



Management Committee Meeting 28 Minutes

Date: Wednesday 19th September 2018 **Time:** 10:00am to 3:00pm

Location: Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus

Attendees

Name	Position	Organisation
Community		
Mr Paul Birch (Chair)	CEO	Fitzroy Basin Association (non voting)
Mr Gerry Graham	Management Committee Representative	Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network
Mrs Elyse Riethmuller	Chief Operating Officer	Fitzroy Basin Association
Mr Brent McLellan	PCCC TUMRA Coordinator	GIDARJIL
Government		
Councillor Desley O'Grady	Councillor	Gladstone Regional Council
Ms Rachel D'Arcy	Manager Reef Partnerships	The Office of the Great Barrier Reef, DES
Ms Angela Stokes	Director Reef Delivery	Heritage, Reef and Marine Division Department of the Environment
Industry		
Dr Megan Ellis	Marine Scientist	Gladstone Ports Corporation
Mr Alan Hayter	Environmental Lead	ConocoPhillips Australia
Mr Patrick Hastings	CEO	Gladstone Industry Leaders Group
ISP Members		
Dr John Rolfe	ISP Chair	GHHP Independent Science Panel
Staff		
Mrs Lyndal Hansen	Media and Communication Team	Amarna Consulting
Dr Uthpala Pinto	Science Team	GHHP
Dr Mark Schultz	Science Team	GHHP
Amy-Lee Pople	GHHP Secretariat	GHHP
Kylie Tapurau	GHHP Secretariat	GHHP

Apologies:

Prof. Owen Nevin	Associate Vice Chancellor	Central Queensland University
------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome

Meeting Started: 10:00am

GHHP Chair welcomed all attending Management Committee members.

Brent McLellan did welcome to country and acknowledged the traditional land holders.

Chair acknowledged an apology from Professor Owen Nevin.

Angela Stokes sitting in as proxy for Michelle Nelson.

Agenda Item 2 – Private Committee Discussion

MC did not require this agenda item.

Agenda Item 3 – Reports

3.1 Previous Minutes and Actions

Previous meeting minutes were accepted to be a true and accurate record.

3.1.2 Confirm flying minutes

MC confirmed agenda item.

3.2 GHHP Science Program Report

Science Team reported on all current projects and their status.

Items to be noted + MC questions:

- Questioned if work has commenced with AIMS without an agreed project scope?
Science team confirmed that tasks were negotiated and outlined to AIMS but confirmed a full project scope has not yet been agreed and signed.
- Questioned if the reports from the science projects will be distributed to the Management Committee and if so when?
GHHP Chair confirmed that reports are distributed and also put on the website at the completion of the project.
- Science team noted that they have received a draft report for Mangroves from Norm Duke at TropWater. Norm has proposed 3 mangrove indicators that are consistent with the scope of work. Science team confirmed that the report is currently under review by the ISP.
Noted that there will be a decision made about the inclusion of Mangrove in the 2018 report card within two weeks. ISP are reviewing the identified baselines (potential changes could be made) but ISP Chair confirmed that the data and indicators are look promising and satisfy the ISP.

3.3 GHHP ISP Chair Report

ISP Chair reported to the Management Committee that:

- Fish health will not be included in the report card this year due to lack of confidence in the wet season sampling.
- Mud crabs require a local non-fished reference site to use as a baseline for the indicator. This would increase the confidence of the indicator scores and grade. ISP Chair noted that the ISP are considering the reference site be Eurimbula creek.
- ISP Chair confirmed that GPC have confirmed that the PCIMP data is going through final quality control approval and is close to being released.

MC Comments/Questions:

- Management Committee asked if the delay in release of PCIMP data will it push out the project?
ISP Chair confirmed there is a process involved but is hopeful that the project will not exceed the time frame but cannot confirm at this stage.

Action Items

28.1 Megan Ellis to follow up the release of PCIMP data.

3.4 GHHP Communications Report

Lyndal Hansen presented the communications report and highlighted:

- Facebook posts and interaction has been a focus for the communications team but requires policies regarding; frequency, content etc.
- Requested permission to post partner profiles.
- Noted that the website space/storage is not large enough to hold the 2018 Report Card data but confirmed more storage allocation is underway with DIMS.
- Confirmed that the scope of work for a new website has been put out and the potential developer has indicated it will take up to 4months to build so it will not be ready for the 2018 Report Card release.
- Requested a clear marketing direction from the Management Committee for the Gladstone Harbour Model.
- Confirmed that VMR has requested a Coral Coring presentation once information is released.

MC Comments/questions:

- Chair requested that the communications team present agenda paper for recommendation of requests at the next Management Committee meeting (Facebook policy, publishing partners via social media and marketing directions for Gladstone Harbour Model)

Action Items

28.2 Communications team to present agenda papers at the next Management Committee meeting:

- **Draft Facebook policy**
- **Publishing Partners via social media proposal**
- **Proposed marketing directions for Gladstone Harbour Model**

3.5 GHHP Citizen Science Report

The Communications team presented an update of all 2018 Citizen Science projects, their current status, citizen science budget expenditure for 2018 and briefed the Management Committee on budget and marketing for the 2019 Citizen Science program.

3.6 GHHP Finance Report

Elyse presented the GHHP finance report to the Management Committee as per agenda paper 3.6.1.

Agenda Item 4 – Items requiring discussion

4.1 Changes to Seagrass scoring methodology

ISP Chair presented the proposed changes to the seagrass scoring for species composition.

The purpose of the change is to avoid Seagrass meadows being assigned a zero score when seagrass is still present.

The proposed alternative in methodology means that where the lowest of the 3 indicator scores is driven by area or biomass, GHHP will use the lowest score (same as previous years' methods), but where species composition is the lowest of the 3 indicator scores, species composition contributes 50% of the overall meadow score, and the next lowest indicator score (biomass or area) contributes the other 50%.

ISP Chair noted that an advantage of this change in methodology is that GPC and GHHP will use the same scoring process and confirmed that it doesn't change the scores dramatically.

MC Comments/Questions:

- Questioned if it will make it difficult to compare to previous report cards?
ISP Chair confirmed that it is still possible to compare the grades because the change in score is very small and there is also the option to provide the technical comparison.
- Asked if it was a consideration from the ISP that this change makes it difficult to do trend analysis?
ISP Chair explained that there is a really good reason for this moving forward and assumed that fixing a perception problem was better to deal with (small challenge of trend analysis) rather than leave the methodology as it is.
- GHHP Chair questioned if 3 figures have improved from last year, is GHHP saying they were wrong in the first way it was done?
ISP Chair explained that it is not that it was done wrong previously, but more so that there is now more information available than before and an improved methodology has been found, which could show GHHP's learning and adaptation.
- ISP Chair noted that the change in methodology is an improved change that does not fundamentally change the science.
- It was suggested to compare both methodologies every year moving forward in the technical report.
- Management Committee all agree that an appropriate communication method needs to be outlined to explain the change and reasons for doing so.

Motion to approve the proposed changes to seagrass scoring methodology for 2018: All present Management Committee members (9) were in favour

4.1.2 Changes to coral scoring methodology

ISP Chair explained that the Marine Monitoring Program (MMP) baseline and size classes used by GHHP and across the Great Barrier Reef has changed since Coral was first established for the GHHP Report Card. The baseline for juvenile coral colonies has changed and MMP now only reports juvenile coral colonies in the 0–2cm and 2–5cm classes (not the 5-10cm class anymore). ISP Chair highlighted that during the 2018 coral monitoring in Gladstone Harbour, AIMS used the current MMP methodology and did not collect data for corals in the 5–10cm size range, now making it impossible to include this data in the 2018 report card. Given this situation, the very

slight impact on scores (absolutely no effect on grades) and the importance to remain aligned with the MMP, the ISP recommends making a permanent change in methodology to only report on the juvenile coral colonies in the 0–2cm and 2–5cm classes.

MC Comment/questions:

- Questioned if it was part of AIMS' scope to report on the 5-10cm size range? ISP Chair confirmed it was in AIMS' contract scope and they made a mistake, but highlighted they are a really good contractor.
- ISP Chair noted that Coral has 4 assessment indicators and the ISP is only proposing a change to 1 indicator so when the indicators are averaged it has a very small affected on the score.
- Management Committee all agree that an appropriate communication method needs to be outlined to explain the change and reasons for doing so.

Motion to approve the proposed changes to coral scoring methodology for 2018: All present Management Committee members (9) were in favour

Action Items

28.3 ISP Chair to write to AIMS informing them of their breach of contract and negotiate appropriate cost reduction and also suggest the use of a field plan highlighting contract requirements before conducting field testing.

4.1.3 Changes to mud crab benchmarks

ISP Chair explained that mud crab benchmarks and worse-case scenarios were initially selected based on existing data and data collected during the 2017 report card monitoring. In 2018, the options are to maintain the same scenarios, or to upgrade them as better information becomes available (including additional data from the project sampling).

The ISP recommend changes in the mud crab benchmarks as sex ratio (3 males to 1 female) was a low confidence benchmark in 2017 as it is based on an unfished population in Micronesia and the abundance benchmark is calculated from catch per unit effort (CPUE) data which is known to be highly variable and was also considered to be a low confidence benchmark in 2017.

Sex ratio benchmark- proposed to update the benchmark with information recently provided by Fisheries Queensland from an un-crabbed estuary in northern NSW (Butcher 2004) and from a non-crabbed section of Moreton Bay (Pillans et al. 2005). Both studies recorded a sex ratio of 2 males to 1 female. Although the use of this benchmark would result in changes to the scores for this measure and the overall mud crab indicator, the benefit of changing the benchmark is that it would be based on suitable reference data from eastern Australia, instead of from an overseas study.

Abundance benchmark- To account for the high level of variability in CPUE data the recommendation is to use a moving average of the 75th percentile across monitoring years up to 10 years (i.e. the benchmark would be updated each year for 10 years with additional sampling data). For 2018 this will change the benchmark to 2.5. The benefit of changing the benchmark is that it would be consistent with other indicators in the report card that use up to 10 years of data, and it would avoid arbitrarily assigning a benchmark to a single year.

MC Comments/Questions:

- It was suggested to put a * in the report card that refers people to the website for further information "methodology change, refer to website"
- ISP Chair confirmed that full explanation for the methodology change will be in the technical report.

- Highlighted that the change in methodology should be seen as adaptive management and that GHHP are doing things in an improved way.

Motion to approve the proposed changes to mud crabs sex ratio benchmark for 2018: All present Management Committee members (9) were in favour

Motion to approve the proposed changes to mud crabs abundance benchmark for 2018: All present Management Committee members (9) were in favour

4.1.4 Changes to water quality benchmarks

ISP Chair explained that in the Queensland government Port Curtis Water Quality Objectives 2014, the guidelines vary between zones if the waterbodies are categorised as either 'slightly to moderately disturbed zones (MD)' or 'high ecological value (HEV)' zones. ISP Chair confirmed that all 13 zones are currently rated using the 50th percentile when 10 of the GHHP zones are rated as MD and scores should be calculated using the 80th percentile, while only the 3 zones that are considered HEV should be applying the 50th percentile.

ISP Chair presented 3 possible solutions to the Management Committee, highlighting the recommended solution from the ISP to set the guideline values for nutrients and physico-chemical properties of water quality in the report card to the 80th percentile values rather than the 50th percentile. The ISP believes this makes the report card more internally consistent, scientifically more accurate, in keeping with recent revisions to national and state guideline values and consistent with approaches in other regional report cards.

MC Comments/Questions:

- DES highlighted significant concerns with the proposed change from the ISP and don't agree with the verbal advice the ISP received.
DES confirmed that the change to calculate all zones by the 80th percentile (while 3 should be calculated by the 50th) isn't consistent with the Gladstone harbour water quality objectives that are bound by legislative force and cannot be changed without a formal amendment.
Department does not support the recommendation to use the 80th percentile and invited the ISP chair and members to meet to discuss this matter further.
- ISP Chair clarified that the current GHHP method is to apply the HEV 50th percentile to all zones which seems to also be against the Gladstone harbour water quality objective and suggests exploring option 2- report using the HEV for the 3 zones and MD for the remaining 10 zones.
- All Management Committee members agreed that this subject requires clarification and discussion between DES and the ISP to ensure an educated and appropriate decision is agreed upon.

Action Items

28.4 GHHP Chair to schedule and chair a conference meeting with all interested MC and ISP member with DES to receive clarification of guidelines, legislative requirements and appropriate option moving forward and present agenda item at the next MC meeting.

4.2 Processes for engaging suppliers for the 2018-2019 Report Card

ISP Chair presented for consideration by the Management Committee the option to re-contract core GHHP projects over several years.

Action Items

28.5 ISP Chair to work with Elyse Reithmuller to present detailed agenda paper at the next MC meeting.

4.3.1 2017/2018 Annual Financial Statements

All present Management Committee members accepted this agenda paper as read.

Management Committee accepted and agreed to the present 2017/18 Annual Financial Statement.

4.4.1 Annual Report DRAFT

Communication team presented the draft annual report to the Management Committee for feedback and comments.

Corrections:

- Title page: 'Leadership' instead of leader group
- Typo in research highlights sections 'longest'
- Kirstin's name is spelt wrong
- Infographics-
 - Questioned what does specially resolved mean and is it meaningful?
 - 1.7m- use the word metres
 - Under 24 should read 'collective'
 - Take out Atlantis information
 - Add citizen science stuff rather than technical information
 - 'longest'
- On first page under QLD map, middle paragraph 'for THE endless'
- No acronyms- under MC have full organisation name for CQ University
- Statement of income- instead of FBA inc. as heading, change to have that in brackets and GHHP as heading
- No need for deficit column
- Under QLD map- website address is wrong
- Superscripted for 150

Action Items

28.6 Communications team to present edits at next meeting MC meeting for final approval.

4.5.1 2018 Report Card DRAFT Layout

Communications team presented the draft 2018 Report Card layout (same as last year) and new front cover image. Communications team highlighted that more of community feel was taken this year from the front cover image instead of the industrial feel the last report card had.

MC Comments/Questions:

- Western basin tag is on Curtis island

Action Items

28.7 Communication team to change the tag on the map for Western Basin.

Management Committee accepted and agreed to the 2018 Report Card DRAFT Layout and front cover image.

4.6.1 Update of story book - Dougie's Gladstone Harbour Stewardship Study

Communications team present the third GHHP Storybook 'Dougies Gladstone Harbour Stewardship Study' to the Management Committee and requested any feedback, comments or questions.

Communications team disclosed that the story book release is scheduled for the Partners meeting in December.

MC Comments/Questions:

- GPC has provided feedback and suggestions via email
- Management Committee questioned the message from the Australian government and feel it doesn't align with stewardship and do not feel that a specific message from that should be coming from one particular partner. Communications team to rectify and remove the blurb from the back page with potential for the Australian Government message to be somewhere in the book.

Action Items

28.8 Angela to confirm approval to remove Australian Government message at the back of the book and report back to GHHP Chair.

28.9 Communications team to send comments received from AIMS to GHHP Chair.

28.10 All Partners to send through up to date logos.

Final approval of the storybook is subject to above actions.

Agenda Item 5 – Items for noting

5.1 Update on Executive Officer Position

Elyse updated the Management Committee that the Executive officer has been advertised twice; first advertisement received 31 applicants and the second 7. Only 3 people have been shortlisted and interviews will take place at the completion of this meeting.

Agenda Item 6 – General/Recurring Business

6.1. Fitzroy Partnership for River Health - Options for collaboration

GHHP Chair introduced Nathan Johnson from Fitzroy Partnership for River Health.

Nathan addressed the Management Committee regarding the options for collaboration between GHHP and Fitzroy Partnership for River Health (FPRH). Nathan also gave a brief description and history of FPRH.

Items to be noted from presentation:

- FPRH first ecosystem report card released in 2013
- Long term interest in viability,
- Collaboration with other GBR Report Cards was identified in FPRH strategic plan in 2015 with GHHP collaboration identified as highest priority/opportunity to explore (early 2016).
- FPRH Committee approves entering into negotiations with GHHP regarding collaboration.
- Nathan gave an overview of the FPRH revenue sector (54% coal)

- Influencing factors for collaboration: same host organisation, same NRM region, share geographic boundaries, common area of interest (western Curtis/narrows), both have strong industry involvement, investment and leadership, major town centres close to each other, positive pressure from natural partner (Government)
- Outlined the FPRH structure
- Shared FPRH proposed potential collaboration options:
 - 1- some shared services
 - Shared services: host, science panel and science technical services
 - Separate: MC and other governance agreements, EO, Chair, administration and communications
 - Potential option2- partial integration
 - Shared: Host, EO, Administration, Comms, Science panel and science technical services
 - Separate: MC and other governance arrangements
 - Option 3- Fully integrated partnership- FBRH feel it is too early to be going to this option straight up and suggests investigating option 1 or 2 and exploring option 3 at a later stage if required.
- Nathan highlights that FPRH is seeking some recognition/interest from GHHP to start exploring the options, but also needs a GHHP representative to be involved in that process.

MC Comments/Questions:

- ISP Chair highlighted that GHHP still doesn't have the reporting full package completed but should be in operational mode by next year, so suggested the option that collaboration should not take place before such time.
- Nathan highlighted to the Management Committee that while FPRH has 50 data providers for water quality and very different styles of data collection that maybe there is potential for integration of the technical assessment and reporting.
- Is this purely sitting as a conceptual aspect? What are the synergies at science panel level etc? – it has not be bought to that next level but FBRH could do some leg work on exploring that. Waiting for some sort of recognition/interest from GHHP to start exploring that. But needs a GHHP rep to be involved in that process.

GHHP chair presented a presentation. In a discussion with chairs from other report cards and where the report cards are going in the years ahead.

Chair:

- Outlined a proposal for future framework and funding. (7 regions across reef regions)
- Explained new model features- common governance charter, shared ISP, maintain local technical working groups, potential for some common report indicators and measures, consistency with report card scoring and grading terminology, potential for producing combined annual report card, potential to roll out report cards monthly between December and June each year.
- Highlighted the importance of looking at the bigger picture and not just the potential to for an agreement/collaboration with FPRH.
 - Nathan confirmed FPRH are in agreeance and there would be no push back for this moving forward.

Comments/questions:

- Management Committee agree there is potential for consistency particularly around science panels, technical working groups and the developing and reporting of grades and indicators.
- Integration could see an expression of interest put out to host all report card partnerships or an extension of regional arrangements.
- Questioned, what about industry and other contributors? How will they flow into this proposed structure?

Chair explained that a potential solution would be a mixed model where some partners and members are able to only invest in their particular region, but for it to work there needs to be allowance for pathways both way.

- Questioned what the value for corporate partners is? If services are centralised do you lose the information/ability to access/communicate to local areas?

Chair explained that one of the key aspect of the model is that the report card will remain owned and run by the local area.

6.3 Next scheduled meeting:

- Next Management Committee meeting rescheduled for Friday 9th November 9:30am.

Meeting closed: 1:05pm

Meeting Actions Register: GHHP and MC

(Once actions have been endorsed as complete in the meeting outcomes, they will be deleted from the list)

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC Meeting 23					
MC 23.3	Follow up the mangrove data from GPC	Patrick Hastings			Megan Ellis to follow up regarding access to mangrove data.
MC Meeting 24					
MC 24.1	Science team to contact EHP to chase up more specific data regarding oil spills from MSQ.	ISP Chair			Still in progress-discussion with Gordon from GPC and will be part of the future contract.
MC Meeting 26					
MC 26.1	ISP Chair to contact RIMREP to see if there is any data providing opportunities.	ISP Chair			Ongoing
MC 26.2	ISP chair to provide full report of the review to the MC	ISP Chair			
MC 26.3	ISP to do a presentation to RIMREP	ISP Chair			Ongoing
MC 26.5	GHHP Chair to draft Management Committee recommendation to be presented to Partners	GHHP Chair			Chase up
MC Meeting 27					
MC 27.2	Elyse to check Intellectual Property clauses with FBA contracts to determine where IP sits.	Elyse Riethmuller			To present at next meeting
MC 27.7	Kirsten to Chair the establishment of a sub-committee to review governance documents. Committee to include: Rachel (Chair), Megan, Patrick, Elyse and Gerry.	Kirsten Kenyon Rachel D'Arcy		Deferred until appointment of EO	Elise requested to be added to the committee-MC agree
MC Meeting 28					
MC 28.1	Follow up the release of PCIMP data	Megan Ellis			

Action Number	Action	Who is responsible?	When it is due?	Status	Notes
MC 28.2	Present agenda papers at the next Management Committee meeting regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft Facebook policy - Publishing Partners via social media proposal - Proposed marketing directions for Gladstone Harbour Model 	Communications team			
MC 28.3	ISP Chair to contact AIMS to discuss scope of the contract and appropriate cost reduction.	ISP Chair/ Science Team			
MC 28.4	Schedule a conference meeting with all interested MC and ISP member with DES to receive clarification of guidelines, legislative requirements and appropriate option moving forward and present agenda item at the next MC meeting.	ISP Chair			
MC 28.5	Present a detailed agenda paper regarding contract agreements and durations at the next MC meeting.	ISP Chair & Elyse Reithmuller			
MC 28.6	Make changes/edits etc to the 2018 Annual report as per agenda item 4.4 and present for final approval.	Communications team			
MC 28.7	Change the tag on the report card map for Western Basin.	Communication team			
MC 28.8	Confirm approval to remove Australian Government message at the back of the story book and report back to GHHP Chair.	Angela Stokes			
MC 28.9	Send comments received from AIMS to GHHP Chair.	Communications team			
MC 28.10	Send up to date logos to communications team.	All Partners			