

Objectives, Indicators and TRPs

Table lists a wide range of objectives which cannot be achieved simultaneously. Many of them will not translate into a TRP or be incorporated into a HCR, but nevertheless would be useful to be measured by indicators for a periodic review of how the Commission is achieving its objectives over long term.

Biological

Initial view-biological objectives more appropriate to LRP- stock viability.

“Sustainability” suggests inclusion of other factors such as economics and ecosystem integrity

While sustainability throughout range may be a key objective, question as to whether this should be linked to a TRP.

Debate regarding wording “throughout their range”
Suggested meaning of objective “provide for fishing sustainability and fishing flexibility”

Biological (cont)

Indicators for this objective as written would need spatial element.

Conclusion that this is a mixed objective – biomass and range. Suggestion remove “throughout their range”.

Understand intention of objective but difficulties with operationalisation for TRP – but it may be a review item.

Economic

In a fully allocated fishery, rights holders should determine economic objectives.

This depends on rights being allocated well initially.

Reconciliation of differing parties' fishery objectives easier when there are clear rights. Holders of better defined rights are likely to prevail in disputes with other rights holders.

Article 10(j) of the Convention - consistent with the Commission's role in determining rights allocation.

Suggestion that the management measures could be tested by their potential economic effects on rights holders.

Economic (cont)

Suggested alternative wording

”Enabling economic yields to be maximised”

Conclusion

In an allocated fishery, view was that the Commission should not be concerned with economic objectives. After it allocates rights, the Commission’s role is in the area of biological and ecological objectives. Proviso is that trade-off analysis to other fisheries still needs to occur as part of allocation.

Social

In allocated fisheries, these objectives should be achieved by governments.

Noted Article 10 (3) of the Convention which references social factors.

These objectives and indicators for them should be used in performance reviews but not for TRPs.

.

Ecosystems – Minimise fishery impact on ecosystem function

Suggestion replace “minimise” with “Avoid remedy or mitigate”

Indicators of necessity complex. E.g. North Pacific example – large suite of indicators which are observed continually for relevant change but are not each individually linked to hard, fast rules.

The important part of this process then becomes a strong advisory role/process.

Objective doesn't lend itself well to a TRP and HRP. It requires careful analysis for input into a management procedure outside of HRP.

Ecosystems – Minimise fishery impact on ecosystem function (cont)

Development of HCRs needs clear TRPs and indicators - difficult in ecosystem context.

Outputs of advisory process (in suite of indicators scenario) should be given due consideration by the Commission, as considerations, if necessary, of amendments to harvest control rule.

Result would be more of imposing a constraint rather than achieving an objective.

Ecosystems – Minimise catch of non-target species

Suggestion replace “minimise” with “Avoid, remedy or mitigate”

Definition of non-target - utilisation of edible by-catch. Species may change from being undesirable bycatch to desirable target species, in which case they should be managed.

For other species, the TRP would be zero or close to and probably lower than LRP.

Noted the Convention refers to minimising by-catch/non-target species but that this has not operationalised by the Commission and perhaps should be.

Discussion points

Trading off objectives – catch vs stability.

In a fully allocated and tradable situation, this would be a decision for rights holders

Current analyses suggest that the differences in catch/value are relatively minor for the example HCRs evaluated

Generally in the stakeholder group primarily involved in the PS fishery, stability is highly valued

Discussion points

HCRs – easier decision making?

Potentially yes, particularly if allocation of rights is already done

But need to consider other issues related to e.g. ecosystem

Discussion points

Concerns about yellowfin and bigeye

HCRs will be needed to specify appropriate levels of catch or impacts on stocks

Probably need to consider YFT separately to BET. YFT is a more targeted species and may be able to specify catch-based rules. BET likely to continue to be managed via technical measures such as limits on FAD sets or FAD closures pending a better capability to monitor catch in near real time. In both cases, it should be feasible to develop rule-based procedures, e.g. duration of FAD closure dependent on TAE.

Discussion points

HCRs for YFT and BET given multi-gear characteristics

Allocated rights need to be comprehensive, i.e. need allocations of BET and YFT catch across PS, LL and other fisheries

Could then have economics driven trading among fishery components but needs to be done using a common currency, e.g. impact of a given catch on the spawning biomass (so 1 tonne of PS bigeye 'quota' converts to some lesser tonnage of LL bigeye 'quota').

Discussion points

TRP for skipjack in 2014

The TRP focus should be biological, i.e. setting a target to maintain a low probability of approaching the LRP.

It was suggested that $50\%SB_0$ could be a reasonable target that reflects both avoidance of the LRP, current and therefore known conditions in the fishery and attitudes of precautionary management amongst the major stakeholders.

Future Work Plan

Should the Commission continue along this path?
If so, how?

Counterfactual - adoption of ad-hoc measures

Harvest control rule approach offers better alternative,
but should be after proper specification of rights.

Needs to be done in accordance with Article 10(j).

The process has been surprisingly useful, but don't want
to wait 4 years to complete. Skipjack could be
implemented quickly.

- Process should include exploration of systems, looking for improvements, using MSE.
- LRPs require good headroom, 50% is a good start, the detail HCR need some work,
- If you want management rules you need to have to have discussions on how to implement them, real life rubber hitting the road, reveals true objectives, true aspirations

- When we come to bigeye need to work with IATTC for coordinated management, particularly if purse-seine fishing continues to grow in central Pacific.
- Timetable will be species or fishery dependent- some could be implemented quickly, others need more preparation.
- Work needs to be integrated through Commission processes and supported properly. Not just a 2-day workshop before the Commission meeting.
- TOR for this process agreed to at MOW1. If process changes, will the Commission to make changes to the TOR?