

STATEMENT OF DECISION

APPLICATION FOR THE GRANT OF AN AQUACULTURE LICENCE

File Number: fA36816
Applicant: Fremantle Seaweed Pty Ltd
Application Date: 31st August 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

Fremantle Seaweed Pty Ltd (FS) is a company established for the purpose of seaweed aquaculture, predominately *Asparagopsis* spp. The company's vision is to culture seaweed as a contributor to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and therefore contribute to a climate change solution; and to use extracts of other seaweed species for alternate purposes such as pharmaceuticals.

Details of the Licence variation application

On 31 August 2021, FS 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, FS seeks to culture the following species:

<i>Asparagopsis armata</i>	Gelidiaceae
<i>Asparagopsis taxiformis</i>	<i>Gracilaria preissiana</i>
<i>Caulerpa lentillifera</i>	<i>Porphyria lucasii</i>
<i>Cladosiphon filum</i>	<i>Pterocladia lucida</i>
Dumontiaceae, <i>Gigartina</i> spp.	<i>Solieria robusta</i>
<i>Ecklonia radiata</i>	<i>Ulva lactuca</i>

<i>Eucheuma speciosum/Betaphycus speciosus</i>	<i>Sargassum spp.</i>
--	-----------------------

FS has also submitted an aquaculture lease application for a 32-hectare site located north of Cockburn Sound and south of Fremantle on Success Bank. (**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 that was undertaken.

I have read and considered **Attachment 2**. 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, it is evident FS directors have backgrounds in business, project management, engineering and horticulture. FS has indicated it will collaborate with research institutions such as Murdoch University to develop scientific knowledge in the emerging industry of seaweed aquaculture. Currently, technical knowledge on seaweed aquaculture within Australia is developing.

- Honesty

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

- Ability

FS is proposing to culture and harvest seaweed for use as a feed supplement for livestock, which purportedly can reduce methane production by cattle by up to 90% when added as a 2% feed additive. The concept of using extracts from *Asparagopsis* for that purpose is supported by FutureFeed and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). Partnership with

research institutions will assist in the research and development of cultivating *Asparagopsis* spp. Extracts from other seaweed species will be marketed to the bioplastic, fertiliser and pharmaceutical industries. FS has identified a staged development plan from the first production to full-scale commercial aquaculture operations, including laboratory cultivation and a processing facility. Among other outcomes, the successful implementation of the project intends to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

With respect to the matter of persons acting on behalf of the licence holder, FS 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” FS, so FS cannot authorise independent contractors or “lessees” to carry out aquaculture.

Based on my consideration of the matters set out above and the information that is before me, on balance, I consider FS is “fit and proper” to hold a licence to conduct aquaculture of the proposed seaweed species at the Success Bank site in Cockburn Sound.

(b) Tenure

FS has submitted an aquaculture lease application for the proposed site under s.97 of the Act.

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

(c) Better interests

For its full-scale commercial operations, FS will employ a team of aquaculture specialists and assistants expanding from two directors up to 10 employees. FS will collaborate with research institutions contributing to the scientific knowledge of culturing emerging seaweed aquaculture species. FS will be contributing to the reduction of global greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, through the production of *Asparagopsis* spp. intended for the cattle feed industry that is aimed at reducing methane in livestock production. FS has identified several other partnerships that will assist in expanding the *Asparagopsis* spp. production industry. FS is a member of ACWA and the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce.

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, FS's aquaculture operation 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 introduction and spread of diseases and pests.

a. Disease introduction

I am confident in the ability of FS to detect known disease agents.

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 being introduced into to be low.

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

FS proposes to collect broodstock from local seaweed populations. Collection amounts will be made according to current seaweed aquaculture policy and following biosecurity conditions posed under a Ministerial Broodstock Exemption.

I consider the threat of disease being introduced to Success Bank 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.

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

FS will use longlines and structures known as growth panels. The proposed site is mostly located over sand to mitigate impact on benthic communities. Where anchors are required, FS will use an anchorage system designed to reduce impact to the benthos. The growth panels will have adequate space between the rows for vessel access and to allow light to reach any benthic communities that may be present.

FS is committed to adhering to the ACWA *Environmental Code of Practice for the Sustainable Management of Western Australia's Abalone Aquaculture Industry* for entanglement of marine mammals.

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 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 FS 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. FS have identified an environmental monitoring program that includes temperature, macroalgal health monitoring and percentage of available light. FS has also committed to carrying out seagrass health surveys of surrounding wild populations with identified response thresholds.

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 comprehensive stakeholder consultation. FS liaised directly with stakeholders that may have been impacted by the proposal. As a result of this consultation, the site was reduced from an initial request for 100 hectares to 32 hectares.

The proposed project will have minimal negative impact on visual amenity and 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

FS has submitted a MEMP in respect of its application for an aquaculture licence (**Attachment 3**). I have considered the contents of the MEMP and am satisfied that FS will manage environmental and biosecurity issues according to the standards set out in the document.

As such, I approve the MEMP provided by FS.

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 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 Success Bank, Cockburn Sound 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 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.

Seaweed aquaculture in Western Australia is an emerging industry and policy development for this sector is currently in an interim phase. It is expected that the MEMP may undergo a full review two years from the date of approval. The review will ensure the MEMP meets all necessary environmental monitoring parameters to maintain sustainability and ensure environmental risk is mitigated as the seaweed aquaculture industry grows.

FS acknowledges its environmental responsibilities and aims to align with the Cockburn Sound Management Council as reflected in *State Environment (Cockburn Sound) Policy, 2015*. FS has presented an aquaculture proposal that aims to minimise any potential environmental impacts and adhering to conditions set out in an aquaculture licence and by means of the reporting and monitoring as set out in the MEMP.

The company demonstrates its strong environmental sustainability focus through its business objectives and values, which identify seaweed aquaculture as contributing to a climate change solution.

Baseline surveys have identified nearby seagrass meadows; however, the proposed site is predominantly located over sand. FS will use an anchoring system designed to minimise impact on the benthic environment. Proposed seaweed growth panels will have adequate space between them to reduce impact of any potential shading of benthic communities. FS has identified an environmental monitoring program that includes monitoring light availability and benthic mapping. Should environmental monitoring detect an impact on the surrounding benthos, appropriate response protocols have been identified in the MEMP. Only seaweeds that naturally occur in the area will be cultured and the MEMP has allowed for a risk assessment to be carried out regarding stocking density of all species on the licence, their compatibility with

each other and any potential impact to the wild populations. Because there will be no supplementary feeding, changes to the surrounding water chemistry will be minimal.

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 licence 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. FS liaised directly with stakeholders that may have been impacted by the proposal. Pursuant to the consultation, the area of the site was reduced from an initial request for 100 hectares to 32 hectares. The boundaries of the proposed 32-hectare site have been set to mitigate impact on navigation and nearby octopus fishing grounds.

(e) The possible impact on navigation

The Department referred the proposal to the Department of Transport (DOT), 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*.

During DOT's assessment of the aquaculture proposal, it was identified that the proposed site at 100 hectares may have an impact on navigation for Yachting Western Australia (YWA)/Australian Sailing. DOT recommended that FS carry out stakeholder consultation with YWA. As stated above, earlier consultation resulted in a reduction of the site area to 32 hectares; ensuing, additional consultation resulted in further alignment of the boundaries of the proposed site to further mitigate impact to YWA navigation. YWA has provided DPIRD with a letter of approval for the proposed 32-hectare site, however it is noted that YWA would not support any increase beyond 32 hectares in the proposed aquaculture site.

(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.

The boundaries of the proposed site were reduced as a consequence of the stakeholder consultation. This risk has been addressed and mitigated in liaison with stakeholders to a satisfactory level that permits recreational fishing activities to continue in the area surrounding the proposed site.

(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.

FS carried out considerable stakeholder engagement to address concerns regarding impact on commercial octopus fishing grounds.

I have noted the following in respect of possible impact on commercial fishing.

Southern Seafood Producers WA Association ("SSPWA") did not support the proposal, commenting that the proposed area covers productive fishing grounds that have been historically fished for octopus and other species.

Following additional consultation with SSPWA and having regard for the most productive fishing areas, FS reduced the area of the proposed site from 100 to 32 hectares and positioned it closer to shore to minimise any impact on recognised, productive octopus fishing areas. In a WAFIC-facilitated meeting between FS and representatives from SSPWA, it was clear that a small portion of SSPWA members was still opposed to the aquaculture proposal even with the reduction in area and relocation of the proposed site. However, FS is committed to working closely with the affected commercial fishing operators and confident that both activities can co-exist with a low risk of fishing gear entanglement. Seaweed aquaculture has the potential to function as a fish attracting device and therefore possibly improve the local wild fishery.

SSPWA has confirmed it is unable to support the application and fishers strongly oppose introduction of any new operations that would displace licence holders

The process included consideration of internal DPIRD data, which demonstrated that the reduction of the proposed site from 100 hectares to 32 hectares significantly reduced the impact on productive fishing grounds in the area.

On balance, I am of the view that the smaller, revised 32-hectare site represents an appropriate balance between commercial fishing and aquaculture interests

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.

(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 minimal 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. Kite surfers and windsurfers as part of Fremantle Sailing Club were represented during consultation and provided support as part of the letter DPIRD received from YWA/Australian Sailing.

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 about aquaculture, in part by providing data pertaining to environmental impact of activities of this nature on the key identified environmental factors at this type of site; namely, the distribution and abundance of seaweed species, benthic communities and habitat, marine environmental quality, monitoring and marine fauna.

The science developed from the proposal would not only increase the efficiency of the commercial activity, but also provide a basis for adaptive management by the Department and assist further development of seaweed aquaculture policy.

(e) No impact on native title

There is no impact on Native Title.

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 FS over the licence conditions. The indicative (intended) substance of the licence conditions is as follows.

LICENCE CONDITIONS

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;

DPIRD Pathologist means the officer(s) occupying a Veterinary Pathologist or Aquatic Veterinary Pathologist position in the DPIRD's Diagnostics and Laboratory Services (DDLS); and

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

(1) 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.

1. 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*.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Marking and Lighting

- (1) Marking and lighting of the marine site must be installed and maintained in accordance with Category 3 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.

6. Aquaculture gear

- (1) Aquaculture gear must be used in such a way that it does not 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@dpiird.wa.gov.au) for guidance.

7. Use of aquaculture gear for the collection of seed stock

The licence holder must ensure that:

- (a) Collection of seedstock must only be from existing aquaculture gear within the boundary of the site as set down in Schedule 2 of this licence; and
- (b) accurate records are made and kept of the estimated weight and numbers of seed stock harvested from the aquaculture gear and make those records available to an authorised DPIRD Fisheries Officer at any time.

8. Record keeping

- (1) The licence holder must make accurate and timely records of –
 - (a) the aquaculture gear used at the site; and
 - (b) all mortalities at the site, both in total and as a percentage of total stock held at the site at the time.
- (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.

- (1) No aquaculture activity is to be conducted on or above any jetty unless a copy of the working load limit certificate is kept at the jetty for inspection at any time by any Fisheries and Marine Officer and the working load limit specified in the certificate is not being exceeded. The original certificate must be kept safe and secure as a record of compliance with this condition.

9. 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 imposing conditions referred to above, I have decided to grant an aquaculture licence to FS authorising the aquaculture of the seaweed species identified above at the specified site at Success Bank in Cockburn Sound.



Bruno Mezzatesta

**DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL
SUSTAINABILITY AND BIOSECURITY**

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

Dated this 21st 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*