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Overview

- Overall measures and objectives
- Note on Article 30
- Purse Seine Arrangements
- Longline Arrangements
- Special Circumstances
- Monitoring and Data Collection
- Remedial Actions
Remain committed to the Objectives of CMM 2012-01 – including stepwise reduction of BET F.

Highlight importance of finalising LRP s and developing TRPs to enhance these objectives.

Achieving F/FMSY = 1 for BET requires action across all sectors – simply unachievable if only targeting one.

Seek measures that result in similar contributions from PS and LL (33% reduction in LL catch and 33% reduction in FAD sets).

The package of measures and the way that they are designed must be better balanced.
Article 30 is about “special requirements of developing States” and is often referenced.

But no consistent understanding of its application – ESP the obligations it places on the Commission and CCMs.

30(2)(c) – Commission shall recognise the need not to transfer a disproportionate burden to developing States, territories etc.

Commission cannot implement a CMM that transfers a disproportionate burden.

No commission wide assessments to date.
Current practice is to place onus on SIDS to convince Commission that there would be a transfer.

WCPFC9 most explicit discussion yet – developed CCMs “yet to be convinced”.

This is the opposite of the intention – Measure can’t be agreed until everyone is convinced there is no transfer.

Such a decision can only be based on an assessment of the flow of benefits as well as the flow of costs.
What happens without satisfying Art 30?

- No agreement
- SIDS exemptions
- Incomplete implementation
- Commission in breach
Recognise that some burden needs to be borne by all (just not disproportionately by developing CCMs)

1. Achieve better balance in measures (PS/LL, HS/EEZ)
2. Compensatory Arrangements (PNAO proposal)
3. Restructuring management arrangements in ways that place Rights in the hands of developing coastal States – realign some of the flow of benefits to balance the costs

How can Art 30 be complied with here?
A. Strengthen effort management across whole fishery (high seas charges)
B. Zone based FAD set allocation
C. Target additional FAD closures on high seas
D. Industry led initiatives
E. Avoid blunt FAD closure extensions
F. Compensatory arrangements
G. Avoid total closures and BET catch limits
A. Further catch reductions – 33%

B. Regulate LL effort:
   i. Specific effort limits such as LLVDS or equivalent
   ii. Capacity limits to prevent fleet expansion
   iii. HS longline closure equivalent to FAD closure (PNAO)
   iv. Capacity reductions to match revised catch limits

Longline measures must prevent transfer of effort to other stocks (ALB and YFT)
Special Circumstances

- Encouragement to archipelagic States to implement their own measures

- Coastal States with dis-contiguous and “locked” EEZs as per Article 10.
Monitoring and Penalties

- Operational data, operational data, operational data
- ESP – any CCM seeking to apply an “alternative measure” such as the current FAD set choice.
- Collection of additional FAD set information – with demonstrated scientific need
- Packaging of outstanding issues such as “principally, occasionally and adjacent”
- Prescribed remedial actions for non-implementation.