



CCSBT-EC/1810/12

CCSBT Strategic Plan

Purpose

To consider implementation issues in relation to the CCSBT Strategic Plan.

Introduction

An updated CCSBT Strategic Plan was adopted by the Annual Meeting of the Extended Commission (EC) during October 2015. The Strategic Plan contains a five-year Action Plan that specifies when the different strategies (action items) of the Strategic Plan should be implemented. Most of the action items are being dealt with in various meetings of the CCSBT. This paper considers five action items specified for 2018 (or for 2019 that require an initial discussion at CCSBT 25) that are not considered elsewhere in these meetings.

- (1) a) 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 priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2018-2019)
- b) Develop mechanisms for extending full CCSBT Membership to Fishing Entities and REIOS (medium priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2018-2019)

Items “a” and “b” above are from two different areas of the Strategic Plan. Item “a” is from section 7.3 in relation to modern fisheries management principles and/or standards, while item “b” is from section 11.1 to ensure that all States, Regional Economic Integration Organisations and fishing entities catching SBT are incorporated in the Commission and engaged in the cooperative management of SBT.

Aspects of items “a” and “b” were discussed together at CCSBT 24 as both potentially involve a review of the CCSBT’s Convention. Consequently, both items are presented together in this paper.

Background

Past Performance Reviews of the CCSBT have made comments or recommendations in relation to whether to amend the CCSBT Convention to incorporate modern standards for fisheries management, including:

- *“UNFSA provides the minimum standards which RFMOs should meet. While the Convention was adopted pre-UNFSA, to ensure it is performing effectively, the CCSBT should satisfy those UNFSA standards. The parties to the Convention could review the Convention and modernise it to UNFSA standards. While this could be a worthwhile exercise, the same outcomes could be achieved more efficiently through means such as development of a CCSBT strategic plan plus a management plan adopting and implementing these minimum standards.”¹*
- *The CCSBT should “take a hard look at its Convention, compare it to more modern instruments, and seriously consider the need to amend or renegotiate it. If the CCSBT concludes that the time is not ripe to undertake such an initiative, it should nevertheless be possible to incorporate many of the modern standards for fisheries management into the work of the Commission in other ways, including through the adoption of additional conservation and management measures and updated Management Procedure.”²;*
- *“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.”³*

At CCSBT 20, the Commission approved amendments to its Resolution to Establish an Extended Commission and an Extended Scientific Committee, to allow the European Union to become a Member of the Extended Commission. The paper submitted by the Secretariat (CCSBT-EC/1310/13) to CCSBT 20 noted that:

“The majority view of CCSBT Members seems to be that modification of the Extended Commission Resolution is the more prudent mechanism to pursue at the present time. This is due to practical considerations such as the amount of effort involved and the lengthy administrative approval process associated with amending the Convention when compared with other priorities of the CCSBT. Nevertheless, amending the Convention would remain an option for the future, possibly as part of a wider review of the CCSBT.”

Paragraphs 89 to 92 of the CCSBT 23 report summarised a brief round table discussion on the Convention that was held during CCSBT 23. These paragraphs are repeated below:

89. *The European Union advised that it wished to seek Members’ views regarding the possibility to allow REIOs to become full Members of the CCSBT, and to provide feedback on the possibility of reviewing and amending the CCSBT Convention if necessary to allow full membership to the EU.*
90. *Taiwan pointed out that the Action Plan of CCSBT’s Strategic Plan includes an action item to Develop mechanisms for extending full CCSBT Membership to Fishing Entities and REIOs (refer to 11.1(i)), and that this work is scheduled to be considered between 2018 and 2019. It continued that the Convention could remain without revising it if all Members believe that the EC functions well.*
91. *Members did not support commencing the process of reviewing the Convention currently due to lack of necessity and other work priorities, however, some Members noted that they might be in a position to consider the European Union’s proposal in the future.*
92. *The European Union indicated that this is an important matter for it because it is representing EU Member States and this is the practise of other RFMO’s and the European Union may initiate some bilateral communications intersessionally to discuss this matter further.*

¹ Report of the Performance Review Working Group (2008).

² Report of the Independent Expert on the CCSBT’s 2008 Performance Review (2008).

³ Performance of the CCSBT 2009-2013: Independent Review (2014).

From the discussion at CCSBT 23, it appeared that work on amending the Convention was not of a sufficiently high priority for most Members to review the Convention in the timeframe specified by the Strategic Plan, which was during 2018 and 2019.

At CCSBT 24, Members discussed the desirability of modernising the Convention including issues related to Membership, and some Members expressed concern about potentially deferring further discussion until the next review of CCSBT's Strategic Plan.

It was agreed that this item should be discussed at CCSBT 25 in the agenda item on the Strategic Plan.

Issues for consideration:

The EC might wish to consider:

- Whether or not the CCSBT's Convention should be amended to include modern fisheries management principles and/or standards. This could include discussion of alternative approaches for ensuring that modern principles of fisheries management are incorporated into the decisions of the CCSBT, such as implementing requirements through the CCSBT's Rules of Procedure⁴ and incorporating any necessary strategies within the CCSBT's Strategic Plan.
- Whether or not the CCSBT's Convention should be amended to allow Fishing Entities and Regional Economic Integration Organisations to accede to the Convention.
- If there is a view that the Convention should be amended, then discuss:
 - an appropriate timeframe for revising the Convention, noting that this task is likely to take several years; and
 - An appropriate process to follow for revising the Convention.

(2) Task the SC with incorporating modern fisheries management principles and/or standards that have not yet been included in its work (medium priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2018-2019)

This strategy is from Goal 7.3 of the Strategic Plan, which is that: *“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”*

The Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) is already required to incorporate advice consistent with the precautionary approach in its advice to the Extended Commission (EC)⁴. The ESC also incorporates the best scientific information available in its advice to the EC, some of which is from cutting edge science such as close-kin genetic analysis and gene tagging. Furthermore, the ESC's work on management strategy evaluation and management procedure development/implementation is leading the world in an area that is now considered extremely important in modern fisheries management. Consequently, it does not seem necessary to task the ESC with any further fisheries management principles and/or standards in relation to its work with southern bluefin tuna.

⁴ For example, the CCSBT's Rules of Procedure require that *“The Scientific Committee shall incorporate advice consistent with the precautionary approach in its advice to the Commission.”*

Nevertheless, the ESC has not incorporated ecosystems-based fisheries management principles into its advice. The Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) is currently the subsidiary body within the CCSBT that provides advice on ecosystems-based matters. However, progress by the ERSWG has been hampered by differing views amongst Members as to the priority of different aspects of its work and appropriate management action to take in relation to ERS matters.

At CCSBT 25, the EC is scheduled to be discussing important matters in relation to Ecologically Related Species (ERS), including the CCSBT's vision in relation to ERS, a possible way of implementing binding ERS measures for the CCSBT, and the Terms of Reference for the ERSWG. These discussions would seem to be a necessary first step before tasking the SC and/or ERSWG with incorporating specific ecosystems-based fisheries management principles into its/their advice. However, some Members may have proposals to suggest that are not dependent on the outcomes of these discussions.

(3) 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. (medium priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2018-2019)

- Clearly define the on-going role of the SFMWG, its name, terms of reference and its chairing arrangements as part of the review at 7.1(vii)
- Include provision in the terms of reference for the SFMWG for incorporating modern fisheries management standards into its advice to the Commission

The SFMWG was created at CCSBT 15 (October 2008) to consider management objectives, a fisheries management plan and stock rebuilding options for the SBT fishery. The original terms of reference (ToR), developed at CCSBT 15, for the SFMWG is provided at **Attachment A**.

Five SFMWG meetings have been held so far. A brief description of the focus of these meetings is provided below to indicate how the SFMWG has been utilised over the past 10 years:

- SFMWG 1: The focus of this meeting was the development of a rebuilding strategy and technical measures for managing the SBT stock. The meeting also commenced discussion on the first strategic plan and provided some feedback to the Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) concerning five alternative constant catch projection options suggested by the ESC.
- SFMWG 2: This meeting further considered the rebuilding strategy for managing the SBT stock, recommended a strategic plan for adoption by the Extended Commission (EC), provided advice to the Management Procedure Technical Working Group and the ESC in relation to development of the Management Procedure, and considered action plans developed by Members in accordance with the "Resolution on action plans to ensure compliance with Conservation and Management Measures".
- SFMWG 3: This meeting was cancelled due to the earthquake and tsunami that struck Japan during March 2011. It had been planned that this meeting would consider: a Draft compliance plan and compliance policy statements; a Revised draft CCSBT strategic plan; Issues related to CCSBT's confidentiality rules; a Draft resolution for provision of fisheries dependent data to support scientific assessments; Discussion of a regional observer

program; Matters relating to the management procedure; and Allocation of the TAC. Due to the cancellation of this SFMWG meeting, some of these matters were considered at a lengthened Special Meeting of the Extended Commission later in the same year.

SFMWG 4: This meeting focused on funding arrangements for the CCSBT's Scientific Research Program, particularly in relation to the Scientific Aerial Survey, and on the development of a revised CCSBT Strategic Plan. The meeting also briefly considered the concept of a fisheries management plan for SBT and possible revised minimum performance requirements for ecologically related species. Nominations for the new Chair of the Compliance Committee were considered by this meeting and a preferred candidate was chosen.

SFMWG 5: The most recent SFMWG meeting was focused primarily on providing advice on the desirable behaviour and specification for the new management procedure. The meeting also considered CCSBT's processes with respect to ecologically related species and whether to develop a fisheries management plan, whether to review the SBT allocation model for future Members and whether to review the form and function of the Compliance Committee.

With a few exceptions, the activities of the SFMWG have been largely within its mandate as described by its ToR. The exceptions include consideration of funding arrangements for the CCSBT's Scientific Research Program, choosing the preferred candidate to Chair the Compliance Committee, and considering the form and function of the Compliance Committee.

A draft revision of the SFMWG's ToR is provided at **Attachment B**. In the revised ToR, the broad purpose of the SFMWG is to provide high level strategic, operational and/or fisheries management advice consistent with modern standards of international fisheries management as requested by the Extended Commission. The revision includes some suggestions that were made for the SFMWG's ToR at a Heads of Delegation meeting at CCSBT 21. The ToR has been purposely left broad in scope so that the Extended Commission can use the SFMWG to provide high level advice in a variety of areas, subject to the needs of the CCSBT. All past activities of the SFMWG fall within the scope of the revised ToR.

All past meetings of the SFMWG have been chaired by the hosting Member. This arrangement has worked well. However, with the new chairing arrangements for the EC, in which a Chair can be re-elected in consecutive years and serve for up to 4 years, it seems more logical for the Chair of the EC, if available, to also Chair the SFMWG. This chairing arrangement has been proposed in the revised ToR.

The EC is invited to consider the draft revision of the SFMWG's ToR at **Attachment B** and to make further revisions to this draft as appropriate.

(4) 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 priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2018-2019)

The CCSBT has, from time to time, sought the participation and/or cooperation of important port and market States. These include the USA, Singapore, China and Mauritius. Of these, the USA and Singapore continue to participate by attending annual meetings of the Compliance Committee and/or Extended Commission. The USA also actively cooperates with the CCSBT's CDS.

To the Secretariat's knowledge, the CCSBT has not sought participation or cooperation from Flag States of carrier vessel. Nevertheless, some carrier vessel Flag States (including include Belize, Liberia and Sierra Leone) have enquired in the past about becoming a Cooperating Non-Member (CNM) of the CCSBT to enable their carrier vessels to receive transshipments of SBT.

At present, carrier vessel Flag States do not require CNM status for their carrier vessels to participate in SBT transshipments. All that is required is for their vessels to be authorised by the catching CCSBT Member to receive that Members' SBT transshipments. However, greater participation and cooperation by these carrier vessel Flag States could potentially be obtained by revising CCSBT's Transshipment Resolution⁵ to require carrier vessels to be flagged to Members or CNMs of the CCSBT. This would also allow the CCSBT to establish tighter controls for carrier vessels (such as reporting requirements) if it wished to do so.

The above change to the CCSBT's Transshipment Resolution, would require that the CCSBT's CNM Resolution⁶ be revised to allow States other than those that fish for SBT, or through whose exclusive economic or fishery zone SBT migrates, to become a CNM⁷.

Legal advice might be required to determine whether the required modification of the CNM Resolution is consistent with the Convention for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna. In particular, does Article 14(1) of the Convention imply that only States and entities whose fishing vessels harvest SBT or through whose exclusive economic or fishery zone SBT migrates may become CNMs?

If the Extended Commission (EC) decides to revise the Transshipment Resolution and the CNM Resolution in relation to SBT carrier vessels, it should also consider whether to revise the CNM Resolution to allow for SBT port States and SBT market States to become CNMs. The ability to invite port and market States to become CNMs could result in improved participation and cooperation from those States. Such participation and cooperation would be necessary if the EC wanted, in the future, to be able to restrict designated SBT ports and/or SBT export destinations to being those of just CCSBT Members and CNMs.

⁵ Resolution on Establishing a Program for Transshipment by Large-Scale Fishing Vessels.

⁶ Resolution to Establish the Status of Cooperating Non-Member of the Extended Commission and the Extended Scientific Committee.

⁷ It should be noted that a modified CNM Resolution will probably need to specify different conditions for SBT fishing States versus States that become CNMs for other reasons (such as to authorise carrier vessels). This is because different CCSBT measures will apply depending on the nature of the cooperating status.

The EC is invited to consider:

- Whether a modification of the CNM Resolution to allow non-Member States with SBT carrier vessels (and possibly SBT ports and SBT markets) to become CNMs is consistent with the Convention;
- Whether the EC wishes to modify the Transshipment Resolution to require that authorised SBT carrier vessels be flagged to Members or CNMs, and to modify the CNM Resolution to allow the Flag States of carrier vessels to become CNMs;
- Whether the EC wishes to modify the CNM Resolution to allow SBT port and/or market States to become CNMs; and
- Any other ways of providing for the participation and/or cooperation of a wider range of actors with the CCSBT.

(5) Undertake Commission performance reviews periodically to routinely assess opportunities for improvements, including both self-assessment and independent reviews. (high priority in the Strategic Plan, scheduled for 2019)

The CCSBT's first performance review was conducted in 2008. This involved a self-assessment of the CCSBT's performance by the Performance Review Working Group (PRWG) which was made up of representatives from the Extended Commission. The PRWG used the criteria agreed at Kobe 1⁸ for reviewing the performance of regional fisheries management organisations. The CCSBT also selected an independent expert (United States Ambassador David Balton) to review the PRWG's self-assessment and other information relevant to the performance of the Commission

The second Performance Review of the CCSBT was an independent review undertaken by Dr. Serge 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). This review also used the performance review criteria from Kobe 1, assessed the progress made by the CCSBT since the first assessment, and assessed the CCSBT's performance against the best available international standards.

The third performance review is scheduled, in the CCSBT's Strategic Plan, to be conducted in 2019. The EC needs to confirm whether it still considers this timeframe to be appropriate.

If the performance review is conducted during 2019, the management objectives for the new Management Procedure (MP) will not be available for consideration by the review panel. Consequently, the performance review would not be able to take account of these import decisions of the CCSBT with respect to rebuilding of the stock. It may be better to defer the performance review until 2021 so that the performance review can take these decisions and the new MP into account. The next full stock assessment is scheduled to be conducted in 2020, so delaying the performance review until 2021 would also allow the most up to date stock assessment to be considered by the review.

⁸ The 2016 joint meeting of the five Tuna RFMOs in Kobe, Japan.

In addition, the 14th round of UNSFA⁹ Informal Consultations, which is scheduled to be held in 2019, will be focusing on the topic of “Performance reviews of regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements”. It may be prudent to wait for the outcomes of this consultation before commencing CCSBT’s next performance review.

Conversely, an advantage of conducting the performance review in 2019 is that performance review recommendations in relation to rebuilding of the stock should be available to the EC in October 2019, which is when the EC is required to select and adopt an MP. This might help the EC to decide between candidate MPs that have been developed. However, it will be too late to develop new candidate MPs in response to recommendations from the performance review. Another advantage of conducting the performance review in 2019 is that subject to priorities and resourcing, the earlier that a performance review is held, the sooner that the CCSBT will be able to act on the outcome to improve its performance.

Regardless of when the review will be conducted, consideration needs to be given to the composition of the performance review panel and terms of reference for the next performance review.

The criteria for the independent review panel for the 2014 performance review did not require any of the panel to have experience of the CCSBT or knowledge of the SBT fishery. In fact, it required that individuals “*Should not be a national of the Member or have been a permanent resident or have worked for the parties since 31/12/2003 [the last 10 years] except where Parties reach a consensus to chose the qualified individuals*” which largely precludes experience and knowledge of the CCSBT. A lack of CCSBT experience and knowledge on the performance review panel makes it difficult for the panel to provide the most relevant and practical recommendations in the CCSBT context.

Most recent performance reviews of other RFMOs that the Secretariat has examined¹⁰ includes RFMO Members on the review panel. This provides the Panel with the necessary experience and knowledge of the RFMO as well as giving the RFMO greater ownership of the outcomes of the performance review.

A draft, of the Composition, Operation and Selection Process for the CCSBT’s third Performance Review Panel is provided at **Attachment C**. The draft proposes that the Panel contain 4-6 individuals, comprising 2-4 Member experts and 2 independent experts. It is proposed that one of the independent experts would Chair the panel. The independence criteria for the independent experts on the panel have been set similar to the criteria agreed at CCSBT 23 for the independent Chairs of CCSBT subsidiary bodies. It is envisaged that there would be one or two physical meetings of the Panel. An approximate cost for the performance review of AU\$115,800 has been included in the draft budget for 2019.

A draft Terms of Reference for the third Performance Review of the CCSBT is provided at **Attachment D**. Like the first two performance reviews of the CCSBT, it is proposed that the CCSBT’s performance would be assessed against the agreed criteria from Kobe 1 (Annex 1 of **Attachment D**). Some changes to the Kobe 1 criteria have been suggested in **Attachment D**.

⁹ The United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

¹⁰ The latest performance reviews of CCAMLR, IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC, NPAFC, NAFO, SPRFMO (this review is underway) and WCPFC were examined by the Secretariat. All review panels, except IATTC, include some Member experts. IATTC’s panel was quite different as it used an independent contractor selected through a competitive process.

to reflect changes that were made to the criteria for the 2016 Performance Review of ICCAT. The EC should consider whether it agrees with some or all of these changes. It is also proposed that the panel would evaluate the CCSBT's performance in implementing relevant recommendations from previous reviews and that the Panel would be asked to identify areas where improvement is needed to strengthen the CCSBT and its management of the SBT fishery. The EC may have other matters that it wishes to be included in the performance review.

Finally, it is important that the outcomes of the performance review be fully evaluated by the EC. This is likely to involve seeking responses from relevant subsidiary bodies (namely the CC, ESC and ERSWG), followed by a SFMWG meeting to consider the outcomes and to update the CCSBT Strategic Plan, together with discussion at one or two annual meetings of the EC. These processes should be factored into the CCSBT's workplan and budget.

The EC is invited to:

- Consider and agree on the timeframe for conducting the next Performance Review.
- Agree on the Composition, Operation and Selection Process for the Performance Review Panel; and
 - If the review is to be conducted in 2019, to also elect the Member experts to be included on the panel.
- Consider and agree on the Terms of Reference and criteria for the Performance Review.

Terms of Reference
Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group

In response to the recommendations of the performance review of the Extended Commission completed in 2008, the Extended Commission has agreed the following Terms of Reference for a Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG).

Composition

1. The SFMWG shall consist of the Commissioners from members of the Extended Commission, the Secretariat, and as appropriate, other experts in fisheries management and fisheries science. Numbers of participants will be kept to a minimum.
2. The first meeting will be chaired by Japan.

Functions

3. The broad purpose of the SFMWG shall be:
 - i. To develop a draft Strategic Plan (SP) which sets out a common view of the strategic direction of the Extended Commission in managing the SBT fishery.
 - ii. To develop a draft Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) for Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) comprising management objectives for the SBT stock and ecologically related species consistent with modern standards of international fisheries management
 - iii. In relation to ii, develop:
 - a rebuild strategy for SBT that is consistent with the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the precautionary approach
 - other technical measures for managing the SBT stock, as appropriate
4. The SFMWG shall take into account any relevant advice from the subsidiary bodies of the Extended Commission.

Workplan

5. The first meeting of the SFMWG will focus on item iii outlined above.
6. The first meeting SFMWG will be held in Tokyo, Japan, from 14-17 April 2009 and any necessary follow up work to the SFMWG meeting will be completed intersessionally before CCSBT16.
7. The recommendations of the SFMWG will be considered by the Extended Commission at CCSBT16.

Draft Revised Terms of Reference of the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group

In response to the recommendations of the performance review of the Extended Commission completed in 2008, the Extended Commission has agreed the following Terms of Reference for a Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG).

Composition and Operation

1. The Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG) shall consist of the Commissioners from ~~m~~Members of the Extended Commission, the Secretariat, and as appropriate, other experts in fisheries management, compliance and fisheries science. Numbers of participants will be kept to a minimum.
2. The SFMWG shall meet on a “when needed” basis as agreed by the Extended Commission.
- ~~1-3.~~ 3. The SFMWG shall be chaired by the Chair of the Extended Commission (EC) when the EC Chair is available. If the EC Chair is not available, the SFMWG shall be chaired by the host Member unless otherwise agreed by the EC.
- ~~2.~~ The first meeting will be chaired by Japan.

Functions

- ~~3-4.~~ 4. The broad purpose of the SFMWG shall be to provide high level strategic, operational and/or fisheries management advice consistent with modern standards of international fisheries management as requested by the Extended Commission from time to time. This may include matters such as:
 - ~~i.~~ i. To develop a draft Revising the CCSBT Strategic Plan (SP) which sets out a common view of the strategic direction of the Extended Commission in managing the SBT fishery;
 - ii. Recommending management objectives for the SBT fishery and for ecologically related species;
 - iii. Recommending measures for managing the SBT fishery, as appropriate;
 - iv. Allocation of resources, such as funding, to competing priorities of research, compliance and management; and
 - v. Other high level operational issues of the CCSBT.
- ~~i.~~
- ~~ii.~~ ii. To develop a draft Fisheries Management Plan (FMP) for Southern Bluefin Tuna (SBT) comprising management objectives for the SBT stock and ecologically related species consistent with modern standards of international fisheries management
- ~~iii.~~ iii. In relation to ii, develop:
 - a rebuild strategy for SBT that is consistent with the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the precautionary approach

- ~~• other technical measures for managing the SBT stock, as appropriate~~

~~5. The SFMWG shall take into account any relevant advice from the Extended Commission and/or subsidiary bodies of the Extended Commission, recommendations from performance reviews of the CCSBT, outcomes of CCSBT Quality Assurance Reviews, and other relevant processes and international instruments, including the Kobe (joint tuna RFMOs) process.~~

~~4.—~~

Workplan

~~5. The first meeting of the SFMWG will focus on item iii outlined above.~~

~~6. The first meeting SFMWG will be held in Tokyo, Japan, from 14-17 April 2009 and any necessary follow up work to the SFMWG meeting will be completed intersessionally before CCSBT16.~~

~~The recommendations of the SFMWG will be considered by the Extended Commission at CCSBT16.~~

Composition, Operation and Selection Process for the Performance Review Panel

Composition of the Performance Review Panel

The independent performance review panel will be comprised of between four and six people as described below:

- Between two and four experts from different Members of the Extended Commission (EC)¹. These experts should have extensive experience with the CCSBT and, as a group, they should have expertise in fisheries management, fisheries science, compliance and legal governance at the international level.
- Two independent external internationally recognised experts with expertise, as a group, in the best practices for international fisheries management (including compliance) and fisheries science. The external experts shall not be officers or officials of the CCSBT or of a CCSBT Member government at the time of appointment nor throughout the term of the contract to conduct the performance review.

Chair and operation of the Performance Review Panel

- The Chair of the Performance Review Panel will be chosen by the EC from one of the independent external experts. The Chair will present the report of the Performance Review Panel to the annual meeting of the CCSBT.
- It is envisaged that there will be one or two physical meetings of the Panel as determined by the Panel.
- The Panel will determine its own mode of operation for conducting the performance review and for preparing its report.
- The Secretariat will provide support to the panel by answering queries and providing background material requested by the Panel and assisting in the organisation of Panel meetings. The Executive Secretary will attend meeting(s) of the Panel if requested by the Chair of the Panel.
- If agreed by the EC, in order to save costs, all work of the review panel will be conducted in English. However, the Secretariat will translate the final report into both official languages of the CCSBT.

Funding

- The participation and attendance of meetings by CCSBT Member experts will be funded by the relevant Member.
- Consultancy fees, travel and associated costs of the two independent experts will be funded by the CCSBT.
- Hire of any necessary meeting venue(s), equipment and catering will be funded by the CCSBT.

¹ The Performance Review could proceed without CCSBT Members on the panel provided that at least one of the independent external experts has sound knowledge of the CCSBT and the SBT fishery, and that each independent external expert has sound knowledge of at least one tuna RFMO.

Selection Process

The process for selecting the panel for the performance review panel is outlined below:

- Experts from Members of the Extended Commission will be nominated and elected at an annual meeting prior to commencement of the Performance Review.
- The two independent external experts will be selected intersessionally, either before or immediately after the annual meeting prior to the performance review. This will involve:
 - Members providing a list of potential independent external experts, together with background information on those candidates, to the Secretariat;
 - The Secretariat circulating the lists of candidates, together with the background information on those candidates, to all Members;
 - Members ranking candidates as well as their preference for the Chair of the Panel and advise the Secretariat; and
 - The Secretariat contacting the suitable candidates in order of rankings and engaging two candidates to conduct the review.

Terms of Reference for the Third Performance Review of the CCSBT

The performance review will be conducted by a review panel, consisting of internal experts from CCSBT Members and independent external experts. The review will:

- Evaluate the performance of the CCSBT using a modified version of the agreed criteria from Kobe 1 at Annex 1¹;
- Evaluate CCSBT's progress in implementing recommendations from the 2008 and 2014 Performance Reviews shown at Annex 2, taking into account the initial comments on those recommendation provided by the EC and its subsidiary bodies in column 4 of Annex 2; and
- Identify areas where improvement is needed to strengthen the organisation and its management of the SBT fishery.

The resources to be provided to the Performance Review Panel include:

- The [Report of the Performance Review Working Group \(2008\)](#)
- The [Report of the Independent Expert \(David Balton\) on the Performance Review \(2008\)](#)
- The [Performance of the CCSBT 2009-2013: Independent Review](#).
- All other publicly available CCSBT meeting reports, documents and data requested by the Panel; and
- Access² to Secretariat staff, independent Chairs (including Compliance Committee, Extended Scientific Committee and Ecologically Related Species Working Group) and Members to respond to questions from the panel.

The final report of the Performance Review Panel should be a concise document that:

- Describes the steps taken to conduct the review (e.g. documents examined, individuals that were consulted etc.);
- Presents the findings of the review; and
- Provides recommendations from the Panel for the CCSBT on how to improve its performance with respect to the review criteria.

The final report should be provided to the Secretariat in English at least 8 weeks prior to the annual meeting of the Extended Commission. The Secretariat will translate the report into Japanese and aim to have both language versions of the report circulated to Members four weeks prior to the commencement of the annual meeting.

The Chair of the performance review panel will present the report to the annual meeting and respond to questions from Members concerning the report. The report will be published on the public area of the CCSBT's website and the joint tuna RFMO website (www.tuna-org.org) after the annual meeting.

¹ These criteria were developed following the first joint meeting of tuna RFMOs (Kobe 1) and have been adopted for use in reviews by the tuna RFMOs, including the 2008 and 2014 reviews of the CCSBT. The modifications to the criteria include relevant criteria that were included in the 2016 Performance Review of ICCAT.

² By email, telephone, and direct person to person contact where this is practical and cost effective.

*Agreed Criteria from Kobe 1 for Reviewing the Performance of
Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) together with relevant criteria from the
2016 Performance Review of ICCAT¹*

Area	General Criteria	Detailed Criteria
1. Conservation and management	Status of living marine resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of major fish stocks under the purview of the RFMO in relation to maximum sustainable yield or other relevant biological standards. • Trends in the status of those stocks. • Status of species that belong to the same ecosystems as, or are associated with or dependent upon, the major target stocks (hereinafter “non-target species”). • Trends in the status of those species.
	Data collection and sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has agreed formats, specifications and timeframes for data submission, taking into account UNFSA Annex I. • Extent to which RFMO members and cooperating non-members, individually or through the RFMO, collect and share complete and accurate fisheries data concerning target stocks and non-target species and other relevant data in a timely manner. • Extent to which fishing data and fishing vessel data are gathered by the RFMO and shared among members and other RFMOs. • <u>Extent to which the RFMO is addressing any gaps in the collection and sharing of data as required.</u> • <u>Extent to which capacity building initiatives are put in place to improve data collection in developing economies.</u>
	Quality and provision of scientific advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which the RFMO receives and/or produces the best scientific advice relevant to the fish stocks and other living marine resources under its purview, as well as to the effects of fishing on the marine environment.</u> • <u>Extent to which the structure, processes, procedures, and expertise of the Scientific Committee and of the RFMO Secretariat meet the needs and resources of the RFMO as well as the highly demanding data and technical requirements of the most recent modelling platforms.</u>
	<u>Participation and capacity building</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which RFMO Members and cooperating non-members participate actively in the provision of the scientific advice.</u> • <u>Extent to which capacity building initiatives are put in place to facilitate the effective participation of developing economies in Scientific Committee activities.</u>
	<u>Long-term planning and research</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which RFMO adopts and regularly reviews a long-term strategy for the Scientific Committee to implement.</u> • <u>Extent to which the research coordinated or undertaken directly by RFMO is aligned with the needs of the Commission to fulfil its mandate.</u>

¹ The changes to the Kobe 1 criteria to include the relevant criteria from ICCAT’s 2016 Performance Review are shown as tracked changes.

Area	General Criteria	Detailed Criteria
	Adoption of conservation and management measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has adopted conservation and management measures for both target stocks and non-target species that ensures the long-term sustainability of such stocks and species and are based on the best scientific evidence available. • Extent to which the RFMO has applied 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. • Extent to which the RFMO has adopted and is implementing effective rebuilding plans for depleted or overfished stocks. • Extent to which the RFMO has moved toward the adoption of conservation and management measures for previously unregulated fisheries, including new and exploratory fisheries. • Extent to which the RFMO has taken due account of the need to conserve marine biological diversity and minimize harmful impacts of fisheries on living marine resources and marine ecosystems. • Extent to which the RFMO has adopted measures to minimize pollution, waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species, and impacts on associated or dependent species, in particular endangered species, through measures including, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective fishing gear and techniques.
	Capacity management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has identified fishing capacity levels commensurate with long-term sustainability and optimum utilization of relevant fisheries. • Extent to which the RFMO has taken actions to prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity and effort.
	Compatibility of management measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which measures have been adopted as reflected in UNFSA Article 7.
	Fishing allocations and opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO agrees on the allocation of allowable catch or levels of fishing effort, including taking into account requests for participation from new members or participants as reflected in UNFSA Article 11.
2. Compliance and enforcement	<u>Reporting Requirements</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Analysis of RFMO reporting requirements to improve efficiency, avoid redundancy and reduce unnecessary burden to CPCs.</u>
	Flag State duties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which RFMO members are fulfilling their duties as flag States under the treaty establishing the RFMO, pursuant to measures adopted by the RFMO, and under other international instruments, including, inter alia, the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention, the UNFSA and the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement, as applicable.
	Port State measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which the RFMO has adopted measures relating to the exercise of the rights and duties of its members as port States, as reflected in UNFSA Article 23 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 8.3.</u> • <u>Extent to which RFMO has adopted Port State Measures pursuant to the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing.</u> • Extent to which these measures are effectively implemented.
	Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has adopted integrated MCS measures (e.g., required use of VMS, observers, catch documentation and trade tracking schemes, restrictions on transshipment, boarding and inspection schemes). • Extent to which these measures are effectively implemented.
	Follow-up on infringements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO, its members and cooperating non-members follow up on infringements to management measures.
	Cooperative mechanisms to detect and deter non-compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has established adequate cooperative mechanisms to both monitor compliance and detect and deter non-compliance (e.g., compliance committees, vessel lists, sharing of information about non-compliance). • Extent to which these mechanisms are being effectively utilized.

Area	General Criteria	Detailed Criteria
	Market-related measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has adopted measures relating to the exercise of the rights and duties of its members as market States. • Extent to which these market-related measures are effectively implemented.
	<u>Reporting Requirements</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Analysis of RFMO reporting requirements to improve efficiency, avoid redundancy and reduce unnecessary burden to Members.</u>
3. Decision-making and dispute settlement	Decision-making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which RFMO has transparent and consistent decision-making procedures that facilitate the adoption of conservation and management measures in a timely and effective manner. • <u>Extent to which these procedures are effectively implemented in RFMO.</u>
	Dispute settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO has established adequate mechanisms for resolving disputes.
4. International cooperation	Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO is operating in a transparent manner, as reflected in UNFSA Article 12 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.1.9. • Extent to which RFMO decisions, meeting reports, scientific advice upon which decisions are made, and other relevant materials are made publicly available in a timely fashion.
	<u>Confidentiality</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which RFMO has set security and confidentiality standards and rules for sharing sensitive scientific and operational/compliance data.</u>
	Relationship to cooperating non-members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO facilitates cooperation between members and non-members, including through the adoption and implementation of procedures for granting cooperating status.
	Relationship to non-cooperating non-members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of fishing activity by vessels of non-members that are not cooperating with the RFMO, as well as measures to deter such activities.
	Cooperation with other RFMOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO cooperates with other RFMOs, including through the network of Regional Fishery Body Secretariats, <u>as well as with other relevant international organizations.</u>
	<u>Participation and capacity building</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which RFMO members and cooperating non-members participate actively and meaningfully in the work of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies.</u> • <u>Extent to which capacity building initiatives and institutional arrangements are in place to facilitate the effective participation of developing economies in the work of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, including in positions of leadership.</u>
	Special requirements of developing States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO recognizes the special needs of developing States and pursues forms of cooperation with developing States, including with respect to fishing allocations or opportunities, taking into account UNFSA Articles 24 and 25, and the Code of Conduct of Responsible Fisheries Article 5. • Extent to which RFMO members, individually or through the RFMO, provide relevant assistance to developing States, as reflected in UNFSA Article 26.
5. Comparison with other RFMOs	<u>Best practices</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>To the extent possible, evaluate the extent to which RFMO's performance is comparable to other tuna RFMOs in relation to the adoption and implementation of conservation and management measures for target and non-target species, status of the resources under its purview, scientific processes and procedures, and adoption and implementation of MCS measures and compliance review procedures.</u> • <u>Identification of areas/best practices that would allow RFMO to enhance its performance.</u>
	<u>Kobe</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Extent to which RFMO implemented the Kobe III recommendations and comparison to the degree of implementation in other tuna RFMOs.</u>
56. Financial and administrative	Availability of resources for RFMO activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which financial and other resources are made available to achieve the aims of the RFMO and to implement the RFMO's decisions.

Area	General Criteria	Detailed Criteria
<i>issues</i>	Efficiency and cost-effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the RFMO is efficiently and effectively managing its human and financial resources, including those of the Secretariat, <u>to support Commission objectives and ensure continuity of operations, including through establishment of clear and transparent office policies, structures, roles and responsibilities, and lines of authority; effective internal and external communication; and other aspects of office planning and operations.</u>

DRAFT

Recommendations from the 2008 and 2014 Performance Reviews of the CCSBT

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	2008 Performance review recommendations	2014 Performance review recommendations	Initial comments from the Extended Commission and its subsidiary bodies following the 2014 performance review 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.	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.	ESC: 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.	ESC: Low priority. Largely captured by the MP approach.
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.	ESC: Done. Assuming ongoing MP / meta rule application. ESC: Low priority. Existing robustness tests broadly cover this as well.

¹ These are initial comments from the Extended Commission and its subsidiary bodies on some of the recommendations. Acronyms are as follows: Extended Commission (EC), Compliance Committee (CC), Extended Scientific Committee (ESC) and Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG). Comments from Secretariat paper CCSBT-CC/1410/05 are indicated with "CCSec". Comments from this paper are included where the paper indicated that no new action items are required by the Compliance Committee in response to the performance review recommendation. These comments are included here because the Compliance Committee did not consider these specific recommendations in its report(s).

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.	ESC: EC responsibility for first part of recommendation. ESC: Low priority. Efforts already being made within constraints of existing operating environment.
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.	ESC: Low priority. ERSWG: 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.
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.	ERSWG: 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.
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.	ERSWG: 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.

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.	<p>ESC: 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.</p> <p>ERSWG: The ERSWG supported this recommendation and noted that it would be very beneficial.</p>
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.	<p>ESC: EC to address.</p> <p>ERSWG: 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>
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.	<p>ESC: Ongoing.</p> <p>ERSWG: The ERSWG found it difficult to respond to this as it did not have the suite of SAWG recommendations before it.</p>

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.	<p>ESC: Ongoing. Support noted through progress of the ERSWG.</p> <p>ERSWG: The ERSWG supported this recommendation and noted that it was fundamental to moving towards and 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>
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.	<p>ESC: Ongoing. High priority in the case of the Independent Panel.</p> <p>ERSWG: 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>
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.	ESC: 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.	ESC: Low priority. Focus is on gene tagging for absolute estimates of recruitment.
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.	ESC: Low priority for additional work but some work already occurring. ESC: Low priority unless new evidence indicating stock structure becomes available.
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.	ESC: Low priority for future work.
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.	ESC: Ongoing. High priority. ERSWG: 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.

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.	ERSWG: 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.
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.	ESC: Refer to ERS ERSWG: 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.
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.	ERSWG: 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.

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) 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>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>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>ERSWG: 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>ERSWG: The ERSWG commented that any progress in this direction needs to be resolved at the Extended Commission level.</p>
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.I.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.	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
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.	ESC: Low priority. Refer to comments in 2014-6.
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.	CCSec: No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall revised CAP ² (2015-2017).
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.	CCSec: This is specified to occur in 2015 and 2016 in the revised CAP.

² Compliance Action Plan

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.	CCSec: the revised CAP for 2015-2017 has been amended to add some additional text regarding harmonising with other RFMOs' systems and processes.

SA-2008-23	<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 neighboring RFMOs with respect to ERS observer data.</p> <p>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>ESC: Done. New observer standards endorsed by the ESC.</p> <p>ERSWG: 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> <p>CCSec: Not added to the revised CAP because work is already in progress on this item within the ERSWG community. A joint tRFMO technical bycatch working group meeting on longline observer bycatch data is scheduled for January 2015. The results of this meeting are expected to be considered at ERSWG 11 in March 2015.</p> <p>ESC: Serious consideration has already been given to an ROP by the CC/EC. This is referred to CC/EC.</p> <p>CCSec: Not added to revised CAP (2015-2017) due to the difficulty Members have had on agreeing to a ROP. However, Members should discuss whether they wish to reconsider this issue as suggested by the recommendation.</p>
------------	---	---	---

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 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.	<p>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 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).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>CC: Agreed to review the CCSBT's 2006 and 2008 VMS Resolutions in its Compliance Action Plan for 2018-2020.</p> <p>CCSec: Not added to revised CAP (2015-2017). The main RFMO of relevance (IOTC) with respect to the quantity of SBT caught, does not have VMS transmissions sent to the Secretariat.</p>
Transshipment at sea	No specific recommendations	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>CCSec: This is specified to occur in 2015 in the revised CAP (2015-2017).</p> <p>CCSec: Not included in CAP (2015-2017) as there is no transshipment at sea from purse seine vessels. This will be revised according to the recommendation if considered likely to occur in the future.</p>
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.	CC: Did not reach consensus on including an action item in the 2018-2020 Compliance Action Plan.

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.	CC: The meeting recommended that the Corrective Actions Policy be revised to specify that a public record of breaches of national allocations of the global TAC be developed and maintained. This record would include the corrective actions that were taken in relation to these breaches.
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. - 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. 	<p>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 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.</p>	<p>CCSec: These recommendations are already covered in the existing CAP (2015-2017).</p>
Decision-making, transparency and dispute settlement			
Decision-making and transparency			
SA-2008-27	<p>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).</p>	<p>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.</p>	

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.	CCSec: No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall CAP (2015-2017).

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.	CCSec: No specific additions have been made for this item as it is addressed by the overall CAP (2015-2017).
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.	<p>ESC: Ongoing. High priority on a case by case basis (e.g. exchanging data for estimates of unaccounted mortality).</p> <p>ERSWG: The ERSWG strongly supports this recommendation and notes that this sort of cooperation is essential to undertaking broader scale assessments.</p> <p>CCSec: The harmonisation and capacity building components of this with highlighted text are already covered in the revised CAP (2015-2017), so no additional changes were required to address those.</p>

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 it is 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.	CC: Agreed to include targeted analysis of capacity building needs and Compliance “missions” to assist developing State Members in its Compliance Action Plan for 2018-2020.
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.	EC: The FAC also considered the Performance Review Panel's comments regarding regular budget under-spending, but no changes were recommended in this regard

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>	