



CCSBT-EC/1010/10

REPORT FROM THE 2010 JOINT TUNA RFMO WORKSHOPS

Purpose

To consider the outcomes of the four joint Tuna RFMO workshops that were held during 2010.

Discussion

Four joint tuna RFMO workshops were held during 2010, these being:

- Joint tuna RFMO meeting of experts to share best practices on the provision of scientific advice (Barcelona, May/ June, 2010).
- International workshop on improvement, harmonisation and compatibility of monitoring, control and surveillance measures, including monitoring catches from catching vessel to markets (Barcelona, June 2010).
- International workshop on tuna RFMO management of issues relating to bycatch (Brisbane, June 2010).
- International workshop on RFMO management of tuna fisheries (Brisbane, June/July 2010).

The reports from these workshops are provided as four separate meeting documents (CCSBT-EC/1010/Info01, CCSBT-CC/1010/Info01, CCSBT-EC/1010/Info02 and CCSBT-EC/1010/Info03). Two common themes in the recommendations from the workshops were the importance of accurate data and the need for capacity building for developing States.

The recommendations from the four workshops are at **Attachments A to D** respectively. Across the four reports there are a total of 75 recommendations. The majority of recommendations from the workshops have either been met by the CCSBT, are under consideration, have been listed for consideration in the draft strategic plan, or are not relevant to the CCSBT's circumstances. However, there also many recommendations that require separate consideration.

The reports of the first two workshops (Provision of scientific advice and Harmonisation of MCS measures) will be considered by the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) and Compliance Committee (CC) prior to the meeting of the Extended Commission (EC), so the EC can be advised on these matters by the outcomes of the ESC and CC meetings.

It would be appropriate for the recommendations from the Bycatch Workshop to be examined by the CCSBT's Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG). However, this group might not meet till early 2012, so an interim examination of the recommendations relating to bycatches at **Attachment C** is appropriate. CCSBT has already commenced progressing some of the issues that are the subject of recommendations from the Bycatch Workshop, but it still has considerable progress to make. Two recommendations that may be appropriate for early attention¹ are "2" in relation to standards for bycatch data collection and "8" in relation to mandatory reporting requirements for bycatch. These two recommendations can be linked with the CCSBT's 2008 ERS Recommendation that:

¹ Possibly for intersessional work in advance of the next ERSWG meeting.

“Members and Cooperating Non-Members will collect and report data on ecologically related species to the Extended Commission and/or its subsidiary bodies as appropriate, including the Ecologically Related Species Working Group”

No data collection standards or reporting requirements have been specified by the CCSBT. Hence, no bycatch data² has been reported to CCSBT apart from that in national reports and this hinders analyses of the SBT fishery’s impact on ERS.

The Bycatch Workshop also recommended that:

“As a matter of priority, establish a joint T-RFMO technical working group to promote greater cooperation and coordination among RFMOs with the attached Terms of Reference. The RFMOs are encouraged to expedite the formation of the joint working group”

The Terms of Reference for this working group (WG) are provided at **Attachment E**. The WG is intended to be small in nature, with only 2-3 representatives from each RFMO. The Extended Commission should consider possible candidates for the CCSBT representatives of the group. This could include the next Chair of the ERSWG provided that the Chair is nominated well before the next meeting of the ERSWG³.

The last of the four joint tuna RFMO workshops was about management of tuna fisheries and had a heavy focus on direct management of capacity. Six of the recommendations from this workshop related to management of capacity (1, 3, 4, 5, 11 and 15). However, CCSBT has used a TAC and national allocations of the TAC as its primary management tool and has let its Members decide on the appropriate capacity for taking their allocation of the TAC. Consequently, within the CCSBT’s draft Strategic Plan, issues related to the management of capacity have been given a low priority and most issues are not scheduled for action until 2013. Therefore, the Extended Commission should consider to what extent it wishes to implement the recommendations of the Management Workshop relating to capacity and whether it wishes to revise the related priorities in the draft Strategic Plan. Regardless of this, it is worth noting that if required, the Secretariat could implement the first recommendation (developing a publicly available authorised and active vessel list) using data from the Catch Documentation Scheme with little difficulty⁴.

Apart from the recommendations about capacity, the only recommendation from the Management Workshop that is not in place or being pursued by the CCSBT is part of recommendation “6” in relation to cross checking of data with “market landings and processing establishment data under the competency of tuna RFMOs”. However, comparisons of total catch data from annual national reports, monthly catch reports and TIS/CDS are presented to the Compliance Committee for its consideration.

Finally, in relation to recommendation “2” of the Management Workshop, it is worth noting that the tuna RFMO Secretariats have agreed on an alternative way of progressing assignment of unique vessel identifiers⁵ to enable a regularly updated global list of tuna vessels to be maintained and intend to hold a meeting of database experts in February 2011 to facilitate this process.

Prepared by the Secretariat

² With the exception of commercial catch effort data from Australia, New Zealand and Taiwan which includes catches of some species other than SBT.

³ Paper CCSBT-EC/1010/11 includes a suggestion that the ERSWG Chair be appointed for a term of at least two meetings and well in advance of the next meeting in order to progress issues in advance of the meeting.

⁴ An “active authorised vessel” could be defined as any authorised vessel that caught any SBT in the previous year according to data from the CDS.

⁵ The original approach involved Lloyds Register-Fairplay and required the RFMOs to collect additional information for vessels in their authorised vessel records. However, none of the tuna RFMOs have made progress in that area.

**Recommendations from the
Meeting of Experts to share Best Practices on the Provision of Scientific Advice**

Routine data collected by year: Catch, effort and size data

1. All members of t-RFMOs are called upon to give a top priority to the provision of data of good quality in a timely manner, according to the existing mandatory data requirements of tuna RFMOs, in order to facilitate the work of tuna RFMOs scientific bodies in the provision of scientific advice based on the most recent information.
2. Lags in the submission of fishery data should be reduced making a full use of communication technologies (e.g. web based) and efforts should be undertaken that basic data formats are harmonized.
3. Efforts should be undertaken so that basic data used in stock assessment (catch, effort and sizes by flag and time/area strata) provided by members should be made available via the websites of tuna RFMOs or by other means.
4. Fine scale operational data should be made available in a timely manner to support stock assessment work, and confidentiality concerns should be addressed through RFMOs rules and procedures for access protection and security of data.
5. Tuna RFMOs should ensure adequate sampling for catch, effort and size composition across all fleets and especially distant water longliners for which this information is becoming limited.
6. Tuna RFMOs should cooperate to improve the quality of data, in particular for methods to estimate: (1) species and size composition of tunas caught by purse seiners and by artisanal fisheries and (2) catch and size of farmed tunas.
7. Tuna RFMOs should use alternative sources of data, notably observer and cannery data, to both validate the information routinely reported by Parties and estimate catches from non-reporting fleets.

Biological data

8. Regular large scale tagging programs should be developed, along with appropriate reporting systems, to estimate natural mortality growth and movement patterns by sex, and other fundamental parameters for stock assessments.
9. Archival tagging should be an ongoing activity of tagging programs as it provides additional insights into tuna behavior and vulnerability.
10. Spatial aspects of assessment should be encouraged within all tuna RFMOs in order to substantiate spatial management measures.
11. The use of high-resolution spatial ecosystem modeling frameworks should be encouraged in all tuna RFMOs since they offer the opportunity to better integrate biological features of tuna stocks and their environment.

Stock assessment

12. Tuna RFMOs should promote peer reviews of their stock assessment works.
13. Tuna RFMOs should use more than one stock assessment model and avoid the use of assumption-rich models in data-poor situations.
14. Chairs of Scientific Committees should jointly develop checklists and minimum standards for stock assessments.

Communication by tuna RFMOs

15. Standardized executive summaries should be developed for consideration by all tuna RFMOs to summarize stock status and management recommendations. These summaries should be discussed and proposed by the chairs of the Scientific Committees at Kobe 3.

16. The application of the Kobe 2 strategy matrix should be expanded and applied primarily to stocks for which sufficient information is available.
17. Tuna RFMOs should develop mechanisms to deliver timely and adequate information on their scientific outcomes to the public.
18. All documents, data and assumptions related to past assessments undertaken by tuna RFMOs should be made available in order to allow evaluation by any interested stakeholder.

Enhanced cooperation between tuna RFMOs

19. Chairs of Scientific Committees should establish an annotated list of common issues that could be addressed jointly by tuna RFMOs and prioritize them for discussion at the Kobe 3 meeting.
20. Tuna RFMOs should actively cooperate with programs integrating ecosystem and socio-economic approaches such as CLIOTOP to support the conservation of multi-species resources.

Capacity-building

21. Where determined by a Tuna RFMO, a review of the effectiveness of capacity-building assistance already provided should be undertaken. Reviews of tuna scientific management capacity in developing countries, within the framework of the respective RFMO may also be conducted at their request.
22. Developed countries should strengthen in a sustained manner their financial and technical support for capacity-building in developing countries, notably small island developing States, on the basis of adequate institutional arrangements in those countries and making full use of local, sub-regional and regional synergies.
23. Tuna RFMOs should have assistance funds that cover various forms of capacity-building (e.g. training of technicians and scientists, scholarships and fellowships, attendance to meetings, institutional building, development of fisheries).
24. Tuna RFMOs, if necessary, should ensure regular training of technicians for collecting and processing of data for developing states, notably those where tuna is landed.
25. The structural weaknesses in the receiving mechanism for capacity building within a country should be improved by working closely with Tuna RFMOs.

Recommendations from the Workshop on Improvement, Harmonisation and Compatibility of Monitoring, Control and surveillance Measures, including Monitoring Catches from Catching Vessel to Markets

The participants in the Kobe II Workshop on MCS held in Barcelona, Spain from June 3-5, 2010 recommended the following to tuna RFMOs, and requested that such RFMOs report on their actions towards these recommendations at the Kobe III Meeting scheduled for 2011:

VMS

1. Where they do not already exist, establish standards for the format (see attached ICCAT format as an example), content, structure and frequency of VMS messages; and
2. Ensure there are no gaps in geographic coverage in regional VMS programs, and all relevant vessel types and sizes participate in VMS programs while on the high seas.

Transshipment

3. Cooperate with other tuna RFMOs to standardize transshipment Declaration forms so that they use, to the maximum extent possible, the same format and include the same required data fields, as well as develop minimum standards for the timeframes by which such Declarations are submitted to RFMO Secretariats, flag States, coastal States, and port States.
4. Establish that advance notifications must be provided to the relevant tuna RFMO Secretariat for those high seas transshipment activities that are permitted by that RFMO's measures (for example, 36 hours in advance of the transshipment operation taking place).

Observers

5. RFMOs are encouraged to support the establishment of regional observer programs which could be built on existing national programs. It is the responsibility of each RFMO to clearly establish the purpose and scope of the information collected by its regional observer program, such as whether it will be used to support scientific or monitoring functions, or both, and then define the specific observer tasks and duties appropriate for that particular purpose and scope.
6. There are specific aspects of observer programs that could benefit from the development of minimum standards or procedures that if utilized by tuna RFMOs could promote comparable observer-generated data.
7. Where appropriate and practical, subject all gear types in high seas fishing operations to observer coverage while adopting a minimum of 5% coverage as an initial level. Observer coverage rates should be evaluated and may be adjusted depending on the scope and objectives of each observer program or particular conservation and management measures.
8. Where appropriate, develop agreements such that RFMO-authorized high seas observers can operate effectively in the various ocean basins covered by other RFMOs with a view to avoiding duplication of observers. Such observer programs will provide required data to the RFMO in whose area the fishing operations take place.
9. Exchange information and examples of the standards developed in each program. These should include:
 - a. Training material and procedures;
 - b. On-board reference materials;
 - c. Health and safety issues;
 - d. Rights, and responsibilities of vessel operators, masters, crew and observers;

- e. Data collection, storage and dissemination including where appropriate between RFMOs;
- f. Debriefing protocols and procedures;
- g. Reporting formats – especially for target and by-catch species;
- h. Basic qualifications and experience of observers.

Catch Documentation Schemes (CDS)

- 10. Establish or expand the use of CDS to fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species and sharks not currently covered by an existing CDS and to which current conservation and management measures apply, taking into account the specific characteristics and circumstances of each RFMO.
- 11. Ensure compatibility between new or expanded CDS and existing certification schemes already implemented by coastal, port and importing States.
- 12. Develop a common/harmonized form for use across RFMOs and the use of electronic systems and tags to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and utility of a CDS.
- 13. Take into account fish caught by purse seine fisheries and delivered to processing plants when implementing an expanded CDS.
- 14. Consider a tagging system for fresh and chilled products to improve the implementation of new or expanded CDS.
- 15. Develop a simplified CDS form to cover catches by artisanal fisheries that are exported (see Appendix 3, EU form that could serve as an example).
- 16. Provide technical assistance and capacity building support to assist developing countries in implementing existing CDSs and any expanded CDS, including ensuring that capacity building funds that currently exist in RFMOs can be used for this purpose.

Port State Measures

- 17. Encourage RFMO Members to consider signing and ratifying the FAO Port State Measures Agreement at their earliest opportunity.
- 18. Where they do not already exist, where appropriate, adopt port State control measures that are consistent with the FAO Port State Measures Agreement, and that take into account the specific characteristics and circumstances of each RFMO.

Data

- 19. When useful to support scientific and MCS purposes, cooperate with other tuna RFMOs to develop protocols for exchanging data, including provisions for data confidentiality.

Recommendations from the Workshop on Tuna RFMO Management of Issues Relating to Bycatch

Participants in the Kobe II Bycatch Workshop support bringing the following recommendations forward to the respective RFMOs as regards bycatch across five taxa (seabirds, sea turtles, finfish, marine mammals, and sharks):

Improving assessment of bycatch within T-RFMOs

1. RFMOs should assess the impact of fisheries for tuna, tuna like and other species covered by the conventions on bycatch by taxon using the best available data.
2. RFMOs should consider adopting standards for bycatch data collection which, at a minimum, allows the data to contribute to the assessment of bycatch species population status and evaluation of the effectiveness of bycatch measures. The data should allow the RFMOs to assess the level of interaction of the fisheries with bycatch species.
3. Encourage the participation of appropriate scientists in relevant T-RFMO working groups to conduct and evaluate bycatch assessments and proposed mitigation strategies.
4. Implement/enhance observer and port sampling programs with sufficient coverage to quantify/estimate bycatch and require timely reporting to inform mitigation needs and support conservation and management objectives, addressing practical and financial constraints.

Improving ways to mitigate/reduce bycatch within T-RFMO

5. RFMO measures should reflect adopted international agreements, tools and guidelines to reduce bycatch, including the relevant provisions of the FAO Code of Conduct, the IPOAs for Seabirds and Sharks, the FAO guidelines on sea turtles, the best practice guidelines for IPOAS for seabirds, and the precautionary approach and ecosystem approaches.
6. For populations of concern including those evaluated as depleted, RFMOs should develop and adopt immediate, effective management measures, for example, prohibition as appropriate on retention of such species where alternative effective sustainability measures are not in place.
7. Evaluate the effectiveness of current bycatch mitigation measures, and their impact on target species catch and management, and identify priorities for action and gaps in implementation, including enforcement of current measures and capacity building needs in developing states.
8. Seek binding measures or strengthen existing mitigation measures, including the development of mandatory reporting requirements for bycatch of all five taxa across all gear types and fishing methods where bycatch is a concern; and
9. Identify research priorities, including potential pilot projects to further develop and evaluate the effectiveness of current or proposed bycatch mitigation measures, working with fishers, fishing industry, IGOs and NGOs, universities and others as appropriate, and facilitate a full compendium of information regarding mitigation techniques or tools currently in use, e.g. building on the WCPFC Bycatch Mitigation Information System.
10. Due to the conservation status of certain populations and in accordance with priorities in the RFMO areas, expedite action on reducing bycatch of threatened and endangered species.

11. Adopt the following principles as the basis for developing best practice on bycatch avoidance and mitigation measures and on bycatch conservation and management measure.
 - binding,
 - clear and direct,
 - measureable,
 - science-based,
 - ecosystem-based,
 - ecologically efficient (reduces the mortality of bycatch),
 - practical and safe,
 - economically efficient,
 - holistic,
 - collaboratively developed with industry and stakeholders, and
 - fully implemented.

Improving cooperation and coordination across RFMOs

12. As a matter of priority, establish a joint T-RFMO technical working group to promote greater cooperation and coordination among RFMOs with the attached Terms of Reference. The RFMOs are encouraged to expedite the formation of the joint working group.
13. Actively develop collaborations between relevant fishing industry, IGOs and NGOs, universities and others as appropriate, and RFMOs to assess the impact of bycatch on the five taxa, study the effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures, and further the understanding of population dynamics of species of conservation concern; and
14. Develop the long-term capacity of T-RFMOs to coordinate and cooperate for data collection, assessment of bycatch, outreach, education, and observer training, including establishing a process to share information on current bycatch initiatives and potential capacity building activities.
15. RFMOs are encouraged to report progress to Kobe III on the formation and on progress against the recommendations in part I and II of this workshop report.

Capacity Building for Developing Countries

16. Acknowledging the additional or new requirements of bycatch mitigation and the need to build further capacity for implementation, in carrying out the recommendations in I, II, and III above, consider capacity building programs for developing countries to assist in their implementation. Establish a list of existing capacity building programs related to bycatch issues (see attached Appendix 2 for example) to avoid duplication where possible and facilitate coordination of new capacity building programs.

Recommendations from the Workshop on RFMO Management of Tuna Fisheries

RFMOs should, as a matter of urgency:

1. Develop publicly available authorised and active vessel⁶ lists for all gears. These lists will include small-scale fishing vessels that are capable of catching significant amounts of fish under the competency of tuna RFMOs.
2. Encourage secretariats to continue their work on the global list of tuna vessels, including the assignment of a unique vessel identifier.
3. As appropriate, RFMOs include only vessels on their active vessel⁶ register in any scheme for reducing capacity by eliminating vessels.
4. Review existing capacity against the best available scientific advice on sustainable levels of catch and implement measures to address any overcapacity identified.
5. Each tuna RFMO consider implementing where appropriate a freeze on fishing capacity on a fishery by fishery basis. Such a freeze should not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries by developing coastal States.
6. All RFMOs establish strong requirements for the provision of accurate data and information to secretariats so that the status of tuna stocks can be accurately assessed. All RFMO members and cooperating non-members should make a firm commitment to provide these data on a timely basis, and it should be cross-checked with market, landings and processing establishment data under the competency of tuna RFMOs.
7. Develop a consistent enforceable regime for sanctions and penalties, to be applied to RFMO members and non-members and their vessels that breach the rules and regulations developed and implemented by RFMOs.
8. Ensure that the effectiveness of all conservation and management measures is not undermined by exemption or exclusion clauses.
9. Ensure that all conservation and management measures are implemented in a consistent and transparent manner and are achieving their management goals.
10. Review and strengthen their MCS framework to improve the integrity of their management regime and measures.

RFMOs should, in the medium term:

11. Develop measures of capacity and, in the absence of an agreed capacity definition, adopt the FAO definition “The amount of fish (or fishing effort) that can be produced over a period of time (e.g. a year or a fishing season) by a vessel or a fleet if fully utilised and for a given resource condition.”
12. Ensure that all stocks maintained at sustainable and optimal levels through science-based measures.
13. Review and develop management regimes, based *inter alia* on the concept of fishing rights for fisheries under the RFMOs’ competence.
14. Consider using right-based management approaches and other approaches as part of a 'tool box' to address the aspirations of developing states, overfishing, overcapacity and allocation.
15. The tuna RFMOs should ensure a constant exchange of information with regard to the capacity of fleets operating within their zones as well as the mechanisms to manage this capacity. Kobe III will provide an opportunity for the tuna RFMOs to provide an update on progress with these issues.

⁶ The definition of ‘active vessel’ is to be determined by individual RFMOs.

Bycatch Joint Technical Working Group: Terms of Reference

The Bycatch Joint Technical Working Group (WG) should be small in nature so as to work more efficiently (e.g. 2-3 representatives from each Tuna RFMO). The WG will support, streamline, and seek to harmonize the bycatch related activities of Ecosystems/Bycatch working groups. The WG will have the ability, where necessary, to consult and work with other experts including those from fishing industry, IGOs and NGOs. The findings / recommendations of the WG will be considered by each RFMO, including, as appropriate, their technical bodies, in accordance with the procedures of each RFMO. The RFMOs may provide feedback to the WG as necessary. To the extent possible, the WG will meet electronically.

Terms of Reference:

1. Identify, compare and review the data fields and collection protocols of logbook and observer bycatch data being employed by each Tuna RFMO. Provide guidance for improving data collection efforts (e.g., information to be collected) and, to the extent possible, the harmonization of data collection protocols among Tuna RFMOs.
2. Identify species of concern that, based on their susceptibility to fisheries and their conservation status, require immediate action across Tuna RFMOs. Review all available information on these species and identify their data needs.
3. Review and identify appropriate qualitative and quantitative species population status determination methods for bycatch species.
4. Review data analyses to identify all fishery and non-fishery (e.g. oceanographic and physical) factors contributing to bycatch, taking into account the confidentiality rules of each RFMO.
5. Review existing bycatch mitigation measures including those adopted by each Tuna RFMO and consider new mitigation research findings to assess the potential utility of such measures in areas covered by other Tuna RFMOs taking into consideration differences among such areas.
6. Review and compile information on bycatch research that has been already conducted or is currently underway to delineate future research priorities and areas for future collaboration.
7. The duration of the WG will depend on the needs and requests of the Tuna RFMOs