



**WCPFC  
SECOND MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES WORKSHOP**

Cairns, Australia  
28-29 November 2013

---

**DISCUSSION PAPER TO INFORM THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FUTURE WORK-PLAN FOR  
ADVANCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE WCPFC**

---

**MOW2-WP/06  
14 Nov 2013**

## **MOW - WP 6 Discussion paper to inform the development of a future work-plan for advancing the development of a management framework for the WCPFC**

### ***Background***

Preliminary work has been done to consider a suite of objectives, indicators and reference points for the WCPFC. The Expert Group, in consultation with CCMs, SC, NC and TCC has developed a 'straw man' of candidate management strategies, including objectives, reference points and indicators (i.e. WCPFC-SC9-2013/ MI-WP-05). The possible use of harvest control rules (HCRs) was also discussed in that paper. This alone has been a significant task, given the differing interests of CCMs. To successfully complete this work will require that all objectives and associated management approaches are comprehensively examined, tested and compared in order to inform negotiations to achieve agreement on an appropriate management framework, underpinned with binding and effective measures.

The ultimate aim of the process outlined in this work-plan is to assist the Commission to develop a set of pre-agreed management responses to the circumstances of the fish stocks and other considerations, which will meet its obligations under international law and provide the best use of the resources for the CCMs.

The benefits and costs of different management options will need careful consideration, with attention given including the need to take account of Article 30 of the Convention referring to SIDS, and time-frames for implementation.

Success will also require that the options are examined in a transparent and participatory process so that all CCMs have input and engagement with the design, testing and comparison of candidate management frameworks/strategies. To ensure this critical requirement is met, it will be necessary to consider the roles and responsibilities of the groups involved in the process.

### ***Roles***

The following short proposed "mission statements" for the primary stakeholders/service deliverers are provided for consideration and to clarify respective roles:

**CCMs** will drive the process and identify and oversee the development of prospective management strategies, including reference points, indicators and, eventually, harvest control rules. They will have input at various levels, including at SC, TCC, NC, the Commission and at proposed subsequent workshops<sup>1</sup>. To be most effective, it will be necessary to have explicit consideration of management strategy options at these three sub-committees, relevant to their particular mandate, and the provision of subsequent advice to the Commission will be necessary to inform decisions.

**The Science Services Provider**, assuming adequate funding is identified, should provide scientific and analytical input into the process, using other management and research bodies to augment this work as appropriate. CCMs should consider how socioeconomic

---

<sup>1</sup> Continuing workshops will be most useful if they are seen as an integral part of the management process, not an interesting option. From that point of view it may be better to consider future such meetings as preparatory management sessions, rather than workshops.

information and analysis should be brought into the process, including the potential role of the SSP, noting that this would require an expanded role and would likely require additional information from CCMs.

**The WCPFC Secretariat** will provide full administrative support to the MOW process including the independent expert group, associated workshops and meetings. Secretariat staff will also, whenever appropriate, provide specialist technical advice.

**The Independent Expert Group** will (i) put forward proposals (including as necessary technical specification of prospective management strategies identified by CCMs) for consideration by a management framework workshop conducted prior to the annual Commission meeting each year (ii) conduct the annual management framework workshops/meetings, and (iii) monitor and guide the technical aspects of testing and comparison of candidate management strategies.

### ***Strategy***

To support the work necessary to underpin negotiation and agreement of a management framework at the Commission the following approach, to be implemented over at least a four year period, is suggested:

1. Continued use of an independent expert group throughout the period.
2. Collection of economic data including costs of fishing, metrics to inform estimation of downstream benefits (processing, employment etc), especially in developing states, noting that economic objectives were considered a key area at MOW1.
3. Intercessional scientific evaluation and comparison of candidate management strategies and their consequences, including candidate objectives, reference points, indicators and harvest control rules.
4. An annual management framework workshop (see above) that will
  - be open to all CCMs and will be serviced by WCPFC (including the SSP) and the expert group;
  - develop and as necessary revise the criteria by which candidate management strategies are developed and compared;
  - consider the results of management strategy evaluations which will test various management strategies, reference points and HCRs as identified by CCMs; and
  - provide progressive recommendations to the annual meeting of the Commission, including via the SC and TCC, for adoption and further guidance as appropriate.

## ***Timeframe***

A programmed approach over three years is contemplated. An example of such a programme is:

### **Years 1 and 2.**

- Confirm and refine the candidate management strategies, including candidate objectives, reference points, indicators and harvest control rules (HCRs) so far developed.
- Develop initial criteria to compare candidate management strategies for a subset of the fisheries defined in MOW1.
- Identify fishery situations (species/gear/area), candidate management strategies and performance indicators for initial testing and 'proof of concept' demonstration. The chosen fishery situations should together include many of the objectives, indicators and, management issues that the broader WCPFC management strategies must deal with. But the chosen examples should be relatively simple, suitable for initial exploration and discussion of the general issues but without the full complexity. The MOW has started this approach with its consideration of specific aspects of the ALB, YFT, and SKJ fisheries in working papers 1 -3 of its 2013 meeting.
- Initial evaluations with existing models (e.g. MultifanCL, Atlantis) with additional modules added, either internally or externally, to address features not well described in these existing mainly biological models (e.g. economic and social performance). These models would be used to illustrate, test, and build understanding of the general behavior of candidate management strategies. The goal would lead to initial comparisons of candidate management strategies against relevant performance indicators.
- Development of more refined operating models will allow more detailed and comprehensive testing and comparison of candidate management strategies. These can be used in years 3 and 4 and should be spatially explicit and attempt to include realistic responses of fleets to management decisions (e.g. changes in stock distribution and economic conditions). The selection of specific management strategy by stakeholders should strive to balance transparency and clear consideration of biological, ecological, economic and social indicators identified as relevant by the WCPFC.
- Review of interim results by the annual management framework workshop.

### **Year 3.**

- Review and refine the candidate management strategies.
- Review and refine criteria to compare candidate management strategies, including the visual presentation and assessment of the performance of different strategies.
- Apply the refined models to evaluate and compare candidate management strategies, and further develop the refined models as appropriate.
- Review of interim results by the annual management framework workshop.

### **Year 4.**

- Review and refine the final candidate management strategies.
- Review and refine criteria to compare candidate management strategies, including the visual presentation and assessment of the performance of different strategies.
- Further develop the refined models as appropriate, including a plan for updating the management strategy evaluation (through improved operating model configuration and testing).
- Apply the refined models to evaluate and compare the final candidate management strategies.
- Review of results by the annual management framework workshop, with this final meeting potentially being an extended one to ensure adequate discussion, and recommendations to the Commission developed through this or associated processes.

This process requires coordinated and incremental review by the WCPFC bodies of the management strategies to be evaluated and the development of revised management strategies based on the results of initial evaluations. This is proposed to be addressed by the MOW providing an interface between the technical analysis and the various WCPFC processes that include the Commission, the SC, the NC and the TCC, as outlined above.

The progress that can be made with specific technical issues at large workshops with more than 40 individuals is limited. Considerable preparation of detailed proposals/options prior to the annual management framework workshops, with as much critical input from CMMs as possible, will be necessary to drive the process.

Efficient and effective delivery of the technical analysis through the proposed process requires that there is a stable and capable team of scientists, managers and external expertise, with dedicated funding and time available to do this work.

There may be funding available from various sources including the FAO/GEF Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) Project to assist with this work.