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Agreeing a future work plan for establishing effective management frameworks for key fisheries in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean

Work has been underway for a number of years in the WCPFC to establish effective management frameworks for key fisheries in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.

The table below sets out the progress of the WCPFC to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HS element</th>
<th>Existing work</th>
<th>Proposed future work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Objectives</td>
<td>Two management objectives workshops, including Reports to the Commission, lists of possible objectives etc.</td>
<td>Continued workshops including background analyses. Consideration of ways to operationalise objectives by the SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
<td>The Commission already uses MSY indicators for both Biomass and Fishing Mortality. The use of other indicators, such as CPUE in the southern longline fishery has also been discussed.</td>
<td>SC to recommend appropriate indicators of management objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference points</td>
<td>Agreed limit reference points for some species. Proposed target reference point being considered for Skipjack Tuna at MOW3 and WCPFC11.</td>
<td>SC to recommend appropriate reference points for each fishery. Commission to make a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable levels of risk</td>
<td>Agreed limit reference points already include agreed levels of risk.</td>
<td>SC to recommend options for appropriate risk levels for each reference point. Commission to make a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring strategy</td>
<td>Considerable existing monitoring frameworks in place, including: VMS, operational data, observer data, port monitoring, tagging studies and through the Science Services Provider</td>
<td>Development of a strategy for each fishery to ensure monitoring can report against reference points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest control rules</td>
<td>No formal harvest control rules adopted</td>
<td>Agreement on decision rules to meet management objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Strategy evaluation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SC to undertake MSE of proposed harvest strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australia suggests that MOW3 recommend to the Commission that a detailed work plan for management frameworks be drawn up in the intersessional period.

Drawing on the discussion paper presented to MOW2 to inform the development of a future work-plan for advancing the development of a management framework for the WCPFC (MOW2-WP/06), Australia submits that the Commission needs to agree how and where this important work on harvest strategies will be undertaken and resourced going forward. Whether or not the draft FFA harvest strategy conservation and management measure is adopted this year, the Commission
needs to agree an appropriate forum in which management frameworks are able to be considered, discussed and developed.

The report from MOW2 noted that while the ‘MOW process is seen as very useful... a two-day workshop before every Commission meeting may not necessarily be the best way to take this process forward.’ Australia is open to discussions at MOW3 that would assist the Commission to decide on how best to work on the development of a management framework for fisheries in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean.

The Commission needs enough space and time to develop and discuss potential management frameworks. Commission meetings already have full agendas and there is not a subsidiary body focused on fisheries management.

Australia proposes the following questions be considered and discussed at MOW3:

- What are the most important components of work needing to be undertaken?
- How should the Commission be undertaking this work?
- When should this work be undertaken?
- Where should this work be undertaken (eg through discussion papers tabled at future MOWs)?
- Who are the technical experts who can best assist with this work?
- What resources are required to undertake this work and how would these resources be funded?

The Commission cannot rely on the Science Services Provider to provide scientific and analytical input into the forward process unless adequate funding is identified. Currently, work undertaken by SPC for PNA and FFA members is being made available to MOW3. This needs to be augmented as the Commission continues to develop harvest strategy elements to ensure the needs and requirements of all CCMs are met. As noted in the MOW2 paper, the Commission may need to use other management and/or research bodies to augment some of the technical work as appropriate.

The development of management frameworks needs to be adequately resourced and accounted for in the Commission’s budget. Australia submits that this is core work for the Commission and essential to enable the Commission to achieve the Convention’s objective.

Accordingly, Australia proposes that as a starting point, MOW3 should recommend that the Commission budget include a new budget line of $70,000 at a minimum, for management options/harvest strategy work.