

Report of the

**FOURTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL FISHERY BODY
SECRETARIATS NETWORK (RSN-4)**

Rome, 13 July 2012



Copies of FAO publications can be requested from:

Sales and Marketing Group
Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension
FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
E-mail: publications-sales@fao.org
Fax: +39 06 57053360
Web site: www.fao.org/icatalog/inter-e.htm

Report of the
FOURTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL FISHERY BODY SECRETARIATS NETWORK (RSN-4)

Rome, 13 July 2012

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

E-ISBN 978-92-5-107459-6 (PDF)

All rights reserved. FAO encourages reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge, upon request. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials, and all queries concerning rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to copyright@fao.org or to the Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch, Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

PREPARATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

This is the final version of the report of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats' Network held in Rome on 13 July 2012.

FAO. 2013.

Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network, Rome, 13 July 2012.

FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Report No. 1013. Rome. 28 pp.

ABSTRACT

The Fourth Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network (RSN-4) was held in Rome, Italy, on 13 July 2012. Prior to the meeting, all regional fishery bodies (RFBs) were asked to contribute a report on the five most pressing issues facing their organization. This material was compiled into a summary report and used to launch discussion at the RSN-4 meeting. The summary report, and subsequent RSN-4 discussion, covered a wide range of topical subjects including RFB financial structures, climate change, recreational fisheries, decision-making procedures within each RFB, the establishment of vulnerable marine ecosystems, and child labour plus other human rights issues in fisheries. In addition, presentations were given by several RFB Executive Secretaries on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, current issues in aquaculture management, and the establishment and management of marine protected areas (MPAs). A further presentation was given by the RSN Secretary on the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. A final presentation was given by the representative of the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, who spoke on the chronological development of MPAs within the United Nations General Assembly, FAO and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Thirty-one RFB Secretariats representing a diverse range of RFBs from all geographic regions were represented at the RSN-4. They included FAO and non-FAO bodies, marine capture and inland capture bodies, aquaculture bodies, and all the tuna regional fisheries management organizations. The meeting fostered collaboration and cooperation between the participating RFBs, and gave consideration to a number of matters that merit the attention of all RFBs, governments and FAO.

CONTENTS

Preparation of this document	iii
Abstract	iii
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	vii
OPENING OF THE MEETING.....	1
ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING ARRANGEMENTS	1
Introduction.....	1
Adoption of the agenda.....	1
Meeting arrangements.....	1
Observers	2
REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON	2
RSN DEVELOPMENTS AND ISSUES.....	3
Financing and participatory matters.....	3
Contributions in arrears.....	4
Climate change.....	4
Recreational fisheries.....	5
Child labour	5
Coordination and cooperation.....	6
Decision-making.....	6
Vulnerable marine ecosystems	7
Conclusion	7
KEY ISSUES AND RSN ENGAGEMENT	7
Port state measures.....	7
Status and trends of IUU fishing.....	8
Aquaculture.....	10
Marine protected areas and vulnerable marine ecosystems	11
ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSONS	12
FIFTH RSN MEETING (RSN-5)	12
ANY OTHER MATTERS.....	12
ADOPTION OF REPORT	12
CLOSURE OF THE MEETING.....	12

Appendix 1: Agenda	13
Appendix 2: List of participants	15
Appendix 3: Summary page: current issues and trends of importance to regional fisheries bodies	20

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACAP	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels
ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area
AFD	French Development Agency
APFIC	Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BCC	Benguela Current Commission
BOBP-IGO	Bay of Bengal Programme – Intergovernmental Organization
CACFish	Central Asian and the Caucasus Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission
CARICOM	Caribbean Community and Common Market
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCAMLR	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CECAF	Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic
CIFAA	Committee for Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture of Africa
COFI	Committee on Fisheries (FAO)
COMHAFAT	Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean
COPESCAL	Commission for Inland Fisheries of Latin America
CPPS	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific
CRFM	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism
CTMFM	Joint Technical Commission for the Argentina/Uruguay Maritime Front
CWP	Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
EIFAAC	European Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture Advisory Commission
EUROFISH	International Organization for the Development of Fisheries in Eastern and Central Europe
FFA	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
FIRMS	Fisheries Resources Monitoring System
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFCM	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
ICES	International Council for the Exploration of the Sea
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
IPHC	International Pacific Halibut Commission
IPOA	international plan of action
IUU	illegal, unreported and unregulated (fishing)
IWC	International Whaling Commission
LTA	Lake Tanganyika Authority
LVFO	Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization
MCS	monitoring, control and surveillance
MEDPAN	Network of Managers of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean
MPA	marine protected area
MRC	Mekong River Commission
NACA	Network of Aquaculture Centres in Asia-Pacific
NAFO	Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
NAMMCO	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission
NASCO	North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization
NEAFC	North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission

NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	non-governmental organization
NPAFC	North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission
NPFC	North Pacific Fisheries Commission
NPOA	national plan of action
OLDESPESCA	Latin American Organization for Fisheries Development
OSPESCA	Central American Organization for the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector
PICES	North Pacific Marine Science Organization
PNA	Parties to the Nauru Agreement
PSC	Pacific Salmon Commission
PSM Agreement	FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
RACMED	Regional Advisory Council for the Mediterranean
RECOFI	Regional Commission for Fisheries
RFB	regional fishery body
RFMO	regional fisheries management organization
RPOA	regional plan of action
RSN	Regional Fisheries Body Secretariats Network
SBT	southern bluefin tuna
SEAFDEC	Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center
SEAFO	South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization
SIDS	small island developing States
SIOFA	South Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SRFC	Subregional Fisheries Commission
SPRFMO	South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization
SWIOFC	South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDOALOS	United Nations Division for Oceans and the Law of the Sea
UNEP-MAP	United Nations Environment Programme Mediterranean Action Plan
UNFSA	United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement
VME	vulnerable marine ecosystem
VMS	vessel monitoring system
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WCPO	Western and Central Pacific Ocean
WECAFC	Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The Chairperson, Mr Andrew Wright of the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), called the meeting to order and invited Mr Árni M Mathiesen, Assistant Director-General, FAO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, to open the meeting.

2. Mr Árni Mathiesen welcomed participants to the Regional Fisheries Body Secretariats Network (RSN), noting that FAO Members had, on several occasions during the current meeting of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), emphasized their expectation that FAO and regional fishery bodies (RFBs) would collaborate for mutual benefit in addressing the priority challenges in world fisheries. He considered RFBs to be valuable partners in FAO efforts around the world to support sustainable fisheries, fight poverty and assist economic development.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

Introduction

3. The Chairperson noted that 31 RFBs were represented at RSN-4.¹ Apologies were received from the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC), the Latin American Organization for Fisheries Development (OLDEPESCA), the Mekong River Commission (MRC), the North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO), the North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES), the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC).

4. The Chairperson welcomed the participation of the following organizations at RSN for the first time: the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC), the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization (SPRFMO) and the Subregional Fisheries Commission (SRFC), noting that the SPRFMO² and NPFC were organizations that had only recently been formally established. He noted that the convention establishing the South Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement (SIOFA) had entered into force in June 2012 but that secretariat arrangements were yet to be established. Two ocean regions stand out as lacking a formal multilateral collaborative arrangement for the conservation and management of marine resources: the South China Sea and the South West Atlantic

5. A list of participants is given in Appendix 2.

Adoption of the agenda

6. The Chairperson recalled that RSN-3 had discussed the possible format and structure of this meeting given the limited time available in the margins of the Thirtieth Session of COFI, RSN-3 had suggested that RSN-4 focus on a reduced agenda of key issues of current interest to the RSN in general and that time be set aside to discuss the structure and format for the subsequent meetings of the RSN.

7. The agenda at Appendix 1 was adopted.

Meeting arrangements

8. The Secretary for the RSN, Ms Gail Lugten (FAO), briefed participants on meeting arrangements.

¹ The RFBs were represented by Secretariat staff. The views expressed during the meeting may not represent the views of the organization concerned and are without prejudice to the views of the members or contracting parties of the RFBs represented.

² Subsequent to RSN-4, in late July, Chile deposited its instrument of ratification for the SPRFMO. The Convention entered into force on 24 August 2012.

Observers

9. Mr Abdellah Srouf, Secretary of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) requested a statement from the Chairperson on the objectives of the RSN, including its mandate. In response, the Chairperson noted that the RSN was a relatively informal meeting. It provides the only opportunity for Secretariats of all regional fisheries bodies and arrangements, with mandates covering inland waterbodies to large ocean regions, to meet to share information and exchange views on themes and emerging issues as they relate to the work of Secretariats. RSN meetings endeavour not to duplicate discussion that takes place in other fora but rather to focus on the role, function, challenges and emerging issues for RFB Secretariats.

10. The Chairperson reported that the RSN had been approached by several additional individuals or groups wishing to participate in this meeting. He advised that the RSN had never formally developed or adopted rules of procedure and that all that was available to guide the meeting was what was recorded in the reports of previous meetings. On that basis he noted that:

- RFB-1 in 1999 had agreed that the group was reserved for the Secretariats of organizations consisting of three members or more (paragraph 5 of the Report of that meeting).
- RFB-2 in 2001 confirmed that the RSN was confined to Secretariats (paragraph 6).

11. The meeting confirmed that these principles would apply to RSN-4 and that the participation of representatives conformed to these arrangements. The Chairperson proposed that, if a participant was not able to conform to these arrangements then, for the purposes of this meeting, they be granted informal observer status. On this basis, the Joint Technical Commission for the Argentina/Uruguay Maritime Front was welcomed as an observer to RSN-4.

12. The Chairperson noted that there was insufficient time to give detailed consideration to the need for formal rules of procedure for the RSN but that the matter might be either taken up by correspondence intersessionally or considered further at a subsequent meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON

13. The Chairperson provided a brief update on issues and developments within the RSN since RSN-3 in 2011:

- **FAO support:** On behalf of the RSN, the Chairperson thanked Mr Hiromoto Watanabe for his past support to the Network and welcomed Ms Gail Lugten to the Network as its Secretary, supported by FAO. He thanked FAO for the support provided to the RSN including in relation to the refinements undertaken on the RSN page of the FAO Web site.
- **Success stories:** The Chairperson reported that the initiative to distribute broadly a series of “success stories” relating to the work of various members of the RSN proposed at RSN-3 had been largely unsuccessful. Numerous approaches to RSN members in early 2011 resulted in six contributions over an extended period. He thanked the SPC, North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), CCAMLR, Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC) and North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission (NPAFC) for their contributions. Because of the low response rate, the proposal to publish a consolidated article had been shelved.
- **Dgroups:** The Chairperson recalled that, periodically, the RSN had utilized Dgroups as a vehicle to support information exchange across the Network. He explained that Dgroups is an online platform offering tools and services that bring individuals and organizations working in the international development community together. Dgroups is a partnership of organizations committed to providing open and accessible Internet services where members of the international development community can safely share information and knowledge, collaborate and engage in dialogue and networking.

The Meeting noted that Dgroups can result in a large number of e-mails and that most members already have a voluminous number of emails to deal with. It was agreed to continue to consider the use of Dgroups as appropriate, but for general correspondence e-mail exchanges were currently preferred.

- Newsletter: The meeting welcomed the RSN newsletter that had been initiated in late 2011. Three editions have been circulated to date. The Chairperson thanked Ms Gail Lugten for this initiative. He noted that continuation of the newsletter is dependent on all RSN members contributing articles from time to time. Although several RSN members have responded positively to invitations to contribute articles, responses had been patchy.

RSN DEVELOPMENTS AND ISSUES

14. The Chairperson invited discussion on a summary paper: “Current Issues and Trends of Importance to Regional Fisheries Bodies”. The paper had been prepared by Ms Gail Lugten drawing on the large number of contributions received in response to an invitation from the Chairperson to the RSN in early 2012 to identify priority issues for each RFB. The summary paper is at Appendix 3. The RSN meeting selected various topics from the summary paper to share ideas and experiences.

Financing and participatory matters

15. Discussion focused on the issue of the current global financial climate and implications for the funding base for RFBs. Most RFBs expected budgets to be under significant pressure in the short term as their members experience increased pressure to constrain government spending domestically.

16. The RFBs reported on the experience of their organization in managing members' contributions in arrears, the establishment of trust funds and other mechanisms that have been established to support the engagement of developing States in the work of RFBs, including through voluntary contributions or providing funding support from their core budget.

17. The North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO) reported that, in order to implement a major programme of research on salmon at sea, it had engaged the private sector in efforts to fund the research. The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) reported on recent efforts to establish a fund to support activities including technical assistance, technology transfer, training and other means of cooperation to assist developing countries within the Commission to fulfil their obligations under the Convention. It is anticipated that this trust fund will be operational in 2013. Such a facility is currently being examined by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) for possible implementation in that organization.

18. The Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT) advised that the organization has funded participation of non-member developing States to its meetings, but that its Convention requires each party to meet its own expenses arising from attendance at CCSBT meetings. The CCSBT currently does not operate any form of trust fund.

19. The SPRFMO, the South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO) and the WCPFC advised the meeting of arrangements provided for within their respective Conventions relating to support for developing States including mandatory contributions to their core budget to support meeting attendance and the establishment of special trust funds to support capacity development. The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) reported on efforts, under way since 2003, to establish a fund to encourage developing country delegations to attend ICCAT meetings and to develop capacity in areas such as data collection. The data collection fund is based on voluntary extrabudgetary funding contributions by members. In 2011, ICCAT established a meeting participation fund, and, as a result of this, member participation in ICCAT has increased significantly. The Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) noted that it also provided funding support for representatives from its small island developing State membership to attend meetings of the Agency and regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) such as the WCPFC, and that this was financed from a combination of core and extrabudgetary sources.

20. The GFCM noted that the Commission, in addition to giving financial assistance to representatives from its members for facilitating their attendance at relevant meetings, also provides opportunities for the development of capacity of members on some selected issues such as data collection, policy advice, small-scale fisheries, and other coastal activities. The Commission is planning to seek additional sources of extrabudgetary support from 2013 through its first framework programme in support of sustainable development and cooperation in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

21. The WCPFC and CCAMLR have similar internship or secondment programmes that are self-funded, funded from the core budget or from special funds established for that purpose. The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) has adopted a permanent internship programme for early career professionals and students from NAFO contracting parties.

22. A trust fund has been established by the Bay of Bengal Programme – Intergovernmental Organization (BOBP-IGO) and is largely used to support students and other eligible persons for training and internships. The Lake Tanganyika Authority (LTA) reported that its efforts to establish a trust fund had largely been unsuccessful to date.

23. The meeting noted that the Assistance Fund established under Part VII of the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA) provided a range of funding opportunities for developing State parties to that Agreement. It was noted that the current balance in the fund was approximately US\$460 000. Several RFBs, including the FFA, WCPFC and LTA noted that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had been an important partner in several major initiatives, some of which had been initiated up to ten years ago. It was noted that, although accessing GEF funds could be a demanding process, a successful relationship with the GEF could develop to support multiyear programmes.

Contributions in arrears

24. The meeting was invited to share the experience of RFBs in managing contributions in arrears. The IATTC reported that several options were under consideration, including the possibility of denying access to special assistance funds for members that are in arrears in respect of their assessed contribution, or suspending their right to engage in decision-making. The latter possibility was an area that was being actively considered by the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM). Several other organizations reported that their conventions or rules of procedure provide for members to be excluded from taking part in decisions if their contributions in arrears exceed an agreed period.

Climate change

25. The meeting noted that climate change and its implications for fisheries and associated ecosystems remained a priority issue for many RFBs.

26. The FFA reported on a forthcoming study concerning the impact of refrigeration systems used by fishing vessels and the processing industry on the ozone layer and liaison with the SPC on the impact of climate change on fisheries for highly migratory species in the Western and Central Pacific. The Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) and the LTA reported on similar research under way in the Asian region and on the African Great Lakes, respectively.

27. In the Caribbean, climate change remains a priority matter for the CRFM, together with emergency disaster risk reduction. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) noted that the Commission was developing a strategy and action plan for climate change that includes US\$7 million funding to support climate change policy development for countries and small island developing States (SIDS) in the Caribbean.

28. Climate change also remains a significant priority issue for NASCO, where it is apparent that salmon distribution and trophic relationships are increasingly affected by climate change. NASCO is prioritizing its climate-related work on habitats, interactions with aquaculture and stock management.

29. The BOBP-IGO noted that climate change was having a significant impact on sardine and mackerel fisheries in the Bay of Bengal. Sardines have now moved into the Bay of Bengal and sizeable quantities are being caught in Bangladesh, which had not previously been experienced. At the same time, mackerel stocks are moving deeper into the water column in the Bay of Bengal. This has important implications for fishing practices for local fishers, including gear and vessel suitability.

Recreational fisheries

30. The WECAFC noted that increasing consideration of the role and engagement of recreational fisheries in the work of RFB warranted future monitoring for some regions.

Child labour

31. APFIC noted that although child labour might not necessarily be a matter directly taken up by RFBs, RFBs were in a good position to collect data that could be used by FAO or other bodies, such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), to address the subject.

32. The BOBP-IGO noted that the subject of human rights in fisheries was gaining momentum and that this was especially the case in small-scale fisheries; additional attention was being given to migration, working conditions, safety and health on board fishing vessels, and these matters could be generically referred to as “human rights in fisheries”.

33. The Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI) reported on a regional consultation in early 2012 concerning development guidelines for small-scale fisheries, which included the issue of child labour. RECOFI noted that the role of RFBs should be to raise awareness among member countries on labour conditions and child labour in the fisheries they operate.

34. The LTA noted that child labour in fishing was a major issue in Africa, particularly in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where there were very limited employment opportunities and children had no option but to go fishing. Without education and training, nothing will change and this is a matter that should be addressed, particularly through programmes supported by development assistance partners and funding agencies.

35. The meeting noted the vicious circle of child labour, its contribution to family livelihoods and alleviating family poverty and the implications for households if children left the labour pool while they received training and education. The meeting agreed that this was a major challenge in some regions.

36. SEAFDEC advocated a need for increased capacity building and awareness raising among RFB members on the problems of child labour. It was suggested that mechanisms such as a certification and product labelling system confirming that child labour was not used could be considered along the lines of current fish product sustainability certification programmes. It was also noted that education could lead to large losses of labour from many small-scale fisheries, which might affect fisheries production.

37. ICCAT suggested that child labour was a sensitive issue and that it was probably a matter that contracting parties themselves could consider within RFBs. ICCAT reported that it used contractual agreements with companies that include specific provisions relating to employment conditions such as salary, life insurance, and conditions of work, and that this was the extent of ICCAT’s intervention in human rights matters in relation to fisheries at this time.

38. The LTA noted that the role of fisheries in food security and poverty reduction was receiving significant attention in Africa. The Authority had recently participated in an African think tank meeting within the African Union on the role of fisheries in addressing African food security and improving the gross domestic product of African countries. In this respect, regional working groups have been established to assess the five regions on the African continent. The LTA is providing technical support to this process as the relevant regional organization in East Africa.

39. The Chairperson suggested that the RSN should continue to share information on the role of child labour in fishing and poverty reduction and monitor developments in other fora, such as the ILO, in relation to these matters.

Coordination and cooperation

40. APFIC introduced the matter raised in the summary paper concerning the relationship between RFBs and other localized bodies noting that there is a need for close cooperation on matters of common interest. Although organizations such as SEAFDEC and APFIC are cooperating effectively on the issue of bycatch in the South China Sea, APFIC considered that there was significantly more potential for the sharing of best practice information and knowledge between RFBs and other bodies.

41. The SRFC noted that a priority activity where support was needed was coordination among different organizations with overlapping jurisdictions where collaboration was currently limited. To assist this goal in the subregion, the African Union through its New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) agency is promoting consultation and dialogue among RFBs and regional economic communities. In addition, both the World Bank and the European Union (Member Organization) have funded projects with a focus on improving fisheries governance in the region.

42. The Ministerial Conference on Fisheries Cooperation among African States bordering the Atlantic Ocean (COMHAFAT) also reported on challenges associated with the coordination of bodies with overlapping areas of jurisdiction, noting the COMHAFAT geographic area included three subregional organizations. Recently, all bodies have been invited to develop a memorandum of understanding that will ensure coordination of work areas and efforts to address priorities for all the member States in the region.

43. The Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic (CECAF) emphasized the need for coordination of RFB activity in the region and that this would be assisted by clarifying roles and responsibilities. Following the recommendation from the CECAF Performance Review and the twentieth session of CECAF, a joint meeting will be organized between CECAF and other RFBs and field projects, to develop strategies for a more structured and formal cooperation.

Decision-making

44. At the request of the IWC, participants described decision-making procedures in their respective RFBs. The SPRFMO advised that the decision-making procedure in SPRFMO possibly reflected the most recent example of a body trying to deal with effective decision-making processes that address the numerous challenges associated with consensus decision-making. Generally, in the SPRFMO, decisions are made by consensus. However, if that fails, decisions are taken by majority vote on both matters of procedure and matters of substance. A three-quarters majority vote is required for an issue to be carried. Financial decisions can only be taken by consensus. Majority voting has objection possibilities if the decision discriminates against a member, is inconsistent with the SPRFMO Convention, or the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) or the UNSFA. The objection is subject to review by a panel that must give their recommendation to the Commission as soon as possible. It is probable that majority voting, with minimal opportunities to object, will become more of the norm in RFBs in the future.

45. The SPRFMO decision-making procedure is drawn from the procedure in place in the WCPFC, except that the WCPFC provides for voting in two chambers where one chamber consists of FFA members and the other of distant-water fishing nations. ICCAT reported that, as an outcome of its recent performance review, the future of the Commission, including decision-making procedures, was currently being discussed. At present, ICCAT decisions are based on consensus but with a provision for objection.

46. The NEAFC noted that voting was an important way of reaching a conclusion when there was no consensus within the Commission. The NEAFC endeavours to obtain consensus but, where this is not possible, decisions are taken on a two-thirds majority vote, which may be subject to objections. With a majority vote, decisions can be made in cases where a decision-making procedure based only

on consensus would have led to an impasse. In the new NEAFC Convention, which should enter into force soon, objections and the intended actions following objections can be put before a dispute settlement panel. The decisions of the panel are binding unless a party to the dispute “appeals” the decision by bringing it into the dispute settlement procedure of the UNCLOS and the UNFSA. The NEAFC also pointed out that decision-making mechanisms of RFBs would realistically have to be either based on consensus only or have a voting system with the option of objecting. To be able to impose the will of a majority upon a sovereign State that disagrees, an organization would have to be a “supranational” rather than an “international” organization. The NEAFC did not have “supranational” authority and was not aware of any other RFB having it either.

47. NAFO operates in the same way as the NEAFC where a two-thirds majority is considered to be an efficient way of preventing delay in the adoption of substantial management measures and on best science available. In NAFO, the dispute settlement panel does not operate as a court but rather it endeavours to find better solutions to resolve conflict.

48. NASCO noted that the external performance review of the Organization’s work had raised the issue of binding Convention-based decisions being developed that would apply to all phases and all habitats in the life cycle of the Atlantic salmon. This would be a major change for the organization if it were implemented.

49. The GFCM noted that the subject of decision-making had not been raised in a recent performance review of the organization. GFCM members consider the current system of consensus to serve the organization well. Consistent with the legal framework of the organization, and in the event consensus cannot be obtained, a matter can be put to a vote. Although there has not been the need for a vote to date (because members have always reached consensus on decision-making), the Commission can rely on such a mechanism as a fallback.

50. The Chairperson advised that decisions in CCAMLR were taken by consensus and that the decision-making processes provided an opportunity for a contracting party to object to a decision within 180 days of the decision. The CCAMLR Convention provides for disputes to be resolved by mediation or an arbitration panel. A final recourse is the International Court of Justice.

Vulnerable marine ecosystems

51. It was noted that the conservation of vulnerable marine ecosystems was a priority matter receiving attention in a number of RFBs including the CCAMLR, NAFO, NEAFC, NPFC, SEAFO, SPRFMO and, once operational, SIOFA.

Conclusion

52. The Chairperson noted that the responses to the invitation to identify priority issues for individual RFBs had been extremely positive and that the summary paper prepared by Ms Gail Lugten had provided the meeting with an enormous amount of material for discussion. However, because of the brevity of the meeting, it was not possible to cover all the issues raised in the summary paper at this meeting.

53. Each participant was invited to review the summary paper (Appendix 3) and provide revisions, comments and additional information, as necessary, to Ms Gail Lugten before the end of August 2012. Ms Gail Lugten would then endeavour to revise the discussion paper and publish it as an FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture technical paper.

KEY ISSUES AND RSN ENGAGEMENT

Port state measures

54. Ms Gail Lugten introduced the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (PSM Agreement). The PSM Agreement was finalized in 2009, and 23 States and regional economic entities have signed it. Only four parties (the European Union [Member Organization], Myanmar, Norway and Sri Lanka) have ratified, accepted or acceded to the PSM Agreement. FAO is urging all RFBs, whether advisory or managerial, inland or

marine capture, to raise awareness among their members on the importance of bringing the PSM Agreement into effect.

55. NAFO noted that port state measures are an effective mechanism to address a range of fisheries management and compliance issues and that the organization's members had similar measures in place. The CRFM is also examining its application in the region as a tool to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing.

56. Several organizations advised that they were in the process of arranging training courses and workshops focused on port state measures. COMHAFAT is organizing regional training workshops on the PSM Agreement using a curriculum that will be developed in collaboration with FAO, with two such workshops scheduled for 2012. The FFA organized a similar regional training course with funding support from the Part VIII Fund in 2010 and is now planning to support national port state workshops.

57. The BOBP-IGO noted that two of the four parties that have currently acceded to the PSM Agreement are from the Bay of Bengal region: Sri Lanka and Myanmar. Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) is generally considered to be weak in the Bay of Bengal, and the PSM Agreement is considered to be a practical measure that can assist in addressing this weakness.

58. APFIC reported on a range of collaborative IUU-related activities involving FAO, including a South East Asian workshop on port state measures that was held in April 2012. Workshops have also been conducted in Thailand in the national language. The workshops have noted a need for port state measures to be included in national legislation of States within the region where there appears to be a general willingness of States to ratify the PSM Agreement.

59. The WECAFC commented that its members had agreed to issue resolutions to facilitate implementation of all international fishery instruments and that the PSM Agreement was one of those receiving priority consideration. The WECAFC Secretariat is assisting the countries in implementing and ratifying these instruments.

Status and trends of IUU fishing

60. Ms Driss Meski, Executive Secretary of ICCAT, presented an overview of the status and trends in IUU fishing focusing on the suite of measures in place among the tuna RFMOs to combat IUU. The measures include systems of at-sea and in-port inspection, authorized vessel lists, IUU vessel lists including reciprocal recognition of the IUU vessel lists of other RFMOs, transshipment monitoring, catch document schemes, vessel monitoring systems (VMSs), and observer deployment schemes.

61. The IATTC noted the importance of observer programmes advising that, in the Eastern Pacific, IATTC observers reported on the sighting of all vessels, not on whether they were illegal or not.

62. The SRFC noted that observers were very important in the subregional area and they performed a wide range of activities. IUU fishing is not just present among large-scale fishers but small-scale fishers are also responsible for IUU activity. Usually, discussion on IUU is focused on the "I" for illegal fishing, and not the "unregulated and unreported" fishing, which are very prevalent in its area. The SRFC advised that, in collaboration with the World Bank and the European Union (Member Organization), a programme had been developed to examine these issues. As a result, the SRFC has the funding to support efforts to address IUU, but currently the capacity to implement activities associated with this is limited. The SRFC further advised of a regional convention developed to deny any form of safe haven to vessels engaged in illegal fishing. However, countries in the region have not implemented the provisions of this convention to date.

63. The Central Asian and the Caucasus Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission (CACFish) noted that the organization had become active in December 2011 with four members, and that IUU fishing, particularly for sturgeon, was a common practice in its region. The members are facing several problems to address IUU fishing effectively relating to limited infrastructure and their technical

capacity to deal with IUU fishing. CACFish is trying to address these through capacity building initiatives, including through regional workshops.

64. The CRFM observed that IUU fishing was also a major problem for the organization. It reported that an engagement with an IUU fishing vessel early in 2012 had resulted in fatalities. IUU fishing is increasing because of the low risks of detection and the inconsequential penalties associated with prosecution. The CRFM considers that a high level of regional and international cooperation is needed to deal with this problem. Within the Caribbean region, the more severe penalties are those imposed through arrangements with the United States of America through the United States Lacey Act. Such arrangements illustrate the type of cooperation that can be promoted to achieve greater effectiveness in dealing with IUU fishing.

65. The GFCM noted that IUU fishing was also an important issue in the Mediterranean. The GFCM is organizing a workshop on IUU fishing in the coming year that will examine the extent of IUU fishing in the area. The GFCM was of the view that IUU fishing was an issue that warranted regular attention and information exchange among the RSN. NAFO agreed, suggesting that IUU could be a basis for strong collaboration among RFBs, especially those with overlapping jurisdictions. As an example of RFB collaboration, the CCAMLR reported on exchange opportunities for professional staff involved in compliance matters. NAFO and the CCAMLR had supported reciprocal exchanges of staff responsible for compliance-related activities in the past, which had proved mutually beneficial to both organizations.

66. The NEAFC noted that the situation in the North East Atlantic might be different to those facing other RFBs present at the meeting as a result of all NEAFC members being developed economies. The NEAFC reported that, although the NEAFC had had many problems with IUU fishing in the region in the past, it had managed to address it. There has been no IUU fishing by flag-of-convenience vessels in the NEAFC Regulatory Area since 2006. The NEAFC offered its experience as representing light at the end of the tunnel and proof that IUU fishing could be beaten. The NEAFC noted that the methods it used could not necessarily be copied directly by other RFBs with the same results, owing to the different circumstances. The representative from the NEAFC offered to provide further information to any representative that was interested.

67. The WCPFC noted that it might be time to redefine the issue of IUU and articulate exactly what the problem was. In the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO), the main problem is in relation to unregulated catches.

68. SEAFDEC reported on capacity-building and awareness-building initiatives supported in the Asian region to assist in addressing IUU. Activities included the recent establishment of a vessel record list and associated consultation among regional experts to support the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) member countries to contribute to the vessel record list.

69. The BOBP-IGO is supporting a range of activities to address IUU fishing in the Bay of Bengal. These include encouraging its members to join the international MCS network, to develop a regional plan of action (RPOA) for IUU fishing and working with national coast guards to promote cooperation and mutual understanding of fisheries management issues. It appears that countries in the region are slowly accepting that their domestic fishing vessels are also contributing to the regional problem of IUU fishing.

70. COMHAFAT expressed concern about the extent of IUU fishing in its region, but noted that, as an advisory body with no management mandate, that it was difficult for it to have an impact on the problem.

71. The LTA deals with small-scale fisheries where IUU fishing, including the use of illegal fishing gear such as ring nets as beach seines, is prevalent. The LTA is working to improve community surveillance at beach landing sites and is also considering the introduction of a VMS to operate on the lake.

72. ICCAT has been attempting to address IUU fishing for more than 20 years. Relatively recently, ICCAT has recognized that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have an important role

to play in addressing IUU fishing and that RFB cooperation on the implementation of MCS-related activities, such as observer programs, is also beneficial. The meeting noted that improved collaboration with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) offered additional potential opportunities to address IUU fishing.

73. In relation to IUU activity, Mr Marc Taconet (Fisheries Resources Monitoring System [FIRMS]) invited the RSN to consider the possible need for developing international standards for data exchange on fisheries operational data (covering broadly fishing vessels and their activity through electronic logbook reporting systems). The Chairperson indicated that this question was a candidate topic for more detailed RSN discussion through a discussion group.

74. The Chairperson concluded the IUU discussion by noting that there was no single solution to combating IUU fishing and that it was necessary to deploy a suite of integrated measures. He noted that, from the CCAMLR experience, there had apparently been a decrease in the IUU catch in the Southern Ocean over the previous ten years, but that IUU activity was still regularly reported from that region. He noted that such operations could only be supported if some States continued to offer their ports as safe havens for these vessels. In addition, the level of surveillance effort in many of the ocean regions served by RFBs is small relative to the size of the region, with the result that obtaining a realistic assessment of the incidence of IUU, and removals associated with IUU, is a major challenge. He noted that, by its nature, information on IUU status and trends was qualified by a significant degree of uncertainty.

Aquaculture

75. Mr Simon Funge-Smith gave a presentation entitled “Global Trends in Aquaculture”. The presentation covered the growth of aquaculture and the relative contributions of the regions and commodities. It was noted that aquaculture production in the last decade had slowed slightly relative to growth in the 1980s and 1990s. Currently, at least 600 species, raised in 190 countries, produce about 80 million tonnes annually. Aquaculture is increasingly providing fish for food and is expected to overtake capture fisheries in this regard. Sixty percent of current production occurs in China, with 9 countries accounting for 89 percent of global production. Marine and freshwater production account for slightly more than 45 percent each, while brackish-water production accounts for about 7 percent. Freshwater fish remain the predominant form of aquaculture for food, and these systems are largely directed at domestic food security rather than international trade. The demand for feeds and environmental dimensions of aquaculture remain a concern in areas where intensification of the subsector is being driven by demand competition for land and water. The presentation discussed issues associated with trends in the use of fishmeal, particularly that processed from offal and residues, which now accounts for 36 percent of global fishmeal production. Other issues covered included the risks of species movements and introductions, the opportunities presented by certification and an outlook on the prospects for aquaculture into the future. Generally, aquaculture’s future is considered to be bright, but the profit margins for aquaculture products are constraining aquaculture in the short term. Projections suggest that, by 2021, cultivation could account for 170 million tonnes annually – a growth rate of 15 percent, above the average for the period 2009–2011. This was compared with projected growth in capture fisheries of around 3 percent annually. There remain good prospects for small-scale producers in developing countries, and increasing consolidation is likely for those commodity species that are exported or directed at higher-value markets.

76. CEECAF expressed concern about competition between aquaculture and capture fisheries (including inland capture fisheries). Prices of imported aquaculture fish from Asia are being kept very low, which is challenging the development of African aquaculture.

77. The BOBP-IGO noted that population growth, food preference trends and the availability of water for fish farming were important considerations when considering the future role of aquaculture. The GFCM reported that it was increasingly addressing some of these issues, including the sustainability of aquaculture, market-related issues, monitoring of environmental impacts of aquaculture and managing and analysing data associated with aquaculture production.

78. NASCO commented that aquaculture offered significant potential to fill demand that could not be addressed by capture fisheries but that there were significant challenges associated with increased aquaculture production that needed to be confronted. Salmon farming consumes more fish protein than it produces. Threats, such as the genetic interactions between escaped farmed salmon and wild salmon and the transfer of parasites from farmed to wild salmon, are of particular concern.

79. The LTA noted that the FAO Burundi office is organizing a workshop on aquaculture that will examine the introduction of caged culture on Lake Tanganyika. The introduction of exotic species to the lake is not currently permitted. The LTA is concerned about the potential for environmental destruction associated with cage culture, as occurred at Lake Victoria.

Marine protected areas and vulnerable marine ecosystems

80. Mr Michael Shewchuk (United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea [UNDOALOS]), Mr Vladimir Shibanhov (NAFO) and the Chairperson of RSN gave a joint presentation on “Current Trends and Issues with Marine Protected Areas and Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems”. The presentation commenced with a chronology of developments in the United Nations General Assembly, FAO and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) relating to marine protected areas (MPAs) and the protection of vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs) and ecologically or biologically significant areas. It described the work under the General Assembly of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Informal Working Group to study issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, including the convening of intersessional workshops in 2013 and the state of debate on the possible development of a multilateral agreement under UNCLOS. Regional responses to these international developments, including UN Resolution 61/105, were reviewed using the NAFO experience in the North West Atlantic as an example.

81. NAFO advised that its Convention was amended in 2007 and that the organization had adopted a special Chapter 2 of NAFO conservation and enforcement measures dealing with “Bottom fisheries in the NAFO Regulatory areas”. It has established a permanent working group of fisheries managers and scientists on VMEs, it has closed fisheries in 18 areas, delineated existing and new fishing areas. It has also developed an exploratory fishing protocol, interim encounter provisions and move-on rules, and published species identification guides for corals and sponges.

82. The NEAFC noted that its system for dealing with VMEs was similar to the NAFO experience. In addition, it is cooperating with its partner organization OSPAR. OSPAR is an environmental organization without competence in fisheries, but with complementary competences for the same area as the NEAFC. There are plans to formalize this partnership further and extend it to other organizations in the future.

83. The NPFC advised that although it was a relatively new organization operating with an interim secretariat provided by the Government of Japan it had managed to adopt interim measures for area closures to protect VMEs. The SPRFMO noted that with the expected deposit of Chile’s instrument of ratification in July 2012, the SPRFMO Convention would enter into force in August 2012.³ In 2007, participants in the series of conferences that led to the establishment of the SPRFMO adopted an interim measure dealing with identification and conservation of VMEs. While interim measures, in line with the FAO guidelines, are currently voluntary, it is expected these will become legally binding instruments after entry into force of the Convention.

84. The CCAMLR advised that it had undertaken a significant amount of work in relation to VMEs and MPAs in the Southern Ocean. Much of the VME-related work was similar to that undertaken in the North Atlantic. The CCAMLR has adopted conservation measures to protect VMEs, including the publication of VME taxa guides, procedures for fisheries notifications including assessments of potential VME impacts, VME indicators, risk areas, the definition of an “encounter”, move-on rules, the establishment of a VME registry and the publication of a regular report on bottom fishing and VMEs.

³ See note 2.

85. The CCAMLR began consideration of MPAs in 2005 with the identification of priority areas for marine spatial planning and agreement to work towards the establishment of a representative system of MPAs in the CCAMLR Convention Area by 2012. At this point, one MPA covering about 94 000 km² has been agreed on the South Orkney Shelf. Currently, CCAMLR members are engaged in bilateral and multilateral efforts to develop MPA proposals for probable formal consideration at the 2012 regular meeting of the CCAMLR. The proposals include East Antarctica, the Ross Sea and an initiative to protect benthic ecosystems beneath newly collapsed ice shelves on the Antarctic Peninsula.

86. The SRFC noted that in the past year, with the support of the French Development Agency (AFD), it had conducted an investigation into the state of the art on MPAs as fisheries management tools, developed a set of recommendations, and was creating a working group to work on MPAs. However, of the 27 MPAs established in the region, only 4 are regulating fisheries. The GFCM reported that it was coorganizing a workshop on MPAs in November 2012. The GFCM has prohibited trawl fishing in certain deep sea areas and implemented seasonal closures for dolphin fish. The BOBP-IGO advised that it was preparing a status paper on small-scale fisheries in the context of MPAs for the Government of India to be presented at the upcoming COP11 meeting of the CBD.

87. The Coordinating Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP) reminded the RSN that, according to its standards, statistics of all harvests from the wild should be collected regardless of whether they were targeted species or not, and regardless of their utilization and commercial value. This includes those fish stocks that are relevant to MPAs and VMEs. The CWP would appreciate guidance from any RSN members on how best to support monitoring and data collection of harvests from MPAs and VMEs.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSONS

88. Mr Andrew Wright (CCAMLR) was selected as Chairperson, Mr Yugraj Yadava (BOBP) as First Vice Chairperson and Mr Kaitira Ibarahim Katonda (LTA) as Second Vice Chairperson.

FIFTH RSN MEETING (RSN-5)

89. The meeting agreed that RSN-5 might be conducted in two sessions, with the first to be held on the Saturday preceding the Thirty-first Session of COFI (COFI31) in June 2014, and the second to be held on the final day (Friday) of COFI31. The exact date of COFI31 is still to be determined by the Director-General of FAO in consultation with the Bureau. The offer by Mr Abdellah Srour to host the meeting at the headquarters of the GFCM, located at Palazzo Blumenstihl in Rome, was accepted.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

90. The meeting noted that 2014 had been proposed as the Year of Aquaculture.

91. The meeting noted that Mr Malcolm Windsor, NASCO, was retiring after almost 30 years with the organization. The meeting expressed appreciation for the contribution that he had made to the RSN over the years and wished him well in his retirement.

92. The meeting expressed appreciation to the NEAFC and CCAMLR Secretariats for providing refreshments for RSN-4.

93. The meeting expressed appreciation to Ms Gail Lugten, Ms Daphne Martel and Ms Karine Erikstein for secretariat support and to FAO for providing the venue.

ADOPTION OF REPORT

94. The meeting adopted this summary report of its meeting.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

95. The meeting closed at 14.00 hours.

AGENDA

1. **Opening of the Meeting**
Mr Árni M Mathiesen, Assistant Director-General, FAO, Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, will open RSN4 at 08:30 hours on Friday 13th July 2012 in the Lebanon Room (D209).
2. **Adoption of the Agenda and meeting arrangements**
 - a) **Adoption of the Agenda**
The Meeting will be invited to adopt an agenda for RSN4.
 - b) **Meeting Arrangements**
The Secretary for the RSN, Ms Gail Lugten (FAO), will brief participants on meeting arrangements.
 - c) **Observers**
The meeting will be invited to consider any applications from non-RSN members to observe the meeting.
3. **Report of the Chairperson**
The Chairperson will provide a brief update on issues and developments with the RSN since RSN3.
4. **RSN current themes**
The meeting will consider a summary of emerging issues and on-going challenges experienced by RSN members since RSN3. The summary will be prepared on the basis of responses to an invitation circulated by the Chairperson in March 2012. Key issues will be identified and participants will be invited to assess implications for RSN activities in the short to medium term. To assist with the preparation of the Report of RSN4, members have been requested to submit a summary (1/2 to 1 page length) of recent developments and RSN activities in advance of the meeting. These summaries have formed the basis of the attached discussion paper.
5. **Key issues and RSN engagement**
 - 5a) **Port state measures**
Ms Gail Lugten (FAO), will provide a brief summary of developments in respect of the 2009 FAO Port State Measures Agreement.
 - 5b) **IUU fishing**
Mr Driss Meski (ICCAT) will provide an overview of the status and trends in IUU fishing. The presentation will summarize recent initiatives of States or fisheries conservation and management organizations or arrangements to reduce threats posed by IUU fishing.
 - 5c) **Deep sea fisheries: VMEs and MPAs**
Mr Andrew Wright (CCAMLR) and Mr Vladimir Shibanov (NAFO) will provide a brief overview of recent developments in managing fishing activities within the ecosystem in deep sea bottom fisheries. The discussion will focus on developments relating to the avoidance of an adverse impact on vulnerable marine ecosystems and initiatives in respect of marine protected areas. Participants will be invited to inform the meeting of other initiatives to protect VMEs and establish MPAs and to discuss other international developments relating to the establishment of high seas MPAs.

5d) Aquaculture

Mr Simon Funge-Smith (APFIC) will provide a brief overview of current themes in aquaculture before a 30 minute discussion of current and/or emerging issues associated with aquaculture.

6. Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons

Subject to any vacancies arising, RSN members will select a chairperson and up to two vice chairpersons to serve the Network from the conclusion of RSN4.

7. Fifth RSN meeting (RSN5) Date and Venue

Participants will be invited to discuss the structure, procedure (including inter-sessional support) and focus for RSN5. A date and venue for RSN5 will also be agreed.

8. Any other matters

The meeting will consider any other matters raised by participants.

9. Adoption of the Report

Time constraints in completing RSN4 prior to the commencement of the final COFI session mean that the RSN4 report will be completed intersessionally and distributed electronically.

10. Closure of the Meeting

The chairperson will close the meeting.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP)

Warren PAPWORTH
 Executive Secretary
 27 Salamanca Square
 Battery Point, Tasmania 7004
 Australia
 Phone: +61 3 62333123
 Fax: +61 3 63335497
 E-mail: WarrenPapworth@acap.aq

Asia Pacific Fisheries Commission (APFIC)

Simon FUNGE-SMITH
 Secretary
 FAO Regional Office for Asia
 and the Pacific (FAORAP)
 39 Phra Athit Road
 Bangkok 10200, Thailand
 Phone: +66 2 6974149
 Fax: +66 2 6974445
 E-mail: Simon.FungeSmith@fao.org

Bay of Bengal Programme Intergovernmental Organization (BOBP-IGO)

Yugraj YADAVA
 Director
 91 St Mary's Road, Abhiramapuram
 Chennai 600 018,
 Tami Nadu, India
 Phone: +91 44 24936188
 Fax: +91 44 24936102
 E-mail: yugraj.yadava@bobbigo.org

Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism (CRFM)

Milton HAUGHTON
 Secretariat
 Princess Margaret Drive
 Belize City
 PO Box 642 Belize
 Phone: +501 223 4443
 Fax: +501 223 4443
 E-mail: miltonhaughton@hotmail.com

Central Asian and Caucasus Regional Fisheries and Aquaculture Commission (CACFish)

Haydar FERSON
 Ivedik cad No 55
 Yenimahalle 06170
 Ankara, Turkey
 Phone: +90 3123079500
 Fax: + 90 3123271705
 E-mail: CACFish-Secretariat@fao.org

Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)

Andrew WRIGHT
 Executive Secretary
 PO Box 213 North Hobart
 Tasmania 7002, Australia
 Phone: +61 3 62101111
 Fax: +61 3 62248744
 E-mail: andrew_wright@ccamlr.org

Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT)

Robert KENNEDY
 Executive Secretary
 PO Box 37
 Deakin West
 ACT 2600, Australia
 Phone: +61 2 62828396
 Fax: +61 2 62828407
 E-mail: rkennedy@ccsbt.org

Coordinated Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP)

Sachiko TSUJI
 Secretary
 Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
 FAO
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00153 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 57055318
 Fax: +39 06 57052476
 E-mail: Sachiko.Tsuji@fao.org

**Ministerial Conference on Fishery
Cooperation among African States
bordering the Atlantic Ocean
(COMHAFAT / ATLAFCO)**

Hachim EL AYOUBI
Executive Secretary
2 rue Ben Ain Darkoul khalouiya Souissi
Rabat BP 1007 Morocco
Phone: +212 5 30774221
Fax: +212 5 30174242
E-mail: hachimelayoubi@gmail.com

**Permanent Commission for the South
Pacific (CPPS)**

Maria del Carmen GONZALEZ CABAL
Complejo Albán Borja
Edif Classic 2do Piso,
Guayaquil, Ecuador
Phone: +593 222 1202
Email: mcgonzalez@cpps-int.org

**Joint Technical Commission for the
Argentina/Uruguay Maritime Front
(CTMFM)**

Ramiro SÁNCHEZ
Juncal 1355, esc604
11000 Montevideo, Uruguay
Phone: +598 2916 1973
Fax: +598 2916 1578
E-mail: rsanchez@ctmfm.org

**European Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture
Advisory Commission (EIFAAC)**

Gerd MARMULLA
Secretary
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy
Phone: +39 06 57052944
Fax: +39 06 57055188
E-mail: Gerd.Marmulla@fao.org

**Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central
Atlantic (CECAF)**

Moustapha KEBE
Acting Secretariat
FAO Regional Office for Africa
Gamal Abdul Nasser Road
PO Box GP 1628
Accra Ghana
Phone: +233 302 675000
Fax: +233 302 668427/7010943
E-mail: moustapha.kebe@fao.org

**General Fisheries Commission for the
Mediterranean (GFCM)**

Abdellah SROUR
Executive Secretary
Palazzo Blumenstihl
Via Vittoria Colonna, 1 Rome 00193
Phone: +39 06 5705 4055
Fax: +39 06 5705 5827
E-mail: abdellah.sroure@fao.org

**Fishery Resources Monitoring System
(FIRMS)**

Marc TACONET
Senior Fisheries Information officer
Fisheries and Aquaculture Department FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy
Phone: +39 3481552753
Fax: +39 06 570 52476
E-mail: marc.taconet@fao.org

**Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
(IATTC)**

Guillermo COMPEAN
Director
8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla CA 92037 – 1508, USA
Phone: +1 858 5467100
Fax: +1 858 5467133
E-mail: gcompean@iattc.org

Jean-Francois PULVENIS DE SILIGNY

8604 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla CA 92037 – 1508
United States of America
E-mail: jpulvenis@iattc.org

**International Commission for the
Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT)**

Driss MESKI
Executive Secretary
Corazón de María 8,
28002 Madrid, Spain
Phone: +34 91 4165600
Fax: +34 91 4136357
E-mail: driss.meski@iccat.int

Pilar PALLARÉS

Assistant Executive Secretary
Corazón de María 8,
28002 Madrid, Spain
Phone: +34 91 4165600
Fax: +34 91 4152612
E-mail: pilarpallares@iccat.int

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC)

Alejandro ANGANUZZI
 Executive Secretary
 PO Box 1011
 Victoria, Seychelles
 Phone: +248 22 5494
 Fax: +248 22 4364
 E-mail: alejandroanganuzzi@iotc.org

Rondolph PAYET
 E-mail: rpayet@swiofp.net

International Whaling Commission (IWC)

Simon BROCKINGTON
 Secretary
 The Red House
 135 Station Road
 Impington, Cambridge
 CB24 9NP,
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and
 Northern Ireland
 Phone: +44 1223 233971
 Fax: +44 1223 232876
 E-mail: secretariat@iwcoffice.org

Lake Tanganyika Authority (LTA)

Henry K Mwima
 Executive Director
 Lake Tanganyika Authority
 Kigobe Nord, 6749/C
 PO Box 4910 – Ngagara, Bujumbura
 Burundi
 Phone: +257 22 27 3580
 E-mail: henrymwima@lta-altorg

Kaitira Ibarahim KATONDA
 Director of Fisheries
 Kigobe Nord, 6749/C
 BP 4910 – Ngagara, Bujumbura
 Burundi
 Phone: +257 79 138 000
 E-mail: kaitirakatonda@lta-altorg
 kaitirakatonda1@gmail.com

Martin VAN DER KNAAP
 Chief Technical Adviser to the Directorate of
 Fisheries of the Lake Tanganyika Authority
 PO Box 4910 – Ngagara, Bujumbura
 Burundi
 Phone: + 257 22 27 69 44
 E-mail: martin.vanderknaap@fao.org

North Atlantic Salmon Conservation Organization (NASCO)

Malcolm WINDSOR
 Secretary
 11 Rutland Square
 Edinburgh EH15 2AS
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and
 Northern Ireland
 Phone: +44 131 228
 E-mail: hq@nasco.int

Peter HUTCHINSON
 Assistant Secretary
 11 Rutland Square
 Edinburgh EH15 2AS
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and
 Northern Ireland
 Phone: +44 131 228
 E-mail: hq@nasco.int

North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC)

Stefan ASMUNDSSON
 Executive Secretary
 22 Berners Street, London
 W1T 3DY
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and
 Northern Ireland
 Phone: +44 20 76310016
 E-mail: stefan@neafc.org

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

Vladimir SHIBANOV
 Executive Secretary
 2 Morris Drive
 PO Box 638
 Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
 B2Y 3Y9, Canada
 Phone: +1 902 4688533
 E-mail: VShibanov@nafo.int

North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC)

Kengo TANAKA
 Interim Secretary
 International Affairs Division
 Fisheries Agency of Japan
 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,
 Tokyo 100-8907, Japan
 Phone: +81 3 35911086
 Fax: +81 3 35042649
 E-mail: kengo_tanaka@nmmaffg.ojp

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Pio MANOA
1 FFA Road, PO Box 629
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Phone: +677 21124
Fax: +677 23995
E-mail: piomanoa@ffa.int

Regional Commission for Fisheries (RECOFI)

Piero MANNINI
Secretary, FAO Regional Office for the Near
East (FAORNE)
11 El Eslah El Zerai Str
PO Box 2223,
Dokki, Cairo, Egypt
Phone: +20 2 331 6136
Fax: +20 2 7495981
E-mail: PieroMannini@fao.org

Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC)

Chumnarn PONGSRI
Secretary-General
SEAFDEC/SECRETARIAT
50 Department of Fisheries
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Phone: +66 2940 5682
Fax: +66 2940 6336
E-mail: sg@seafdec.org

Somboon SIRIRAKSOPHON
Policy and Program Coordinator
SEAFDEC/SECRETARIAT
50 Department of Fisheries
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Phone: +66 2940 6333
Fax: +66 2940 6336
E-mail: somboon@seafdec.org

South Pacific Regional Fishery Management Organization (SPRFMO)

Robin ALLEN
Executive Secretary
Interim Secretariat
PO Box 3797 Wellington 6140
New Zealand
Phone: +64 4 499 9889
Fax: +64 4 473 957
E-mail: robinallen@southpacificrfmo.org

South East Atlantic Fisheries Organization (SEAFO)

Ben VAN ZYL
Executive Secretary
1st Floor, SAVVAS Building
c/o Nangolo Mbumba Drive and 11th Road
PO Box 4296
Walvis Bay, Namibia
Phone: +264 64 220387
Fax: +264 64 220389
E-mail: bvanzyl@seafo.org

Subregional Fisheries Commission (SRFC)

Hamady Diop PhD
Head of Department of Research and Information
Systems
Sub Regional Fisheries Commission
Secretariat Permanent de la CSRP
Karack, Rue KA-38
BP 25485
Dakar – Fann, Senegal
Phone: +221 33 864 0475
E-mail: hamadydiop@gmail.com

Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC)

Raymon van ANROOY
Secretary
Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission
FAO Subregional Office for the Caribbean
(FAO-SLC)
2nd Floor, United Nations House, Marine
Gardens, Hastings Christ Church, BB11000,
Barbados
Phone :+1 246 426 7110/11
Fax : +1 246 427 6075
E-mail: raymon.vananrooy@fao.org

United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UNDOALOS)

Michael SHEWCHUK
2 United Nations Plaza, DC2-410
Phone: +1 917 367 2255
Fax: +1 212 963 5847
E-mail: shewchuk@un.org

FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy

Assistant Director-General

Árni M. MATHIESEN

Secretary RSN

Gail LUGTEN

Rapporteur

Karine ERIKSTEIN

Meeting Organizer

Daphne MARTEL

SUMMARY PAGE
CURRENT ISSUES AND TRENDS OF IMPORTANCE TO REGIONAL FISHERIES BODIES

INTRODUCTION

1. As part of the invitation to attend the 2012 Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network meeting (RSN4), Regional Fishery Bodies (RFBs) were invited to provide information on the five most important issues or trends currently confronting their RFB. Owing to the way this question was expressed, a majority of RFBs responded by identifying problem issues. However, some bodies chose to respond by describing their management programmes, or goals, subjects that were not necessarily problematic.

2. The responses have been categorised into four general subject areas which have some level of application to all RFBs, regardless of their specialisation.

- 1) Science and Research – this category attracted the most prolific of responses. It includes collection of, accuracy of, and gaps in, fisheries data. Responses in this category covered climate change, marine protected areas (MPAs), vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries and Aquaculture, and general environment observations.
- 2) Institutional – this category also attracted a significant number of responses. It includes matters relating to RFB secretariats, member countries, funding and mandates.
- 3) Fishing – this category includes IUU fishing; monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS), the use of observers; recreational fishing, by-catch, and safety at sea. This category clearly has a particular relevance for marine capture bodies, but some aspects of the category (such as IUU fishing, and the use of observers) also have some application to inland capture fisheries.
- 4) Post-harvest – this category includes fish trade and the enhancing of fisher livelihoods.
- 5) Inevitably there is some overlap between the categories.

SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

3. Almost every RFB responding to this survey commented on the need for better science and more research in fisheries management.

4. The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) noted the need to fill the gaps in data relating to seabird population status and trends, especially for the species which are currently in decline. They noted the need to support research on the development of more effective and efficient seabird by-catch mitigation measures.

5. Eleven fishery bodies noted the need for high quality and valuable technical advice. They identified the need for better science, improved statistics, reliable assessments of stocks, enhanced modelling, filling of data gaps, and better utilization of the scientific advice that exists¹.

6. Two fishery bodies are concerned at the need to identify factors affecting stock recovery and to ensure the rebuilding of stocks².

7. Other bodies raised matters of concern over specific species and stocks. Most general concern related to the incidental capture of sharks. This subject is addressed in more detail under Part IV of this report.

¹APFIC, CACFish, CCAMLR, CECAF, CRFM, GFCM, IATTC, IOTC, NAFO, RECOFI, SEAFO, SPC, SWIOFC and WECAFC. It should also be noted that ICCAT are improving basic data reporting within the Commission by adopting penalties for non-reporting. At the same time, funds have been devoted to technical capacity building and training to assist developing CPCs to improve their performance.

²CCSBT, CCAMLR.

8. The BOBP-IGO are constructing management plans for Hilsa fisheries in their member countries³. The Joint Technical Commission For The Argentina/Uruguay Maritime Front (CTMFM) are applying new management measures for species covered by their convention area⁴. CCSBT notes concern over low spawning stock biomass of Southern bluefin Tuna (SBT) and the need to monitor the global catch of SBT. CCAMLR has convened several scientific working groups with a mandate to provide advice to the Scientific Committee. These include acoustic surveys for krill using commercial fishing vessels and assessment of fisheries for toothfish and icefish. They have also noted the scientific work that will be required to support the development of a feedback management approach for the krill fishery and the management of bottom fishing in the vicinity of VMEs. The CRFM, WECAFC and Central American Organization for Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector (OSPESCA)/SICA have specific concerns over the spiny lobster fishery. ICCAT are to review their management plans for bluefin tuna. IPHC has noted the reducing yield and spawning biomass losses to the halibut stocks caused by non-direct by-catch mortality. The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) have noted that five of the sixteen stocks of IOTC species are in good condition, but little is known about the remaining eleven species⁵. NAFO are noting the recovery of cod on the Flemish Cap, and American plaice which is still under moratorium. However, moratoria are continuing for eight NAFO stocks, and TACs have been reduced for a further five NAFO stocks. NASCO has noted the need for research on the causes of mortality of salmon at sea and its implication for management plans. In addition, the organization notes the need to manage salmon so as to utilize only harvestable surpluses. NEAFC are reviewing management plans for Rockall haddock, blue whiting and Norwegian spring spawning herring. SPC have noted concern over bigeye tuna and sea cucumbers. The SPC have also noted the development of a new tool for tuna managers: an interactive tuna management simulator: TUMaS. WECAFC have described an urgent need for more information on the deep seas and high seas in the whole of FAO Area 31.

9. An important initiative launched by WECAFC has been to establish and / or reactivate sub-regional joint working groups, with clear terms of reference to deal with collaborative approaches to the management of particular species⁶. Whilst sounding innovative and dynamic in practice, an alternative perspective has been noted by SPC with regard to the sub-regional tuna fisheries management initiatives amongst 22 Pacific Island countries and territories. This is that there are more meetings to service, more management proposals to evaluate, and a consequent increase in Secretariat workloads.

10. A number of aquaculture bodies also noted the need for improved science and research⁷. In particular, expression has been given to the need to identify best practices in aquaculture, to minimise chemical use, and to develop a network mechanism for genetics and biodiversity. APFIC noted the need for improved feeds for aquaculture. Similarly, CRFM observed that aquaculture and mariculture are emerging priority areas and extensive work is being done on low cost feeds that use local materials. BOBP-IGO noted that the herbivore species, mainly the carps, are contributing substantially to the overall production from aquaculture and are meeting domestic fish food requirements. However, as they are generally not traded internationally, there is less focus on them. BOBP-IGO argue that this trend needs to be reversed so that their contribution to the food and nutritional security is well recognised and their future growth is well supported through research and technical means. The Network of Aquaculture Centers In Asia And The Pacific (NACA) is striving for an ecosystem approach to aquaculture that will ensure environmental sustainability and reduce the risks of aquatic

³ India, Bangladesh and also in Myanmar. Presently, Myanmar is not a member of the BOBP-IGO, but they are participating in many activities conducted by the Organization.

⁴ Argentine hake, white croaker, striped weakfish, red porgy, Patagonian smoothhound shark, rays, anchovy and squid.

⁵ The data that is available has been sufficient to conduct assessments for 5 of the stocks, but particularly since large-scale tagging experiments were completed, there is a lack of more precise fishery data, such as a distribution of sizes, and this has affected the precision of the assessments.

⁶ OSPESCA/WECAFC/CRFM/CMFC Working Group on Spiny Lobster;
WECAFC/OSPESCA/CRFM/CMFC Working Group on Recreational Fisheries;
CMFC / OSPESCA / WECAFC/CRFM Queen Conch Working Group;
CRFM / WECAFC Flying Fish in the Eastern Caribbean Working Group;
CMFC / WECAFC Spawning Aggregations Working Group.

⁷ BOBP-IGO, NACA, MRC, APFIC, CRFM, EIFAAC, GFCM, RECOFI, SICA AND CIFAA.

animal diseases. Their current science / research workplan focuses on the conservation and management of aquatic genetic resources to create sound broodstock, and minimise the deleterious effects of captive breeding and associated genetic effects. The NACA are also working on assessing the vulnerability of the aquaculture sector under different climate change scenarios – these include consideration of social and environmental factors as well as productivity. NASCO are working to minimise the impacts of aquaculture, particularly with regard to introductions, transfers and transgenics. OSPESCA are working to integrate their fisheries and coastal aquaculture. CIFAA have established several science / research based working groups to further African inland fisheries and aquaculture including a climate change working group and a genetic diversity working group.

11. A more comprehensive aquaculture contribution, and one which is worthy of noting in full, was sent by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

“SPC has recently completed an evaluation on the past experience of the region with mariculture development and opportunities for the future. The study found considerable waste of resources in a series of donor and NGO promoted projects which had little chance of economic viability. The conclusions urge more thorough evaluation of markets and production costs; and a much stronger role for the private sector in mariculture development in future.

There is a vigorous debate over the proposed introduction of GIFT tilapia into countries (and areas within countries) for aquaculture development which is pitting an “invasive species lobby” against the “aquaculture development for food security lobby”.

The lack of adequate controls for aquaculture bio-security is a continuing weakness. Due to the isolation of many of the countries, this is a region that could be developing a reputation for disease-free stock. Instead, unwise movement of aquaculture species is introducing avoidable diseases. SPC is working to develop a regional framework for aquatic bio-security, but it is an initiative that has had little success in attracting funding support to date”⁸.

12. *The SPC comments raise an interesting consideration for all RFBs involved in aquaculture Is the science moving faster than the law and policy?*

13. The marine mammal bodies have also noted the need for more science and more research. The IWC has several research initiatives underway including the establishment of a Conservation Management Plan for the most at-risk populations, the development of a five-year IWC whale-watching strategy, ongoing work to reduce collisions between whales and ships, and improved responses for the rescue of large whales entangled in marine debris⁹. The NAMMCO noted the need for more research into marine mammal killing methods, focusing on efficiency of weaponry, as well as speed of death, animal welfare, safety of hunters and training of hunters. In addition, NAMMCO are planning and coordinating (in conjunction with States bordering the North Atlantic) a comprehensive North Atlantic synoptic survey(s) for cetaceans in 2015. The Commission is interested in any RSN member feedback regarding ongoing fisheries surveys and programmes that could potentially provide ancillary platforms of opportunity for observers.

14. The inland fisheries RFBs are also requiring additional levels of science and research. CIFAA have noted their plans to develop an inland fishery strategy. MRC is working towards a regional assessment of trans-boundary fisheries and social impacts in the face of Mekong mainstream hydropower development¹⁰.

15. Seven RFBs expressed a need for more research to assist them with implementing / strengthening the ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF) and the ecosystem approach to aquaculture

⁸ SPC Response to Request for Inputs into the Agenda of RSN4.

⁹ This of course overlaps the category of fishing and the ongoing problem of lost and abandoned fishing gear.

¹⁰ This has been triggered by the announcement of the Government of Lao PMS that it intends to build the first mainstream dam on the Lower Mekong Basin.

(EAA)¹¹. NAFO noted their progress towards a roadmap for developing an ecosystem approach to fisheries which includes developing Integrated Ecosystem Assessments (IEA)¹².

16. Bearing in mind that a core finding from the 2012 Rio Oceans Declaration is the need to scale-up successful ecosystem based management efforts for national and regional marine areas, as well as those beyond national jurisdiction, can we say that RFBs have the same level of concern as the international community?¹³

17. At a broader environmental level, NASCO are working on habitat protection and restoration where past problems have impacted on the decline in wild salmon stocks. They note that over the past 150 years factors such as the building of hydro-electric dams, gravel abstraction, canalization, water abstraction and pollution have led to environmental degradation. However, with the decline of heavy industries, and considerable restoration initiatives, there have been significant gains in habitat quality over recent years. New guidelines have been developed to assist jurisdictions in making further progress in implementing NASCO's agreements and to provide a basis for future information exchange¹⁴.

18. SEAFO noted that its Scientific Committee is in a difficult position with providing advice to the Commission on harvesting strategies, when they have poor quality of data due to limited fishing in the Convention Area. The Organization notes that the application of the precautionary approach becomes debateable when poor quality data is weighed up against an increase in fishing that would create more data.

19. Other considerations on the application of the precautionary approach arise from the ongoing question of whether RFBs can operate most effectively with majority voting or consensus voting¹⁵.

20. Consider a hypothetical situation where one RFMO member defies all other members in not applying the precautionary approach to catch limits. As the RFMO works by consensus decision making, and consensus cannot be achieved because of the one recalcitrant State, the precautionary approach cannot be applied. In 2007 Chatham House conducted a broad ranging study into best-practice RFMOs¹⁶. Their findings argue that consensus decision-making is not best practice, at least not without some mechanism for moving past a deadlock. However, as States are sovereign entities, it is not possible to force compliance, and so having States reach "agreement" is vital. The solution proposed by the Chatham House report is that RFMOs adopt majority decision making processes, and, where there is a dissenting State, the dissenter will lose access to the resource¹⁷. Is this an extreme measure, or one which is worthy of consideration by the RSN?

21. The protection of VME is a priority consideration for three RFBs: CCAMLR, NEAFC and NPFC CCAMLR are moving to the establishment of Marine Protected Areas within their Convention area. The IWC have noted that they are dealing with the proposed establishment of a South Atlantic Whale Sanctuary which will be similar to the Southern Ocean and Indian Ocean sanctuaries already established by the Commission BOBP-IGO argues that some MPAs which have been established in the past are proving detrimental to the livelihoods of small-scale fishing communities and the establishment of MPAs should be done in a more fully participatory manner, where relevant communities are consulted.

¹¹ APFIC, CTMFM, ICCAT, IOTC, NAFO, SPC, SWIOFC.

¹² NAFO have accepted the definition of IEA provided by Levin, Fogarty, Murawski and Fluharty in *Integrated Ecosystem Assessments: Developing the Scientific Basis for Ecosystem-Based Management of the Ocean* (2009) PLOS Biol7(1). This approach was approved by the NAFO Performance Assessment Panel.

¹³ http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/pdf_Rio_Ocean_Declaration_2012.pdf

¹⁴ www.nasco.int/habitat.html

¹⁵ Note criticisms raised by S Cullis-Suzuki and D Pauly in "Failing the high seas: A global evaluation of regional fisheries management organisations" in (2010) 34 *Marine Policy* 1036-1042.

¹⁶ Lodge M et al, "Recommended Best Practices for Regional Fisheries Management Organisations: Report of an independent panel to develop a model for improved governance by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations" (Chatham House, 2007).

¹⁷ *Ibid*, at 31 The legal argument offered in support of this strategy is that under the UNFSA, States must abide by the determinations of RFMOs – unfortunately, the reality is that currently, only 78 States have ratified the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and the most recent of these States was St Vincent and the Grenadines on 29 October 2010. Of course there is also strong support for the counter- legal argument of freedom of fishing.

22. Finally, it is worth noting that the last comprehensive RFB report which was written in 2010, noted that six bodies were seeking better science and more research into the impact of climate change on fisheries and aquaculture¹⁸. In 2012, the list of RFBs with an interest in climate change is decreasing, not increasing Only APFIC, BOBP-IGO, CIFAA, NACA and LTA raised the subject.

23. *Are RFBs losing interest in climate change?*

INSTITUTIONAL MATTERS

24. Almost one-third of the regional fishery bodies responding to this survey expressed concern (to a greater or lesser extent), about their funding situation.¹⁹ It was observed that funding impacted on both the RFBs ability to generally “resource” their regional management projects, as well as the ability of RFB member countries to domestically implement the broader regional programmes. Both SEAFO and LTA noted problems with member States not paying their annual contributions. This also led to insufficient funding, or no funding to implement fisheries management projects, and wasted time spent on chasing annual fees.

25. Several FAO RFBs, both Article VI and Article XIV bodies, also expressed funding concerns. Some of the FAO bodies noted that their current budget hindered their attempts to fully implement their FAO fisheries and aquaculture mandate. Other bodies commented that greater consideration needed to be given to obtaining extra-budgetary funding.²⁰

26. FFA remarked on the funding available under the UN Fish Stocks Agreement Part VII Fund. They particularly acknowledged the valuable contribution that this Fund had made to their regional fishing activities, acknowledged those donors who have supported the Fund, and encouraged States to continue contributing.

27. IATTC are in the process of developing a fund to facilitate technical assistance, technology transfer, training and other means of cooperation aimed at developing countries that are members of the Commission, in order to assist them in fulfilling their obligations under the Convention. This is an interesting development as many RFBs are comprised of both developed and developing States. The Convention and financial regulations for WCPFC establish a Fund to support the engagement of developing States in the work of the Commission. In this regard WCPFC has successfully partnered with a range of external development assistance agencies, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), on projects covering data collection, scientific research and institutional strengthening including in relation to monitoring, control and surveillance.

28. *Should more RFBs be giving consideration to an internal trust fund that could assist developing State members in fulfilling their obligations under the Convention?*

29. Over one-third of the RFBs responding to this survey have commented on the need to strengthen policy, staffing, legal, and / or institutional arrangements of governance.²¹ Three bodies also noted the need for greater transparency in the decision making / management processes²².

30. Several bodies also raised matters of law, either with regard to their own management mandates and the need to update their Agreements,²³ or concerning fisheries legislation within their member countries where laws needed to be updated in order to reflect the changing values of international fisheries law.²⁴

¹⁸ Lugten G “The Role of International Fishery Organizations and Other Bodies in the Conservation and Management of Living Aquatic Resources” FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Circular No 1054 (2010). The six bodies were ICES, OSPESCA, NPAFC, PSC, CCAMLR and NACA.

¹⁹ ACAP, CECAF, CIFAA, CRFM, EIFAAC, FFA, GFCM, IPHC, LTA, RECOFI, SEAFO.

²⁰ CECAF, CIFAA, EIFAAC, GFCM, RECOFI, and SWIOFC.

²¹ APFIC, CECAF, CRFM, CIFAA, EIFAAC, GFCM, ICCAT, IPHC, MRC, RECOFI, OSPESCA, SWIOFC, and IOTC.

²² IWC, RECOFI and SWIOFC.

²³ CIFAA, RECOFI, IOTC NAFO are still awaiting the required 75 percent ratification by their contracting parties of amendments made to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. To date, only three contracting parties: Norway, Canada and the EU have ratified.

²⁴ SPC have noted that new coastal fisheries legislation is in place in one of their member countries, and in process in three more member countries CRFM are working to strengthen national and regional policy.

31. SPRFMO have noted a need for greater clarification on the management of (non-highly migratory) stocks which straddle the area of competence of an RFMO and coastal States. Similar issues are associated with highly migratory stocks such as tuna. The issue of compatibility between conservation and management arrangements put in place by coastal States for shared stocks while in their internal or archipelagic waters and arrangements in the relevant RFMOs is an issue for some tuna RFMOs. Compatibility between RFMOs sharing highly migratory stocks is also a concern: such as in relation to tuna and the shared interests of WCPFC and IATTC.

32. OSPESCA has noted the challenges of progressing principles from voluntary regional and international mechanisms into binding national programmes.

33. CRFM note that the strengthening of their governance regime for fisheries and aquaculture is a major issue. The text of a draft treaty establishing a Common Fisheries Policy for Caribbean Community And Common Market (CARICOM) countries was endorsed by the CRFM Ministerial Council and the Council for Trade and Economic Development of CARICOM in 2011. The treaty is expected to be submitted to the CARICOM Heads of State for final approval in 2012.

34. The GFCM has noted the need for better inter-institutional coordination to improve governance in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and to this end the Commission has liaised with several partner organizations in order to institutionalise ongoing cooperation with them. Six of these organizations have subsequently concluded memorandums of understanding with the Commission: United Nations Environment Programme Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP-MAP); Agreement On The Conservation Of Cetaceans Of The Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea And Contiguous Atlantic Area (ACCOBAMS), Black Sea Commission, MedPan, Regional Advisory Council for the Mediterranean (RAC-MED) and International Organization for central and Eastern Europe to assist in developing Fisheries and Aquaculture (EUROFISH).

35. Several RFBs highlighted that their relationship with other localised bodies was a priority area of concern / attention / workload.²⁵ For this reason, the GFCM initiative in drafting MOUs with other relevant regional entities raises an interesting discussion question for the RSN to consider: Bearing in mind the proliferation of bodies (RFBs, IGOs, NGOs) which share or overlap mandates, is it desirable for more RFBs to act in the manner of GFCM, and collaborate with their partner bodies by drafting MOUs which could elaborate shared and divided responsibilities and functions? Or are these matters best left unspoken?

36. NACA are developing an education and training programme which assists capacity building among NACA member countries through the exchange and sharing of knowledge and skills between members. Activities may take the form of training courses, study visits and even personnel exchanges.

37. Do other RFBs see value in either applying a “study visit programme” or an “exchange” programme between the RFB and its member countries, or between the RFBs themselves?

38. Several bodies commented that the process of implementing RFB recommendations or decisions within member countries, was slow, or flawed (with some member countries not fully understanding the decisions that have been taken by the RFB), or that the process just needed monitoring (and prodding).²⁶ Three bodies noted that greater capacity building and / or technology transfers within their member countries may be needed²⁷ Four bodies noted the need to improve the member country understanding of the role and value of the RFB and its work.²⁸

39. Although several bodies spoke of long-term management initiatives, very few bodies actually prioritised “the future” of the body as a primary focus of work

40. Should RFBs consider (regardless of external pressures such as performance reviews) the question of where they would like to be in ten years from now?

²⁵ CEEAF, IATTC, ICCAT, MRC, RECOFI, OSPESCA, SPC.

²⁶ APFIC, CEEAF, EIFAAC.

²⁷ APFIC, FFA, OSPESCA.

²⁸ MRC, OSPESCA, RECOFI, and SWIOFC.

FISHING

41. Over half of the bodies responding to this survey noted that IUU fishing and monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) are priority subjects for both marine capture and inland capture RFBs. Due to the importance of the subject, specific responses will be noted in Attachment I.

42. The problem of IUU fishing is interesting for the diverse range of MCS techniques being employed to try and address it. Broadly speaking, these techniques vary with the region size and location and the economic strength of member countries.

43. *Some RFBs expressed a preference for observer training and observer coverage on vessels, yet as a sole MCS tool, observers can be argued to be a relatively unsophisticated method of policing IUU and implementing MCS. It is certainly prone to human weaknesses. In contrast, vessel record lists (for both licensed vessels and IUU vessels), plus trade and market measures, are arguably less fallible. Should more RFBs be moving towards MCS that embodies these tools, and if so, what prevents them from doing so – member country politics, lack of capacity with human / economic resourcing?*

44. In many RFBs the role of observers is strongly debated. While the scientific community often insist that observers be deployed purely for scientific purposes other constituents argue that observers can successfully contribute to a compliance monitoring effort.

45. Eight RFBs expressed concern over some form, or several forms of by-catch.²⁹

46. ACAP are seeking better collection of data on seabird by-catch and the implementation of best practice mitigation measures in both domestic and high seas fisheries.

47. CCAMLR noted concern that while seabird mortality in their Convention Area has been reduced to almost zero on the high seas, the mortality of the same species in the regulatory areas of other organizations which are contiguous to CCAMLR, is significant.

48. NAMMCO noted by-catch issues associated with coastal gillnetting (mainly cod and monkfish) within the waters of member countries that result in high removals of harbour porpoises, and possibly, other marine mammal species.

49. SEAFDEC countries are faced with by-catch of sharks, rays, sea turtles and other endangered species from fishing operations, particularly trawling, tuna purse seining and pelagic long-lining. The Centre is collaborating with organizations, such as FAO, to promote by-catch reduction methodologies.

50. No data was received on by-catch as an issue for inland fisheries bodies. However, in the last RFB survey conducted in 2010, the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) noted that longline fishing vessels were having bird by-catch problems, as well as by-catch of small mammals such as otters.

51. There is no doubt that sharks are a particular concern to many of the marine capture bodies.³⁰ NEAFC notes that at its annual meeting in 2011, measures were adopted regarding 18 different species of deep-sea sharks. OSPESCA describe a “regional problem of shark-finning”. IOTC lament the particularly poor data on incidental catch of sharks. They note that whilst sharks are not directly under the mandate of the Commission, they are a focus of concern of members who have agreed on the need to take conservation measures. However, the lack of fishery data on sharks compromises the ability of the Scientific Committee to produce appropriate management advice.

52. *Is there a need for more research (and action) on the extent of incidental capture of sharks?*

²⁹ ACAP, CCSBT, CCAMLR, CTMFM, ICCAT, IPHC, NAMMCO, and SEAFDEC.

³⁰ BOBP-IGO, IATTC, IOTC, ICCAT, NEAFC, OSPESCA, SEAFDEC and SPC have all raised concern and / or action plans.

53. Four bodies expressed concern regarding fishing over capacity. BOBP-IGO are working to reduce fishing capacity in the Bay of Bengal. APFIC are promoting reduction of fishing over-capacity. IATTC are continuing to work towards reduction of the Eastern Pacific Ocean tuna fishing fleet. Consistent with the FAO International Plan of Action (IPOA)-Capacity, the Commission has developed and adopted in June 2005, a Plan for Regional Management of Fishing Capacity which establishes as an objective, the reduction of the total purse seine capacity from 218 000 m³ to 158 000 m³. SEAFDEC recognises the problem of overcapacity as a pressing issue impacting on regional fisheries governance. The Center is working with member countries to implement a policy framework and best practice guidelines to address the problem.

54. Two bodies noted the increasing impact of recreational fishing OSPESCA noted the rise of tourism based recreational fishing. WECAFC also noted the growing importance of recreational fishing in the region and reported on the interest expressed by recreational fishing lobby groups in working as co-managers of target species resources.

55. Two bodies also prioritised the subject of fisher safety at sea The BOBP-IGO has initiated a program on the subject of safety at sea for small-scale fisheries. The objectives of the programme are aimed at improving the livelihoods of small-scale fishing communities by decreasing the number of accidents at sea and the effects of such accidents. The programme specifically focuses on provision and analysis of data to identify the cause of accidents, onshore monitoring and pre-voyage checks to ensure real time reporting and reduction of accidents due to personal negligence. The programme additionally aims to provide technical support to member countries to implement sea-safety programmes through awareness building, especially by involving the fisher families, outreach programmes and the training of trainers, fishers and inspectors in safety requirements and good working conditions for fishers.

56. The CCAMLR annual meeting of 2011 succeeded in adopting two resolutions aimed at improving vessel safety and reducing the loss of life in the Southern Ocean. But still, vessel safety is a flag State responsibility, and lives were again lost in the Southern Ocean in 2012.

POST-HARVEST

57. The 2012 RFB survey has noted an emerging priority area in regional fisheries management after the science has been done, the management plans put in place, and the fish have been caught. This subject can be generically referred to as "Post-harvest" but it comprises two main sub-categories: fish trade and fisher livelihoods.

58. An increasing number of RFBs are applying or strengthening some form of Catch Documentation Scheme. OSPESCA are working with member countries to enhance intra and extra-regional marketing. CCAMLR are strengthening their CDS. The CCSBT has introduced improved systems to monitor the catch of its members and cooperating non-members (CNMs) as well as SBT trade by members and CNMs. However, these measures will not succeed if the SBT is marketed by non-cooperating non-members (NCNMs). Accordingly, both the monitoring of emerging SBT markets, and the seeking of cooperation from NCNMs, are becoming a priority focus of the CCSBT

59. Similarly, ICCAT have noted that strict management plans are in place for bluefin tuna stocks, but ensuring control of the fishery is vital, and the management plans are set for review in 2012. The Secretariat is in the process of establishing an electronic bluefin tuna CDS which is expected to be an important tool for the control of the fishery from net to market. These e-BCD systems will be subject to control testing and evaluation as they are developed.

60. Some Pacific Island States are clearly concerned by trade-based barriers to other fish markets. The FFA are supporting members in addressing the recent and emerging requirements for fish trade including the EU's IUU regulations.³¹ The SPC is also providing training and support to four countries in order to continue the tuna trade with, or allow market access of tuna to, the European Union.

³¹ On the 1st of January 2010 the European Council introduced Regulation No 1005 / 2008 This regulation stipulated that the only marine fishery products to be imported into, or exported from, the EU must be validated by the flag State or the exporting State (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:286:0001:0032:EN:PDF>). The regulation

61. As the EU initiative is likely to be replicated in other regions of the world, either publicly at the State level, or through private enterprise, should more collaborative / cooperative work be done to include the voice (and considerations) of all stakeholders in “green marketing”?

62. On improved fisher livelihoods, APFIC noted that improving livelihoods in both fishing and aquaculture communities is a priority of the Commission.

63. BOBP-IGO raised the important issue of child labour in marine capture fisheries. They note that the problem is prevalent in almost all countries of the region, but is most visible in India and Bangladesh. Children are largely working as supporters to elder fishers in on-shore activities, rather than going out to sea. These on-shore activities involve removing fish from nets, sorting, icing, etc, and is often done after school hours as family dwellings are usually close to the landing sites. In Bangladesh there is some evidence that children in the age group of 14-18 are going to sea on the boats.

64. Child labour in fishing is a significant part of the global problem of child labour in agriculture. Approximately 129 million boys and girls, between 5 and 17 years of age are child labourers in agriculture, including fishing. Although this is not a direct issue for many RFBs, where it is a problem, should RFBs be doing more to raise awareness of this issue with Member Countries?

65. CRFM noted that improving the incomes and the welfare of fishers and fishing communities, and the reduction of poverty, and vulnerability to poverty are important issues for their body. The CRFM have acknowledged funding and technical assistance from the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID) which completed a diagnostic study on poverty levels in fishing communities.

66. SWIOFC has noted that an increasing number of countries in the south west Indian Ocean are placing greater emphasis on poverty reduction and food security, and to respond to this need, the member countries have formulated national strategies which involve fisheries, amongst other sectoral contributors.

67. The role of fisheries in food security and poverty reduction and its contribution to the millennium development goals is often undervalued and under-represented. This oversight should be addressed by all RFBs and regional economic organizations. Is this currently being done?

CONCLUSIONS

This 2012 RSN survey has attracted more responses than previous RFB research exercises, and the responses were of an excellent quality. This may be indicative of the large number of complex issues confronting fisheries managers in the 21st century. It may also be indicative of a greater willingness to share knowledge and experiences. It is certainly clear from the quality of feedback that RFBs are not complacent and it is equally clear that the global picture of fisheries management is always changing. Thus while some old enemies, such as IUU fishing, continue to persist, new and important priorities are emerging such as the status of sharks, the science and policy of aquaculture, fish trade, fisher safety, fisher livelihoods, ending child labour in fishing, and recognising the role of fisheries in eradicating poverty and addressing global food security.

provides for heavy penalties for EU fishers who engage in IUU fishing anywhere in the world. In addition, a list of non-compliant flag States which are failing to combat IUU fishing has been developed, and the EU will not import fish produce from those countries.

The Fourth Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network (RSN-4) was held in Rome, Italy, on 13 July 2012. Prior to the meeting, all regional fishery bodies (RFBs) were asked to contribute a report on the five most pressing issues facing their organization. This material was compiled into a summary report and used to launch discussion at the RSN-4 meeting. The summary report, and subsequent RSN-4 discussion, covered a wide range of topical subjects including RFB financial structures, climate change, recreational fisheries, decision-making procedures within each RFB, the establishment of vulnerable marine ecosystems, and child labour plus other human rights issues in fisheries. In addition, presentations were given by several RFB Executive Secretaries on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, current issues in aquaculture management, and the establishment and management of marine protected areas (MPAs). A further presentation was given by the RSN Secretary on the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. A final presentation was given by the representative of the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, who spoke on the chronological development of MPAs within the United Nations General Assembly, FAO and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Thirty-one RFB Secretariats representing a diverse range of RFBs from all geographic regions were represented at the RSN-4. They included FAO and non-FAO bodies, marine capture and inland capture bodies, aquaculture bodies, and all the tuna regional fisheries management organizations. The meeting fostered collaboration and cooperation between the participating RFBs, and gave consideration to a number of matters that merit the attention of all RFBs, governments and FAO.