



**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
SEVENTH REGULAR SESSION**

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
9-17 August 2011

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PEER REVIEW OF THE
2011 STOCK ASSESSMENT OF BIGEYE TUNA**

WCPFC-SC7-2011/GN-WP-04

Prepared by the Secretariat

Background

Following a 2008 “Independent Review of the Commission’s Science Structure and Function”, by MRAG UK, the Secretariat prepared an information paper “A Proposal for the Peer Review of ISC and SC stock assessments” (SC5-GN-IP-10) which presented options for delivery of the peer assessment. SC6 recommended a peer review on 2010 bigeye stock assessment to be conducted in 2011. However, WCPFC7 endorsed undertaking a workshop-style peer-review of the 2011 bigeye stock assessment in early 2012, and requested, in consultation with SPC; a relevant budget be proposed by SC7 to WCPFC8.

Points of consideration

The following items and suggestions are prepared to facilitate discussion, and SC7 will provide recommendations to the Commission for approval on 2012 peer review process.

Reviewers

Several options can be considered and the following examples in the matrix below are suggested for consideration. In the case of selecting independent international experts, it is critical to select experts that can review stock assessments interactively with the assessment scientists. Odd number may be preferred in case of decision making.

Option		Pro	Con
1	Centre for Independent Experts (CIE) Review (http://www.ciereviews.org/)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established infrastructure, and recognised and accepted process • Although US based, expertise is taken from a global pool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The typical CIE desk based approach may be less useful than engaging directly with the stock assessment team throughout the process.

Option		Pro	Con
2	MRAG (www.mrag.co.uk)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MRAG is commercially responsive and may be able to provide expertise at short notice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MRAG UK may not have sufficient in-house stock assessment expertise at present.
3	Internal review by CCMs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs may be reduced through the support of the CCMs Reviewing scientists should be familiar with the stock conditions and stock assessments being reviewed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review will not appear to be fully independent
4	Independent international experts, including other RFMO experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant expertise would be applied to the peer review Independence ensured A register of independent experts can be developed for future use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be resource conflicts if tuna RFMO experts are selected and its stock assessments have similar timelines.

Procedure and schedule

- a) A [] day workshop-style peer review in [February] 2012;
- b) Submit an Interim Review Report to the April Stock Assessment Preparatory Workshop;
- c) The stock assessment group provide comments on the Interim Review Report;
- d) Possible additional work in relation to the 2012 bigeye assessment (April – July 2012) such as undertaking a short review of 2012 stock assessment process.
- e) Provide the Final Review Report on completed review to SC8 (by 20 July 2012);
- f) SC8 submit comments on the Final Review Report to WCPFC9.

Cost, if independent international experts hired

- a) Cost covers consultancy fee, airfare and DSA.
 - Standard daily rate: around USD []
 - Total working days for daily rate: [] days for preparation + [] days for workshop + [] days for completion
 - Travel airfare (direct route and economic class), DSA at UN rate, and incidental expenses (internet and transportation) – reimbursement will be made subject to submission of evidences
- b) Total cost for the completion of the peer review: around USD12,000 ~ 15,000 per expert