



CCSBT-EC/2210/13

## Report from the Performance Review

### Purpose

To consider the report and recommendations from the 2021 Performance Review of the CCSBT.

### Background

The report of the 2021 Performance Review of the CCSBT was provided to CCSBT Members on 1 March 2022 in Circular #2022/007. The Chair of the Performance Review Panel, Dr. Hussain Sinan, will introduce the report to the Extended Commission meeting.

The report has or is being provided to the ERSWG<sup>1</sup>, ESC<sup>2</sup> and CC<sup>3</sup> for these subsidiary bodies to consider any pertinent recommendations and to provide advice to CCSBT 29 on recommendations relating to them. The CC does not meet until immediately before CCSBT 29. The deliberations on the Performance Review by the ERSWG and the ESC are provided at **Attachments A and B** respectively. Both meetings found it difficult to provide well considered advice to the EC due to the large number of recommendations, the diversity of views amongst meeting participants, limited meeting time available for consideration of the recommendations and the virtual format of the meetings.

The full report of the 2021 CCSBT Performance Review by the Performance Review Panel is provided at **Attachment C**.

The [Terms of Reference for the Performance Review](#) states that the 2022 Extended Commission meeting will consider advice from subsidiary bodies and provide direction to the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG) in relation to development of an implementation plan for the Performance Review recommendations. The SFMWG is scheduled to meet in approximately mid-2023. Due to the difficulties that subsidiary bodies have had in providing well considered advice, the Secretariat expects that substantial work and intersessional discussion will be required in the lead-up to the SFMWG meeting to enable the SFMWG to develop an implementation plan for the Performance Review recommendations.

### Prepared by the Secretariat

---

<sup>1</sup> Ecologically Related Species Working Group.

<sup>2</sup> Extended Scientific Committee.

<sup>3</sup> Compliance Committee.

### **Consideration of the Performance Review by the ERSWG**

The ERSWG considered the report of the CCSBT Performance Review. A total of 37 recommendations were initially determined to be of potential relevance to the scope of the ERSWG. These were provided to members prior to the meeting for comment on 5 aspects:

- Whether you consider this to be an appropriate recommendation for the ERSWG to consider (i.e. within the ERSWG's scope).
- Priority of the recommendation from your perspective.
- The level of action required for the recommendation.
- Which CCSBT body is recommended to take the lead for implementing the recommendation?
- Pertinent comments relating to the recommendation.

The responses were collated by the Secretariat and considered during the meeting. The responses were then reviewed and important recommendations were considered to those for which:

- At least half the Members view the recommendation as appropriate for the ERSWG to consider;
- At least half the Members consider the recommendation to be a medium or high priority;
- Some new actions were considered to be necessary to implement the recommendation; and
- At least half the Members considered the ERSWG should take the lead in implementing the recommendation.

Using these criteria, the following seven recommendations were considered as being most important from the ERSWG's perspective and required new action, noting that even with these recommendations, there were some differences of views between Members:

- PR2021-6 - Consider the feasibility of a collaborative programme (between RFMOs and institutions with competency in biodiversity conservation) to forecast the likely impacts of climate change on tuna ecosystems, SBT, ERS, and their productivity, distribution, and resilience;
- PR2021-8 - Conduct capacity building programs to improve data collection and reporting, in particular in developing countries;
- PR2021-11 - Establish mechanisms to improve consistency and avoid ambiguity in national reports;
- PR2021-20 - Establish a clear and concise bycatch policy and management strategy;
- PR2021-27 - Strengthen the implementation of current measures to reduce bycatch, particularly of seabirds, and explore the potential for an incentivised mechanism to combat an increase in bycatch and address the impact of fisheries on living marine resources and the ecosystem;
- PR2021-30 - Identify and analyse compatibility issues and risks associated with adopting resolutions from other RFMOs, especially in monitoring, compliance, and surveillance for ERS, and develop mitigation measures and strategies; and
- PR2021-54 - Review the reporting templates periodically.

## **Consideration of the Performance Review by the ESC**

The ESC reviewed the report from the Performance Review and noted the approach used by ERSWG to rank recommendations (Report of ERSWG14), leading to identification and highlighting of seven recommendations considered to be of most importance to the ERSWG.

No papers were submitted by Members to the ESC on the Performance Review recommendations. However, the Secretariat circulated a paper in mid-July containing the recommendations from the Performance Review that the Secretariat identified as possibly relevant to the ESC. That paper included a table as used by the ERSWG in which Members were asked to comment on the priority assigned, level of action required, and whether the ESC should take the lead. Members were also asked to comment on each recommendation.

Using the same ranking criteria as the ERSWG, the Secretariat ordered the recommendations and highlighted those that might be of most relevance and priority. The ESC thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of the summary of recommendations and preliminary ranking.

While the ESC found the approach useful, it noted that there was a large degree of variation in Members responses to individual recommendations, in terms of the extent to which a recommendation fell within the purview of the ESC, the priority given to different recommendations for the ESC, and the extent to which new action was considered a priority action. It was also noted that while the overall response from Members to numerical ranking of individual recommendations was high, only a few Members had provided commentary to add context to their rankings.

Following further discussion, an alternative system to rank the priority of individual recommendations using the pre-meeting input from Members was agreed, and the Secretariat provided an updated table of relative priorities ([Attachment 10](#)).

The ESC noted that while this revised prioritisation approach identified some natural priorities among the highest ranking recommendations, it also resulted in other recommendations that Members, to differing degree, considered should be afforded higher priority. Importantly, given the relatively low level of pre-meeting commentary from Members on potential activities/actions, even for recommendations that were unanimously considered high priority, there was discomfort that the process being used was adequate to properly respond to the large list of recommendations. It was also noted that all of the Performance Review recommendations have merit and using a prioritisation approach should not be interpreted as implying those ranked lowest do not have value and should not be responded to fully.

Notwithstanding this difficulty, there were some common themes to recommendations that were scored as high priority by Members:

- Ongoing activities (e.g., gene tagging, CKMR, and otolith ageing) were seen as high priority, consistent with the Performance Review recommendations.
- Capacity building was seen as a high priority, but it was recognised that responsibility to take action lies primarily with the EC and individual Members. While responsibility for ensuring capacity building lies with the EC and Members, the ESC is in a strong position to assist and advise.
- Forecasting the impacts of climate change on SBT and other fisheries and ERS was seen as high priority but there was no discussion on how the ESC or Members could be involved in collaborative programs.

The ESC considered the option of following the approach of the ERSWG, at least as an initial step for this year, and recommending the 6-10 highest recommendations to the EC. However, for the reasons noted above, it was agreed that this would risk excluding potentially important recommendations, that are lower ranked using the current system, from being considered for future action (e.g. development of electronic monitoring and cross tuna RFMO coordination).

The ESC considered it would be valuable to develop a synthesised ranking of priority areas and associated actions. However, given the large number of recommendations considered relevant to the ESC and the diversity of views on relative priority and relevance to the ESC, it was not considered practical to work through individual recommendations to do this at ESC27.

The ESC noted that the Strategy and Fisheries Management Working Group (SFMWG) has been tasked by the EC to complete an Implementation Plan in response to the Performance Review recommendations by EC 30. It also notes there is a SFMWG meeting scheduled in 2023 prior to EC 30 which may present an opportunity to develop such a list of priority recommendations and actions. The ESC encouraged Members to provide their synthesised views on priorities and actions to the SFMWG. The ESC does not have further action in its workplan and budget for 2023.