

Management Objectives

Workshop 2

Working Group 4

**Managing impacts on a key tuna species across gear types;
Options for addressing bigeye tuna overfishing**

The importance of including economic or financial assessments in the evaluation of proposals and options

- Considered self-evident, as reinforced by the Convention, that economics and financial assessments are important.
- A view that the degree to which biological considerations supersede economic /financial considerations is dependent on the status of the stock e.g. rebuilding a very depleted stock.

How current modelling approaches could be enhanced to provide more meaningful assessment of fishery trade-offs

- Analysis of options in WP4 all have same biological outcome for bigeye, but impacts on parameters other than catch value are not clear.
- Need to ensure model and modeling are 'fit for purpose' - Multifan focuses on species stock assessment and the analysis so far has been very specific (end bigeye overfishing).
- Needs clear instructions from CMMs in a timely manner, in line with SC/TCC/Commission timetable
- Analysis need to be extended to include a range of potential indicators: economic, environmental etc

How current modelling approaches could be enhanced to provide more meaningful assessment of fishery trade-offs

- May be opportunities in the future to apply other models e.g. Sepodym
- SPC [Multifan] generates results at a coarse spatial level – possible for some EEZ-level analysis but to review in detail at a finer scale would need additional work/a more sophisticated model

Types of data and indicators that would be needed to better inform Commission decision making

- The Commission does not have detailed economic data— this may be held at a sub-regional or country level.
- WCPFC needs to consider what economic data it needs and how to access it.
- ‘Disproportionate burden’ (in relation to SIDS) needs to be quantified
- Economics are dynamic, conservation issues are more long-term. Economic projections are valid most for only one or two years

Types of data and indicators that would be needed to better inform Commission decision making

- Potential in mixed spp fisheries e.g. tropical PS for interaction with artisanal fisheries.
- Spatial indicators may be important
- Consider value chain – not just catch values

Mechanisms for the Commission to consider trade-off evaluations to determine whether they are acceptable and if not how they can be rearranged

- While there is no fixed mechanism/protocol, the WCPFC currently makes implicit trade-offs and will continue to do so
- Individual CMMs or groups of CMMs (e.g. PNA) will continue to take positions in national best interest, and, where appropriate, consider trade-offs during negotiation at the Commission.
- WCPFC takes into consideration a wide range of issues, but is bound by the Convention

Mechanisms for the Commission to consider trade-off evaluations to determine whether they are acceptable and if not how they can be rearranged

- Useful to consider boundaries on the decision space – e.g. the Convention, codified practices over time (e.g. disproportionate burden) etc
- ‘Red lines’ should demark areas where trade-offs do not apply e.g LRPs, HCRs
- CMMs and groups of CMMs will continue to enact compatible management measures

Mechanisms for the Commission to consider trade-off evaluations to determine whether they are acceptable and if not how they can be rearranged

Forum for discussion of fisheries management issues – options:

- Additional meeting as per the Tokyo TT meeting
- Use existing Sub-committees - SC has Man. Issues theme, TCC could add element
- As above with ad hoc meetings as required

Balance – burden on delegations vs need for focus on management

SC should not comment on “management” issues, but could introduce an economic theme or discuss economics within the existing Management Issues theme

Additional discussion point: Who decides the trade-off? Is it the Commission or owners of the fishing rights and how is that trade off determined?

- Wary of any process that takes away the ownership of decision making from the CMMs/ SIDS .
- Balance needed in the decision making process – partly based on the convention
- Individual parties/groups (CCMs, PNA, FFA etc.) may determine actions independent of the commission
- A narrow decision area with quantified trade-offs makes the process more manageable

Where to from here?

- MOW is a useful process and should continue; needs to be member-driven, even if it is difficult to get member feedback – these are important issues and need to be fully understood
- The process can be taken up in SC and TCC – but would be a difficult process – nature of these workshops is very useful to improve understanding.
- Need to better prioritise future work.
- Move away from awareness to a producing specific options/suggestions for action
- Could define general framework with associated fisheries management plans – e.g. NAFO
- Possible to move forward in a stepwise manner and introduce interim measure[s] as a start