



OIA16-0445

21 OCT 2016

Graham Carter
C/- fyi.org.nz

Dear Graham Carter

OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

I refer to your official information request to Minister Guy (30 July 2016) which was transferred to the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) on 12 August 2016. You have requested the following:

1. any documentation or information relating to any Memorandum of Understanding or agreement, in relation to the Trident cameras on fishing vessels?
2. any legal documentation or legislation in relation to who is allowed to view any camera footage recorded from fishing vessels?
3. any documentation on the involvement of MPI in the Trident Camera system?
4. any documentation on the capital investment made by MPI into the Trident camera system?
5. any documentation on the involvement and participation of other companies involved in the Trident Camera system held by MPI?
6. any documentation on what boats the Trident Camera system are currently on?
7. all documentation and information on when installation will become compulsory?
8. any documentation on what control or authority does MPI have on the Trident Camera systems?

In respect of questions 1-3 and 5-8, you have requested any and all documentation with regard to the Trident camera system. The information requested is substantial and would be held in a number of locations and databases. Therefore, your request is refused pursuant to section 18(f) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA) as the information requested cannot be made available without substantial collation or research.

In making the decision to refuse parts of your request pursuant to section 18(f) of the OIA on the grounds that the information cannot be made available without substantial collation or research, we considered this request together with your other requests relating to fisheries management issues. We also considered whether fixing a charge would enable us to grant your request. Given the considerable amount of information requested, we have decided that charging would not be appropriate. The diversion of resources required to meet your requests would unreasonably interfere with the operations of MPI.

Secondly, pursuant to section 18B, we considered consulting you about revising the scope of the requests. Given the substantial amount of information requested, we do not see that entering into correspondence on this issue is likely to refocus the requests down to a manageable scale.

MPI can, however, add in relation to:

- question four, there is no documentation regarding capital investment in the Trident camera system. MPI undertook a tender process and the contract was awarded to and accepted by Trident Systems. Therefore, documentation on the referred capital investment is refused pursuant to section 18(e) of the OIA as the document alleged to contain the information requested does not exist.
- question five, MPI has a contract with Trident Systems. Trident has subcontracted SnapIT to manage the review of the footage and regular reports to project stakeholders. Any involvement and/or participation of other companies would be managed by Trident.
- question six, the Trident camera system is currently being used to provide 100% coverage in the SNA1 trawl fishery. If any other vessels are using this system that would be an industry initiative.
- question seven, the introduction of IEMRS capabilities will require a number of regulatory changes, including to require the installation of cameras on vessels. MPI will shortly be releasing a document seeking comment on a range of possible regulatory amendments.

You have the right under section 28(3) of the OIA to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of our decision to refuse your request.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter McCarthy', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Peter McCarthy
Chief Legal Adviser