - Citizen Science
 - Litter and Marine Debris
- The Stewardship Response report has been prepared by the communications team where the approach taken is to develop stewardship stories rather than quantitative assessments. This does not require ISP assessment or endorsement.
- The ISP raised some concerns with the draft Urban Water Stewardship Framework report—its subjective scoring system, some of the grading/coloring not matching the presented scores and the GHHP ISP's limited role in the review process. It was noted that there was not enough detail provided in the report to understand the scoring, but that the GBR ISP had been reviewing the methodology on behalf of all the report cards.
 - The ISP agreed to indicate that: *the methodology has been reviewed and endorsed by GBR expert panel. The ISP GHHP has accepted the separate review process and has noted the material, however, cannot endorse the report.*
- The design of the Human Dimensions indicator is being led by the Office of the Great Barrier Reef for potential inclusion in the 2022 report card. More information will be provided as the design progresses.
- The ISP Chair noted that it was proposed that the requirements for the citizen science component would be met by the Visual Fish Assessment indicator, and preliminary discussions with OGBR staff had indicated that this would be acceptable.
- The ISP considered two main options for an indicator for Litter and Marine Debris:
 - Drain Buddies and
 - the Tangaroa Blue marine litter metric
 - The ISP noted that Drain Buddies was entirely relevant to Gladstone, whereas marine litter has an unknown origin/source and is thus, outside the management abilities of the harbour.
 - However the marine litter metric draws on a national data base (for data relevant to Gladstone) and similar indicators are being developed for the other GBR report cards. For 2021-22 the litter metric will be developed for GHHP free of charge.
 - The ISP recommended a note about the Drain Buddies summary information would be useful as a narrative but preferred to continue the investigation of the Tangaroa Blue litter metric—which was free of charge, robustly designed and aligned with other report cards.

Error in calculation of 2020 seagrass biomass scores

- Alex Carter at JCU has advised GPC and GHHP about a small error in the calculation of the seagrass scores for the 2019-2020 GHHP report card. Through an agreement with Gladstone Ports Corporation (GPC), JCU performs the seagrass monitoring for GPC each year, and then provides an additional assessment and report to GHHP based on the collected data.
- Meadow grades are unchanged for almost all monitoring meadows (although the scores did adjust slightly within each grade for most meadows). The exception is that Meadow 21 (The Narrows) changes from very good to good. The overall score for seagrass remains as Good in 2019.
- It also makes the overall habitat grade more marginal at the lower end of the C grade.

- The ISP agreed that an appropriate response was to add an appendix or addendum to the 2020 seagrass report and 2020 technical report about the changes in the scores, rather than re-issuing the 2020 report card results. The ISP also recommended to update the scores in DIMS for 2020 so that the database holds the most accurate information.

ISP reimbursement rates

- The ISP gave an update and history related to this agenda item. The GHHP Chair noted that the workloads had been declining over time with the shorter meetings and asked if the meeting preparation times should be reduced. This would help to ensure that the ISP reimbursements did not go over the budget allocation for ISP time.
- The ISP was hesitant to recommend this as up to four hours of time involvement was occurring between meetings to review reports and/or data. There is also the fact that not every ISP member attends every meeting, nor every member in attendance sends an invoice.
- It was agreed to leave the current guidelines unchanged as up to four hours preparation time per meeting, but that members would be careful with their time commitments to help meet the budget allocation for the ISP.

The ISP Meeting Closed at 3:30pm