



SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP COMMUNIQUÉ – MEETING No. 54 11 September 2012

The following members were present at the Scientific Working Group (SWG) meeting held on 11 September 2012: Peter Fairweather (chair), Luciano Beheregaray, Anthony Cheshire, Sean Connell, Milena Fernandes, Charlie Huveneers, Martine Kinloch, Hugh Kirkman, Luciana Moller and Scoresby Shepherd. Apologies were received from Hazel Vandeleur and Bronwyn Gillanders.

The SWG wishes to advise the Minister of the following key outcomes:

- SWG discussed the new departmental structure for DEWNR and some concerns were raised about a lack of clarity (as yet) with the Department's intentions concerning the place and role of monitoring of marine environmental matters, future integration of marine issues into existing work sections, and other aspects of interest to marine scientists.
 - SWG decided to dedicate their next meeting to developing advice about the draft management plans and impact statements as part of the public consultation.
 - SWG discussed the draft management plans. It was the view of the SWG that there is a need to better link sections within the plan. In particular, the management plans need to more explicitly address the underlying program logic that flows from the management challenges identified in Section 3.1 of the plans. Therefore the SWG advises the Minister of the following:
 - Section 3.1 of the management plans needs to identify known risks and be explicitly linked to the habitat vulnerability papers produced by the SWG. In this way we can more clearly identify areas requiring active management within each Marine Park (taking cognisance of the aims of the different zones);
 - Section 4.2 should then identify the strategies and actions that are required in order to address these challenges;
 - Section 4.3 should detail the relevant indicators that need to be measured in order to evaluate the performance of the management arrangements (including both specific management actions as well as the overall zoning strategies). Such indicators need to include both management actions and the environmental responses (resource condition) at a park level and Statewide across the network.
-

- By way of example for the Encounter Marine Park: Section 3.1 would detail the management challenge of maintaining coastal water quality and ecological integrity in the face of increasing levels of waste water and storm water discharge (particularly in the Encounter Bay region). These discharges are becoming problematical due to increasing urbanisation in the Victor Harbour region. The strategies under Section 4.2 would then target improvements to waste water and storm water treatment and management programs to ensure the maintenance of coastal water quality. Section 4.3 would close the loop by identifying monitoring requirements that report on relevant indicators, such as coastal water quality and the status of coastal reefs, with particular reference to impacts from nutrient and sediment loads; this would provide a basis for evaluating the efficacy of management actions.
- SWG also worked with departmental officers on an approach to making predictions about changes to the status of rocky reefs for specific parks, and also heard an interim report on a workshop about how to best make use of DEWNR's existing data on reefs (amongst other habitats) in terms of assessing marine park performance in the future.



Prof. Peter Fairweather
Chair, Scientific Working Group