



**TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**

**Eighteenth Regular Session**

Electronic Meeting 21 – 27 September 2022

---

**A RISK-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR THE WCPFC COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME  
- SUPPLEMENT**

---

**WCPFC-TCC18-2022-11\_suppl.  
15 September 2022**

**Paper by the CMS-IWG Lead on RBAF**

## Questions to facilitate discussion on the Risk Based Assessment Framework at TCC 18,

September 2022

- Note the differences between the risk rating of obligations by FFA, EU and Philippines, with only shared views on 77 obligations. It may be time-consuming and difficult to reach WCPFC consensus on the **risk rating of every individual obligation**.
  - Is there agreement that it may not be worthwhile to try and reach WCPFC agreement on the risk rating of every individual obligations?
  - Members may, however, risk-rate obligations themselves as a means of assisting their own process of prioritising obligations – or they may find the risk ratings by FFA, EU and PH to be useful. What are members views?
- As a way of streamlining the CMS and prioritising the selection of obligations, **“Implementation” obligations** are held on file. Nonetheless, some “implementation” obligations are still regularly assessed. [See para 25 and table on page 8]
  - Which implementation obligations are “mission critical” and should still be regularly assessed?
- The RBAF is a tool – it provides members with a rationale to use when prioritising obligations for assessment. It provides a means for CCMs to compare the relative importance of obligations from different CMMs, including in relation to the broader objectives of the Convention.
- Obligations can be **grouped by their risk-ratings; categories** (limit, report, implementation, deadline); **and thematic groups**. The descriptions of these groups (using risk-based language) may assist members to prioritise obligations.
  - Are these groupings useful?
  - Should any of these groupings be *excluded* from the RBAF?
  - Do members have drafting suggestions for the descriptions of these groups?
- **“Baked In” obligations**. What groups of obligations should be automatically baked-in to the annual list of obligations for assessment (i.e. reflecting their importance and the risk of non-compliance)?
  - All limit obligations (21)? Or just some of the limit obligations? [see pp15-16]
  - Based on the risk-ratings and descriptions, are there “mission critical” obligations in the implementation, report and deadline categories? [See suggestions pp16-19]
- Could the grouping of obligations be used to inform a **forward schedule** for the review of obligations? [para 29-30]
  - In addition to limit obligations, this could include a proportion of obligations from other groups (e.g. categories or thematic groups based on risk-ratings and descriptions).
  - Are there other factors that should guide the selection of obligations?
- Do members have **other suggestions** to help rationalise the CMS or to prioritise the selection of obligations?