



CCSBT-EC/1510/13

Development of a Revised CCSBT Strategic Plan

Purpose

To further develop the revised draft CCSBT Strategic Plan and to either finalise the revised Strategic Plan or agree on a process for its finalisation.

Background

CCSBT 21 agreed that development of a revised CCSBT Strategic Plan would be progressed at a three-day meeting of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG) during 2015. It was further agreed that New Zealand would prepare a first draft of the revised Strategic Plan for consideration by the SFMWG.

The SFMWG considered the draft Strategic Plan produced by New Zealand and produced a further revised draft, which is provided at **Attachment A**. Items highlighted inside square brackets require further consideration by Members to either confirm Members' positions or to consider further modifications of the text to enable agreement to be reached on those items.

The SFMWG noted that further consideration of the recommendations from the 2014 Performance Review would be required after the Extended Commission's subsidiary bodies have provided their comments on the Performance Review recommendations. Comments on the Performance Review recommendations from the Ecologically Related Species Working Group are provided at **Attachment B**. Comments from the Extended Scientific Committee are provided at **Attachment C**.

The SFMWG also noted that an Action Plan needs to be developed to provide a timeframe for implementation of the strategies within the Strategic Plan. A draft Action Plan, based on the strategies and priorities in the revised draft Strategic Plan, has been prepared by the Secretariat and is provided at **Attachment D** for consideration by the Extended Commission.

**Strategic Plan for the Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna**

2015 - 2020

DRAFT

June 2015

1. Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A strategic plan for the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna | 1 |
| The Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna | 1 |
| Origins | 1 |
| The role of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna | 1 |
| Membership of the Commission | 2 |
| The southern bluefin tuna fishery | 3 |
| Characterisation of the fishery | 3 |
| Status of the stock | 3 |
| Strategic issues | 4 |
| Performance review | 4 |
| Key challenges | 4 |
| 2. OBJECTIVE, VISION, AND GOALS | 8 |
| Convention objective | 8 |
| Vision and goals | 8 |
| A. Management of SBT | 8 |
| B. Operation/Administration of the Commission and Secretariat | 8 |
| C. Participation and implementation by Members, including Compliance | 8 |

Introduction

A strategic plan for the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna

This strategic plan outlines a common vision for how Members would like to see the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna in the future. Components of that vision include the state of the southern bluefin tuna stock; how the Commission operates to effectively manage the stock; and how Members are implementing their obligations and benefiting from their successful management of the stock.

A strategic plan outlines not only a desired future state, but also specific strategies and tasks associated with achieving the desired future state (even if achieving that state is a long term goal). A recent review of the Commission's performance provided many suggestions for ongoing performance improvements. A strategic plan allows these suggested actions to be incorporated, as appropriate, into future work plans. Suggested actions are prioritised so that the overall work plan is achievable.

[The performance review also recommended development of a management plan that would be complementary to the strategic plan and will provide a greater level of operational detail.]

Within this document, all references to 'Members' includes Cooperating Non-Members (CNMs) and all references to the 'Commission' includes the Extended Commission.

The Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna

Origins

Southern bluefin tuna (SBT) were heavily fished in the past, with annual catches reaching 80,000 tonnes in the early 1960s. Heavy fishing resulted in a significant decline in the numbers of mature fish, and the annual catch began to fall rapidly. In the mid-1980s it became apparent that a way of limiting catches was needed. To enable the SBT stocks to rebuild, the main nations fishing SBT at the time – Australia, Japan and New Zealand – began to apply strict quotas to their fishing fleets from 1985.

On 20 May 1994, the voluntary management arrangement between Australia, Japan and New Zealand was formalised when the Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna, which the three countries signed in May 1993, came into force.

The role of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna

The objective of the Convention is to ensure, through appropriate management, the conservation and optimum utilisation of southern bluefin tuna. The Convention created the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) and describes how it operates and functions. The functions of the CCSBT include—

- collecting information,
- deciding on a total allowable catch (TAC) and its allocation,
- deciding on additional measures including monitoring, control, and surveillance (MCS) measures considered necessary in order to achieve effective implementation of the Convention,

- agreeing an annual budget, and
- encouraging accession by other states.

The CCSBT meets annually. The CCSBT has five subsidiary bodies which provide advice on their areas of expertise—

- the Scientific Committee (SC)/Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) (along with other technical working groups that may be required to complete its work, such as the Operating Model and Management Procedure (OMMP) Technical Meeting),
- Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG),
- the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG),
- Compliance Committee (CC),
- the Finance and Administration Committee (FAC).

A panel of independent scientists attend ESC meetings and are able to provide advice directly to the CCSBT if required.

The Convention also provided for the establishment of the CCSBT Secretariat, which supports the running of the Commission. The Secretariat is based in Canberra, Australia. Staff include an Executive Secretary, Deputy Executive Secretary, a Data Manager, Compliance Manager, and an Administration Officer.

The Commission has adopted a relatively devolved mode of operation, with a small Secretariat staff and most core functions (such as provision of science and monitoring, control, and surveillance services) done directly by Members, sometimes in line with standards established by the Commission.

Membership of the Commission

Membership of the CCSBT is only open to States. To facilitate the participation of fishing entities, the CCSBT established by resolution the extended CCSBT (ECCSBT) and the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) in 2001 and revised the resolution in 2013 to accommodate REIOs. Membership of the ECCSBT and the ESC includes all parties to the Convention, fishing entities, and REIOs may also be admitted. The fishing entity of Taiwan was admitted in 2002. An application by the European Union to be admitted to the Extended Commission will be considered in 2015.

The ECCSBT and the ESC perform the same functions as the CCSBT and the SC respectively. Each Member has equal voting rights. Decisions of the ECCSBT that are reported to the CCSBT become decisions of the CCSBT unless the CCSBT agrees otherwise. Any decision of the Commission that affects the operation of the ECCSBT or the rights, obligations, or status of any individual Member within the ECCSBT should not be taken without prior due deliberation of that issue by the ECCSBT.

Currently the ECCSBT consists of six Members and three Cooperating Non-Members:

Members

- Australia
- Fishing entity of Taiwan (member of the ECCSBT only)
- Indonesia
- Japan
- New Zealand
- Republic of Korea

Cooperating Non-Members

- European Union
- Philippines
- South Africa

The southern bluefin tuna fishery

Characterisation of the fishery

The primary market for SBT is the Japanese Sashimi market, where premium prices can be obtained, largely because of the high fat content of SBT flesh.

The main methods used for catching SBT are longline fishing and purse seining.

Longlining involves using long lengths of fishing line with many hooks. The SBT caught are mainly frozen at very low temperatures (-60C) and either unloaded at intermediate ports and shipped to markets in Japan or unloaded directly at markets in Japan.

Purse seining involves using purse seine nets to enclose schools of SBT. This method is currently only used in the Australian SBT fishery. The enclosed schools of fish are towed to waters near the Australian mainland and placed in floating cages anchored to the ocean floor. The tuna are fattened for several months and sold direct to export markets as frozen or chilled fish.

Status of the stock

As noted above, the SBT stock was historically subject to high levels of fishing pressure and remains in a depleted state. CCSBT has adopted a Management Procedure – a pre-agreed set of rules that can specify changes to the TAC based on updated monitoring data – with the aim of rebuilding the stock based on scientific guidance on TAC setting.

The 2014 assessment suggested that the SBT stock remains at a very low state, estimated to be 9% of the initial spawning stock biomass, and well below the level required to produce maximum sustainable yield (MSY). There has been some improvement since the 2011 stock assessment, and fishing mortality is assessed as being below the level associated with MSY.

The 2014 assessment included sensitivity analysis around all sources of unaccounted catch mortality. The Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) noted that it appears that significant levels of unaccounted mortality may have occurred which were not considered in the design of the Management Procedure, and that if these levels are accurate, they would amount to exceptional circumstances because the probability of rebuilding under the Management Procedure will be well below what was intended by the Commission.

The ESC also noted that continuing to follow the Management Procedure as proposed does lead to continued rebuilding in the short term even if the circumstances of the hypothesised additional unaccounted mortality are true. Hence, the ESC advised the Commission to continue to follow the MP as formulated but, as a matter of urgency, to take steps to quantify all sources of unaccounted SBT mortality. If substantial levels of unaccounted mortality are confirmed, the ESC noted that there will be a need to retune the Management Procedure to achieve the COMMISSION's stated rebuilding

objective. In addition, the ESC advised that the EC take steps to ensure adherence to its TACs.

Strategic issues

This section highlights strategic issues facing the Commission that this plan will seek to address. These issues have been identified recently through a performance review; and through an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) facing the Commission (see page 9). This SWOT analysis helped highlight any other areas outside the performance review that might help the Commission in developing its strategic plan (see below).

Performance review

In 2008, a Performance Review Working Group made up of representatives from the Commission undertook a self-assessment of the Commission's performance, using the criteria adopted at the 2006 Joint Meeting of the five Tuna RFMOs in Kobe, Japan. An independent expert, United States Ambassador David Balton, reviewed the self-assessment.

The second Performance Review of the CCSBT was undertaken by Dr. Serge. M. Garcia, Chair of the IUCN Fisheries Expert Group, and Ms. Holly Koehler, Vice President for Policy and Outreach at the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF). The review assessed the progress made by the CCSBT since the first assessment, and its present performance against the best available international standards. This approach resulted in extensive recommendations which are shown in Appendix 1.

Key challenges

Taking into account the wide range of recommendations made by the performance reviews of the CCSBT, and the other strategic issues identified above, key challenges include:

- Providing for the rebuild of the SBT fishery to the level that can sustain maximum sustainable yields (stock re-building);
- Balancing the competing demands of those who harvest SBT against the biological demands of stock rebuilding (TAC setting and allocation);
- Ensuring all SBT mortalities are accounted for within national allocations, and unreported catches are prevented (compliance);
- Ensuring that all countries with an interest in SBT fisheries are cooperating with the Commission; and
- Ensuring CCSBT's systems and processes allow for the rights and responsibilities of all Members, and encourage cooperation from non-members (governance).
- Considering the special requirements and capacity building needs of developing Members and Cooperating Non-Members in terms of compliance with CCSBT obligations.

For the most part, CCSBT has chosen to adopt a decentralised model, where Members are responsible for undertaking their own science, administrative and monitoring processes (such as running national VMS and observer programmes). Further, due to the trans-regional nature of CCSBT, the CCSBT has chosen to apply, where appropriate, the rules of other RFMOs in conserving and managing the SBT fisheries

rather than developing stand-alone rules in a number of instances, for example, in its VMS resolution and recommendation on ERS. For similar reasons and to enable shared use of resources, the CCSBT has harmonised some of its decisions (e.g. for transshipments) with those of other tuna RFMOs too.

This mode of operation has both potential advantages (reduced Commission costs, flexibility of organisation to respond to changing circumstances), and potential disadvantages (such as unclear allocation of costs for some programmes such as scientific research, and difficulties in gaining agreement for larger-scale undertakings that need the cooperation of all Members). Where implementation of many important functions is devolved to Members (rather than being undertaken centrally or by shared service-providers, as in some other RFMOs), there is a much stronger need for clear roles, responsibilities, and performance standards to be set so that expectations on all Members are clear. This strategic plan, along with associated documents such as a management plan, compliance policy, and potentially a research plan, provide the opportunity to do so.

The CCSBT Convention was adopted in 1994, and as such it predates some more recent international agreements that set modern principles and/or standards for fisheries management, including the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA). Key principles of UNFSA include:

- Establishing general principles, including inter-alia precautionary approach, ecosystem-based management, and best scientific information available, for the conservation and management of the subject stocks.
- Requiring the application of the precautionary approach to fisheries conservation and management—calling on States to be more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable or inadequate.
- Requiring compatibility between conservation and management measures adopted for areas under national jurisdiction and those established in the adjacent high seas, so as to ensure conservation and management of fish stocks in their entirety.
- Strengthening the role of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations and arrangements.
- Strengthening the responsibility of flag States over fishing vessels flying their flag on the high seas.
- Ensuring effective mechanisms for compliance and enforcement of international conservation and management measures.
- Recognising the special requirements of developing countries in relation to conservation and management.
- Providing mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes between States Parties.

[Ensuring CCSBT's decision making practices are fit for purpose, noting that newer RFMOs established after UNFSA have adopted alternative decision making mechanisms. Whereas newer RFMOs established after UNFSA have experimented with adopting alternative decision-making frameworks that may make it easier to avoid an impasse, CCSBT's decision making is based on consensus.]

The CCSBT Convention was developed without consideration of the potential for developing State Member participation.

Objective: to ensure, through appropriate management, the conservation and optimum utilisation of southern bluefin tuna

| STRENGTHS | WEAKNESSES |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adoption of an agreed Management Procedure to guide global TAC setting - Well-regarded model for provision of science advice, including model-based stock assessment and Management Procedure - Decision-making components established (including Compliance Committee, Scientific Committee, annual meeting, centralised Secretariat) - Coordination with other Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) - Agreements reached on basic monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) components (e.g. catch documentation) and compliance policy, including specification of minimum performance requirements - A program of independent audits to assess the suitability of Members' systems and processes for ensuring compliance with the CCSBT measures - Competency for all areas in which SBT found - Agreed mechanism for controlling fishing for SBT (global Total Allowable Catch) - Scientific Committee is instructed to take the precautionary approach into account in its advice to the Commission. - Adoption of the common definition of attributable SBT catch, and an agreed timeframe for its implementation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current uncertainty regarding unaccounted mortalities, including those external to CCSBT Members - Funding constraints limit capacity to implement research programs over the next 2-5 years and requires further prioritisation of research - Currently SBT stock estimated to be less than 10% of virgin spawning stock biomass - History of failure to decide on and implement key management measures (e.g. TACs), in part due to limitations of consensus-based decision-making model - Information base for stock assessment and management requires strengthening, and all relevant data is not always available for assessment - Objective of Convention relates only to single species (SBT) and does not fully reflect the changing benchmark of international instruments and modern fisheries management expectations. - Members have not always met their obligations under the Convention, including implementing agreed measures, or have interpreted their obligations inconsistently - No specific provisions in the Convention for developing countries or for membership of fishing entities and REIOs - Challenges with improving monitoring and reporting on interactions with ERS - Lack of transparency in decision-making and subsidiary body processes - Not all countries with an interest in the SBT fishery are cooperating with the Commission |
| OPPORTUNITIES | THREATS (potential risks) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased value (economic, catch per unit effort, social) from stock at the biomass that supports maximum sustainable yields - Harmonisation with and improved access to reporting from other RFMOs to increase efficiencies and improve management - Taking advantage of developing concepts of best practice for fisheries management - Opportunity to incorporate modern principles and/or standards of fisheries management (e.g. precautionary approach, ecosystem-based management) - Developing innovative measures to allow more efficient fishing - Innovative and emerging new technologies for understanding the stock and traceability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing, including by non-members, particularly as catch rates increase through rebuilding and/or new markets for SBT develop - Overcapacity in global tuna fleets and pressures on other tuna stocks - Failure of Commission to adequately take into account scientific advice - Failure of Members to abide by their allocation of the global SBT TAC - Members or Member's fishing operations failing to comply with their other obligations- Disruption to industry caused by stock collapse - International community and market/consumer criticism of managing SBT stock at low biomass level and with insufficient management of its ecologically related species and ecosystem impacts |

- Agreement to better account for all SBT mortalities in assessment and management.
- Increasing transparency in decision-making processes to build trust with broader stakeholders, markets and consumers.
- Small membership offers potential for adoption of decisive actions

- Inability to sustain a robust Management Procedure that meets the CCSBT's objective to rebuild the stock
- Other RFMOs fail to cooperate with CCSBT

Objective, vision, and goals

This strategic plan sets out the objective of the Commission (as outlined in the Convention text). The plan also establishes a common vision for how Members would like to see the Commission in the future. Components of that vision include the state of the southern bluefin tuna stock; how the Commission operates to effectively manage the stock; and how Members are implementing their obligations and benefiting from their successful management of the stock. Each of these components is associated with specific **goals** – the desired future state of the Commission – and **strategies** – the suggested approach to achieving the desired future state.

Convention objective

The objective of the Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna is to ensure, through appropriate management, the conservation and optimum utilisation of southern bluefin tuna.

Vision and goals

A. Management of SBT

Southern bluefin tuna stocks are managed at a biomass level that supports the maximum sustainable yield, and the risks of fishing for SBT are mitigated

This category includes strategies concerning stock rebuilding, allocation, ecologically related species.

B. Operation/Administration of the Commission and Secretariat

The Commission is operating effectively and efficiently, to responsibly manage fishing for SBT

This category includes strategies for effective and efficient operation of Commission, its subsidiary bodies and Secretariat, including harmonisation with other RFMOs.

C. Participation and implementation by Members, including Compliance

Members are actively participating in management of SBT through the Commission, and implementing its decisions

This category includes strategies concerning MCS, sanctions, assistance to developing countries.

| A. Goals concerning management of SBT | |
|--|---|
| Goals | Strategies |
| 1. Re-building SBT | |
| 1.1 Stock is at a biomass level that supports the MSY <i>Priority: Very High</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) [Set target and limit reference points for rebuilding the SBT stock, and adopt strategies for achieving the target and avoiding the limit points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The interim target reference point is to rebuild the SBT stock to 20% of the original spawning biomass, with 70% probability, by 2035 ▪ The limit reference point is SSB_{2010} ▪ Assess the costs and benefits of alternative rebuilding strategies, including those that favour stock rebuilding over short-term catch increase] |
| 2. Sound scientific basis for setting TAC | |
| 2.1 A Management Procedure is used to provide guidance on TAC setting <i>Priority: Very High</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Scientific Committee review the function and inputs to the Management Procedure in 2016 and 2017 to ensure it will achieve rebuild targets and timeframes and thereafter at six yearly intervals (ii) Continue to use MP as input to setting global TAC (iii) Monitor stock status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of stock and fishery indicators (annual) ▪ In depth stock assessment (every 3 years) |
| 3. Quality and provision of scientific advice | |
| 3.1 Accurate verified data is provided to the Scientific Committee and Commission in a timely manner <i>Priority: Very High</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Continue to implement the High Level Code of Practise for Scientific Data Verification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See also goal 8 (monitoring, control and surveillance) (ii) [Develop enhanced rules for commercially confidential scientific data to encourage sharing of these data in order to harmonise activities with other RFMOs and improve the functioning of the Commission] (iii) Implement the definition of attributable catch agreed at the CCSBT 21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Members report accurate and complete data on all sources of mortality for SBT in accordance with the data provision rules. |
| 3.2 Science process provides best available independent advice for management decisions <i>Priority: Medium/High</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Maintain the independent chairs and advisory panel for the scientific process, but periodically review the number and skill sets of independent experts required (ii) Develop and agree a CCSBT research plan including Member-funded, collaborative and CCSBT-funded projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of CCSBT five year research plan ▪ Implement necessary scientific research by Commission and/or Members |
| 4. Ecologically related species | |
| 4.1 Risks to ecologically related species caused by fishing for SBT are identified and appropriately managed <i>Priority: Medium/High</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Implement the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on ERS of fishing for SBT, including collection and reporting of data on ERS (para 3), implementation of mitigation measures (para 2) and assessment of the risks caused by fishing for SBT (para 7) in each fishery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All Members implement the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on ERS of Fishing for SBT ▪ Review the implementation of the Recommendation on ERS |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide ERS data in line with agreed requirements for reporting of bycatch and mitigation measures used in each fishery ▪ Assess how well the mitigation measures adopted by other area-based RFMOs mitigate the risks caused by fishing [in order to determine the need for any additional or different measures when fishing for SBT] ▪ Where necessary, identify and adopt additional mitigation measures to manage risk taking into account the coordination and harmonisation with other RFMOs <p>(ii) Coordination and harmonization with area-based RFMOs, including on data reporting (see above)</p> <p>(iii) [Develop a policy and management strategy for ERS, adopting clear objectives as well as reference values or trends, limits and targets, against which performance could be assessed. Better use of observers would improve the efficiency of the policy.]</p> |
| <p>4.2 Predator and prey species which may affect the condition of the SBT stock are monitored</p> <p><i>Priority: Medium</i></p> | <p>(i) Instruct the ERSWG to monitor predator and prey species which may affect the condition of the SBT stock and report its findings to the Commission</p> |
| <p>4.3 Improve knowledge of SBT fisheries ecosystems</p> <p><i>Priority: To be agreed</i></p> | <p>(i) Promote research on ecosystem conditions that may affect the reproduction of SBT, with a view to improving knowledge of the effect of climate change on reproduction and recruitment of SBT.</p> |
| <p>5. Allocation</p> | |
| <p>5.1 The global TAC is allocated amongst Members, including new members, in accordance with Article 8(4) of the Convention</p> <p><i>Priority: Medium/high</i></p> | <p>(i) Continue to implement the Resolution on the Allocation of the Global Total Allowable Catch</p> <p>(ii) Establish principles for allocation to Members, following Article 8(4) of the Convention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop options (based on Convention text) for long term allocation arrangements for all Members, including new members, and apply to TAC increases or decreases |
| <p>6 Flexible management arrangements</p> | |
| <p>6.1 The SBT resource is harvested in an optimal manner, and Members have incentives to comply with TACs</p> <p><i>Priority: High</i></p> | <p>(i) In the longer term, implement flexible management arrangements such as quota trading and under and over fishing rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Resolution on Limited Carry-forward of Unfished Annual Total Allowable Catch of Southern Bluefin Tuna allows for some flexibility ▪ Implement the Corrective Actions Policy (Compliance Policy Guideline 3) if needed to respond to overcatch ▪ As appropriate, conduct trading between Members |
| <p>6.2 SBT fishing capacity is commensurate with fishing opportunities</p> <p><i>Priority: Low/Medium</i></p> | <p>(i) Monitor capacity in the fishery in relation to available catches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flag states/fishing entities to complete self-assessments of capacity with respect to national allocations. Flag State/fishing entity to take corrective action if required ▪ Secretariat continue to manage the CCSBT active vessel list ▪ Assess threats to SBT from overcapacity in other fleets |

B. Goals concerning Operation/Administration of Commission and Secretariat

| Goals | Strategies |
|---|--|
| <i>7. Operation of the Commission</i> | |
| <p>7.1 The Commission is running effectively and efficiently</p> <p><i>Priority: High</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Streamline Commission processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify ways to streamline Commission processes (including annual and subsidiary meetings) (ii) Review the costs and benefits of changing the current chairing arrangements for CCSBT including consideration of longer term appointments to ensure full year availability of a Chair for support, decision making and continuity (iii) Coordinate services amongst Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (e.g. transshipment management, management of ERS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instruct the Secretariat to identify opportunities for services to be coordinated amongst Regional Fisheries Management Organisations and to provide suggestions to the Commission (iv) Undertake Commission performance reviews periodically to routinely assess opportunities for improvements, including both self-assessment and independent reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree on regular reviews of Commission performance (including timeframes, running and funding of the review, criteria (including any changes proposed through the joint tuna RFMO process), involvement of independent experts, and links between review outcomes and the CCSBT strategic plan) |
| <p>7.2 The Commission is running in an open and transparent manner</p> <p><i>Priority: Medium</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Clearly document the reasons for decisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement a rule that the Commission must clearly document the rationale for decisions, including where they differ from the science advice provided to the Commission ▪ Ensure past Commission decisions are readily accessible (ii) Continue with open publication of Commission documents in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of CCSBT (iii) Continue to allow access to observers in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of CCSBT (iv) Consider the need to improve transparency of the decision making processes by minimising the use of Heads of Delegation meetings |
| <p>7.3 Modern fisheries management principles and/or standards (e.g. precautionary approach, ecosystem-based management, best scientific information available) are incorporated into the Convention and, where appropriate, in the Commission's decisions</p> <p><i>Priority: Medium</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Review Convention text (if Member/s propose such negotiations) and, where appropriate, incorporate through decisions of the Commission e.g. in reviewing Management Procedure; measures to manage ERS (noting the latter option may be more efficient) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review parameters for the Management Procedure that ensure the precautionary approach is applied and ecosystem-based management is incorporated ▪ Task the SC with incorporating modern fisheries management principles and/or standards that have not yet been included in its work ▪ Review decisions of the Commission to ensure principles and standards are incorporated (ii) Formalise the ongoing role of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG), including to ensure modern fisheries management standards are incorporated into the Commission's decision making. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Clearly define the on-going role of the SFMWG, its terms of reference and its chairing arrangements▪ Include provision in the terms of reference for the SFMWG for incorporating modern fisheries management standards into its advice to the Commission |
|--|---|

C. Goals concerning participation and implementation by Members

Goals

Strategies

8. Monitoring, control, and surveillance

8.1 Integrated, targeted and cost-effective monitoring, control and surveillance measures are in place to ensure the Commission's goals are met

Priority: High

- (i) Implementation by Members of agreed MCS measures
 - Maintain the list of the Commission's conservation and management measures contained in the CCSBT's "Minimum performance requirements to meet CCSBT Obligations" and review Members against these obligations at the Compliance Committee and through independent audits to obtain accurate data on all fisheries
 - Continue to use standards and procedures to ensure data integrity (e.g. certain percentage of complete correct documentation accompanying landings and export/domestic sales; certain percentage of inspection)
- (ii) Implement Compliance Plan
 - Assess the necessity of additional MCS measures and/or improvement of agreed MCS measures to meet Commission objectives (e.g. eliminate unreported catch and have accurate verified data)
 - Identify any gaps between MCS measures in place and any improvements or additional measures required and a process to implement these
- (iii) Continue to strengthen efforts by all Members and Cooperating Non-Members to ensure sufficient compliance at each stage of SBT fisheries, from catch grounds to markets, including transshipment, farming and trade
 - Consider introducing a Port State measure either in the form of a recommendation or resolution, **consistent with the UNFAO Port State Measures agreement.**
- (iv) Monitoring of any possible SBT catch by non-cooperating non-members and/or expansion of their SBT markets, including through MCS activities and reviewing SBT trade data
- (v) Review of data confidentiality rules to facilitate the exchange of compliance data
- (vi) The Secretariat should continue to:
 - Conduct analyses of MCS data submitted to the Secretariat, and report, on an annual basis, trends in MCS data
 - Assess the effectiveness of existing MCS measures based on data submitted to the Secretariat
 - Manage and monitor the CCSBT's compliance initiatives

9. Members' obligations

9.1 All Members comply with rules of CCSBT

Priority: High

- (i) Routinely audit Members' implementation, enforcement, and compliance with conservation and management measures and international obligations as they relate to CCSBT (e.g. UN Fishstocks Agreement)
 - See above (8.1)
- (ii) Apply the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy to breaches in the rules of the CCSBT and establish incentives to promote compliance

10. Supporting developing countries

10.1 Developing country Members are able to comply with the Commission's

- (i) Develop programme to assist developing countries with Commission requirements

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>management measures and other requirements</p> <p><i>Priority: High</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with developing country Members to identify areas where assistance would be beneficial to ensure they meet obligations under Commission decisions ▪ Identify ways in which assistance may be provided (e.g. up-skilling, secondments, workshops etc.) ▪ Develop and implement a programme to assist developing countries with Commission requirements |
| <p>11. Participation in the CCSBT</p> | |
| <p>11.1 [Ensure that all States, Regional Economic Integration Organisations (REIOs) and fishing entities catching SBT are incorporated in the Commission and engaged in the cooperative management of SBT]</p> <p><i>Priority: Medium</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) [Develop mechanisms for extending full CCSBT Membership to Fishing Entities and REIOs]. (ii) Define processes for those seeking cooperating non-member or membership status to the CCSBT (iii) Identify non-cooperating non-members' SBT catches and, if any, seek participation and/or cooperation of relevant entities (iv) Investigate ways of providing for the participation and/or cooperation of a wider range of actors (such as port, market or carrier vessel flag states that do not fish for SBT) |
| <p>11.2 Encourage the cooperation of port and market States with CCSBT's objectives and management arrangements</p> <p><i>Priority: High</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Establish a process for identifying non-member States that have, or are likely to become, important port or market States for SBT, and seek the cooperation of such States with the implementation of CCSBT management measures |

Appendix One: CCSBT performance review recommendations

Key: SA-2008 CCSBT's 2008 self-assessment of performance; PR-2008 CCSBT's 2008 Independent Review of Performance (undertaken by Ambassador Balton); PR-2014 2014 Independent Review of CCSBT Performance.

| Source of recommendation | Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation |
|--|--|---|
| Conservation and management | | |
| Status of living marine resources | | |
| SA-2008-1 | Support best endeavours of the ESC to recreate historical catch and catch per unit of effort series for the fishery but give maximum priority to accurate reporting and validation of future catch and effort. | PR-2014-1: The original recommendation remains valid and efforts should continue in the same direction. PR-2014-2: The compliance with and efficiency of the Data Verification procedures should be regularly checked. |
| PR-2008-1 | Develop stock assessment methodologies that are robust to past underreporting. | PR-2014-3: The CCSBT ESC should undertake from time to time (e.g. every 5-6 years) an assessment of the robustness of the assessments, e.g. through retrospective analysis, comparing past forecasts with subsequent realizations. |
| PR-2008-2 | Take a precautionary approach to management and lower the TAC as the uncertainty increases. | PR-2014-4: The recommendation, in its present form might be considered as fulfilled as long as the MP / Metarule "tandem" function properly (See PR-2008-3 on SBT stock rebuilding strategy). PR-2014-5: In the future, the CCSBT could undertake to test the robustness of the MP to climate change. It should also take every opportunity to give priority to stock rebuilding above increasing catch, when exceptional positive recruitment spikes occur above the variations against which the MP has been tested. |
| PR-2008-3: | Determine management objectives and rebuild strategy consistent with UNFSA requirements to guide future scientific assessments. Set TACs at a level that will allow the stock to rebuild. | PR-2014-6: Every effort should be made to enhance (speed-up) the rebuilding trajectory in line with the precautionary approach to fisheries (cf. PR-2008-2). Special efforts should be made to identify additional measures (e.g. protected areas) to support spawning and recruitment and improve resilience to fishing and climate change. |
| SA-2008-2 | Make the maximum effort to implement the items which have been identified and prioritised by the Extended Scientific Committee in the CCSBTs Scientific Research Program (Attachment 9 of the SC12 Report) | PR-2014-7: The CCSBT could consider the feasibility of a collaborative programme (between RFMOs and institutions competent in biodiversity conservation) to assess ex ante the likely impacts of climate change on the tuna ecosystems, the SBT, the ERS, their productivity, distribution and resilience. The outcome of this work would indicate which ocean parameters could be usefully monitored to better inform the Meta Rule of the MP Process. |
| SA-2008-3 | Assess and monitor, directly or with other RFMOs, the risks and impacts on ERS and adopt a mitigation strategy. | PR-2014-8: The CCSBT should specify the mitigation strategies for each ERS, area and fishery with their objectives (short and long-term), management and enforcement measures, and performance assessment. Considering the amount of work this represents, each strategy should also specify the order of priority given by the CCSBT to the different ERS, areas and fisheries, and it should record its rationale for these decisions. |
| SA-2008-4 | To base decisions on periodic full assessments of the SBT stock and establishing a rebuild strategy. | PR-2014-9: It can be considered that the recommendation is being implemented and has been integrated in the CCSBT best practice. No more recommendation needed. |

| Data collection and sharing | | |
|---|--|--|
| SA-2008-5 | Develop a strategy to collect and share data between CCSBT Members and RFMOs. | PR-2014-10: Based on the above the original SA recommendation might be considered as completed. However the PR suggests maintaining it as a leading title under which for more specific recommendations might be nested as need arise, e.g. regarding the SBT catches in recreational and artisanal fisheries. |
| SA-2008-6 | Clear standards are to be set on the type of data and level of detail to be provided by Members [and cooperating non-members], in order to ensure the science process has the information it requires. | PR-2014-11: More efforts need to be made to resolve the data confidentiality (regarding observers and operational fishery data) in order to improve the resolution and accuracy of the assessments and precision of the scientific advice. |
| SA-2008-7 | All members and cooperating non-members fulfil the UNFSA / Kobe requirements regarding collection and sharing of data (e.g.: Scientific data; Observers' data; ERS data; Catch documentation; Listing of vessels and farms; Transshipment; Data gap-filling; and data confidentiality (SA-2008). See also SA-2008-10. | PR-2014-12: The initial recommendation, as formulated, seems to have accomplished its role and could be considered as completed and replaced, in the future by more specific ones. |
| SA-2008-8 | Commercial confidentiality should no longer limit the access to data within the CCSBT. Members should make every effort to ensure that domestic constraints on data provision will not undermine the conservation and management efforts by CCSBT. Members and Cooperating Non-Members fully comply with the confidentiality agreements and provisions within the CCSBT. | PR-2014-13: As long as the confidentiality problem will hamper the quality of the scientific assessment efforts CCSBT should continue to improve the accessibility of "confidential" data for this purpose, with appropriate safeguards. A time limit should be adopted in the data confidentiality rules, putting most if not all data in the public domain after a given period of time sufficient to reduce sufficiently or eliminate any risk from its broader use. |
| SAWG-2010 (Scientific Advice Working Group (of Kobe II)) | Range of recommendations on data collection and sharing. | PR-2014-14: It is recommended that the SAWG recommendations be carefully examined and integrated in the data collection and sharing agenda. |
| Quality and provision of scientific advice | | |
| SA-2008-9 | Achieve a better balance between the scientific efforts dedicated to SBT on the one hand and ERS on the other. | PR-2014-15: The above recommendation is important and is probably a long-term one with implications for research but also for management. However, because of the subjectivity of the concept of balance and its potential financial implications, it should be used as a "chapeau" and be complemented by more specific ones, related to specific species/areas requiring more attention. |
| SA-2008-10 | The current structure of the Extended Scientific Committee, especially, the independent chairs and advisory panel, should be maintained. | PR-2014-16: No additional recommendation is needed regarding the continuing role of the ESC Independent Chair and Panel |
| SA-2008-11 | In light of the requirement to focus on future information with which to assess the stock status of SBT, the number and skill sets of independent experts required in support of the scientific process should be reviewed. | PR-2014-17: Assess the eventual gaps in scientific skills and proceed to fill them through recruitment (including of new/ complementary profiles in the Independent Panel) and capacity building in partner countries. |
| SA-2008-12 | The need for a management procedure for the fishery in the short term should be reconsidered in light of the alternative approach of periodic stock assessments using the agreed operating model. | PR-2014-18: The original recommendation should be considered as superseded. No new recommendation needed as the MP is now integrated in the assessment and advisory tool box of the Commission and its performance will be regularly assessed. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Kobe III-1: Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) | Contribute to a Joint Technical WG on MSE to facilitate the implementation the PA (Kobe III p.4 and Annex 3 § 1.3) | PR-2014-19: The CCSBT should continue to contribute to tuna RFMOs effort to develop MSE capacity and implementation. As the Joint WG now exists, more specific recommendations might be more useful in the future. |
| SAWG-2010 | - Regular large scale tagging programs (including archival tagging) to estimate natural mortality growth and movement patterns as well as tuna behavior and vulnerability. | PR-2014-20: Large scale tagging programmes do not seem to be undertaken anymore which means that the recommendation above is not fulfilled. It should be maintained or formally rejected by the ESC with an explicit rationale. |
| SAWG-2010 | - The study of spatial aspects of stock assessment to substantiate spatial management measures. | PR-2014-21: Efforts to gain information on the spatial structure and movements of the SBT stock and the fleets exploiting it should be continued as they are of paramount importance for management and conservation. PR-2014-22: A spatial, ecosystem-based framework could be developed as a strategic layer of assessment, added to the presently more tactical framework (imposed by the knowledge available as well as the need to deliver an undifferentiated TAC estimate), to be used every 5-10 years, perhaps in connection (not in synchrony) with the MP 6-yearly performance assessment, for obtaining a more realistic foresight. |
| SAWG-2010 | - The use of high-resolution spatial ecosystem models to better integrate biological features of tuna stocks and their environment. - Agree on a list of minimum standards for stock assessment | PR-2014-23: The recommendation is apparently being implemented across various activities. It should probably be maintained until a formal document is agreed and published on minimal stock assessment standards. |
| SAWG-2010 | - Develop research capacity in developing Members' countries | PR-2014-24: This subject is important for the future of the CCSBT decision making progress and legitimacy and should be elevated to a continuing recommendation. The direct role of CCSBT might be limited (by its funding and own capacity to train) but it could help identify needs, promote assistance and monitor capacity-building activities directly related to the fulfilment of its mandate. |
| Bycatch policy and management strategy | No specific recommendations | PR-2014-25: It is recommended to bring together all the elements presently related to ERS to elaborate a proper policy and management strategy for ERS, adopting clear objectives as well as reference values or trends, limits and targets, against which performance could be assessed. Better use of observers would improve the efficiency of the policy. |
| Adoption of conservation and management measures | | |
| SA-2008-13 | The CCSBT should continue to make conservation and management measures which are consistent with scientific advice from the Extended Scientific Committee. | PR-2014-26: As a consequence, the recommendation above, in its present form, could be considered as being implemented correctly. As it seems to have been incorporated in the ordinary practice of the EC, it might be eliminated from the list and replaced, as appropriate with more specific ones in the future. |
| SA-2008-14 | The CCSBT should satisfy the UNFSA standards. | PR-2014-27: This recommendation refers to an international legal obligation. It could be maintained but cannot be usefully assessed unless it is made more specific (see next recommendation). New recommendations could, for example, call for explicit implementation of instruments that further the implementation of UNCLOS and UNFSA such as International Guidelines and Action Plans for management of fishing capacity, control of IUU, |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | management of sharks, etc... or the CBD and WSSD requirements for Marine Protected Areas (e.g. to protect SBT spawners and juveniles or ERS) and other international agreements. It could also call for binding measures for CCSBT ERS conservation and management. |
| SA-2008-15 | The parties to the Convention could review the Convention and modernise it to UNFSA standards. | PR-2014-28: The CCSBT should formally consider the need to align its Convention to the UNFSA principles and standards. A gap analysis could be an easy first step based on which a decision to proceed with a formal revision or through Strategic and management planning could be explicitly made. |
| SA-2008-16 | The CCSBT should develop a Strategic Plan plus a Management Plan to implement minimum standards for the fishery (SA-2008). | PR-2014-29: The CCSBT should pursue the effort of coherent planning. As conservation and management are the core of the CCSBT mandate and the Strategic Plan provides a comprehensive framework for fulfilling that mandate, it could be suggested to attach to the recently adopted Strategic Plan (as an annex) a management Plan, going into more implementation details. This could help avoid duplication and integrate better the policy, the strategy and the management plan. The management procedure and metarule processes are part of the Management Plan. |
| SA-2008-17 | Consider moving to alternative allocation principles of the TAC rather than set tonnages. | PR-2014-30: The present practice fulfills the recommendation. As long as members and candidate members find the present approach convenient, there is no reason to change it. |
| Kobe-1: Ecologically related species | Strengthen conservation and management measures to minimize harmful impacts of SBT fisheries on non-target populations and their ecosystems and ensure long-term sustainability, using the best scientific evidence available. In particular: Increase attention on sharks, seabirds, turtles and mammals (KIII.5.b.f), minimizing the impact of fishing (KI.I.10; KI.I.11). Assess and manage sharks (KI.I.11; KII.1f; KIII.5.b.d). Require the use of on-board observers to collect discards data (KIII.5.b.a); | PR-2014-31: There is obviously a trade-off in the use of the observers' time which affects the precision of the data (and ensuing assessments) of SBT and ERS respectively. Although the detailed data collected eventually by observers is not known, a minimal assessment of the state of the ERS (or contribution to such assessment in a collaborative framework) will probably require more ERS data to be collected. The use of video cameras might be a useful assistance to the observer. |
| Kobe-1: Ecologically related species | Ensure that [management] measures reflect international agreements, tools and guidelines to reduce bycatch, including the relevant provisions of the FAO Code of Conduct, the IPOAs for Seabirds and Sharks and the FAO guidelines on sea turtles. (BCWG 2010). | PR-2014-32: The CCSBT relies on its members to comply with non-CCSBT institutions requirements and the degree of control or verification by CCSBT of the effectiveness is not clear and possibly insufficient. Formally adopting the relevant FAO IPOAs, adapting them to regional plans of Action (RPOAs), and instituting an implementation framework would be an efficient way to align CCSBT management practices with the international standards while strengthening the purely voluntary FAO instruments. |
| Kobe-1: Ecologically related species | Adopt the following principles reflecting best practice: bycatch avoidance and mitigation measures should be: (1) binding, (2) clear and direct, (3) measurable, (4) science-based, (5) ecosystem-based, (6) ecologically efficient (reduces the mortality of bycatch), (7) practical and safe, (8) economically efficient, (9) holistic, (10) | PR-2014-33: The real extent of the problem (if any) in relation of turtles and mammals should be transparently assessed by the ERSWG. The overall policy in relation to ERS, summarized in the Strategic Plan, provides the higher level frame for the ERS part of a future management plan. PR-2014-34: As mentioned in the PR-2008, the most effective way to reduce collateral impacts on ERS is through binding measures implemented by members and |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | collaboratively developed with industry and stakeholders, and (11) fully implemented. | cooperating non-members and the duty to do so is established through the commitments made by governments in other fora to use the CCSBT and other RFMOs for just such purposes. The commitments are referred to also in the Kobe criteria a, h, and i. |
| PR-2008-4 | Apply the precautionary approach as set forth in UNFSA Article 6 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.5, including the application of precautionary reference points (PR-2008; Kobe I, § I.1.4 and 1.10). | PR-2014-35: This generic recommendation has very long-term implementation implications and could be considered as being implemented continuously as long as a precautionary MP is used together with the metarule. If formally adopted as a Principle (possibly inserted in a revised Convention), it would not need to be carried forward as a recommendation. |
| Kobe-2: the ecosystem approach | Apply the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) to manage bycatch of target and non-target species (Kobe I, §I.4, §I.10); | PR-2014-36: Consider the present elements of the CCSBT fishery policy and management framework which belong to an EAF. Identify possible gaps, discuss them, and move to fill them. Assess explicitly the compliance with the agreed EAF framework. |
| Kobe-3: rebuilding plans | Adopt and implement effective rebuilding plans for depleted or overfished stocks (Kobe I § 1.4); | PR-2014-35: As it stands the original recommendation is largely completed with the adoption of a Management procedure and a Strategic Plan. However, the effectiveness of the rebuilding strategy and plans needs to be regularly checked for performance. |
| Capacity management | | |
| PR-2008-5 | The CCSBT should at very least implement the recommendations set forth in the FAO International Plan of Action on the management of fishing capacity. | PR-2014-37: As a minimum, the CCSBT should continue to monitor the list of vessels (authorized and IUU) and develop indices of capacity (e.g. number of vessels as corrected by size, tonnage and technology) to ascertain that capacity is adjusted to the stock's biological productivity (and hence to the TAC). PR-2014-38: If the stock builds up, the TAC will increase and higher capacity will be needed to take it. As CCSBT plans to assess the MSY (or MEY) replacement yield, it should simultaneously project the capacity it will need, compare it to the present one and act accordingly. PR-2014-39: A longer-term proposition might be to seek agreement of other tuna RFMOs for a coordinated regional management of tuna fleets capacity to connect to the Global Register of ATVs. |
| Compatibility of management measures | | |
| SA-2008-18 | The CCSBT's arrangements in relation to catch limits and national allocations are compatible between high seas and in areas under national jurisdiction. The CCSBT should continue to ensure that measures are compatible. | PR-2014-40. Because of the central importance of spawning and recruitment for stock rebuilding, additional efforts should be made to develop, in Indonesian waters, spatio-temporal restrictions, equitable and compatible with the rest of the management strategy. |
| Fishing allocations and opportunities | | |
| SA-2008-19 | The CCSBT should improve its accountability for decision making and move towards separating the TAC decision from allocation decisions... the CCSBT should consider moving to national allocations based on alternative principles, rather than set tonnages. | PR-2014-41: This recommendation has been completed and the required separation between the TAC determination and the national allocations is now institutionalized and part of the normal practice of the CCSBT. |

| Compliance and enforcement | | |
|--|---|---|
| Flag State duties | | |
| SA-2008-20 | All members and cooperating non-members should continue to take all necessary actions to ensure compliance with conservation and management measures adopted by the CCSBT. There is now an urgent need for CCSBT to finalise longer term MCS arrangements centred on harmonised arrangements under a CDS. | PR-2014-42: The CCSBT should continue to ensure compliance by all possible means, including through continued, and full implementation of the enhanced Compliance Committee process, QAR program and compliance action plans and policies. Any additional recommendations on compliance that stem from these new processes should be specific and lead to action by the CCSBT in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Compliance Committee and related Compliance Action Plan and tools. No additional recommendations are necessary. |
| Port State measures | | |
| SA-2008-21 | Bearing in mind the need to avoid duplication of effort, the [outcome of the] FAO Technical Consultation on Port State Measures that was held in Rome on 23-27 June 2008, provides the Commission with some guidance on a preferred model when considering implementation of any CCSBT Port State measure. That new agreement may not enter into force for several years. In the meantime, the CCSBT should move to adopt a broader set of Port State Measures designed to prevent the landing and transshipment of illegal, unreported and unregulated SBT catches – including by vessels on the CCSBT authorized vessel list. | PR-2014-41: The CCSBT should accelerate its progress in developing a Resolution on Port State Measures consistent with the 2009 FAO Port States Agreement. |
| Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) | | |
| SA-2008-22 | As the CCSBT does not have its Convention area and SBT migrates into the other tuna RFMOs' areas of jurisdiction, the CCSBT should cooperate with the other tuna RFMOs to optimise harmonisation; improve global effectiveness; and avoid duplication of work. The CCSBT should prioritise the development of MCS in the context of a compliance plan. | PR-2014-43: Considering that both technology and sister RFMOs programmes keep evolving, the CCSBT should continue to improve its MCS measures and scheme, and take additional steps to harmonize its MCS measures with other RFMOs. Details on areas to harmonize further are examined below. |
| SA-2008-23 | Acknowledging the 2007 Kobe commitment to consistent ROP standards, the CCSBT should align its observer program with those of other RFMOs which also have an observer program such as CCAMLR and the IOTC. | PR-2014-44: The CCSBT should accelerate its efforts to strengthen its Scientific Observer Standards and ensure they are harmonized with those of neighboring RFMOs with respect to ERS observer data. The CCSBT should also give serious consideration to the development of a ROP, perhaps through forging a relationship with the WCPFC to allow for mutual recognition or cross endorsement of observers, as the WCPFC and IATTC have done. |
| PR-2008-6 | A VMS that is not centralised has limited effectiveness and CCAMLR has adopted a centralised VMS (SA-2008). Although most CCSBT members require their vessels to use satellite-based vessel | PR-2014-45: The CCSBT should trigger paragraph 5 of its 2008 CCSBT Resolution and goal 8.3 of its Compliance Action Plan, and review and revise the Resolution to include specific baseline operational VMS standards for SBT vessels regardless of their area of |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | monitoring systems (VMS) and despite the adoption in 2006 of a CCSBT resolution committing members and cooperating non-members to adopt an integrated VMS system, the CCSBT still does not have such a system in place. The Commission should institute one promptly. | operation, such as reporting frequencies, recipients and use of VMS data (such as by the CCSBT Secretariat, SC/ESC, and ERSWG and Compliance Committees (other than summary reports currently required under the 2008 Resolution). For instance, CCSBT members and CNMs could agree that their SBT vessels operating in other RFMO Convention Areas would transmit the VMS reports sent under those VMS programs to the CCSBT Secretariat. |
| Transshipment at sea | No specific recommendations | PR-2014-46: The CCSBT should accelerate its progress in reviewing its Transshipment Program for tuna longline vessels in conjunction with the development of a Port State measures resolution that is consistent with the 2009 FAO Port States Agreement. The CCSBT should also be prepared to develop rules to govern at sea transshipment involving purse seine vessels that are consistent with those adopted by the WCPFC, if at-sea transshipment activities involving such vessels begin to be utilized in the future. |
| High seas boarding and inspection | No specific recommendations | PR-2014-47: CCSBT should therefore develop as a matter of priority procedures for high seas boarding and inspection of SBT vessels. |
| Follow-up on infringements | | |
| SA-2008-24 | The CCSBT should, as a minimum, establish agreed rules on the treatment of overcatch (requirement of payback). Ideally, the CCSBT should establish a range of penalties in relation to all conservation measures. | PR-2014-48: The CCSBT has taken steps since 2008 to considerably strengthen its compliance assessment processes and tools, including a framework for applying a range of penalties for instances of Member and CNM non-compliance with CCSBT measures. CCSBT should continue to refine these tools and ensure they are transparently and fairly implemented when necessary to ensure legitimacy and integrity in its system, thereby creating an incentive for compliance among members and CNMs. |
| Cooperative mechanisms to detect and deter non-compliance | | |
| SA-2008-25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All Members and Cooperating Non-Members should submit their national reports to the CCSBT. - The CCSBT allocate sufficient time to the CC and the Extended Commission to allow them to complete both routine and development work each year. | PR-2014-49: The CCSBT has taken steps since 2008 to considerably strengthen its compliance assessment processes and tools, including reworking its Compliance Committee terms of reference, giving the Committee adequate time to meet, and adopting an IUU Vessel List measure. Members and CNMs are cooperating with the process, providing their national reports on time and submitting themselves to a multilateral review of their compliance in the Compliance Committee. The CCSBT should continue implement these tools fully and ensure non-compliance is transparently and fairly assessed, thereby creating an incentive for compliance among members and CNMs. The CCSBT should also consider mandating that a member who is being considered for a sanction under its policies may not participate in the decision-making on that issue. |
| Market-related measures | | |
| SA-2008-26 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CCSBT should thus continue to move forward smartly toward the adoption and implementation of a full Catch documentation system (CDS). - The CCSBT should implement a CDS as matter of urgency. | PR-2014-50: The initial recommendations are already fairly well implemented. CCSBT should explore all available options for tracking the trade of SBT between those States that are not members or CNMs, and continue to engage in outreach (both from the Secretariat and individually as CCSBT members or |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pending implementation of a CDS, all members and cooperating non-members should be required to implement the TIS. - The CCSBT should monitor all market and port states and encourage compliance with CCSBT monitoring and trade measures. | CNMs, such as through diplomatic channels and in bilateral contacts) to those non-member nations to encourage their participation in and implementation of the CCSBT CDS. |
| Decision-making, transparency and dispute settlement | | |
| Decision-making and transparency | | |
| SA-2008-27 | Consensus decision making does mean that some decision making is delayed but the Commission could also consider that some day to day operational decision making could be devolved to the Chair or the Executive Secretary (by unanimous decision of the Commission). | PR-2014-51: As changing the CCSBT decision-making model (from unanimous to majority decision-making) would require amending the Convention, no specific recommendations are offered. However, should the CCSBT decide to embark on a process to evaluate and modify its Convention provisions – as several other RFMOs have done in the last decade (e.g., see NAFO, NEAFC, ICCAT and IATTC) and which is noted in the CCSBT Strategic Plan- there are a number of alternative models for decision-making (currently employed by other RFMOs) from which it could choose. |
| SA-2008-28 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As [the rules and procedures on observers] are not in keeping with the spirit of current international fisheries governance frameworks, the CCSBT should consider modernizing Rule 3 of its rules of procedure. - The CCSBT and its members should improve openness by better publication of the rules for observers. One possible option would be to put the information about the current arrangements to accept observers on the CCSBT website. | PR-2014-52: The present policy and regulations of CCSBT regarding observers are now in line with international standards and the initial recommendations can be considered as fulfilled and dropped. |
| Decision-making and dispute settlement | | |
| Kobe-4: dispute settlement | Establish adequate mechanisms for dispute settlement. | PR-2014-53: It is recommended that the CCSBT seriously consider developing an alternative approach to dispute settlement/conflict resolution to avoid the potential for future stalemates that could significantly compromise the conservation and management of the SBT resource. As noted by the PR-2008, the additional dispute settlement rules provided by the UNFSA could usefully be used as now all CNMs and members of the Extended Commission, except Taiwan, are party to the UNFSA. |
| International cooperation | | |
| Relationship to cooperating non-members (CNMs) | | |
| Kobe-5: Cooperating non-members | Extent to which the RFMO facilitates cooperation between members and non-members, including through the adoption and implementation of procedures for granting cooperating status. | PR-2014-54: CCSBT has given particular attention to the subject of non-members with a view to facilitate their participation in the governance process. No particular recommendation is therefore needed except to continue paying attention to the issue and pursue its efforts towards the remaining non-members and potential newcomers in the fishery. |

| Relationship to non-cooperating non-members | | |
|---|--|--|
| Kobe-6: Non-cooperating non-members | Members and cooperating non-members of CCSBT should share information about non-cooperating non-members' vessels fishing on SBT and take appropriate measures to deter the activities of such vessels. | PR-2014-55: CCSBT has given particular attention also to the subject of non-cooperating non-members with a view to deter the activities of their vessels. CCSBT should continue its efforts to improve collaboration with all the actors in the fishery to continue to strengthen its efforts in combating IUU fishing activities and ensure the effective implementation of its measures and programs. In addition, the development of port State measures in line with the FAO Port States Agreement (as is discussed in section 4.2.2) could greatly assist in this area. |
| Cooperation with other RFMOs | | |
| SA-2008-29 PR-2008 | <p>- There are significant opportunities for the CCSBT to work more closely with and to harmonise measures with other RFMOs, especially with the other tuna-RFMOs, and this should be a priority area for the CCSBT.</p> <p>- The CCSBT should add combating IUU fishing activities to the list of crosscutting issues affecting all tuna RFMOs, as well as monitoring and regulating transshipment, particularly given CCSBT's geographical overlap with the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.</p> | PR-2014-56: Given the reliance of the CCSBT, in many ways, on cooperative relationships with other RFMOs for "harmonizing" with (and using directly) a number of those neighbouring RFMOs' measures, the work called for by the Kobe process and its 2010 workshops is particularly relevant. The CCSBT should look seriously for opportunities to re-invigorate discussions among its neighbouring RFMOs to work more closely to implement the Kobe recommendations. Key areas of collaboration include: more systematic exchange of data and information (interoperable databases); additional harmonization of measures; conducting more joint scientific workshops; increasing coordination of compliance work, particularly to combat IUU fishing and conserve and manage ERS; large-scale tagging programmes; ecosystem approach implementation; large scale ecosystem-based modelling; Management Strategy Evaluation; harmonisation of MCS systems; common formats for assessing compliance (with data reporting; infringements, etc.); capacity-building (e.g. training courses); and development of common positions at IUCN, CITES, CBD, and the UNGA. |
| Special requirements of developing States | | |
| SA-2008-30 | No change [in the CCSBT policy regarding developing Members and CNMs] is necessary. | PR-2014-57: As is noted in Strategic Plan, the CCSBT should develop a more comprehensive strategy for addressing the capacity building needs, particularly with regard to compliance with CCSBT obligations, programs, and implementing the CDS, of developing State members/CNMs. One model to consider is that of the IOTC, which conducts compliance "missions" in country to assist developing State members in identifying areas of deficiency and in developing an action plan to improve. |
| Financial and administrative issues | | |
| Availability of resources for RFMO activities | | |
| SA-2008-31 | The CCSBT should consider establishing a position at the Secretariat to: (i) provide policy and management advice; (ii) take a more proactive role in seeking advice/positions of members; and (iii) enhance implementation of the Strategic Plan. | PR-2014-58: This recommendation has been fully implemented. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Financial resources | No specific recommendations | PR-2014-59: This, together with the fact that there do not seem to be any indication of under-delivery, would indicate that resources allocated by Members to the Commission are more than sufficient to cover planned activities. The resulting systematic carry-over is probably an illustration of the Secretariat's concern with financial efficiency. However, systematic carry-over is usually not considered good budgetary practice as, in principle, unless all funding requests were accepted during the budgeting process, the savings indicate that activities that were not funded for lack of funds could have been undertaken and suffered unnecessarily from the decision. Uncertainties are always an issue but if they always result in carry-over they may indicate there may be room for improved planning (with better risk assessment). A more professional advice should be given by the Auditor. |
| Funding of the aerial survey | No specific recommendations | The PR-2014 does not have the elements needed to propose any recommendation on this subject. |
| Efficiency and cost-effectiveness | | |
| SA-2008-32 | The Secretariat should continue to run the CCSBT efficiently and effectively. | PR-2014-60: Considering the values generated and the costs supported one might suspect that real "efficiency" might be made more by accelerating stock rebuilding than reducing administrative and research costs. As a consequence, considering that the CCSBT deals with one single species and few markets. It might be in a better position than other tuna RFMOs to consider undertaking at least a preliminary economic analysis of implications of its rebuilding strategy (taking into account, first, only market values) in order to shed some light on the economic implications of the parameters presently used for the Management Procedure and the planned rebuilding trajectory (still undefined). |
| Overall CCSBT performance review process | | |
| FAO review of performance reviews in RFMOs | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performance Review Panels: Use a common approach and criteria but maintain flexibility. 2. Budget: Provide a reasonable and appropriate budget for the PR. 3. Cooperation: If needed call for cooperation with other RFMOs to enhance the PR. 4. Role of the Secretariat: Play a proactive role, as a resource and a participant in the PR. 5. Role of Members: Should be encouraged to provide views/ comments on the PR. 6. Role of other stakeholders: Should be encouraged to provide views/comments on the PR. 7. Methodology: Provide maximum opportunity for communication among the panel members, by one or more meetings and or through other means. | <p>PR-2014-61: Based on the above elements of evidence, it appears that the CCSBT has satisfactorily fulfilled the criteria established for the RFMOs Performance Review process.</p> <p>PR-2014-62: If not available yet, It would be useful and in line with best administration practices, to keep a formal record of all recommendations with related metadata (date, subject, achievements, current status, etc.). It is therefore recommended to keep such a formal central repository of the recommendations emanating from the EC and ESC, and also from working groups or other processes.</p> <p>PR-2014-63: The fact that the Strategic Plan is structured along the main Kobe Criteria mean that sooner rather than later, the Performance Review could become an integral part of the Strategic Plan implementation and the Recommendation Repository an important part of the implementation dashboard.</p> |

ERSWG Consideration of the Recommendations from the 2014 Performance Review of the CCSBT

(from Attachment 9 of the Report of ERSWG 11, 3-6 March 2015)

| Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ERSWG11 recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Make the maximum effort to implement the items which have been identified and prioritised by the Extended Scientific Committee in the CCSBTs Scientific Research Program (Attachment 9 of the SC12 Report)</p> | <p>PR-2014-7: The CCSBT could consider the feasibility of a collaborative programme (between RFMOs and institutions competent in biodiversity conservation) to assess ex ante the likely impacts of climate change on the tuna ecosystems, the SBT, the ERS, their productivity, distribution and resilience. The outcome of this work would indicate which ocean parameters could be usefully monitored to better inform the Meta Rule of the MP Process.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported this recommendation noting that the ecosystem approach is growing in importance and requires collaboration. This recommendation has been added to the ERSWG's workplan.</p> |
| <p>Assess and monitor, directly or with other RFMOs, the risks and impacts on ERS and adopt a mitigation strategy.</p> | <p>PR-2014-8: The CCSBT should specify the mitigation strategies for each ERS, area and fishery with their objectives (short and long-term), management and enforcement measures, and performance assessment. Considering the amount of work this represents, each strategy should also specify the order of priority given by the CCSBT to the different ERS, areas and fisheries, and it should record its rationale for these decisions.</p> | <p>The ERSWG strongly supported this recommendation and viewed it as a high priority. Links were noted between this recommendation and recommendations 25 and 32. The work could be conducted in collaboration with other tuna RFMOs.</p> |
| <p>Develop a strategy to collect and share data between CCSBT members and RFMOs.</p> | <p>PR-2014-10: Based on the above the original SA recommendation might be considered as completed. However the PR suggests maintaining it as a leading title under which for more specific recommendations might be nested as need arise, e.g. regarding the SBT catches in recreational and artisanal fisheries.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported the original recommendation noting that limited data sharing in this context reduces the working group's effectiveness. The ERSWG does not consider the original recommendation to be complete.</p> |
| <p>Clear standards are to be set on the type of data and level of detail to be provided by members [and cooperating non-members], in order to ensure the science process has the information it requires.</p> | <p>PR-2014-11: More efforts need to be made to resolve the data confidentiality (regarding observers and operational fishery data) in order to improve the resolution and accuracy of the assessments and precision of the scientific advice.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported this recommendation and noted that it would be very beneficial.</p> |

| Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ERSWG11 recommendation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Commercial confidentiality should no longer limit the access to data within the CCSBT. Members should make every effort to ensure that domestic constraints on data provision will not undermine the conservation and management efforts by CCSBT. Members and Cooperating Non-Members fully comply with the confidentiality agreements and provisions within the CCSBT.</p> | <p>PR-2014-13: As long as the confidentiality problem will hamper the quality of the scientific assessment efforts CCSBT should continue to improve the accessibility of “confidential” data for this purpose, with appropriate safeguards. A time limit should be adopted in the data confidentiality rules, putting most if not all data in the public domain after a given period of time sufficient to reduce sufficiently or eliminate any risk from its broader use.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported the first sentence of this recommendation, in the context that the data needs to be used in a collaborative approach, but had reservations about making data public after a set period of time.</p> |
| <p>Range of recommendations on data collection and sharing.</p> | <p>PR-2014-14: It is recommended that the SAWG recommendations be carefully examined and integrated in the data collection and sharing agenda.</p> | <p>The ERSWG found it difficult to respond to this as it did not have the suite of SAWG recommendations before it.</p> |
| <p>Achieve a better balance between the scientific efforts dedicated to SBT on the one hand and ERS on the other.</p> | <p>PR-2014-15: The above recommendation is important and is probably a long-term one with implications for research but also for management. However, because of the subjectivity of the concept of balance and its potential financial implications, it should be used as a “chapeau” and be complemented by more specific ones, related to specific species/areas requiring more attention.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported this recommendation and noted that it was fundamental to moving towards an ecosystem approach. It was also noted that this type of balance is relevant to observer programs and the time observers spend on ERS activities. The working group noted that it has been valuable having an independent chair and that aligning closely to the ESC model (such as having independent experts) may help to progress work more rapidly. The ERSWG noted the value of having independent experts at the SMMTG meeting.</p> |
| <p>In light of the requirement to focus on future information with which to assess the stock status of SBT, the number and skill sets of independent experts required in support of the scientific process should be reviewed.</p> | <p>PR-2014-17: Assess the eventual gaps in scientific skills and proceed to fill them through recruitment (including of new/complementary profiles in the Independent Panel) and capacity building in partner countries.</p> | <p>This recommendation was supported by the ERSWG. The ERSWG noted the ideas on capacity building developed at the SMMTG and ERSWG and that these are likely to come to fruition through the Birdlife International component of the ABNJ Tuna Project.</p> |

| Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ERSWG11 recommendation |
|---|---|--|
| <p>- Develop research capacity in developing Members' countries</p> | <p>PR-2014-24: This subject is important for the future of the CCSBT decision making progress and legitimacy and should be elevated to a continuing recommendation. The direct role of CCSBT might be limited (by its funding and own capacity to train) but it could help identify needs, promote assistance and monitor capacity-building activities directly related to the fulfilment of its mandate.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supports capacity building as an important endeavour. The CCSBT should seek to fund such work from both its own resources and external sources wherever possible. It was noted that ACAP had a secondments grant program specifically aimed at capacity building.</p> |
| <p>No specific recommendations</p> | <p>PR-2014-25: It is recommended to bring together all the elements presently related to ERS to elaborate a proper policy and management strategy for ERS, adopting clear objectives as well as reference values or trends, limits and targets, against which performance could be assessed. Better use of observers would improve the efficiency of the policy.</p> | <p>The ERSWG strongly supported this recommendation and regarded it as high priority, noting that this has links to recommendation 8. Harmonisation with other tuna RFMOs should be considered.</p> |
| <p>Strengthen conservation and management measures to minimize harmful impacts of SBT fisheries on non-target populations and their ecosystems and ensure long-term sustainability, using the best scientific evidence available. In particular: Increase attention on sharks, seabirds, turtles and mammals (KIII.5.b.f), minimizing the impact of fishing (KII.10; KII.11). Assess and manage sharks (KII.11; KII.1f; KIII.5.b.d). Require the use of on-board observers to collect discards data (KIII.5.b.a);</p> | <p>PR-2014-31: There is obviously a trade-off in the use of the observers' time which affects the precision of the data (and ensuing assessments) of SBT and ERS respectively. Although the detailed data collected eventually by observers is not known, a minimal assessment of the state of the ERS (or contribution to such assessment in a collaborative framework) will probably require more ERS data to be collected. The use of video cameras might be a useful assistance to the observer.</p> | <p>The ERSWG noted that the workload of observers is an issue, but is one of the cheapest options when considering alternatives to reducing uncertainty in risk assessments. This recommendation should not be limited to video cameras. The use of e-monitoring and e-reporting can also be useful in reducing the workload of observers.</p> |

| Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ERSWG11 recommendation |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Ensure that [management] measures reflect international agreements, tools and guidelines to reduce bycatch, including the relevant provisions of the FAO Code of Conduct, the IPOAs for Seabirds and Sharks and the FAO guidelines on sea turtles. (BCWG 2010).</p> | <p>PR-2014-32: The CCSBT relies on its members to comply with non-CCSBT institutions requirements and the degree of control or verification by CCSBT of the effectiveness is not clear and possibly insufficient. Formally adopting the relevant FAO IPOAs, adapting them to regional plans of Action (RPOAs), and instituting an implementation framework would be an efficient way to align CCSBT management practices with the international standards while strengthening the purely voluntary FAO instruments.</p> | <p>The ERSWG supported this recommendation and noted that the FAO IPOAs are useful resources that provides guidance in a number of areas and the FAO best practice guidelines provides a useful framework. It was also noted that this recommendation is linked to recommendations 8 and 25, and that this recommendation should be considered in the context of the limited resources of Members.</p> |
| <p>Adopt the following principles reflecting best practice: bycatch avoidance and mitigation measures should be: (1) binding, (2) clear and direct, (3) measureable, (4) science-based, (5) ecosystem-based, (6) ecologically efficient (reduces the mortality of bycatch), (7) practical and safe, (8) economically efficient, (9) holistic, (10) collaboratively developed with industry and stakeholders, and (11) fully implemented.</p> | <p>PR-2014-33: The real extent of the problem (if any) in relation of turtles and mammals should be transparently assessed by the ERSWG. The overall policy in relation to ERS, summarized in the Strategic Plan, provides the higher level frame for the ERS part of a future management plan.</p> | <p>The ERSWG noted that the ERS part of a management plan should cover all ERS, including turtles and mammals, and the relative priority of species groups should be assigned in the future.</p> |
| | <p>PR-2014-34: As mentioned in the PR-2008, the most effective way to reduce collateral impacts on ERS is through binding measures implemented by members and cooperating non-members and the duty to do so is established through the commitments made by governments in other fora to use the CCSBT and other RFMOs for just such purposes. The commitments are referred to also in the Kobe criteria a, h, and i.</p> | <p>The ERSWG commented that any progress in this direction needs to be resolved at the Extended Commission level.</p> |
| <p>Acknowledging the 2007 Kobe commitment to consistent ROP standards, the CCSBT should align its observer program with those of other RFMOs which also have an observer program such as CCAMLR and the IOTC.</p> | <p>PR-2014-44: The CCSBT should accelerate its efforts to strengthen its Scientific Observer Standards and ensure they are harmonized with those of neighbouring RFMOs with respect to ERS observer data. The CCSBT should also give serious consideration to the development of a ROP, perhaps through forging a relationship with the WCPFC to allow for mutual recognition or cross endorsement of observers, as the WCPFC and IATTC have done.</p> | <p>The ERSWG strongly supported this recommendation and considered it as high priority. The January 2015 meeting of the joint tuna RFMO bycatch technical working group for harmonisation of longline bycatch data collected by tuna RFMOs was recognised in this context.</p> |

| Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ERSWG11 recommendation |
|---|---|---|
| <p>- There are significant opportunities for the CCSBT to work more closely with and to harmonise measures with other RFMOs, especially with the other tuna- RFMOs, and this should be a priority area for the CCSBT.</p> <p>- The CCSBT should add combating IUU fishing activities to the list of crosscutting issues affecting all tuna RFMOs, as well as monitoring and regulating transshipment, particularly given CCSBT's geographical overlap with the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.</p> | <p>PR-2014-56: Given the reliance of the CCSBT, in many ways, on cooperative relationships with other RFMOs for “harmonizing” with (and using directly) a number of those neighbouring RFMOs’ measures, the work called for by the Kobe process and its 2010 workshops is particularly relevant. The CCSBT should look seriously for opportunities to re-invigorate discussions among its neighbouring RFMOs to work more closely to implement the Kobe recommendations. Key areas of collaboration include: more systematic exchange of data and information (interoperable databases); additional harmonization of measures; conducting more joint scientific workshops; increasing coordination of compliance work, particularly to combat IUU fishing and conserve and manage ERS; large-scale tagging programmes; ecosystem approach implementation; large scale ecosystem-based modelling; Management Strategy Evaluation; harmonisation of MCS systems; common formats for assessing compliance (with data reporting; infringements, etc.); capacity-building (e.g. training courses); and development of common positions at IUCN, CITES, CBD, and the UNGA.</p> | <p>The ERSWG strongly supports this recommendation and notes that this sort of cooperation is essential to undertaking broader scale assessments.</p> |

ESC's Recommendations to Relevant Recommendations from CCSBT's Performance Review 2014

(from Attachment 10 of the Report of the Extended Commission of SC20, 1-5 September 2015)

| Source of recommendation ¹ | Original recommendation | 2014 Performance review recommendation | ESC Recommendation |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1. Conservation and management | | | |
| Status of living marine resources | | | |
| SA-2008-1 | Support best endeavours of the ESC to recreate historical catch and catch per unit of effort series for the fishery but give maximum priority to accurate reporting and validation of future catch and effort. | <p>PR-2014-1: The original recommendation remains valid and efforts should continue in the same direction.</p> <p>PR-2014-2: The compliance with and efficiency of the Data Verification procedures should be regularly checked.</p> | Done. These are ongoing processes of the Commission. |
| PR-2008-1 | Develop stock assessment methodologies that are robust to past underreporting. | PR-2014-3: The CCSBT ESC should undertake from time to time (e.g. every 5-6 years) an assessment of the robustness of the assessments, e.g. through retrospective analysis, comparing past forecasts with subsequent realizations. | Low priority. Largely captured by the MP approach. |

¹ "SA-2008" refers to recommendations from CCSBT's 2008 Self-Assessment of Performance, "PR-2008" refers to recommendations from the Independent Review of the Self Assessment (undertaken by U.S. Ambassador Balton), "PR-2014" refers to recommendations from the 2014 Independent Review of the CCSBT's Performance.

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| PR-2008-2 | Take a precautionary approach to management and lower the TAC as the uncertainty increases. | <p>PR-2014-4: The recommendation, in its present form might be considered as fulfilled as long as the MP / Metarule “tandem” function properly (See PR-2008-3 on SBT stock rebuilding strategy).</p> <p>PR-2014-5: In the future, the CCSBT could undertake to test the robustness of the MP to climate change. It should also take every opportunity to give priority to stock rebuilding above increasing catch, when exceptional positive recruitment spikes occur above the variations against which the MP has been tested.</p> | <p>Done. Assuming ongoing MP / meta rule application.</p> <p>Low priority. Existing robustness tests broadly cover this as well.</p> |
| PR-2008-3: | Determine management objectives and rebuild strategy consistent with UNFSA requirements to guide future scientific assessments. Set TACs at a level that will allow the stock to rebuild. | <p>PR-2014-6: Every effort should be made to enhance (speed-up) the rebuilding trajectory in line with the precautionary approach to fisheries (cf. PR-2008-2). Special efforts should be made to identify additional measures (e.g. protected areas) to support spawning and recruitment and improve resilience to fishing and climate change.</p> | <p>EC responsibility for first part of recommendation.</p> <p>Low priority. Efforts already being made within constraints of existing operating environment.</p> |
| SA-2008-2 | Make the maximum effort to implement the items which have been identified and prioritised by the Extended Scientific Committee in the CCSBTs Scientific Research Program (Attachment 9 of the SC12 Report) | <p>PR-2014-7: The CCSBT could consider the feasibility of a collaborative programme (between RFMOs and institutions competent in biodiversity conservation) to assess ex ante the likely impacts of climate change on the tuna ecosystems, the SBT, the ERS, their productivity, distribution and resilience. The outcome of this work would indicate which ocean parameters could be usefully monitored to better inform the Meta Rule of the MP Process.</p> | <p>Low priority.</p> |

| Data collection and sharing | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| SA-2008-5 | Develop a strategy to collect and share data between CCSBT members and RFMOs. | PR-2014-10: Based on the above the original SA recommendation might be considered as completed. However the PR suggests maintaining it as a leading title under which for more specific recommendations might be nested as need arise, e.g. regarding the SBT catches in recreational and artisanal fisheries. | Ongoing. |
| SA-2008-6 | Clear standards are to be set on the type of data and level of detail to be provided by members [and cooperating non-members], in order to ensure the science process has the information it requires. | PR-2014-11: More efforts need to be made to resolve the data confidentiality (regarding observers and operational fishery data) in order to improve the resolution and accuracy of the assessments and precision of the scientific advice. | Access to data sets and operational data would appreciably enhance the work of the ESC, recognising nevertheless that commercial confidentiality concerns would need to be addressed by the Extended Commission. |
| SA-2008-8 | Commercial confidentiality should no longer limit the access to data within the CCSBT. Members should make every effort to ensure that domestic constraints on data provision will not undermine the conservation and management efforts by CCSBT. Members and Cooperating Non-Members fully comply with the confidentiality agreements and provisions within the CCSBT. | PR-2014-13: As long as the confidentiality problem will hamper the quality of the scientific assessment efforts CCSBT should continue to improve the accessibility of “confidential” data for this purpose, with appropriate safeguards. A time limit should be adopted in the data confidentiality rules, putting most if not all data in the public domain after a given period of time sufficient to reduce sufficiently or eliminate any risk from its broader use. | EC to address. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| SAWG-2010 (Scientific Advice Working Group (of Kobe II)) | Range of recommendations on data collection and sharing. | PR-2014-14: It is recommended that the SAWG recommendations be carefully examined and integrated in the data collection and sharing agenda. | Ongoing. |
| Quality and provision of scientific advice | | | |
| SA-2008-9 | Achieve a better balance between the scientific efforts dedicated to SBT on the one hand and ERS on the other. | PR-2014-15: The above recommendation is important and is probably a long-term one with implications for research but also for management. However, because of the subjectivity of the concept of balance and its potential financial implications, it should be used as a “chapeau” and be complemented by more specific ones, related to specific species/areas requiring more attention. | Ongoing. Support noted through progress of the ERSWG. |
| SA-2008-11 | In light of the requirement to focus on future information with which to assess the stock status of SBT, the number and skill sets of independent experts required in support of the scientific process should be reviewed. | PR-2014-17: Assess the eventual gaps in scientific skills and proceed to fill them through recruitment (including of new/ complementary profiles in the Independent Panel) and capacity building in partner countries. | Ongoing. High priority in the case of the Independent Panel. |
| Kobe III-1: Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) | Contribute to a Joint Technical WG on MSE to facilitate the implementation the PA (Kobe III p.4 and Annex 3 § 1.3) | PR-2014-19: The CCSBT should continue to contribute to tuna RFMOs effort to develop MSE capacity and implementation. As the Joint WG now exists, more specific recommendations might be more useful in the future. | Ongoing. |
| SAWG-2010 | - Regular large scale tagging programs (including archival tagging) to estimate natural mortality growth and movement patterns as well as tuna behavior and vulnerability. | PR-2014-20: Large scale tagging programmes do not seem to be undertaken anymore which means that the recommendation above is not fulfilled. It should be maintained or formally rejected by the ESC with an explicit rationale. | Low priority. Focus is on gene tagging for absolute estimates of recruitment. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| SAWG-2010 | <p>- The study of spatial aspects of stock assessment to substantiate spatial management measures.</p> | <p>PR-2014-21: Efforts to gain information on the spatial structure and movements of the SBT stock and the fleets exploiting it should be continued as they are of paramount importance for management and conservation.</p> <p>PR-2014-22: A spatial, ecosystem-based framework could be developed as a strategic layer of assessment, added to the presently more tactical framework (imposed by the knowledge available as well as the need to deliver an undifferentiated TAC estimate), to be used every 5-10 years, perhaps in connection (not in synchrony) with the MP 6-yearly performance assessment, for obtaining a more realistic foresight.</p> | <p>Low priority for additional work but some work already occurring.</p> <p>Low priority unless new evidence indicating stock structure becomes available.</p> |
| SAWG-2010 | <p>- The use of high-resolution spatial ecosystem models to better integrate biological features of tuna stocks and their environment.</p> <p>- Agree on a list of minimum standards for stock assessment</p> | <p>PR-2014-23: The recommendation is apparently being implemented across various activities. It should probably be maintained until a formal document is agreed and published on minimal stock assessment standards.</p> | <p>Low priority for future work.</p> |
| SAWG-2010 | <p>- Develop research capacity in developing Members' countries</p> | <p>PR-2014-24: This subject is important for the future of the CCSBT decision making progress and legitimacy and should be elevated to a continuing recommendation. The direct role of CCSBT might be limited (by its funding and own capacity to train) but it could help identify needs, promote assistance and monitor capacity-building activities directly related to the fulfilment of its mandate.</p> | <p>Ongoing. High priority.</p> |
| Adoption of conservation and management measures | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Kobe-1: Ecologically related species | Strengthen conservation and management measures to minimize harmful impacts of SBT fisheries on non-target populations and their ecosystems and ensure long-term sustainability, using the best scientific evidence available. In particular: Increase attention on sharks, seabirds, turtles and mammals (KIII.5.b.f), minimizing the impact of fishing (KI.I.10; KI.I.11). Assess and manage sharks (KI.I.11; KII.1f; KIII.5.b.d). Require the use of on-board observers to collect discards data (KIII.5.b.a); | PR-2014-31: There is obviously a trade-off in the use of the observers' time which affects the precision of the data (and ensuing assessments) of SBT and ERS respectively. Although the detailed data collected eventually by observers is not known, a minimal assessment of the state of the ERS (or contribution to such assessment in a collaborative framework) will probably require more ERS data to be collected. The use of video cameras might be a useful assistance to the observer. | Refer to ERS |
| Compatibility of management measures | | | |
| SA-2008-18 | The CCSBT's arrangements in relation to catch limits and national allocations are compatible between high seas and in areas under national jurisdiction. The CCSBT should continue to ensure that measures are compatible. | PR-2014-40. Because of the central importance of spawning and recruitment for stock rebuilding, additional efforts should be made to develop, in Indonesian waters, spatio-temporal restrictions, equitable and compatible with the rest of the management strategy. | Low priority. Refer to comments in 2014-6. |
| 2. Compliance and enforcement | | | |
| Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| SA-2008-23 | Acknowledging the 2007 Kobe commitment to consistent ROP standards, the CCSBT should align its observer program with those of other RFMOs which also have an observer program such as CCAMLR and the IOTC. | PR-2014-44: The CCSBT should accelerate its efforts to strengthen its Scientific Observer Standards and ensure they are harmonized with those of neighbouring RFMOs with respect to ERS observer data. The CCSBT should also give serious consideration to the development of a ROP, perhaps through forging a relationship with the WCPFC to allow for mutual recognition or cross endorsement of observers, as the WCPFC and IATTC have done. | Done. New observer standards endorsed by the ESC. Serious consideration has already been given to an ROP by the CC/EC. This is referred to CC/EC. |
|------------|--|--|--|

| 3. International cooperation | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Cooperation with other RFMOs | | | |
| SA-2008-29 PR-2008 | <p>- There are significant opportunities for the CCSBT to work more closely with and to harmonise measures with other RFMOs, especially with the other tuna-RFMOs, and this should be a priority area for the CCSBT.</p> <p>- The CCSBT should add combating IUU fishing activities to the list of crosscutting issues affecting all tuna RFMOs, as well as monitoring and regulating transshipment, particularly given CCSBT's geographical overlap with the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.</p> | <p>PR-2014-56: Given the reliance of the CCSBT, in many ways, on cooperative relationships with other RFMOs for “harmonizing” with (and using directly) a number of those neighbouring RFMOs’ measures, the work called for by the Kobe process and its 2010 workshops is particularly relevant. The CCSBT should look seriously for opportunities to re-invigorate discussions among its neighbouring RFMOs to work more closely to implement the Kobe recommendations. Key areas of collaboration include: more systematic exchange of data and information (interoperable databases); additional harmonization of measures; conducting more joint scientific workshops; increasing coordination of compliance work, particularly to combat IUU fishing and conserve and manage ERS; large-scale tagging programmes; ecosystem approach implementation; large scale ecosystem-based modelling; Management Strategy Evaluation; harmonisation of MCS systems; common formats for assessing compliance (with data reporting; infringements, etc.); capacity-building (e.g. training courses); and development of common positions at IUCN, CITES, CBD, and the UNGA.</p> | <p>Ongoing. High priority on a case by case basis (e.g. exchanging data for estimates of unaccounted mortality).</p> |

Draft five-year Action Plan for implementing the CCSBT Strategic Plan

The Action Plan provides a timeframe for implementing the strategies specified in the Strategic Plan. For “new” items of work, unless otherwise specified, the following timeframes have been used for each of the priorities specified in the Strategic Plan:

| Priority | Timeframe |
|-------------|-----------|
| Very High | 2016-2017 |
| High | 2017-2018 |
| Medium/High | 2018 |
| Medium | 2018-2019 |
| Medium/Low | 2019 |
| Low | 2019-2020 |

Many of the strategies identified within the Strategic Plan have already been implemented and do not require additional commitments from Members and/or the Secretariat other than those that have previously been agreed. To assist in identifying where additional work is required, the following symbols have been used within the Action Plan:

| Symbol | Description |
|--------|---|
| ✓ | Action items that are considered to be part of the CCSBT’s regular ongoing work, or that have been agreed to be conducted by the CCSBT. These action items require no additional commitments other than those that have previously been agreed. |
| ⇒ | As above, except that additional commitments from the Secretariat and/or some Members is required to fully implement this strategy or to achieve the necessary quality of implementation. |
| ● | Action items that have not yet been incorporated into CCSBT’s future work plan. Implementation of these strategies will require new commitments. |

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|---|---|--------------|------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| (A) Goals Concerning Management of SBT | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Re-building SBT | | | | | | |
| | [Set target and limit reference points for rebuilding the SBT stock, and adopt strategies for achieving the target and avoiding the limit points | Very High | | | | | |
| | • The interim target reference point is to rebuild the SBT stock to 20% of the original spawning biomass, with 70% probability, by 2035 | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | • The limit reference point is SSB ₂₀₁₀ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | • Assess the costs and benefits of alternative rebuilding strategies, including those that favour stock rebuilding over short-term catch increase] | | • | • | | | |
| 2 | Sound scientific basis for setting TAC | | | | | | |
| 2.1(i) | The Scientific Committee review the function and inputs to the Management Procedure in 2016 and 2017 to ensure it will achieve rebuild targets and timeframes and thereafter at six yearly intervals | Very High | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| 2.1(ii) | Continue to use MP as input to setting global TAC | Very High | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| 2.1(iii) | Monitor stock status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of stock and fishery indicators (annual) • In depth stock assessment (every 3 years) | Very High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3 | Quality & provision of scientific advice | | | | | | |
| 3.1(i) | Continue to implement the High Level Code of Practise for Scientific Data Verification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See also goal 8 (monitoring, control and surveillance) | Very High | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 3.1(ii) | [Develop enhanced rules for commercially confidential scientific data to encourage sharing of these data in order to harmonise activities with other RFMOs and improve the functioning of the Commission] | Very High | • | • | | | |
| 3.1(iii) | Implement the definition of attributable catch agreed at the CCSBT 21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members report accurate and complete data on all sources of mortality for SBT in accordance with the data provision rules | Very High | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | | |
| 3.2(i) | Maintain the independent chairs & advisory panel for the scientific process, but periodically review the number and skill sets of independent experts required | Medium /High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|----------|--|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| 3.2(ii) | Develop and agree a CCSBT research plan including Member-funded, collaborative and CCSBT-funded projects | Medium /High | | | ● | | |
| | • Implementation of CCSBT five year research plan | | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| | • Implement necessary scientific research by Commission and/or members | | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 4 | Ecologically related species | | | | | | |
| 4.1(i) | Implement the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on ERS of fishing for SBT, including collection and reporting of data on ERS (para 3), implementation of mitigation measures (para 2) and assessment of the risks caused by fishing for SBT (para 7) in each fishery | Medium /High | | | | | |
| | • All Members implement the Recommendation to Mitigate the Impact on ERS of Fishing for SBT | | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| | • Review the implementation of the Recommendation on ERS | | | | ● ¹ | | |
| | • Continue to provide ERS data in line with agreed requirements for reporting of bycatch and mitigation measures used in each fishery | | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| | • Assess how well the mitigation measures adopted by other area-based RFMOs mitigate the risks caused by fishing [in order to determine the need for any additional or different measures when fishing for SBT] | | | ✓ ² | | ✓ ² | |
| | • Where necessary, identify and adopt additional mitigation measures to manage risk taking into account the coordination and harmonisation with other RFMOs | | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 4.1(ii) | Coordination and harmonization with area-based RFMOs, including on data reporting (see above) | Medium /High | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 4.1(iii) | [Develop a policy and management strategy for ERS, adopting clear objectives as well as reference values or trends, limits and targets, against which performance could be assessed. Better use of observers would improve the efficiency of the policy.] | Medium /High | | | ● ³ | ● ³ | |

¹ Each Member's/CNM's implementation of the ERS Recommendation should be reviewed each year at the Compliance Committee when the Committee reviews annual reports. It has been assumed that this task is intended to be a more comprehensive review of the implementation of this recommendation.

² This is a standing item on ERSWG meeting agendas. ERSWG meetings are typically conducted once every two years.

³ It is assumed that the EC would prepare the initial policy document/management strategy and that after this, the ERSWG would provide advice on reference values, limits and targets etc. as appropriate.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|----------|---|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| 4.2(i) | Instruct the ERSWG to monitor predator and prey species which may affect the condition of the SBT stock and report its findings to the Commission | Medium | | ✓ ² | | ✓ ² | |
| 4.3(i) | Promote research on ecosystem conditions that may affect the reproduction of SBT, with a view to improving knowledge of the effect of climate change on reproduction and recruitment of SBT. | To be agreed | ? ● | ? ● | ? ● | ? ● | ? ● |
| 5 | Allocation | | | | | | |
| 5.1(i) | Continue to implement the Resolution on the Allocation of the Global Total Allowable Catch | Medium /High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 5.1(ii) | Establish principles for allocation to Members, following Article 8(4) of the Convention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop options (based on Convention text) for long term allocation arrangements for all Members, including new members, and apply to TAC increases or decreases | Medium /High | | | ● ⁴ | | |
| 6 | Flexible management arrangements | | | | | | |
| 6.1(i) | In the longer term, implement flexible management arrangements such as quota trading and under and over fishing rules | High | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Resolution on Limited Carry-forward of Unfished Annual Total Allowable Catch of Southern Bluefin Tuna allows for some flexibility | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the Corrective Actions Policy (Compliance Policy Guideline 3) if needed to respond to overcatch | | ⇨ | ⇨ | ⇨ | ⇨ | ⇨ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As appropriate, conduct <u>quota</u> trading between Members | | | ● | ● | | |
| 6.2(i) | Monitor capacity in the fishery in relation to available catches | Low /Medium | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flag states/fishing entities to complete self-assessments of capacity with respect to national allocations. Flag State/fishing entity to take corrective action if required | | ✓ ⁵ | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretariat continue to manage the CCSBT active vessel list | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

⁴ Allocation rules were established in the “Resolution on the Allocation of the Global Total Allowable Catch”. This Resolution should be updated once new Members (e.g. the European Union and South Africa) have joined the extended Commission.

⁵ Indonesia is the only Member that has yet to complete its self-assessment and this is scheduled to occur during 2015.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|--|--|----------|----------------|------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess threats to SBT from overcapacity in other fleets | | ⇒ ⁶ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| (B) Goals concerning Operation/Administration of Commission and Secretariat | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Operation of the Commission | | | | | | |
| 7.1(i) | Streamline Commission processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify ways to streamline Commission processes (including annual and subsidiary meetings) | High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7.1(ii) | Review the costs and benefits of changing the current chairing arrangements for CCSBT including consideration of longer term appointments to ensure full year availability of a Chair for support, decision making and continuity | High | | ● | ● | | |
| 7.1(iii) | Coordinate services amongst Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (e.g. transshipment management, management of ERS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruct the Secretariat to identify opportunities for services to be coordinated amongst Regional Fisheries Management Organisations and to provide suggestions to the Commission | High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7.1(iv) | Undertake Commission performance reviews periodically to routinely assess opportunities for improvements, including both self-assessment and independent reviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree on regular reviews of Commission performance (including timeframes, running and funding of the review, criteria (including any changes proposed through the joint tuna RFMO process), involvement of independent experts, and links between review outcomes and the CCSBT strategic plan) | High | | | | ● ⁷ | |
| 7.2(i) | Clearly document the reasons for decisions | Medium | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a rule that the Commission must clearly document the rationale for decisions, including where they differ from the science advice provided to the Commission | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure past Commission decisions are readily accessible | | ⇒ | ⇒ | | | |

⁶ Threats to SBT are currently being assessed by evaluating the likelihood of other fleets catching SBT and by monitoring trade of SBT. Further work in these areas is required. It has been assumed that a specific project to assess threats from overcapacity in other fleets is not required, but this needs to be confirmed.

⁷ The last performance review of the CCSBT was conducted in 2014, so the next review should be conducted in 2019 if CCSBT's original recommendation for Performance Reviews every five years is still considered to be appropriate.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|----------|---|----------|------------|----------------|-------------|------|----------------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| 7.2(ii) | Continue with open publication of Commission documents in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of CCSBT | Medium | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7.2(iii) | Continue to allow access to observers in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of CCSBT | Medium | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7.2(iv) | Consider the need to improve transparency of the decision making processes by minimising the use of Heads of Delegation meetings | Medium | | | ● | ● | |
| 7.3(i) | Review Convention text (if Member/s propose such negotiations) and, where appropriate, incorporate modern fisheries management principles and/or standards through decisions of the Commission e.g. in reviewing Management Procedure; measures to manage ERS (noting the latter option may be more efficient) | Medium | | | ● | ● | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review parameters for the Management Procedure that ensure the precautionary approach is applied and ecosystem-based management is incorporated | | | ● ⁸ | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task the SC with incorporating modern fisheries management principles and/or standards that have not yet been included in its work | | | | ● | ● | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review decisions of the Commission to ensure modern fisheries management principles and standards are incorporated | | | | | | ● ⁹ |
| 7.3(ii) | Formalise the ongoing role of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG), including to ensure modern fisheries management standards are incorporated into the Commission's decision making. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly define the on-going role of the SFMWG, its terms of reference and its chairing arrangements Include provision in the terms of reference for the SFMWG for incorporating modern fisheries management standards into its advice to the Commission | Medium | | | ● | ● | |

⁸ The “Medium” priority suggests that this should be conducted in 2018-2019. However, it would be best to review the parameters of the MP as part of the review of the MP scheduled for 2017. Other parts of this work (e.g. ecosystem-based management) might be better scheduled for the next review of the MP (6 years later).

⁹ A review of the CCSBT's decisions in relation to modern fisheries management standards and principles was conducted as part of the 2014 Performance Review of the CCSBT. It would be sensible and efficient to conduct the next review of decisions as part of the next performance review of the CCSBT.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|---|---|----------|-----------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| (C) Goals concerning participation and implementation by Members | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Monitoring, control and surveillance | | | | | | |
| 8.1(i) | Implementation by Members of agreed MCS measures | High | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the list of the Commission’s conservation and management measures contained in the CCSBT’s “Minimum performance requirements to meet CCSBT Obligations” and review Members against these obligations at the Compliance Committee and through independent audits to obtain accurate data on all fisheries Continue to use standards and procedures to ensure data integrity (e.g. certain percentage of complete correct documentation accompanying landings and export/domestic sales; certain percentage of inspection | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 8.1(ii) | Implement Compliance Plan | High | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the necessity of additional MCS measures and/or improvement of agreed MCS measures to meet Commission objectives (e.g. eliminate unreported catch and have accurate verified data) Identify any gaps between MCS measures in place and any improvements or additional measures required and a process to implement these | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 8.1(iii) | Continue to strengthen efforts by all Members and Cooperating Non-Members to ensure sufficient compliance at each stage of SBT fisheries, from catch grounds to markets, including transshipment, farming and trade | High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider introducing a Port State measure either in the form of a recommendation or resolution, [consistent with the UNFAO Port State Measures agreement.] | | ⇒ | ⇒ | | | |
| 8.1(iv) | Monitoring of any possible SBT catch by non-cooperating non-members and/or expansion of their SBT markets, including through MCS activities and reviewing SBT trade data | High | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 8.1(v) | Review of data confidentiality rules to facilitate the exchange of compliance data | High | ✓ ¹⁰ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

¹⁰ Data confidentiality rules and an MCS information collection and sharing policy were adopted as part of the implementation of the previous Strategic Plan. It is assumed that the intent of this action item is to allow these rules and policy to be reviewed to facilitate the exchange of compliance data as the need arises.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|-----------|---|----------|-----------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| 8.1(vi) | The Secretariat should continue to: | High | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct analyses of MCS data submitted to the Secretariat, and report, on an annual basis, trends in MCS data | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the effectiveness of existing MCS measures based on data submitted to the Secretariat | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage and monitor the CCSBT's compliance initiatives | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 9 | Members' obligations | | | | | | |
| 9.1(i) | Routinely audit Members' implementation, enforcement, and compliance with conservation and management measures and international obligations as they relate to CCSBT (e.g. UN Fishstocks Agreement). See above (8.1(i)) | High | ✓ ¹¹ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 9.1(ii) | Apply the CCSBT's Corrective Actions Policy to breaches in the rules of the CCSBT and establish incentives to promote compliance (linked to 6.1 above) | High | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 10 | Supporting developing countries | | | | | | |
| 10.1(i) | Develop programme to assist developing countries with Commission requirements | High | | | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with developing country Members to identify areas where assistance would be beneficial to ensure they meet obligations under Commission decisions | | | ● | ● | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify ways in which assistance may be provided (e.g. up-skilling, secondments, workshops etc.) | | | ● | ● | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement a programme to assist developing countries with Commission requirements | | | ● | ● | | |
| 11 | Participation in the CCSBT | | | | | | |
| 11.1(i) | [Develop mechanisms for extending full CCSBT Membership to Fishing Entities and REIOs]. | Medium | | | ● | ● | |
| 11.1(ii) | Define processes for those seeking cooperating non-member or membership status to the CCSBT | Medium | | | ● | ● | |

¹¹ The "audit" referred to is assumed to comprise the annual review of compliance by the Compliance Committee together with regular Quality Assurance Reviews.

| | | Priority | Short term | | Medium term | | Long term |
|-----------|---|----------|------------|------|-------------|------|-----------|
| | | | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020++ |
| 11.1(iii) | Identify non-cooperating non-members' SBT catches and, if any, seek participation and/or cooperation of relevant entities | Medium | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ | ⇒ |
| 11.1(iv) | Investigate ways of providing for the participation and/or cooperation of a wider range of actors (such as port, market or carrier vessel flag states that do not fish for SBT) | Medium | | | ● | ● | |
| 11.2(i) | Establish a process for identifying non-member States that have, or are likely to become, important port or market States for SBT, and seek the cooperation of such States with the implementation of CCSBT management measures | High | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |