Harvest Strategy Workshop (MOW4)

The Stones Hotel
Bali 30 Nov- 1 December

Skipjack working group

Discussion of objectives

- The proposed TRP (50%) for SJ meets a broad range of objectives by maintaining the fishery at around current levels of catch and effort
- The proposed TRP meets the economic goals of PNA, noting some compromise among PNA members
- While some concern was expressed about potential impacts on artisanal/coastal fleets, it was sometimes difficult to estimate these (there is a need for better data on artisanal catches)
- Suggestion that any artisanal impacts in PICs may be more related to FAD bycatch

Trading off objectives

- There is currently no explicit consideration of other species/fisheries in the development of a SJ harvest strategy; management arrangements for other species will be addressed through via other measures (e.g. bigeye via FAD measures).
- Need for clarity in the rationale and description of HCRs to promote understanding and support by industry

Frequency of catch/effort adjustment using HCR

- Should be related to the risk of a bad outcome and the stock status – closer to LRP = higher frequency of catch/effort adjustment
- While SJ is a short-lived species (may indicate more frequent review), currently a large ‘buffer’ exists for this stock and catches/stock/CPUE have been stable for a long period
- General agreement that updating at 3 years intervals is appropriate, unless there are high/unforseen circumstances in the fishery – use of metarules can deal with this eventuality

Limits on changes to catch/effort between management periods

- General agreement that limits would be useful; in the case of SJ, primarily for economic reasons noting potentially undesirable effects of significant change
- Suggestion that there is a need for flexibility in case of exceptional circumstances – metalrules could deal with these
- *Metarule = a rule governing the content, form, or application of other rules*

Limits on changes to catch/effort between management periods

- Agreement that the use of offset catch/effort adjustment will be useful i.e. lower limit for increase than decrease
- MSE should offer an invaluable tool to test all elements of a candidate HCR, including limits on changes
- Key objective of HCR is to avoid major fluctuations and maintain the stock around the TRP on average rather than overfishing and then implementing rebuilding requiring dramatic change

Limits on changes to catch/effort between management periods

- General support for limits, but need to be moderated to avoid undue volatility, noting issue with mobility of capital and current over-capitalisation
- Need to test range of values for change limits 20% (approx current for SBT/ICES, BFT in ICCAT) too high
- Possibility that changes can be implemented over a number of years

Limits on changes to catch/effort between management periods

- Consider trade-offs:
  - Tight limits = more frequent adjustments and harder to keep in target range
  - Wide limits = less frequent but large changes may be required

Frequency of HCR re-evaluation

- Will depend on time to determine effectiveness of, and stock response to, HCR
- 3 years generally considered to be reasonable?
- Provided adequate MSE testing, less frequent re-evaluation might be reasonable

HCRs and management objectives

- TRP generally meets objectives expressed at MOW
- Alternative HCRs to achieve a given TRP are possible and should be tested via MSE
- (fishing less during good times will tend to result in less revenue over time but give greater stability of returns – another trade off)
- Establishment of ‘trigger points’ for action important

Potential HCR indicators for SC consideration

- Stock status – SC to advise on best choice of biological indicators
- Changes in CPUE (noting effort creep/hyperstability considerations)
- Economic indicators
- Spatial indicators
- Effort/capacity
- Other species

Other issues

- Compatibility
- HCRs can be based on economic indicators