Department of Conservation
Te Papa Atawbai

Meeting: **Conservation Services Programme Research Advisory Group**

Date: 18 February 2015
Time: 9:30 am – 4:00 pm
Place: Conservation House, 18 - 32 Manners St, Wellington.
Chair: Ian Angus (ph: 04-471 - 3081; email: iangus@doc.govt.nz)

Attendance: Karen Baird (Forest & Bird/Birdlife International), Barry Weeber (ECO), Tom Clark (FINZ), Richard Wells (DWG/FINZ), Jim Roberts (NIWA), Vicky Reeve, Tiffany Bock, Michelle Beritzhoff-Law, Nathan Walker, Dominique Vallieres (MPI), Igor Debski, Kris Ramm, Katie Clemens-Seely, Katherine Clements Paul Crozier (DOC), and Simon Childerhouse (BPM) on speakerphone.

Apologies: David Thompson (NIWA), Martin Cryer, Rich Ford, Rohan Currey (MPI), & Milena Palka (WWF)

Discussion on Prioritisation process

There was discussion on whether threat status is the most appropriate criterion to use in this situation as species can be threatened due to effects other than the adverse effects of commercial fishing. As such, using that status to rank projects that are supposed to directly investigate the adverse effects of commercial fishing could be misleading. However, threat status does provide an objective overall indication of susceptibility to any additional threat such as fishing.

There was discussion over the pros and cons of the proposed prioritisation framework and it was decided that although this system is not perfect, it is the first time CSP has done this and it has come out of previous RAG meetings and feedback, and it is a good starting point.

It became evident very quickly during the prioritisation process that the group was heavily divided on exactly how to score projects due to differences in interpretation of CSP mandate.

Prioritisation

Interaction projects were scored following the proposed prioritisation process. As previously mentioned, the group was highly divided, and at least two entirely separate scores emerged for each project. After progressing through this series of projects the Chair decided to change the process for considering prioritisation of the remaining population and mitigation projects.

The remaining projects were presented in prioritised order based on initial DOC scoring and comments were sought on each individual project and their relative priority. This methodology was more efficient then the morning's analysis and the results of the discussion are presented in Appendix 1.

The chair requested feedback on a how the proposed prioritisation framework could be amended for next year's research planning, and whether there were any large information gaps/high priority work that wasn't discussed.