**SC14 - MANAGEMENT ISSUES THEME**

**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE COMMISSON**

**AGENDA 5.1 -DEVELOPMENT OF A HARVEST STRATEGY FRAMEWORK**

Agenda Item 5.1.2: Target Reference Points (TRP)

South Pacific Albacore Tuna

1. SC14 noted that WCPFC14 deferred the possible adoption of an interim TRP for the South Pacific albacore stock, which had originally been agreed to take place in 2015 under the Harvest Strategy Work Plan, until December 2018 at the latest. Recalling that it had previously reviewed a number of working papers and provided advice to the WCPFC over the past three years on this issue, SC14 reaffirms the previous recommendations made by SC13. In particular, SC14: (adopted)
* notes that FFA CCMs have communicated their objectives for the south Pacific albacore stock as taken by the southern longline fishery at various times, and have proposed (in WCPFC14-DP13) a TRP that would maintain or restore average longline albacore CPUE to 10% above its 2013 value by 2028, and to 17% above its 2013 level by 2038. (adopted)
* encourages other CCMs to describe their objectives for the fishery as specified in the Roadmap to implement the elements needed for the effective conservation and management for South Pacific albacore adopted by WCPFC14; (adopted)
* draws the attention of WCPFC15 to the Limit Reference Point already adopted by the Commission for south Pacific albacore and the need to maintain the stock well above that limit; and, (adopted)
* draws attention to the need to identify a TRP ~~which maintains the stock well above this limit, and~~ at a level which best achieves the fisheries management objectives of CCMs with a real interest in this stock. (adopted)

SC14 also draws the attention of WCPFC15 to the updated assessment for south Pacific albacore reviewed by SC14 (described in WCPFC-SC14-2018/SA-WP-05) which indicates that the current status of this stock is well above the LRP (with the median value of SBlatest/SBF=0=0.52). To assist CCMs in the identification and evaluation of an appropriate TRP for south Pacific albacore SC14 also recommends that the Scientific Services Provider provides to CCMs an updated analysis using an approach similar to working paper HSW-WP-05 as presented to theWCPFC Harvest Strategy Workshop held in late November 2015. (adopted)

In view of the decision by WCPFC14 that “CCMs will work together in advance of WCPFC15 to develop TRP proposals” this analysis may need to be provided and discussed at a meeting of the WCPFC South Pacific Albacore Roadmap Working Group in the margins of TCC14 or in conjunction with WCPFC15. (adopted)

Agenda Item 5.1.5: Science and management dialogue

1. Noting Paragraph 215 of the WCPFC14 Summary Report on the need for a Science-Management Dialogue, SC14 discussed the elements to consider when formulating such a dialogue and the consultative draft terms of reference (WCPFC-SC14-2018/MI-WP-06). SC14 expressed strong support for such a Science-Management Dialogue to begin in 2019 in order to make expedited progress consistent with the agreed Harvest Strategy Work Plan and taking full advantage of the WCPFC14 recommendation to give sufficient time during SC to the work on harvest strategies. (adopted)
2. SC14 therefore recommends that WCPFC15 take the necessary steps to establish such a Dialogue in 2019 and consider the draft Terms of Reference provided in Attachment X. (adopted)
3. SC14 noted that it is important for this group to possess authority to enable them to make the appropriate recommendations to the Commission. SC14 therefore recommends the Commission define the appropriate format for this group. (adopted)
4. SC14 also discussed the timing of the meeting and various options were expressed. SC14 recognised that this is a decision for WCPFC15. (adopted)
5. SC14 recommends that WCPFC15 take the following elements into consideration when establishing this group:
* While the size of the meeting should remain manageable, at least 1 senior fishery manager per CCM and 1 scientist per CCM should be encouraged to attend. Additional scientific advisors to these managers may also attend. Also, the participation of stakeholders is important and encouraged. (adopted)
* Given the need to have informal (capacity building) and formal (decision-making) elements to the meeting, particularly in the initial stages, a 2 day meeting was the minimum meeting length believed appropriate. However, the duration of the meeting would need to be flexible based upon the agenda, which should be linked closely to the harvest strategy workplan. (adopted)
* Capacity building elements of the meeting should focus on a ‘learning by doing’ approach, whereby key tuna stock and fishery results are used within the process. (adopted)
* The potential for input and facilitation by external experts was noted, and the cost implications of this should be considered. (adopted)
* This group should specifically rely on information derived from SC or through SC requests, and should not change the scientific advice but may add to it from a management perspective. (adopted)
1. SC14 also recommends that WCPFC15 adopt an appropriate name for this dialogue, such as the Harvest Strategy Development Working Group. (adopted)

**AGENDA 5.3 - IMPLEMENTATION OF CMM-2017-01**

Agenda Item 5.3.1: Effectiveness of CMM-2017-01

1. As requested in the Harvest Strategy Work Plan, as updated by WCPFC14, SC14 reviewed information on the likely outcomes of the revised tropical tuna measure (CMM 2017-01) in relation to bigeye tuna (WCPFC-SC14-2018/MI-WP-08a; detailed analysis of the projections of BET is provided in Section XX of [this report (SC14 Summary Report’s Stock Status and Management Advice section]). SC14 noted that outcomes are strongly influenced by the assumed future recruitment levels and the time period of the projections SC14 recommended that the working paper be forwarded to WCPFC15. SC14 noted that projection analyses such as those detailed in the working paper should be presented in conjunction with the stock assessment results in future SC meetings. (adopted)

Agenda Item 5.3.2: Management Issues Related to FADs

FAD Tracking

1. SC14 reviewed information on analyses of the PNA’s fish aggregating device (FAD) tracking program (WCPFC-SC14-2018/MI-WP-09). SC14 expressed strong support for this type of research and its continuation, noting that the PNA FAD tracking program is providing information and insight that is adding substantial value to the scientific understanding of WCPO fisheries. However, SC14 noted the ongoing practice of fleets not providing full data (estimates indicate that 60–70% of buoy transmissions are not forwarded to the PNA via practices such as geo-fencing) which substantially undermines the scientific value of the information and prevents the SC from being able to provide comprehensive advice to the Commission on FAD dynamics, economics and management. SC14 also expressed concern about the estimated high rate (5%) of beaching events in tracked FADs, with the vast majority of these being in PNA countries, together with the estimated high rate of ‘lost’ FADs (up to 27%). (adopted)
2. SC14 recommends that WCPFC15 note the importance of FAD marking and monitoring programs to better identify and follow individual FADs. To address the marine pollution issue, reduce the risk to coastal communities, reefs, and fish stocks SC14 recommends the use of biodegradable FADs, non-entangling, non-entrapping, and environmentally-friendly FAD designs, better measures for FAD control and retrieval, and fewer FAD deployments. SC14 also recommends that the Secretariat ensure this working paper is made available to inform the deliberations of the FAD Management IWG meeting to be held in October 2018 and that WCPFC15 take note of the concerns expressed above and support appropriate measures.(adopted)

FAD Numbers

1. SC14 reviewed information on the estimation of the number of drifting Fish Aggregating Device (FAD) deployments and active FADs per vessel over the period 2011-2018 (WCPFC-SC14-2018/MI-WP-10), noting that purse seine fishing on drifting FADs accounts for about 40% of the purse seine tuna catch in the WCPO. SC14 noted the limitations of the different sources of data used in the analysis but expressed strong support for and the utility of this research. Preliminary estimates of FAD deployments ranged between 30,700–56,900 in 2016 and 44,700–64,900 in 2017 (using combined fishery and PNA FAD tracking data). SC14 also noted that based upon the information provided in the paper, the present per vessel limit of 350 active FADs (at any one time) in the WCPO likely does not constrain or reduce the number of FADs in the water, given that the average vessel at the moment is estimated to have around 117 FADs in the water at any time (assuming the average life of an active FAD is 6 months). However, pointing to the uncertainty of the number of FADs deployed in the WCPO, the identified deficiencies in FAD tracking data, and the differences of the number of active FADs between estimates and the actual operations, some CCMs suggested that the SC continues to provide the further analysis on active FAD number with the additional available data such as improving the FAD data fields to be reported by observers and/or vessel operators. (adopted)
2. SC14 recommends that the Secretariat ensure this working paper is made available to inform the deliberations of the FAD Management IWG meeting to be held in October 2018. SC14 also recommends that the FAD Management IWG and WCPFC15 take into consideration the concerns expressed above and determine a more appropriate limit that (i) helps reduce the amount of marine debris, synthetic pollution and beaching events generated by FAD deployment, and (ii) helps to avoid any economic impacts on the purse seine fishery through reduced CPUE. SC14 also recommends that additional work on these issues be supported, noting that improved data collection in both the observer and logbook records would also assist this research. (adopted)

Attachment X (adopted in full)

**Consultative Draft Terms of Reference for a WCPFC Science-Management Dialogue meeting**

# Consideration elements

The proposed science-management dialogue would be distinct from, but combine features of, Scientific Committee and Commission meetings. To facilitate further discussion on the ‘science-management dialogue’ meeting, a non-exhaustive list of key elements and issues is provided below, which would benefit from SC14 consideration. It is noted that SC14 did not reach consensus on some of these issues:

1. The science-management dialogue needs to make formal recommendations to the Commission (and also requests of other Commission bodies and groups). Should the dialogue be established as a formal subsidiary body of the Commission, established by Paragraph 6, Article 11?
2. If the science-management dialogue holds formal meetings, does the SC see benefit in including an informal discussion element to the meeting, to ensure all stakeholders (science, management, industry, NGOs) are able to engage in the process?
3. Should the structure of the science-management dialogue meeting therefore include both formal and informal sessions?
	* The informal session could provide opportunity for capacity building for all attendees with (minimal) presentation, and interactive discussion of available analytical results. The informal nature of this session would facilitate involvement by the wider stakeholder group. This may have implications for meeting length but this element is expected to decrease over time.
	* The formal session can cover substantial issues, which may include developing and reviewing relevant CMMs and clearing meeting recommendations (assuming the remainder of the report could be cleared electronically).
4. What elements should be considered to structure and organise a science-management dialogue, noting that a large, formal Commission-style meeting has become the norm? Should as a minimum a scientist and manager from each CCM, where possible, be recommended to attend?
5. Under the assumption that a Harvest Control Rule will be implemented through fishery/stock-specific CMMs, will the science-management dialogue meeting have any direct role in the development or review of those CMMs and provide recommendations to the Commission?
6. Should it be required that all technical/analytical information be first reviewed by the Scientific Committee before it is made available to the science-management dialogue and to the Commission? If so, should there be an exception made for new information that the Scientific Committee has specifically recommended to be made available?
7. How should a Science-Management Dialogue be chaired? One option that reflects the management/science balance of the meeting could be for it to be co-chaired by the Chair of the Commission and the Chair of the Scientific Committee.
8. Should the use of external experts to provide input to and potentially facilitate the meeting be considered?
9. Should the [inaugural?] science-management dialogue be proposed as a [one/two]-day meeting that incorporates both capacity building and the progression of substantial issues, including adoption of recommendations?
10. Are there ways that the SC agenda could be reprioritised to allow sufficient time for consideration of harvest strategy issues?

# Consultative draft Terms of Reference for the Working Group on harvest strategy development (WGHSD)

To facilitate further discussion on the ‘Working Group on Harvest Strategy Development’, a consultative draft Terms of Reference is presented here, encompassing the input and advice of SC14. The harvest strategy work of this Working Group would focus specifically on those tuna fisheries and stocks detailed within the harvest strategy workplan[[1]](#footnote-1) and any other stocks the Commission might decide while noting that this does not apply to Northern stocks.

**Objectives**

The Working Group on Harvest Strategy Development would have the following objectives:

1. To enhance mutual, consistent understanding and capacity building through focused interactions and communications among managers, scientists and other stakeholders on the objectives and outcomes relating to harvest strategies for key tuna fisheries and stocks in the western and central Pacific Ocean, thereby aiding:
	1. the ability of managers to drive the process of harvest strategy development and guide further scientific work, by promoting full and consistent technical understanding on harvest strategy concepts and the functions of its elements; and
	2. the ability of scientists to efficiently deliver relevant technical outputs by promoting full and consistent understanding of the WCPO management and policy environment.
2. To facilitate the iterative process of decision making in relation to WCPO harvest strategies by the Commission and its Committees.
3. To refine candidate harvest strategy options through review of analyses of the performance of candidate harvest strategies against noted management objectives, then forward a reduced number of acceptable candidates to the Commission, allowing the Commission to concentrate its decision making role on a reduced number of acceptable candidate options, thereby increasing efficiency.

**Tasks**

**The activities of this Working Group** **will be guided by the WCPFC harvest strategy workplan.**

1. The Working Group on Harvest Strategy Development would have the following tasks, which are split into formal and informal meeting components:

Meeting components:

* 1. Iterative development and refinement of the key elements of harvest strategies as described in CMM 2014-06 and other associated ingredients.
	2. Reviewing and refining the detailed Scientific Committee outputs on Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE).
	3. When appropriate, recommending to the Commission appropriate candidate harvest strategies that adequately meet noted management objectives for the fishery/stock, highlighting key trade-offs and risks.
	4. Requesting through the Commission of the Scientific Services Provider, additional analyses and new/refined harvest strategy elements (e.g. candidate harvest control rules, calculation and weighting of performance indicators) for re-evaluation, which may better achieve objectives and desired trade-offs.
	5. Requesting through the Commission of the Scientific Services Provider, improved approaches to presenting results to increase clarity and enhance decision making.
	6. Considering the implications of developing harvest strategies in relation to data collection and fishery monitoring systems and implementation mechanisms to ensure the future effectiveness of strategies, and making recommendations to the Commission.
	7. Review and update the WCPFC harvest strategy work plan for recommendation to the Commission.
	8. Review the performance and implementation of any agreed harvest strategy, including through the monitoring strategy.
	9. Enhancing the understanding of managers, scientists and the wider stakeholder group through review and discussion of detailed Scientific Committee outputs.

**Meeting**

1. For the Working Group on Harvest Strategy Development to efficiently facilitate the development of harvest strategies, physical meetings will be convened consistent with Paragraph 6[[2]](#footnote-2) of the Convention Article 11, for the production of formal recommendations to the Commission. All Commission rules will be applied to CCMs and observers, including provision of funding for participation by developing CCMs.
2. The Chair(s) of the meeting shall be determined by the Commission and the Chair will develop the agenda for the meeting, consistent with the harvest strategy workplan.
3. To facilitate appropriate dialogue, CCMs are encouraged to ensure attendance by both scientific and management personnel on their delegation. The participation of stakeholders is also encouraged.
4. The structure and size of the meeting, including informal and formal sessions, will be agreed by the Commission.
5. The meeting shall adopt a summary report detailing advice and recommendations for consideration by the Commission, and requests of its relevant Committees and Scientific Services Provider, as described above.

**Timeframe**

1. The meeting will be held for [one/two] days at a time determined by the Commission, as appropriate to maximise the attendance of CCM scientists and managers and facilitate the functioning of those other meetings.
2. The first meeting will be held in 2019. WCPFC16 will review the effectiveness of the meeting and determine its future.

1. The draft workplan was outlined in WCPFC12-2015-DP09\_rev1 and is reviewed and updated annually by the Commission as a permanent agenda item. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Commission may establish such other subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary for the exercise of its functions, including working groups for the purpose of examining technical issues relating to particular species or stocks and reporting thereon to the Commission. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)