

STATEMENT OF DECISION

APPLICATION FOR THE GRANT OF AN AQUACULTURE LICENCE

File Number: fA38639
Applicant: Harvest Road Oceans Pty Ltd
Application Date: 13 September 2021
Application Type: Grant of an Authorisation

This Statement of Decision should be read in conjunction with the document entitled *Assessment Criteria for the Grant or Variation of an Aquaculture Licence – Explanatory Notes* (“Explanatory Notes”), which provides explanations, comments and additional information relating to Statements of Decision made in respect of applications for grant or variation of aquaculture licences. The document is available at:

http://www.fish.wa.gov.au/Documents/Aquaculture/sod_assessment_criteria_explanatory_notes.pdf

1. DETAILS OF THE APPLICATION

Background facts

Harvest Road Oceans Pty Ltd (“Harvest Road”) maintains business holdings in the Western Australian (“WA”) aquaculture industry with sites in Cockburn Sound, Warnbro Sound and Albany as well as a current aquaculture trial sites in Carnarvon, WA, which are authorised under an R&D Exemption No. 3468 (“the Exemption”).

Following positive results recorded over the past 2 years at aquaculture trials in the Carnarvon area under the Exemption, Harvest Road proposes to increase the area of the site to support development of a commercial-scale aquaculture business. For that purpose, Harvest Road is seeking grant of an aquaculture licence authorising the activity. Harvest Road is seeking tenure for the proposed area from the Department of Transport, in which the area is vested.

Details of the Licence variation application

On 13 September 2021, Harvest Road made an application to the CEO of the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (“Department”) under s.92 of the Fish Resources Management Act 1994 (“the Act”), for the grant of an aquaculture licence.

The application fee, a Management and Environmental Monitoring Plan (“MEMP”) and additional information were submitted with the application.

In its application, Harvest Road seeks to culture the following oyster species:

- *Saccostrea glomerata*; and
- *Saccostrea cucullata*.

In its application, Harvest Road is seeking to culture the above oyster species at two sites located within The Fascine near Carnarvon and in Massey Bay, comprising 2.5 hectares and 42.9 hectares, respectively (**Attachment 1**).

2. RELEVANT CRITERIA TO BE SATISFIED

Consultation was undertaken according to the process set out in Administrative Guideline No. 1 *Assessment of Applications for Aquaculture and Pearling in Coastal Waters of Western Australia* (“AG1”). **Attachment 2** provides a summary of the consultation process.

Where relevant, those matters arising out of the consultation process that are of greater significance are referred to below.

The matters arising by reason of s 92 and 92A of the Act are twofold:

1. The criteria specified in s 92(1); and
2. The Management and Environmental Monitoring Plan (“MEMP”).

2.1 Criteria in s.92(1)

(a) “Fit and proper person”

Considerations relevant to the “fit and proper person” criterion by reference to the key concepts of knowledge, honesty and ability are set out below.

- Knowledge

From the information submitted with the application, I have noted that Harvest Road and its employees have a proven history of success within the aquaculture industry. Harvest Road has sufficient capital to ensure the project’s operational and environmental practices are conducted to the highest standard. Based on the information provided I am of the view that Harvest Road has the knowledge required to undertake the proposed aquaculture activity.

- Honesty

I have no reason to believe Harvest Road does not meet the concept of honesty.

- Ability

The business plan, which Harvest Road was required to produce as part of its application, provided information on insurance and risk management, operations, marketing and financial backing. Based on the information provided, I have no reason to believe that Harvest Road would not have the capacity to raise the finance needed for the establishment and operation of the project.

Further, Harvest Road has successfully completed 2 year trial on oyster growth and environmental suitability at the proposed sites in Massey Bay and The Fascine, finding both sites are suitable for the proposed project.

With respect to the matter of persons acting on behalf of the licence holder, Harvest Road is a company and accordingly must act through natural person agents. These persons are the officers (such as directors) and employees of the company. The Licence does not authorise persons to act “on behalf of” Harvest Road, so Harvest Road cannot authorise independent contractors or “lessees” to carry out aquaculture at the proposed sites.

Based on my consideration of the matters set out above and the information that is before me, on balance, I consider Harvest Road is “fit and proper” to hold a licence to conduct aquaculture of the proposed species at the authorised sites.

(b) Tenure

The proposed sites are vested in the Minister for Transport (with power to lease) under the provisions of the *Marine and Harbours Act 1981*.

Harvest Road is in the process of securing a lease from the Department of Transport.

Accordingly, I consider that Harvest Road will have appropriate tenure over the authorised sites.

(c) Better interests

Aquaculture comprises a significant and sustainable industry in WA and has the potential to expand. Further investment and growth of this industry will facilitate this expansion. Granting an aquaculture licence to Harvest Road will further contribute to the State’s economy and provide increased community benefits such as employment opportunities and economic diversification. Economic benefits to the region are largely attributed to the appointment of local suppliers, service providers and employees.

This application comprises an important component of a larger plan by Harvest Road to significantly increase the production of rock oysters in WA, supporting employment in regional centres including Carnarvon and Albany, and providing economic returns to the state.

Harvest Road has track record of successfully developing linkages within government, the community, educational institutions and charitable organisations. The Company has committed to continue engagement with local educational initiatives within the Carnarvon area and expressed an interest in facilitating training opportunities and employment within the aquaculture industry in regional areas.

By reason of the above considerations, I am of the view that the grant of the application would be in the better interests of the State and community.

(d) Whether the proposed activities are unlikely to adversely affect other fish or the aquatic environment

The main considerations in respect of whether the proposed activities will adversely affect other fish or the aquatic environment are discussed below.

1. Genetics, disease and pests

Genetics is not an issue because the proposal does not contemplate introducing new genetic combinations.

In respect of diseases and pests, Harvest Road will operate under controls imposed through licence conditions and a MEMP, which includes biosecurity protocols and procedures. These controls are based on the requirement to demonstrate low risk of disease and pest introduction and spread.

Harvest Road has also developed a Biosecurity Plan that will apply to its aquaculture operations in Albany and Carnarvon. I note that the Department has reviewed the Biosecurity Plan.

a. Disease and pest introduction

I am confident in the ability of Harvest Road to detect known disease agents and pests.

I note that from time to time the DPIRD's Diagnostics and Laboratory Services ("DDLS") may wish to undertake disease testing in the absence of a reported disease event and that these requirements may change from time to time, taking into account the diseases of interest, the characteristics of the tests available and the required confidence in the result as determined by a risk assessment. A licence condition will be imposed to enable DDLS to determine these requirements for disease testing.

Given the biosecurity protocols in place for a licenced site and the controls imposed, or that may be imposed, over the movement of the proposed species, I consider the threat of disease and pests being introduced into to be low.

I note that any movements to the site will require health certification, which would deal with disease risk.

Harvest Road proposes to use broodstock that are genetically similar populations to those which naturally occur at the intended aquaculture site. If necessary, any collection amounts will be subject to assessment by the Department and will follow biosecurity conditions posed under a Ministerial Broodstock Exemption.

I consider the threat of disease and pests being introduced to The Fascine, Massey Bay and the surrounding areas generally to be low, given the biosecurity protocols in place and the controls imposed, or that may be imposed, over the movement of the fish to the site.

b. Disease development in situ

I am mindful of the conditions to be imposed on the Licence in respect of disease reporting requirements and the biosecurity provisions set out in the MEMP and Biosecurity Plan.

Therefore, I consider the risk of disease outbreak at the site and the spreading of disease from the site to be generally low, given the biosecurity protocols in place and the controls imposed, or that may be imposed, over the species being grown at the site.

2. Aquaculture gear

a. Impact of the aquaculture gear

Harvest Road will be using a combination of intertidal and subtidal oyster gear, typical of that it uses elsewhere in WA.

The proposed site is mostly located over sand to mitigate impact on benthic communities. Where anchors are required, Harvest Road will use an anchorage system designed to minimise impacts to the benthos. This system has been used at other Harvest Road aquaculture sites that include seagrass beds, without apparent significant impacts. The longlines will have adequate space between the rows for vessel access and to allow light to reach any benthic communities that may be present.

Through its MEMP, Harvest Road is committed to adhering to the relevant sections of the 2013 ACWA *Environmental Code of Practice for the Sustainable Management of Western Australia's Mussel and Oyster Aquaculture Industries* for entanglement of marine mammals and has detailed a response and reporting plan for any negative interactions between protected species and aquaculture gear.

Therefore, I consider that there would be minimal environmental impact arising from the use of the described aquaculture gear.

b. Removal of the aquaculture gear

In the event of a major storm that results in damage to aquaculture gear, Harvest Road will be responsible for retrieving any infrastructure and equipment damaged or adrift.

If its lease is terminated or expires, Section 101 (1) of the FRMA allows the CEO to direct Harvest Road to clean up and rehabilitate the former leased area and s.101(2) allows the CEO to complete clean up and rehabilitation works and recover reasonable costs from those works.

In the event of aquaculture ceasing, any issues concerning the clean-up and rehabilitation of the sites would be covered by the relevant provisions of the Act.

3. Environmental impact

I note that it is in the best commercial interest of Harvest Road to maintain a healthy environment and to ensure any ongoing environmental impact is adequately measured and managed. The monitoring and management of environmental factors is a separate issue dealt with in the MEMP section below.

I have noted that the proposed species will not require supplementary feeding; consequently, there will be no increase in nutrient levels arising from the introduction of manufactured feeds. I therefore consider the proposed species will have minimal impact on the surrounding environment.

Harvest Road has identified an environmental monitoring program that includes the completion of video transects within the proposed site and at a control location to enable detection of impacts on sensitive benthic habitats resulting from aquaculture activities. Harvest Road will also collect and report operational data relevant to oyster growth and health as part of its monitoring program to detect potential exceedance of carrying capacity.

Therefore, I consider that the matter of environmental impact has been fully addressed and sufficient environmental monitoring and management controls provided in the MEMP and conditions of the Licence.

4. Visual amenity and noise pollution

The proposed aquaculture operations underwent considerable stakeholder consultation. Harvest Road liaised directly with stakeholders that may have been impacted by the proposal.

The proposed project will have minimal negative impact on visual amenity and will not result in any noise pollution.

After considering the relevant issues regarding s.92(1)(c), I am satisfied the proposed activities are unlikely to affect other fish or the aquatic environment and can be managed through the MEMP and conditions imposed on the licence under s.95 of the Act.

(e) Whether the proposed activities have been approved by other relevant authorities

S.92(1)(d) requires the CEO to be satisfied that the proposed activities have been approved by relevant authorities. I have not identified any other relevant authority that needs to provide approval.

(f) Other matters prescribed

S.92(1)(e) requires the CEO to be satisfied of any other matters prescribed for the purposes of s.92(1). There are no other prescribed matters.

Therefore, I am satisfied of the criteria in s.92(1) of the Act, in respect of the application.

2.2 The MEMP

Harvest Road has submitted a MEMP in respect of its application for an aquaculture licence. I have considered the contents of the MEMP and am satisfied that Harvest Road will manage environmental and biosecurity issues according to the standards set out in the document.

As such, I approve the MEMP provided by Harvest Road (**Attachment 3**).

In respect of the public availability of the MEMP, I note that under s.250(1)(c) of the Act, a MEMP lodged under the Act is “confidential information” and cannot be divulged by the Department.

3. DISCRETION TO GRANT – MERITS OF THE APPLICATION

In considering the exercise of discretion, I give regard to the merits of the application. That requires balancing the opposing considerations against the supporting considerations. For any detrimental factors, I give regard to how detriments may be minimised and controlled.

Potential disadvantages of granting an aquaculture licence

(a) Genetics, diseases and pests

I have considered the issue of genetics earlier at part 2.1(d)(1) of this decision, including interbreeding, and concluded genetic issues will be unlikely to have any detrimental impact.

I have considered the issue of disease and pest introduction earlier at part 2.1(d)(1) of this decision and concluded sufficient controls will be in place and that this issue will be unlikely to have any detrimental impact.

To address the risk of disease development *in situ*, additional testing of the proposed species at the farm sites in The Fascine and Massey Bay can be required through licence conditions.

I have noted the issue cannot be about eliminating all risk; otherwise, aquaculture operations in the marine environment would not be able to proceed. That is contrary to the object and operation of the Act. The task, therefore, is to reduce the risk of disease outbreak and pest introduction to an appropriately low level by identifying and assessing biosecurity, environmental and other risks and implementing management strategies and controls to reduce the risks. This is addressed primarily through biosecurity controls imposed through the MEMP and licence conditions.

(b) Environmental impact

The MEMP provides an environmental monitoring program developed to ensure the proposed aquaculture activity will be unlikely to have any significant impact on the environment and that any impacts that may occur will be managed effectively.

Among other things, the MEMP focuses on matters such as measurement and analysis of environmental factors and indicators, including:

- environmental carrying capacity;
- benthic habitats and communities including seagrasses; and
- impacts on protected species.

Harvest Road has presented an aquaculture proposal that aims to minimise any potential environmental impacts and ensures adherence to conditions set out in an aquaculture licence and by means of the reporting and monitoring as set out in the MEMP.

The MEMP identifies an environmental monitoring program, which will form the basis of an annual report that will be submitted to the Department in line with standard license conditions.

Given the information provided in the MEMP, I am of the view that the proposed aquaculture activity could be implemented without significant deleterious impacts on the environment. Existing aquaculture legislation and adaptive management mechanisms provide further confidence that the aquaculture industry can be developed sustainably.

Given the information set out above, I am of the view there are sufficient controls in place to manage any environmental impact

(c) Impact on compliance and resourcing

I do not consider that compliance activities undertaken to enforce the varied Licence conditions in this case will be unduly onerous, as they should fall within the usual activities of the Department.

(d) Whether the proposal involves limitation on access to the proposed waters.

The proposed aquaculture operations underwent considerable stakeholder consultation that included community groups. Harvest Road liaised directly with stakeholders that may have been impacted by the proposal. This included working closely with the organisers of Carnarvon Windfest to mitigate impacts on their event resulting from the development of aquaculture at the Massey Bay site.

(e) The possible impact on navigation

The Department referred the proposal to the Department of Transport, which considered the site to be a Category 1 as defined in the document *Guidance Statement for Evaluating & Determining Categories of Marking and Lighting for Aquaculture and Pearling Leases/Licences 2019*.

(f) The possible impact on recreational fishing

The granting of an aquaculture licence to conduct aquaculture activities at a certain area does not of itself confer any exclusive access to the area. Recreational fishing

may still be carried out in the general area, noting that it is an offence for a person to remove fish from or interfere with aquaculture gear.

(g) The possible impact on commercial fishing and other commercial activities including tourism

As with recreational fishing, the granting of an aquaculture licence to conduct aquaculture activities at a certain area does not of itself confer any exclusive access to the area. Commercial fishing and other commercial activities may still be carried out in the general area, noting that it is an offence for a person to interfere with aquaculture gear unless authorised by the owner.

I have noted the following in respect of possible impact on commercial fishing. Operators in the Gascoyne inshore net fishery, while not voicing specific objections, have alerted the proponent (and the Department) to the fact they can and do operate in the area and plan to continue to do so.

Potential advantages of granting an aquaculture licence

(a) Suitability of the location for aquaculture and proximity to existing operation

There are numerous reasons why the site location is suitable for the proposed activity, including that the natural features of the sites satisfy the biological requirements for growing the proposed species. I am of the view that, for the reasons set out above, the location is suitable for the aquaculture of the proposed species.

I note that Harvest Road have completed an 2 year growth trial at Massey Bay and The Fascine, under Exemption 3468, and that this trial yielded positive results for both growth rates and shell shape.

(b) Very low impact on other users of the resource (providing disease issues are dealt with)

For the reasons set out above, the granting of a new aquaculture licence would have limited impact on other users of the resource and has been mitigated to a satisfactory level during consultation.

I have noted that the proposal was developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders.

Providing that disease issues are dealt with, I have formed the view that the proposal will have little to no impact on other users of the resource.

(c) Potential economic benefits for the State

The establishment of aquaculture operations in regional areas has the potential to add to the economic growth of the region, increase local employment, and provide

opportunities for diversification. Existing aquaculture farms around the State are already providing employment opportunities.

I have considered the issue of economic benefits for the State earlier at part 2.1(c) of this decision.

(d) Contribution to ongoing development of science and knowledge of aquaculture

Information generated from the expansion of aquaculture activities at the site would contribute to the ongoing development of the science and knowledge of aquaculture, in part by providing data pertaining to environmental suitability of the waters nearby Carnarvon for rock oyster aquaculture.

The science developed from the proposal will increase the efficiency of the commercial activity, not only around Carnarvon, but also potentially State-wide given that it will trial the commercial viability of using northern nursery areas followed by relaying oysters to southern grow-out areas.

(e) No impact on native title

There is no impact on Native Title. I note that Harvest Road has liaised with the Yinggarda Aboriginal Corporation through the Yamatji Marlpa Aboriginal Corporation to ensure that aquaculture operations do not impact on other culturally significant areas.

In respect of the various issues opposing and in favour of the proposal, I am satisfied the benefits outweigh the disadvantages and that the risks, possible detriments and other issues associated with the proposed licence can be managed by licence conditions and the MEMP.

4. LICENCE CONDITIONS

The Department has liaised with Harvest Road over the licence conditions. The indicative (intended) substance of the licence conditions is as follows.

CATEGORY 6: BIVALVE SHELLFISH GROW OUT OR RESEEDING

1. Interpretation

(1) In the conditions on this licence –

DPIRD means the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development;

Pathologist means an employee of, or contractor to, a laboratory facility that is accredited for Anatomical Pathology testing by the National Association of Testing Authorities, Australia, and who is a registered veterinarian with relevant post graduate qualifications in diagnostic

procedures (e.g., Pathology, Medicine and Management of Aquatic Animals);

DPIRD Pathologist means an officer(s) occupying the position of Veterinary Pathologist in the DPIRD's Diagnostics and Laboratory Services; and

site means the area specified in Schedule 2 of this licence.

(2) The following terms used in the conditions on this licence have the same meaning as in the *Fish Resources Management Act 1994* –

- aquaculture lease;
- CEO;
- Department;
- record.

2. Requirement for legal right to authorise activity.

The holder of this licence must always maintain in force, the legal right to use the site. The legal right to use the site must be a lease or licence granted in accordance with the power conferred under the *Land Administration Act 1997*, or under section 92 or 97 of the *Fish Resources Management Act 1994*.

3. Movement of fish to and from the site – Disease Testing

- (1) The licence holder must not move fish to and from the site unless –
- (a) the licence holder has received a health certificate from a Pathologist in respect of all fish being moved from the site; and
 - (b) where the health certificate has been provided by a Pathologist that is not a DPIRD Pathologist, the licence holder has received written confirmation from a DPIRD Pathologist that the health certificate is satisfactory.
- (2) The licence holder must ensure:
- (a) that any fish moved to and from the site are only moved during the period for which the health certificate received under condition (1) (a) and (b) is valid and always accompanied by a copy of the health certificate; and
 - (b) Advance notification of the movements is given to DPIRD by calling 1300 278 292 (all hours).
- (3) The cost of testing carried out under condition (1) (a) and (b) will be borne by the licence holder.
- (4) Conditions (1) (a) and (b) do not apply to fish being moved to the aquaculture licensed site if originating from the same location as defined in Schedule 2 of this licence.
- (5) Condition (1) does not apply to fish being moved from the site -
- (a) for the purposes of processing or sale for consumption; or
 - (b) for the purpose of approved research if the fish are being moved to a land-based facility; or
 - (c) if they are broodstock being moved to a licensed land-based aquaculture facility; or
 - (d) if the movement of fish has the prior written approval of the CEO; or

(e) for the purpose of testing for quality assurance programs.

(6) In addition to condition (1) (a) and (b), the licence holder must ensure that appropriate samples of fish are submitted to the DPIRD Diagnostics and Laboratory Services for disease testing, if required in writing by a DPIRD Pathologist. The cost of the testing undertaken will be borne by the licence holder.

4. Disease, mortality and pest reporting

Where the licence holder –

- (1) suspects that any fish at the site are affected by disease (including any suspicion or detection of a declared pest, or suspicion or knowledge that fish are infected with a declared pest, (as defined under the *Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act 2007*); or
- (2) becomes aware of any significant or unusually high levels of fish mortality, caused by disease or otherwise, the licence holder must -
 - (a) Report to DPIRD as soon as practicable (and within 24 hours) by calling 1300 278 292 (all hours) the level of mortality, signs of disease or reason for suspecting the presence of a disease or declared pest; and
 - (b) follow the directions of the DPIRD's Diagnostics and Laboratory Services in relation to providing reports, samples of fish, or any other relevant item; and
 - (c) Collect, retain, and provide suitable samples of the fish for confirmatory testing as instructed by the DPIRD Diagnostics and Laboratory Services.

5. Management and Environmental Monitoring Plan (MEMP) Compliance Audit

An independent audit of compliance with the MEMP must be commissioned and carried out by the licence holder, at the expense of the licence holder, within four months of being directed in writing by the CEO to commission the audit. A copy of any interim and final audit report must be delivered to the CEO within seven days of being received by the licence holder.

6. MEMP Report

The licence holder must:

- (1) at all times comply with and implement the latest MEMP prepared by the licence holder, and delivered to the Department; and
- (2) before 31 July each year, submit to the CEO, a written annual report on its activities conducted under the MEMP during the year, which must include all results of management and monitoring activities to 1 July.
- (3) ensure that the MEMP is updated every two years at the time the licence is renewed and submitted to the CEO for approval.

(4) ensure that a species listed in Schedule 1 of this licence is not present at the location listed in Schedule 2 unless:

- (a) A risk assessment for that species has been included in the current MEMP; or
- (b) The MEMP is updated with a risk assessment for that species and has been submitted to the CEO for approval.

7. Marking and Lighting (if marine based)

- (1) Marking and lighting of the marine site must be installed and maintained in accordance with Category 1 as set out in the document "*Guidance Statement for Evaluating and Determining Categories of Marking and Lighting for Aquaculture and Pearling Leases/ Licences (2019)*".
- (2) The marking and lighting required under paragraph (1) must be installed before any aquaculture activity is undertaken at the site.
- (3) No marking is required if the site is only used for bottom culture where to top of the aquaculture gear is at least five metres below the surface at lowest tide.

8. Aquaculture gear

- (1) Aquaculture gear must be used in such a way that it does not cause significant damage any reef, coral or seagrass bed.
- (2) The holder of the licence must ensure that all aquaculture gear is located within the boundaries of the site, and maintained in a safe, secure and seaworthy condition; and all floating aquaculture gear, including ropes and buoys, must be fastened securely.
- (3) Upon termination, non-renewal of the licence or cessation of the aquaculture activity, the licence holder must remove from the area all property, aquaculture gear, refuse and debris belonging to the licence holder and restore the area to a condition approved by the CEO.
- (4) Aquaculture gear that is to be moved from one location to another must be completely air dried and biological waste disposed of on land prior to being installed in its new location. The licence holder can contact Aquatic Pest Biosecurity (aquatic.biosecurity@dpird.wa.gov.au) for guidance.

9. Record keeping

- (1) The licence holder must make accurate and timely records of –
 - (a) the aquaculture gear used at the site;
 - (b) the movement of fish to each type of aquaculture gear, including –
 - i. the estimated average weight and numbers of the fish moved;
 - ii. the time and date the movement took place; and
 - iii. any mortalities of fish that occurred during the movement;
 - (c) the estimated weight and numbers of fish being kept on or in each type of gear at the site;
 - (d) the estimated weight and numbers of fish harvested from each type of aquaculture gear at the site;

- (e) all mortalities at the site, both in total and as a percentage of total stock held at the site at the time; and
 - (f) all health certificates issued to the licence holder by a Pathologist.
- (2) The licence holder must keep the records made under paragraph (1) in a secure place at the licence holder's registered place of business for a period of seven years.
- (3) Records under paragraph (1) must be available to an authorised DPIRD Fisheries Officer at any time.

10. Interaction with protected species

Any interactions between any aquaculture gear at the site and any protected species, including entangles or stranded animals must be immediately reported to the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attraction's (DBCA) Wildcare Hotline on (08) 94749055 (24hr emergency number), the DBCA's Nature Protection Branch on (08) 9219 9837 and the local DBCA District Office.

DECISION

On the basis of the above and subject to the grant of a new aquaculture licence by imposing conditions referred to above, I have decided to grant an Aquaculture Licence to Harvest Road Oceans Pty Ltd to culture *Saccostrea glomerata* and *Saccostrea cucullate* at The Fascine and Massey Bay, near Carnarvon.

I have also decided to approve the MEMP



Bruno Mezzatesta
DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL
SUSTAINABILITY AND BIOSECURITY

As delegate of the CEO, Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development

Dated this Tuesday, 20 day of September

2022

I hereby give instruction for notice of the decision to vary the Licence under s.142 of the Act and impose conditions under s.95 of the Act to be advertised in the West Australian newspaper in accordance with s.148 of the *Fish Resources Management Act 1994*