この文書の日本語版は、現在作成中です。日本語版が出来上がり次第このウェッブサイトに掲載します。

この文書の日本語版完成時期の詳細については、電子メールアドレス sec@ccsbt.org までお問い合わせください。

ご迷惑をおかけしました。

Commission for the Conservation of
Southern Bluefin Tuna


みなみまぐろ保存委員会

# Report of the Second Special Meeting

**29 April - 3 May 1996**
**Canberra, Australia**

**Report of the Second Special Meeting**
**29 April - 3 May 1996**
**Canberra, Australia**

The representatives of the Governments of Japan, New Zealand and Australia met for the Second Special Meeting of the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna during 29 April to 3 May to consider management measures for southern bluefin tuna.

The meeting was chaired by Dr Alison Turner (Australia). Lisa Futschek (New Zealand) was Vice-Chair. The agenda and delegation lists for the meeting are at Attachments A and B. The Commission approved the conclusions set out below.

***Opening Remarks***

All parties recognised the need for the Commission to resolve its current difficulties and to demonstrate the Commission's effectiveness as an international fisheries management organisation in ensuring a sustainable and responsibly managed fishery.

Japan indicated that in its view an experimental fishing program (EFP) such as the one proposed by Japan would be a most effective and practical way of resolving uncertainty in the stock assessment of SBT and that the expected benefits from an EFP would contribute substantially to resolving the current impasse on TAC. Japan urged the Commission parties to agree to review the EFP proposed by Japan in a constructive and speedy manner and to commence an EFP as soon as possible.

Australia and New Zealand emphasised the need to maintain a cautious approach in any collaborative work on experimental fishing and that any process adopted by the Commission would need to be fully evaluated with effective criteria to guide its implementation and monitoring. Both countries said that any consideration of experimental fishing should be premised on the principle of not jeopardising the recovery of the SBT stock, and of having a scientifically defensible and robust design.

***Consideration of Experimental Fishing***

The parties considered the issue of experimental fishing and came to a general agreement to work collaboratively on timely development and evaluation experimental fishing. The parties noted that EFP proposals, while carrying additional short term risk, can be an effective tool for reducing uncertainty in stock assessment, resulting in more responsive management.

Australia and New Zealand indicated that they would support collaborative and timely work on designing and evaluating an EFP, linked by means of predetermined management responses to clear management objectives. All parties strongly endorsed the need for any experimental program to not jeopardise stock recovery to the 1980 parent stock level by 2020 and for progress of any EFP to be reviewed annually. They recognised the potential benefits from conducting an EFP.

Australia and New Zealand clarified that any consideration of an experimental fishing program should not interfere with or disrupt the existing stock assessment process and that adequate additional time and resources would be required to develop and evaluate an EFP.

Japan indicated that, taking into account the benefits which could be derived from an EFP, ie reducing uncertainties in the stock assessment, the Commission's existing timetable for the stock assessment process should be modified to expedite steps relevant to the initiation of an EFP.

The Commission decided on a set of objectives and principles for the design and implementation of an EFP (Attachment C), providing a framework for addressing the substantive issues involved.

The Commission received a report prepared by the scientists which, although it did not represent a consensus view of the scientists, was of assistance in deciding on a process to evaluate the impacts of additional removals for experimental fishing on the recovery of the SBT stock as well as the design and evaluation of EFP's and the timetable required for this work (Attachment D).

The Commission agreed on the timetable for work on EFP and the 1996 Scientific Committee meeting and Annual Commission meeting at Attachment E.

***Total allowable catch and its allocation among the Parties***

The Commission decided that, for the 1995/96 fishing year, the total allowable catch would remain unchanged at 11,750 tonnes, and that the allocations to the Convention parties would be retained at:

| | |
|---|---|
| Japan | 6,065 tonnes |
| Australia | 5,265 tonnes |
| New Zealand | 420 tonnes |

Japan stated that it felt that the understanding on future allocation of quota at Annex 2 of the Conclusion of the First Commission Meeting was inappropriate, and that it would seek to have it abolished at the Commission's 1996 Annual Meeting. Japan stressed that it wished the Commission to establish a new mechanism for future national allocation in the light of the provisions of the Convention. New Zealand and Australia agreed to Japan's request to review the current understanding at the 1996 Annual Meeting.

***Other Business***

***a) Scientific Committee Rules of Procedure (RoP)***

Australia tabled draft RoP for the Scientific Committee on which the parties agreed to provide comments to Australia inter-sessionally, with the objective of having a revised version of the RoP available for consideration by the scientists at the next Scientific

Committee meeting.

***b) Compliance Committee Terms of Reference (ToR)***

Australia tabled a draft ToR, which Japan and New Zealand agreed to provide comments to Australia on inter-sessionally. Japan noted inclusion of principles from the UN Agreement on Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and Straddling Fish Stocks and expressed the view that as the UN Agreement was not in effect, that it would not be appropriate to refer to that agreement in the draft ToR for the Compliance Committee. Japan felt that the Commission would need to consider adding articles to its Convention to embrace compliance objectives arising from the UN agreement when it enters into force and is ratified by the three parties.

Australia commented that it considered the draft ToR to be written in the spirit and the letter of the existing Convention and that the Commission should look to the future and adopt the concepts on compliance of the UN agreement as soon as possible, even though it was not yet in force.

***c) 1996 Data Exchange***

New Zealand indicated that they had provided all required data as agreed on 1 April 1996 and reported that it had not received any Japanese data prior to the start of the Special Meeting.

Australia expressed concern that the data received from Japan on 18 April 1996 was not useable by Australian scientists. Japan mentioned that it had received the complete Australian data after 10 April 1996 confirmed that complete Japanese data in the form adjusted for use by Australian scientist had been sent to the other parties on 29 April. Australia noted that these d, had been received on 1 May 1996. New Zealand advised that it had still not received the Japanese data as at 2 May 1996.

***d) Proposed Red Book Listing of SBT***

It was noted that a concurrent International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) meeting in London was considering whether to have SBT listed in the "Red List" as endangered. The parties agreed to share information concerning action by the IUCN in relation to the listing of SBT the "Red List" and in particular wished to obtain information on the such a listing.

***e) 1996 Commission meeting and workshop timetable***

The Commission agreed on the timetable for work on the EFP and timing of this year's Scientific Committee and annual Commission meeting. New Zealand and Australia agreed to reduce the time between the Scientific Committee and the Commission from three to two weeks on the basis that it would not create a precedent for future years. The parties agreed to set tentative timing for some components of Step 3 (design and implementation), and so the ranges of possible meeting dates for that part of the timetable were noted to be tentative, although the parties agreed to hold the necessary

meetings, and to have the Special CCSBT meeting in Canberra (Attachment E).

### *f) Secretariat matters*

The meeting noted the steps taken by Australia to establish the Secretariat, to appoint an Acting Executive Secretary and to promulgate the Commission's privileges and immunities regulations.

The head of the Australian delegation and the Vice-Chair initiated the Headquarters Agreement and Australia advised that it expected to be in a position to sign the Agreement at the next annual Commission meeting. The Commission decided that, provided Australia proposed no further changes to the text, it would sign the Agreement at that time. It was noted that the majority of Australia's obligations in the Agreement were now binding on Australia under the regulations.

### *g) IOTC*

The Commission noted that the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) Agreement had come into force and that Japan was intending to become a member. All parties concurred that the Commission should work towards establishing a clear understanding with the IOTC regarding the CCSBT's competency to manage SBT stocks.

### *h) Kyoto Declaration and Plan of action*

Japan noted that Australia and New Zealand were amongst the countries that had adopted the Kyoto Declaration and Plan of Action by consensus. Japan sought the Commission's endorsement for the Declaration.

The Chair proposed and the Commission decided that the Secretariat should prepare a paper outlining an approach for the Commission to adopt in terms of its position on instruments such as the Kyoto Declaration and other international fishing initiatives.

### *i) UN report*

Australia noted the United Nations Secretary-General's request to individual countries for input to an annual compilation report on fisheries issues and recommended that the Commission should, as part of establishing its profile, report into this process. New Zealand endorsed this approach.

### *j) Non-parties*

The parties reaffirmed the importance of progressing the Commission's efforts and encouraging the involvement of non-parties with the Commission. Australia reported that the work in preparing correspondence to the Republic of Korea, Indonesia and Taiwan would be speeded with the establishment of the Secretariat.

***k) Japanese legislation***

Japan provided information about draft legislation including possible tuna import product restrictions currently being prepared by Diet members in Japan.

Signed

Alison Turner
Chair, CCSBT
5 May 1996

**Attachment A**

## Agenda

1. Opening of Meeting
   a) Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair
   b) Introductions
   c) Appointment of Rapporteurs
   d) Meeting Arrangements
   e) Adoption of Agenda

2. Chair's Opening Address

3. Opening Remarks
   a) New Zealand
   b) Japan
   c) Australia

4. Consideration of Experimental Fishing
   a) Principles and Scientific Procedures
   b) Criteria for Judging Effect of Experimental Fishing on Recovery of SBT Stock
   c) List of Questions for scientific Workshop on Experimental fishing

5. Total allowable catch and its allocation among the Parties

6. Other Business
   a) Scientific Committee Rules of Procedure
   b) Compliance Committee Terms of reference
   c) 1996 Data Exchange
   d) Proposed Red Book listing of SBT
   e) 1996 Commission meetings and workshop timetable
   f) Secretariat Matters
   g) IOTC
   h) Kyoto Declaration
   i) UN General Assembly Resolution
   j) Third parties

7. Close of Discussion

8. Adoption of Report and Close of Meeting

**Attachment B**

# List of Participants

## Chair

Dr Alison TURNER — First Assistant Secretary
Petroleum and Fisheries Division
Department of Primary Industry and Energy

## Australia

***Delegation***

Ms Mary HARWOOD — Acting Assistant Secretary
Fisheries Policy Branch
Department of Primary Industry and Energy
*(Head of Delegation)*

Mr Neil HERMES — Acting Director
International Relations Section
Fisheries Policy Branch
Department of Primary Industry and Energy

Mr Lindsay CHAPMAN — Manager
SBT and Western Tuna Fisheries
Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Mr Peter CASSELLS — Assistant Director
International Relations Section
Fisheries Policy Branch
Department of Primary Industry and Energy

***Government Experts and Advisers***

Dr Keith SAINSBURY — Program Leader
Pelagic Fisheries resources Program
Division of Fisheries
CSIRO

Dr Derek STAPLES — Director
Fisheries Resources Branch
Bureau of Resource Sciences
Department of Primary Industry and Energy

Mr Andrew McNEE — Director, Wildlife and Marine Management Section
Australian Nature Conservation Agency
Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Andrew SERDY | Sea Law and Ocean Policy Group<br>The Legal Office<br>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade |
| Mr Neil HUGHES | Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories |
| Mr Anthony PIGOUNIS | International Relations Section<br>Fisheries Policy Branch<br>Department of Primary Industry and Energy |

***Non-governmental Experts and Advisers***

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Glenn SANT | TRAFFIC Oceania |
| Mr Brian JEFFRIESS | President<br>Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia |
| Mr Terry ROMARO | Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia |
| Mr Joe PUGLIS | Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia |
| Mr Greg HONEYCHURCH | Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia |
| Mr Mario VALCIC | Tuna Boat Owners Association of Australia |

**Japan**

***Delegation***

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Minoru MORIMOTO | Councillor<br>Oceanic Fisheries Department<br>Fisheries Agency<br>*(Head of Delegation)* |
| Mr Masayuki KOMATSU | Deputy Director<br>Far Seas Fisheries Division<br>Fisheries Agency |
| Mr Daishiro NAGAHATA | Assistant Director<br>Far Seas Fisheries Division<br>Fisheries Agency |
| Mr Hiroshi TAKENOI | Far Seas Fisheries Division<br>Fisheries Agency |
| Mr Kiyoshi KATSUYAMA | Assistant Director<br>Marine Resources Division<br>Fisheries Agency |

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Jiro SUZUKI | Director-General<br>National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries<br>Fisheries Agency |
| Dr Yoshio ISHIZUKA | Chief<br>Research Planning and Coordination Section<br>National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries<br>Fisheries Agency |
| Ms Naoko HAMAGUCHI | Fisheries Section<br>Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| Mr Michio IIDA | First Secretary<br>Embassy of Japan<br>Canberra |

***Advisers to the Delegation***

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Hiroaki YAMAMOTO | National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association |
| Mr Tetsuo SAITO | National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association |
| Mr Tadakazu SHIMIZU | National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association |
| Mr Tsutomu WATANABE | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Yuji KAWAI | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Tsutomu HORII | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Keigo HARADA | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Kiichiro YOROZUYA | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Yoshikatsu HATAKEYAMA | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Hiroshi HANEDA | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |
| Mr Masahiro YAMADA | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |

| | |
|---|---|
| Ms Masako NAGAMITSU | Federation of Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Associations |

***Interpreter for the Delegation***
Ms Nami HOSHIZIMA

**New Zealand**

***Delegation***

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Arthur HORE | Regional Policy Manager, Ministry of Fisheries *(Head of Delegation)* |
| Dr Talbot MURRAY | National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research |
| Ms Lisa FUTSCHEK | Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade |
| Ms Lee ROBINSON | Ministry of Fisheries |

***Non-government Experts and Advisers***

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Charles HUFFLET | Solander Fisheries LTD |

**Interpreters**

Ms Saemi BABA

Ms Kumi KOIKE

**Attachment C**

Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna

**Second Special Meeting**
**Canberra**
**3 MAY 1996**

# Objectives and principles for the design and implementation of an experimental fishing program

## Preamble

The objectives of the Commission are to ensure the conservation and optimum utilisation of southern bluefin tuna. To achieve this the Commission requires scientific information on which to base management decisions.

Recognising that the lack of adequate scientific information impedes the ability of the Commission to make sound management decisions, there are measures available to the Commission to improve the quality and quantity of the scientific information. Experimental fishing would be such a measure and increasing removals above the current TAC should provide an opportunity for experimental fishing to proceed. This could happen where there is agreement within the Commission that the risks of such extra removals are outweighed by the benefits. The benefits come from the Commission's capacity, on the basis of the enhanced understanding of the stock derived from experimental fishing, to reduce uncertainty, thereby improving the stock assessment which would then allow the Commission to make improved management decisions for achieving management objectives.

Prior to the Commission deciding to proceed with any experimental fishing program it will need to agree on the way in which results coming from the program would be incorporated into the stock assessment and the future management decision-making for the fishery.

The following objectives and principles, understood in the context of the above, would apply to any experimental fishing program agreed by the Commission.

## Objectives and Principles

1. That any experimental fishing program's aim should be to reduce uncertainty in the stock assessment and projections as far as possible.

This should include:

(a) identifying major uncertainties in the stock assessment and the benefits expected from reducing those uncertainties

(b) identifying major uncertainties and the benefits that could be addressed by experimental fishing

(c) identifying other methods of addressing uncertainties that would augment any experimental fishing program

2. That the development, evaluation, implementation and analysis of the results of the experimental fishing program should be collaborative and agreed between all parties; and that

   (a) due consideration should be given to:

   - the program for experimental fishing proposed by Japan in January 1996;

   - other papers submitted to the Second Special Meeting of the Commission in April 1996; those developed by the CCSBT scientific process; and

   - proposal developed by any Party within the agreed timetable, to include closing dates for papers, for development of an experimental fishing program

   (b) parties agree on the equitable allocation between the parties of any increase in catch above the current TAC, and the consequential responsibilities prescribed for the fishing of that allocation

3. That the development and implementation of any program should not adversely impact on the process of conducting the annual stock assessment or the Commission's agreed program of other scientific work, recognising that the Commission may need to vary its agreed work program as priorities change.

   (a) it is necessary to maintain the integrity and scientific focus on the annual stock assessment

   (b) substantive issues relating to the development and evaluation of experimental fishing should be mainly handled by meetings scheduled specifically for that purpose or by the allocation of adequate time in other meetings

4. That any increase in catch, recommended above the current TAC to accommodate experimental fishing should not jeopardise the potential recovery of the parental stock to the 1980 level by 2020, or undermine other agreed management objectives.

   (a) prior to any experimental fishing program being implemented, agreement should be reached on specific criteria for determining whether any additional removals will jeopardise stock recovery

   (b) criteria for judging an experimental fishing program should be derived from management objectives e.g. a 50 to 90% chance of achieving 1980 parental stock

levels by 2020, and maintaining parental stock above that level having achieved it, or; the median of the parent stock projection returns to the 1980 level by 2020 and remains within the 95% confident interval of the agreed base case projection using current TAC.

(c) the Commission should agree as to the acceptable level of risk to the stock in assessing any proposal for experimental fishing which requires catch above the current TAC. The Commission should give due consideration to the benefits derived from experimental fishing.

5. That any experimental fishing program should be designed to deliver scientifically valid and meaningful results and that it should be designed for implementation by the commercial fishing vessels: The experimental program should;

   (a) give due consideration to evaluating experimental fishing programs for reducing uncertainty using existing methods for assessing experimental fisheries management where applicable

   (b) be capable of providing scientific answers to the uncertainties identified

   (c) be based on a scientific design which is shown to have valid and adequate statistical power and which will produce results which reduce uncertainty in the stock assessment

   (d) give due consideration to the continuity of data to enhance benefit from the experimental fishing program

   (e) improve scientific inputs to stock assessment including increased spatio-temporal coverage of catch and effort data

   In addition;

   (f) the views of fishers involved in the SBT fishery should be incorporated in developing any experimental fishing program

   (g) there should be an agreed definition of scientific validity

   (h) there will need to be an agreed trade off between scientific rigor and commercial considerations based on an agreed experimental design

   (i) notwithstanding (h) above, the agreed experimental design may determine the time and location of some fishing operations

   (j) whilst the experimental fishing will be conducted by commercial vessels other supporting programs may also be necessary (see Point 1 (c) )

6. There should be appropriate monitoring of any program, designed and conducted in a collaborative manner amongst the parties.

(a) the level and type of monitoring needed to meet the objectives of the program should be evaluated and agreed as part of the experimental design prior to implementation

(b) the level and type of monitoring should provide for verification of experimental data and any other agreed activities

(c) the Commission will ensure that members have individually or collaboratively put in place arrangements that will ensure that the agreed monitoring program proceeds

(d) monitoring should avoid as much as possible inconvenience to the vessels involved in the program

7. That any experimental fishing program contains specific provisions for instituting adjustments to the program as further information becomes available, bearing in mind that additional management measures may be required for the fishery as information becomes available from the program and the full range of Commission scientific work

   (a) the need for such adjustments and management measures will be reviewed annually amongst the Commission parties as any experimental fishing program proceeds.

8. That any experimental program should be incorporate agreed practical measures to minimise adverse impacts on ecologically related species

9. That, at its Annual meeting in 1996, the Commission will review progress and make a decision as to whether it is in a position to proceed with an experimental fishing program including the option of a pilot program. If the Commission agrees to proceed with an experimental fishing program, it will also make specific decisions on the catch levels, timing, and design of any program agreed at that meeting.

**Attachment D**

**Scientists report on evaluating the impact of additional removals for experimental fishing on the recovery of the SBT stock**

Evaluation of the impact of additional removals is part of a broader evaluation of the use of experimental fishing to meet the objectives and principles as produced by the CCSBT 3 May 1996 meeting. A process was agreed for evaluation of experimental fishing proposals. The process involves three steps. The first two steps could be conducted at a workshop prior to the next Scientific Committee, and a report provided to the Commission. The scientists agreed that a 6 day workshop would be necessary to achieve steps 1 and 2. The Commission may wish to review the results of steps 1 and 2 before step 3 proceeds, but the scientific work on step 3 could be started in parallel with steps 1 and 2.

Steps two and three require definition by the Commission of stock recovery (eg. rebuilding to the 1980 parental biornass level by the year 2020). If the Commission agrees on a probability of recovery (eg. 50 - 90 percent chance of rebuilding to the 1980 parental biomass level by the year y) then step two would provide the catch levels that would deliver the agreed probability of recovery.

Step 1.

Agree on the range of uncertainty to be considered in evaluation of experimental fishing proposals, and the weight to be placed on the various options within that range.

The range of uncertainty in GLM, VPA and projections will be addressed. The recent workshop provides a very good start on the uncertainties relating to GLM and VPA, with the report identifying 25 specific agreements.

It is agreed that the workshop will proceed by

- identifying an initial range of interpretation within each type of uncertainty
- narrowing that range as much as is possible using scientific criteria and existing knowledge
- developing a method to determine reasonable and objective weights.

The scientists agreed that the method for determining weights should be developed as soon as possible. and that Baysian approaches may be one of the appropriate methods.

Step 2.

An initial evaluation of the effect of changed catch levels on the chance of recovery. This would include:

- the effect on recovery probability of constant increases or decreases in catches of various levels,
- the effect on recovery of a range of catch scenarios as might happen under experimental fishing (eg, increase by x tonnes for y years then return to present levels for a certain age or size range of fish caught),

- the effect on recovery of resolving the main uncertainties in the points above, and suggestions as to how such resolution might be achieved,
- suggest requirements for additional information (eg research surveys etc).

Step 3.

An evaluation of experimental management to determine the most effective use of experimental catch. This includes the type of information provided from the experimental fishing and how that information would be used by management. The approach to this evaluation would be

- empirical analysis of past fishing experience on possible results from the proposed experiment,
- seek to develop a simulation model that incorporated the agreed uncertainties,
- simulation of the possible results of proposed experiments,
- analysis of the simulated results by agreed methods.

**Scientists notes on a timetable for evaluating experimental fishing and the annual stock assessment**

The scientists discussed possible timetables for conducting (a) the three step evaluation of experimental fishing described in the report to the Commission titled "Scientists report on evaluating the impact of additional removals for experimental fishing on the recovery of the SBT stock", and (b) the annual stock assessment.

The scientists discussed the requirements to complete the three steps as well as the annual stock assessment before the 3rd annual CCSBT Commission meeting,. The scientists agreed that it was not possible to do all of the work on that timetable, but that significant progress could be made. By the 3rd annual meeting steps 1 and 2 could be done and the answers provided to the Commission, step 3 could be started, and the stock assessment could be done.

One suggested timetable of meetings and work, that was possible to do in the available time:

- Data provision 2 May 1996
- 3 weeks preparation for experimental management workshop
- 10 day experimental management workshop, which will:
    - address steps 1 and 2 to evaluate experimental fishing (6 days).
    - scientists/Commissioners/industry meeting to review the results of steps 1 and 2 in the evaluation, to describe and discuss any proposals for experimental fishing (including new proposals), and to obtain input from industry on any matters relevant to experimental fishing (2 days).
    - scientists develop methods that will be used in step 3 (2 days).
- 11 weeks analysis and preparation for the annual Scientific Committee meeting
- Scientific Committee meeting. 10 days
- 3 week period for consideration of Report from Scientific Committee
- 3rd CCSBT Commission level
- finalisation of step 3, if required, including one further scientific workshop, and reporting to either a special Commission meeting or the latest the 4th Commission meeting.

The above program is an outline only, and does not take account of the previous commitments and the schedule of work of the people involved.

Various options for shortening the suggested timetable were discussed. These included reducing the previously agreed 11 weeks for the stock assessment. But no solution could be found during the meeting that would deliver both the annual stock assessment and the full 3 steps of evaluation of experimental fishing. Not withstanding that, possible ways to shorten the above timetable should be considered.

In the above timetable the scientific work that will be completed by the 3rd CCSBT Commission meeting is:

- the annual stock assessment,

- steps 1 and 2 of the evaluation of experimental fishing,
- receipt of proposals for experimental fishing,
- development of methods for conducting step 3 of the evaluation of experimental fishing.

This work program would be expected to provide the following information to the 3rd Commission meeting:

- The probability of achieving recovery targets at different levels of possible experimental fishing catch.
- If the acceptable probability of achieving the recovery target is provided then the catch level giving that probability will be calculated for a range of possible durations and age composition of experimental catches.
- Updated stock assessments, and if step one of the evaluation process is successful then all the analyses should be similar.
- Recommendations on the methods for evaluating the benefits of conducting experimental fishing and optimising the experimental design.

On the suggested timetable, the 3rd Commission meeting it would have the scientific input it needed to

1. consider the risks of experimental fishing at various catch levels, and
2. review the recommended approaches to evaluate the benefits of conducting experimental fishing and optimising the experimental design (ie step 3).

**Attachment E**

**Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna**
**2nd Special Meeting Canberra 29 April - 3 May 1996**

**Agreed Timetable for**
**Evaluation and Development of an Experimental Fishing Program**