



CCSBT-EC/1810/15

Kobe Process Kobe プロセス

Purpose 目的

This is a standing item on the CCSBT agenda to provide an update on activities associated with the Kobe Process¹ and to provide the opportunity for CCSBT Members to review progress with Kobe Process recommendations that require actions by the CCSBT.

本件は CCSBT 会合における常設の議題項目であり、Kobe プロセス **Error! Bookmark not defined.** 関連活動についてのアップデートを行うとともに、CCSBT メンバーに対して、CCSBT による対応が求められている Kobe プロセス勧告の進捗状況をレビューする機会を提供するものである。

Kobe Steering Committee Meeting Kobe プロセス運営委員会

A meeting of the Kobe Process Steering Committee (KSC) was held on 11 July 2018 in parallel with FAO's Committee on Fisheries. The draft report from this meeting is provided at **Attachment A** for information.

Kobe プロセス運営委員会 (KSC) 会合は、FAO 水産委員会と平行して 2018 年 7 月 11 日に開催された。同会合の報告書案を参考として別紙 **A** に示した。

The meeting largely focused on the future of the Kobe Process and generally agreed that: 会合では Kobe プロセスの将来が主な論点となり、全体として以下が合意された。

- The Steering Committee should continue its work;
運営委員会は、その業務を継続していくべきこと
- The process should continue to identify technical meetings and step-up the organisation of technical groups; and
Kobe プロセスでは引き続き技術会合を特定し、技術グループの組織としてステップアップしていくべきこと
- Consider whether and when to hold another large-scale Kobe meeting noting that this needs to be carefully prepared and every RFMO (as distinct from the Secretariats) needs to be consulted.
本件は周到な準備を必要とすること及び（事務局以外の）全 RFMO との協議

¹ A cooperative process involving joint meetings of members of the five tuna RFMOs. The first meeting was held in Kobe, Japan. 5 つのまぐる類 RFMO のメンバー国による合同会合を含む協力プロセスであり、第一回会合が日本の神戸市で開催された。

が必要であることに留意しつつ、大規模な Kobe 会合をもう一度開催するかどうか、また開催の時期について検討すること

It was recognised that the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project has supported several of the Kobe-generated activities and that there would be benefits in linking a second-generation Kobe process to a second phase of the ABNJ Tuna Project. It was also noted that the current ABNJ Tuna Project could potentially fund a large-scale Kobe meeting, but that this project concludes in September 2019, so a large-scale meeting would need to be held by September 2018 if it were to utilise ABNJ Tuna Project Funds.

公海（ABNJ）まぐろプロジェクトが Kobe プロセスに由来するいくつかの活動をサポートしてきたこと、及び次世代の Kobe プロセスを ABNJ まぐろプロジェクトの第 2 期と連動させることは有益と考えられることが確認された。また、現行の ABNJ まぐろプロジェクトも大規模な Kobe 会合のために資金を拠出できる可能性があるが、同プロジェクトは 2019 年 9 月に終了するので、もし ABNJ まぐろプロジェクトによる資金を活用するのであれば、大規模会合は 2018 年 9 月までに開催する必要があることが留意された。

The current Chair of the KSC, Mr. Stefaan Depypere, confirmed that as the Vice-Chair of ICCAT he was happy to continue to serve as Chair of the Kobe Steering Committee if no alternatives were found. The Steering Committee accepted this offer and Mr. Depypere was reconfirmed as Chair of the Kobe Steering Committee.

現在の KSC 議長であるステファン・デピピエ氏は、もし代替りの人材がいなければ、ICCAT の副議長として、引き続き Kobe 運営委員会議長を引き受けるのにやぶさかではないと確認した。運営委員会はこの申し出を受け入れ、デピピエ氏が Kobe 運営委員会議長として再任された。

Kobe Process Chair's Concept Note on Adjusting the Work under the KOBE process **Kobe プロセスの下での作業の調整に関する Kobe プロセス議長によるコンセプト・ノート**

The Chair of the KSC has prepared a draft concept note for consideration by the five tuna RFMOs on adjusting the work under the KOBE process. The draft concept note is provided at **Attachment B**. It expands on discussion held during the KSC meeting.

KSC 議長は、5 つのまぐろ類 RFMO による検討を求め、Kobe プロセスの下での作業の調整に関するコンセプト・ノートを作成した。このコンセプト・ノート案は別紙 **B** のとおりである。同案は、KSC 会合における議論を活性化した。

The Chair's concept note provides introductory remarks that highlight the importance of the Kobe Process as well as basic principles of the Kobe Process, such as the process should not provide oversight of the t-RFMOs and also should not set binding frameworks for t-RFMOs or their Members. Rather, the Kobe process should provide for a platform for enhanced coordination and collaboration instead of being a decision-making platform.

議長のコンセプト・ノートでは、Kobe プロセスの重要性、並びに Kobe プロセスの基本原則（すなわちプロセスがまぐろ類 RFMO を監視するものであってはならず、またまぐろ類 RFMO やそれぞれのメンバーに対して法的拘束力のある枠組みを定めてはならない等）を強調した緒言が記されている。Kobe プロセスは、意思決定のた

めのプラットフォームというよりもむしろ、調整及び協力の強化のためのプラットフォームであるべきである。

The Chair's note proposed that practical work would be arranged in three main categories: 議長のノートでは、以下3つの主なカテゴリーにおける実務作業をアレンジすることを提案している。

1. Cooperation, exchange of information and coordination within the steering committee. This may involve participation in the annual meeting or other events organised by fellow t-RFMOs.
運営委員会内における協力、情報交換及び調整。これには、会員であるまぐろ類 RFMO が主催する年次会合やその他のイベントへの参加が含まれる。
2. Organisation of meetings of existing or new working groups covering particular topics. (e.g. MSE, FADs, By-catch, catch documentation, external communication, best practices in science, compliance). These meetings would need to rely on the initiatives and on the voluntary contributions by Members, stakeholders and t-RFMO themselves. Participation would be open to everybody who wishes to cooperate.
特定のトピック（例えば MSE、FAD、混獲、漁獲証明、涉外、科学上のベスト・プラクティス、遵守）を網羅する既存の、又は新規の作業部会会合の調整。これらの会合は、メンバー、利害関係者及びまぐろ類 RFMO 自身によるイニシアティブ及び任意の拠出に頼る必要がある。協力を希望するいずれの者に対しても門戸は開かれる。
3. The organisation of a new large-scale meeting will also be considered. Such a meeting would be challenging to organise but is considered beneficial in terms of inclusiveness and transparency. It would require all tuna RFMOs and sufficient Members and stakeholders to prepare content for the meeting and attend actively. The FAO is considering whether it can finance and host such a meeting. Tentative timing is September 2019.
また、新たな大規模会合の調整についても検討する。こうした会合の調整は困難を伴うが、当事者意識及び透明性の観点から有益と考えられる。全 RFMO 及び十分な数のメンバー及び利害関係者が会合に向けたコンテンツを準備し、積極的に参加することが必要である。FAO は、そうした会合についての予算措置及び主催が可能かどうかを検討しているところである。暫定的に2019年9月の開催が予定されている。

The Extended Commission is invited to peruse and comment on the minutes of the KSC and the KSC Chair's concept note. In particular, the Extended Commission should:

拡大委員会は、KSC の文書及び KSC 議長によるコンセプト・ノートを精読してコメントを行うよう招請されている。特に、拡大委員会は以下を行うべきである。

- Consider whether it supports the three main categories proposed for adjusting work under the Kobe Process;
拡大委員会として、Kobe プロセスの下での作業の調整のために提案された3つの主要カテゴリーを支持するかどうか検討すること。
- Advise on topics that it would like new or existing working groups to cover and the extent to which the CCSBT and its Member could contribute to such groups; and
新規又は既存の作業部会によって対応されたいトピック、及びそうした作業部会に対して CCSBT 及びメンバーが貢献できる程度について助言すること。

- Provide its views on the merits of holding a large-scale Kobe meeting, together with suggestions for the agenda for that meeting and its views on the suitability of the proposed tentative timing of September 2019 for the CCSBT.
大規模な Kobe 会合を開催することのメリットに関する見解を示すとともに、同会合の議題に関する提案を行うこと。また、2019年9月として暫定的に提案されている日程が CCSBT にとって適切かどうかについての見解を示すこと。

Kobe Steering Committee Meeting

FAO Headquarters

Rome, Italy

11 July 2018

Meeting Report (DRAFT)

1 Opening and Introductions

The Chair of the Kobe Steering Committee, Stefaan Depypere (First Vice-Chair, ICCAT) opened the meeting by explaining that participants represented both the five t-RFMOs as well as others he had invited to contribute to the future direction of the group. The following were in attendance:

- Alejandro Anganuzzi (Global Coordinator, Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project)
- Guillermo Compeán (Director, IATTC)
- Kristopher Du Rietz (Chair, CCSBT)
- John Henderschedt (Director International Affairs, NOAA)
- Robert Kennedy (Executive Secretary, CCSBT)
- Camille Jean Pierre Manel (Executive Secretary, ICCAT)
- Carlos Marín (Chair, IATTC)
- Árni Mathiesen (Assistant Director-General, FAO)
- Driss Meski (Chair of the RFB network)
- Chris O'Brien (Executive Secretary, IOTC)
- Feleti Penitala Teo OBE (Executive Director, WCPFC)
- Jean Francois Pulvenis (Senior Policy Advisor, IATTC)
- Sebastian Rodriguez (Executive Secretary, SPRFMO)
- Susan Imende Ungadi (Chair, IOTC)

as well as

- Angela Martini (Assistant to the Chair, EU)
- Shelley Clarke (Assistant to the Chair, FAO)

2 Background to the Meeting

The Chair provided a brief history of the Joint t-RFMOs (or Kobe) process since the first meeting in Kobe, Japan in January 2007. That meeting identified fourteen key issues and challenges and defined a process for future work. After a second meeting in San Sebastian, Spain in April 2009, several technical workshops, and a third meeting in La Jolla, USA in July 2011 the focus of "Kobe process" activities shifted away from plenary-type meetings to a steering committee. Although the steering committee has not met regularly, work under the Kobe umbrella has progressed. According to a self-assessment reviewed by the Chair, t-RFMOs report achieving 70-80% of the original Kobe process goals. Other relevant work on FAD management, management strategy evaluation, the ecosystem approach to fisheries, bycatch and other topics has been carried out.

The Chair considered that experience has shown on the one hand that the organization of big meetings has proved challenging and on the other hand that working only in a Steering Committee format was not sufficiently productive. The Steering Committee should encourage medium scope activities. We find that the process has worked better when focusing on technical subjects and small

participation. The FADs joint Working group that took place in Madrid in 2017 was successful and is a model to be repeated.

3 Kobe Process Re-set: How and Why

The Chair considered that the continuation of a cross t-RFMO body in some form is important for conveying key messages to civil society regarding progress in fisheries management, particularly in the context of ongoing BBNJ discussions and the UNFSA review process.¹

It is central to decide in what way to bring forward the process. In this respect the following options should be considered:

- Steering committee to continue its work: continuity should be ensured and the Steering committee should encourage activities and endorse the outcomes
- Continue to identify technical meetings and step up their organization
- Prepare big meeting: this needs to be carefully prepared and every RFMO (as distinct from their Secretariats) needs to be consulted. Subject to be covered and objectives of meeting need to be clear and “appealing” to get support from RFMO members.

FAO noted that the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project has supported several of the Kobe-generated working groups which otherwise would have struggled to find funding. However, these groups were left orphaned by the Kobe process in the sense that their recommendations are now reported back to some t-RFMOs individually, but lack a forum for coordinated discussion of a response.

NOAA raised the United States Fishery Management Council system as a potential model for the Kobe process. In that system thematic coordination is proving effective with success attributed to the availability of sufficient resources for meeting preparation and facilitation. In bringing forward the process the following elements need to be taken into account: how (big meetings vs small ones), recognition of the regional dimension, efficiency, communication and spill-over of good results.

WCPFC noted that its membership was not able to support any WCPFC participation in the recent FAD working group meetings. Some of its members have expressed serious reservations regarding the continued relevance and effectiveness of the Kobe process. It would be necessary for any future participation of WCPFC in any Kobe related activities for the Steering Committee to clearly re-articulate and communicate to the WCPFC and other t-RFMOs the key strategic objectives /of strategic goals of the Kobe process. Small island developing States of the WCPFC in particular are concerned that a Kobe or Kobe-like process should not provide oversight of the t-RFMOs and also should not set binding frameworks for t-RFMOs or their members. Rather the Kobe process provided for a platform for enhanced coordination and collaboration instead of being a decision-making platform.

Several participants recalled that the Kobe process had been effective when it defined specific, coordinated actions such as the Kobe plot reporting format and record of fishing vessel harmonization.

FAO identified benefits to a Kobe process associated with improved public perceptions of transparency and progress, particularly given the importance of tuna to a variety of market sectors. While small meetings are more manageable and efficient, it was noted that large meetings are

¹ In 2019 the UNFSA review process will focus on the performance of RFMOs

costly but relatively more transparent. In order to be successful the agenda needs to be well crafted.

IATTC considered that the basis for the previous Kobe cooperation was a common goal of harmonization and that has now largely been achieved. Therefore new and achievable goals need to be defined recognizing that there are inherent differences between the t-RFMOs, both structurally and on specific issues.

The Chair agreed with this comment, which is in line with the earlier comment by WCPFC. He argued that the Kobe process should avoid prescriptive guidance and make this very clear within the RFMO community.²

FAO suggested that the spirit of the Kobe process is grounded in sharing knowledge and building on commonalities, for example catch documentation schemes, data collection and reporting, as well as a number of other topics advanced under the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project. The Kobe process can serve as an important focal point for mutually-beneficial cooperation.

Several participants noted the importance of having a clear mandate from their membership to participate in cross t-RFMO activities. There will need to be a well-constructed and skillfully communicated strategy to connect the Kobe coordination activities to the priority agenda items of the membership. The benefits of linking a second generation Kobe process to a second phase of the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project were recognized. It was also stressed that ABNJ ends by September 2019 so if it is decided to organize a big meeting, it should take place earlier to benefit from financial support.

The importance of strategic communications was emphasized by several participants, including communicating between t-RFMOs to identify shared priorities, identifying which joint actions would benefit all t-RFMOs, and then having an outward-facing communications strategy aimed at members and civil society. It was noted that the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project is working toward this to some extent but a more cohesive narrative is required. Also, as the focus of the Regional Fisheries Bodies Secretariats' Network (RSN) is on coordination between the Secretariats, the distinction of the Kobe process will be its aim to coordinate between t-RFMO members.

There was general agreement that a concept note outlining the key selling points and re-setting the agenda of a revived Kobe process would be a necessary first step.

4 Sources of Funding

Participants considered that funding from the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project would be ideal, but that support from non-governmental organizations or philanthropic organizations may also be possible and should be further explored. The Chair noted he had explored industry contributions but does not consider this to have a high potential. Reaching out to retailers should also be considered. The Chair and FAO committed to further consideration and discussions with potential funding sources.

The EU stated that funding has been specifically earmarked for specific purposes (e.g. FAD management or bycatch) under the Kobe process umbrella. However, in order to benefit from

² This is why, e.g., the FAD meeting issued no "recommendations" but limited itself to suggest points of interest.

funding, it is essential to commit the money by the end of the year. While a second joint FADs working group should take place in May 2019 in La Jolla (back to back with IATTC Scientific Committee Meeting), nothing concrete has been identified for work on by-catch. CCSBT volunteered to engage with the EU to determine details of the funding and then to liaise with the Chair of the Kobe bycatch technical working group to explore the possibility of organizing a meeting.

5 Governance

Discussions on the issue of governance were restricted to the Steering Committee *stricto sensu* members.

Participants agreed that transparency is key to gaining trust and cooperation; however, they also agreed that it was better to keep the Kobe process informal.

The Chair agreed to prepare a concept note to be shared with members of the Steering Committee for feedback. In addition to clearly conveying the objectives of the process, the concept note should re-confirm and provide the contact details of the chairs of each of the Joint t-RFMO working groups.

After some discussion of the appropriate procedure for appointing these chairs it was agreed that chairs will be nominated and if there is no objection the nomination will be confirmed. If there are multiple nominations a consultative process will be required.

S. Depypere confirmed that as the Vice-Chair of ICCAT he was happy to continue to serve as Chair of the Kobe Steering Committee if no alternatives were found. The Steering Committee accepted this offer and he was reconfirmed as Chair of the Kobe Steering Committee.

It was also recognized the need to establish some light Secretariat to support the process.

6 Support to the Kobe Steering Committee

It was agreed that FAO would continue to provide limited support to the Kobe Steering Committee in the form of document management and communications. Web-based information should be updated and then maintained taking advantage of the existing www.tuna-org.org website.

7 Next Steps

The Chair agreed to circulate the minutes of this meeting promptly and to begin drafting a concept note for the input of others. The need for this Steering Committee to meet again (perhaps by weblink) will be confirmed after initial feedback on the concept note is received. A subsequent step would be to report the initiative to the t-RFMO members at their regular sessions. A general goal of holding a plenary-type meeting to re-set/re-start the Kobe Process in late 2019 was articulated. CCSBT commented that the suggestion made for a September meeting was not good timing for the CCSBT's participation.

Coordination and Cooperation between t-RFMO¹

Adjusting the work under the KOBE process.
A Concept note
(DRAFT)

Introductory remarks:

In the present Ocean Governance set-up, RFMOs have been entrusted with a critical role to manage highly migratory² stocks properly. The t-RFMOs constitute a sub-set of RFMOs with a particular responsibility in this context.

Generally speaking, the performance of the t-RFMOs can be qualified as rather satisfactory.³ The scientific processes function, decisions about management measures are taken, compliance is monitored and measures are regularly reviewed to take account of changing circumstances. The performance of all the t-RFMO has been assessed at least once.

Yet, occasionally t-RFMOs attract criticism about their performance. Sometimes also other organisations⁴, relying on a separate conservation mandate, venture into their activity domain. At times there are even suggestions that more overarching global organisations ought to be set-up.⁵

The best reply to such criticism and challenges is for the t-RFMO to continue working on their performance and to continue working jointly on issues of common interest. There has been, for more than a decade, a systematic effort to pursue such cooperation under the “Kobe process”.

During the first meeting in Kobe, Japan in January 2007 fourteen key issues and challenges and a process for future work were defined. After a second meeting in San Sebastian, Spain in April 2009, several technical workshops were set up and at a third meeting in La Jolla, USA in July 2011 the focus of “Kobe process” activities shifted away from plenary-type meetings to a steering committee. The steering committee consists of the chairs and executive secretaries (or directors) of the five t-RFMO.

According to a self-assessment, t-RFMOs report achieving 70-80% of the original Kobe process goals. Other relevant work on FAD management, management strategy evaluation, the ecosystem approach to fisheries, by-catch and other topics has been carried out.

The continuation of a cross t-RFMO cooperation process in some form is important for conveying key messages regarding progress in fisheries

¹ Tuna RFMO

² And other stocks of common interest like straddling stocks

³ See argumentation in: S.DEPYPERE, *Ocean Governance for Sustainable Fisheries, in Nordquist e.a. 372-378* © Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, 2017.

⁴ Which arguably, are less performing or less committed to following good practices than t-RFMOs

⁵ E.g. during the BBNJ preparatory discussions.

management to all stakeholders, including producers, consumers and civil society. This should be relevant also for the UNFSA review process.

The steering committee has been trying to assess its own performance and to improve the cooperation mechanisms. During its most recent meeting⁶ at the occasion of the COFI meeting at the FAO in Rome, an exchange of views resulted in a broad agreement on a way forward.

Basic principles

The process will continue to work as a lean –virtual- organisation. It will continue to rely on the t-RFMO, on contracting parties and on efforts and contributions by various stakeholders (civil society, fleet operators, processors, retail organisations etc.).

The FAO will continue to support the process and will also offer a light secretariat service. Various communication tools will be used but efforts will be made to enhance the website “www.tuna-org.org” which is hosted by ICCAT.

It has been made very clear that the process should not provide oversight of the t-RFMOs and also should not set binding frameworks for t-RFMOs or their members. Rather the Kobe process should provide for a platform for enhanced coordination and collaboration instead of being a decision-making platform. It should avoid prescriptive guidance and make this very clear within the RFMO community.

As many of the previous goals were reached, new and achievable goals need to be defined recognizing that there are inherent differences between the t-RFMOs, both structurally and on specific issues.

There are benefits to a Kobe process associated with improved public perceptions of transparency and progress, particularly given the importance of tuna to a variety of market sectors. While small meetings are more manageable and efficient, it was noted that large meetings are costly but relatively more transparent. In order to be successful the agenda needs to be well crafted.

Fostering strategic communications is considered to be very important, including communication between t-RFMOs to identify shared priorities, identifying joint actions which would benefit all t-RFMOs, and then having an outward-facing communications strategy aimed at members and all stakeholders, including civil society.

The spirit of the Kobe process is grounded in sharing knowledge and building on commonalities, for example catch documentation schemes, data collection and reporting, as well as a number of other topics⁷. It can serve as an important focal point for mutually beneficial cooperation.

⁶ 11/07/2018

⁷ advanced also under the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project.

It is important for the representatives of each t-RFMO at the steering committee to obtain a clear mandate from their membership to participate in cross t-RFMO activities. As already previously agreed, the Kobe process will feature as a point on the agenda of the annual meeting of each t-RFMO.

Practical work

Work would be arranged in three main categories:

Cooperation, exchange of information and coordination within the steering committee. This may involve participation in the annual meeting or other events organised by fellow t-RFMOs.

Organisation of meetings of existing⁸ or new working groups covering particular topics. (MSE, FADs, By-catch, catch documentation, external communication, best practices in science, compliance,..)

Such cooperation will need to rely on the initiatives and on the voluntary contributions (intellectually, financially, logistically) by contracting parties, stakeholders and t-RFMO themselves. Participation would be open to everybody who wishes to cooperate.

All parties are invited to reflect on possible topics and to consider contributing. The steering committee will act as a broker for such information and will facilitate forms of cooperation.

The organisation of a new large-scale meeting⁹ will also be considered. On the one hand, such a large-scale meeting poses quite a challenge. Preparation is a daunting task. On the other hand, it is considered very beneficial in terms of inclusiveness and transparency. It would only make sense, however, if all t-RFMO and enough contracting parties and stakeholders were ready to prepare this content-wise and to attend actively. The FAO is considering whether it can finance and host such a meeting. Tentative timing would be September 2019.

Invitation

All t-RFMO are invited to discuss these ideas at their annual meeting or otherwise.¹⁰

⁸ The list of existing working groups and their chairs will be communicated separately.

⁹ A "Kobe IV".

¹⁰ Due to the scheduling of Annual Meetings, fixing suitable calendars and deadlines is very difficult.