



## **Report from the Second Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network, RSN-2, 9-10 March 2009, FAO Headquarters, Rome.**

### **Note by the Secretariat**

#### **1. Introduction**

These meetings, which are not FAO meetings any more, but the responsibility of participating secretariats, have found a form that makes attending them worthwhile. At this meeting, under the able chairmanship of the Executive Secretary of CCAMLR, there seemed to be consensus on how to proceed, seeing the diversity of the Group as an advantage rather than a problem. It was realised that every RFB has something to contribute and has experiences with different parts of the puzzle that fisheries management and, to an even larger extent, ocean management has to deal with.

The diversity is in the setup of the different bodies (advisory or management mandate, form underdeveloped or developed economies, single species groups (cetaceans, tuna, or anadromous stocks) or regional pelagic and demersal fisheries management mandate, marine or freshwater, FAO bodies or convention based bodies) in some instances leads to a rather unfocussed discussion but, on the other hand, also makes it possible to obtain some interesting information.

The meeting reviewed the outcome of the 28<sup>h</sup> FAO COFI meeting and possible consequences for the RFBs. The result of these discussions is reported in detail in the Report of Second Meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network (attached).

#### **2. Summary of the Meeting**

A summary of the results of the meeting was presented to the 8<sup>th</sup> Informal Consultation of States Parties to UNFSA, 16 – 19 March, 2009, UN Headquarters, New York.

#### **Statement of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network**

Presented by the Chair of RSN, Kjartan Hoydal, NEAFC

The Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network (RSN) is an informal consortium of secretariats representing up to 46 regional fisheries bodies (RFBs)<sup>1</sup> responsible for inland, coastal and oceanic fisheries. It provides a forum for promoting dialogue and consultation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term RFB is used in this document to encompass Regional Fishery Bodies, Regional Fishery Management Organizations and Regional Arrangements

In executing its function the RSN serves to underpin the important role played by RFBs in the conservation and management of fish stocks.

This role has been stressed in international law and instruments and UNGA resolutions. RFBs face similar challenges in their efforts to support collaborative processes that assist their members in their collective and individual endeavours to achieve sustainable resource use, conservation and management. They reflect the consensus policy position of their Contracting Parties. RFB mandates are varied and include one or more of the following:

- Organisations with a management mandate and organizations that simply support cooperative arrangements for information sharing;
- Convention-based, informal agreement or FAO-affiliated bodies;
- Development and provision of scientific advice;
- Highly migratory oceanic pelagic stocks, demersal and pelagic straddling stocks, shared inland and riverine stocks and anadromous stocks;
- Single species organizations, to organizations dealing with a large number of target species and species taken incidentally, to organizations that address entire ecosystems and multiple industry sectors;
- Artisanal, small scale fisheries or high technological, capital intensive, large scale fisheries.

The members of the institutions participating in the RSN include most States with an economic interest in marine or freshwater fisheries; these states account for the vast majority of the annual global harvest of wild-caught fish. Many inter-governmental and non-government organizations participate as observers in the work of these bodies. .

Members of the RSN are undertaking performance reviews as a mechanism for improving transparency as well as performance. Six fisheries organizations have concluded a performance review and at least six others have commenced or have ongoing review processes. The review processes employed have been similar, largely drawing on the uniform set of criteria drafted at the Review Conference in 2006, but taking into account unique characteristics that may be associated with individual organizations. Each review process involved external experts who were either tasked to carry out the assessment or who reviewed the assessment carried out by an internal panel; in one case, the review was performed by stakeholders and NGOs. Members of those organizations that have completed a review are now actively engaged in programmes of work to assess and implement their review's recommendations and advice.

The most recent meeting of the RSN took place 9-10 March at FAO Headquarters in Rome, Italy. One of the important agenda items was an exchange of ideas and experience of network members in combating IUU fishing. The discussion identified several important factors that should be considered in the design of strategies to combat IUU fishing:

- Port state measures
- Establishment of fishing and fish transport vessel “black lists”
- Catch documentation schemes to enhance traceability of fish products
- The establishment of a global record of fishing vessels
- The capacity of developing countries
- Regional cooperation and information sharing

Issues discussed during RSN biennial meetings include:

- The role of RFBs
- External factors affecting fisheries management
- Global fisheries governance
- IUU fishing
- Overcapacity
- Incorporating ecosystem considerations into management arrangements
- Relations between RFBs and other multi-lateral agencies with shared interests
- Market and trade-related issues
- Small-scale fisheries
- Inland fisheries
- Aquaculture
- Capacity development in developing countries

FAO serves as the secretariat to the RFB Secretariats Network that meets biennially immediately after FAO's Committee on Fisheries meeting. The RSN provides a valuable international resource for disseminating information relating to the Agreement and discussing regional and sub-regional experiences associated with it. More information can be found at <http://www.fao.org/fishery/rsn>.

October 2009

## **SECOND MEETING OF THE REGIONAL FISHERY BODY SECRETARIATS NETWORK**

**Rome, Italy, 9-10 March 2009**

### **DRAFT REPORT**

#### **OPENING OF THE MEETING**

1. The second meeting of the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats Network (RSN-2) (being the sixth meeting of regional fishery bodies) was held at FAO headquarters, Rome, Italy, from 9 to 10 March 2009. Participants included representatives from thirty-two Regional Fishery Body Secretariats and organizations with mandates that are related to fisheries, an office bearer of the United Nation Division for Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea (UN/DOALOS) and the Secretary of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI). Representatives of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department (FI) were also in attendance. A list of participants is in Appendix B.

2. Mr. Ichiro Nomura (Assistant Director-General, FAO/FI) opened the meeting. He described the unique role played by regional fishery bodies (RFBs) in facilitating cooperation for the conservation and management of fish stocks and noted the special recognition accorded to some for their work in the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. Mr. Nomura referred to the wide range of issues addressed by RFBs, and reaffirmed the strong expectation and commitment of FAO to work with RFBs continuously and in a collaborative manner. He noted the consensus of COFI in preferring the current meeting schedule, and undertook to convey these views within FAO. In closing, Mr Nomura emphasized that cooperation and coordination among RFBs was one of the most effective ways to strengthen regional fisheries governance and affirmed that FAO would endeavour to collaborate to facilitate decisions that may be taken during the Meeting. The full text of the Assistant Director-General's statement is in Appendix D.

3. The Chair of the Meeting announced that the Executive Secretary of the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean, Mr Alain Bonzon, would be unable to attend and undertook to convey to him the Meeting's warm wishes for recovery and good health.

#### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND MEETING ARRANGEMENTS**

4. The Meeting adopted the agenda in Appendix A. A list of documents provided to the Meeting is in Appendix C. Mr. Hiromoto Watanabe coordinated meeting arrangements and Ms Judith Swan served as rapporteur.

5. The Chair noted that thematic sessions would be held under Agenda Item 6, the Role of Regional Fishery Bodies. It was agreed that aquaculture would be also be addressed by the group on small-scale and inland fisheries issues, noting that discussion could also take place in relation to aquaculture networks.

6. It was agreed to maintain the status quo regarding the participation of observers in the Meeting so as to preserve the informality of the proceedings and to allow a free exchange of views.

#### **REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF COFI RELATING TO REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES**

7. The Secretary of COFI, Mr Ndiaga Gueye, reviewed COFI-28 issues relevant to RFBs. He noted that there was no specific COFI agenda item on RFBs, but their important role was repeatedly

underscored in several substantial agenda items. In particular, he drew attention to progress in the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (Code of Conduct), noting that response rate to the FAO questionnaire by Members and RFBs was low, and encouraged RFBs to respond more appropriately in future. Referring to deep-sea fisheries, Mr Gueye emphasized the key role of RFBs, particularly with respect to actions agreed in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution on Sustainable Fisheries 61/105 and as agreed by COFI. He noted the development of a vessel identifier system by some RFMOs and noted its possible contribution to the development of a Global Record of Fishing Vessels. He acknowledged that the proposed timing of COFI meetings could conflict with the schedules of some RFMOs. In closing, Mr Gueye reaffirmed the importance of strengthened institutions and FAO's strong commitment to work with RFBs continuously and in a very collaborative manner.

8. The Chair highlighted the following issues from the COFI-28 Report as being important for RFBs.

- Responses to the FAO questionnaire on implementation of the Code of Conduct. (COFI-28 Report, Paragraph 10)

The RSN expressed concern about the low rate of responses to the questionnaire, resulting in a weak information base in relation to the impact of implementation. In this regard, the Meeting encouraged quantitative analysis based on performance indicators to help to assess how the Code is being implemented. Some reasons for the low response rate were discussed. It was agreed that the RSN should promote the Code in the best possible way among RFB members.

- Implementation of the Code of Conduct. (Paragraph 11)

The RSN recognized the important coordinating role that the Network plays in advancing implementation of the Code. It was suggested that responses to the FAO questionnaire on the implementation of the Code of Conduct should be made publicly available. However, a need for confidentiality was understood and it was acknowledged that the FAO summary of responses identifies the respondents and summarizes all information submitted. In the interests of transparency, it was noted that any RFB may decide to make its response to the questionnaire publicly available.

- Implementation of the International Plans of Action (IPOAs) elaborated under the Code of Conduct. (Paragraph 13)

The RSN noted that the Committee agreed on further actions to be taken by RFMO/As in relation to the four IPOAs. Further discussion is under Agenda item 4.

- Fundamental importance of subregional and regional cooperation. (Paragraph 14)

The RSN noted the call by COFI to improve regional cooperation, especially with respect to MCS and IUU fishing. Further discussion is under Agenda items 4(b) and 6(b).

- Performance reviews of regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements (RFMO/A). (Paragraph 15)

The RSN took strong note of the call to strengthen regional governance by conducting and implementing performance reviews, and that consequences of the failure of some RFMO/A members

to implement agreed management measures was to erode the effectiveness and credibility of these organizations. Further discussion is under Agenda item 6(b).

- Failure to implement the Code might undermine its objective and the role of FAO and RFMO/As. (Paragraph 22)

The RSN expressed serious concern about the consequences of failure to implement the Code.

- Development of best practices guidelines for catch documentation schemes and for traceability for consideration by the next Session of COFI:FT. (Paragraph 34)

The RSN noted the recommendation for the Secretariat to develop best practices guidelines, mindful that this issue had been flagged at previous RSN meetings along with the need to review the outcomes on harmonization of catch documentation of the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade. Further discussion is addressed under Agenda item 4(b)(i).

- Regional aquaculture networks. (Paragraph 41)

It was acknowledged that the RSN could facilitate the exchange of information between aquaculture and blue water fisheries and vice versa. Equally, it could assist the development of relevant networks. Further discussion is under Agenda item 6(c).

- Implementation of UNGA Resolution on Sustainable Fisheries 61/105. (Paragraph 52)

The RSN noted COFI's conclusion that, in some cases, additional efforts by RFMO/As were required to respond fully to Resolution 61/105. Further discussion is under Agenda item 5.

- New RFMO/As. (Paragraphs 53, 82)

The Network noted that the establishment of new RFBs (in the South Pacific, North Pacific and Red Sea regions) would promote cooperation in fisheries management. Once established, these organizations would be welcome to become members of the Network. There had been no further developments regarding the establishment of an RFMO in the South China Sea since CWP reported this lacuna to RSN-1.

- Strengthen high seas governance. (Paragraph 61)

The RSN noted that the call to strengthen high seas governance related to both deep-sea fisheries and IUU fishing. The network has a facilitation role in strengthening high seas governance *inter alia* by sharing best practice information. Further discussion is under Agenda items 4(b)(i) and 5.

- Action by RFMO/As to combat IUU fishing. (Paragraph 64)

It was noted that COFI cited measures adopted by RFMOs that have had some success in combating IUU fishing. Further discussion is under Agenda item 4(b)(i).

- Development of a Global Record of Fishing Vessels. (Paragraph 70)

The development by the tuna RFMOs of unique vessel identifier systems and its potential usefulness to the FAO Global Record initiative was noted. Further discussion is under Agenda item 5(b).

- Climate change and fisheries management. (Paragraph 88)

Active collaboration on information gathering encouraged by COFI was noted, and further discussion is under Agenda item 5.

- Developing country assistance and capacity building. (Paragraphs 17, 21, 27, 55, 69, 80, 90 and 91)

The RSN endorsed development assistance and capacity building for developing countries and recognized that without sufficient capacity it would not be possible to attain many of the goals elaborated by COFI and RFMO/As at a global level. It was strongly emphasized that development assistance and capacity building is fundamental to the work of all RFBs.

- High priorities among activities relating to Organization Results of the FAO Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture. (Paragraph 100)

All of the priority activities identified by COFI were noted.

- Small-scale fisheries. (Paragraph 102)

The RSN recognized the importance of small scale fisheries as an organizational result for FAO as a whole. Further discussion is under Agenda item 6, where the issue of how network can make space for such considerations in the future will be addressed.

- Timing of the next COFI meeting. (Paragraph 104)

Some members expressed difficulty with the proposed timing of the next COFI meeting in the later part of 2010, noting conflicts with international and regional meetings.

9. In discussion, it was noted that the role and effectiveness of RFBs in fisheries management is heavily dependent on the financial and human resources available to each and every organization, particularly in the current global economic climate.

## **FACTORS AFFECTING FISHERIES MANAGEMENT**

10. Note was taken of the outcomes from the conference on the World Ocean in Globalization: Challenges for Marine Regions held in August 2008 in Oslo, Norway, sponsored by the Nansen Institute.

11. It was noted that IUU fishing undermines the work of RFBs and diverts financial and human resources, making sustainable management of resources very difficult.

12. Mr David Douman, Senior Fisheries Liaison Officer, International Institutions and Liaison Service, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, briefed the Meeting on current FAO activities with respect to IUU fishing. He announced that the second resumed session of the Technical Consultation to draft a legally-binding agreement on port State measures would be convened in Rome, Italy from 4 to 8 May 2009, and an Expert Consultation on flag State performance, originally called for by the Twenty-seventh Session of COFI, would be held in Rome, Italy from 22 to 26 June 2009. He noted that the Twenty-eighth Session of COFI had also agreed to proceed with a Technical Consultation on flag State performance and reported that FAO would endeavour to coordinate this prior to the next COFI.

13. The RSN strongly emphasized the importance of regional cooperation and robust institutional arrangements to combat IUU fishing on the high seas and particularly in coastal and inland fisheries. It was acknowledged that wherever IUU fishing occurred, it was imperative for RFBs and their members to cooperate and exchange and disseminate good information, ensure adequate resources to deal with the problem, including bringing collective wisdom to bear on it. In relation to recent developments, problems and successes in efforts to combat IUU fishing, the Meeting noted that a range of issues under review in one tuna RFB included: (a) a minimum vessel size limit for inclusion on an IUU vessel list; whether a flag State can exercise a veto in preventing their vessels from being included on an IUU vessel list; (b) varying criteria for inclusion on an IUU vessel list among RFBs and the consequences of automatic listing of vessels from another RFB; and (c) followup on how members monitor landings and implement their obligations for prohibiting IUU vessels from landing their catch.

14. The RSN also noted that tuna organizations were reviewing three other issues in relation to a process for identifying and taking action against IUU fishing. These comprised: (a) recognition of IUU vessel lists from other RFMOs; (b) expanding the reach of penalties for confirmed IUU fishers so that the inclusion of a vessel on an IUU vessel list would result in all other vessels in a fleet owned by that person or entity being listed; and (c) achieving consensus in the decision making process, where flag States of vessels being considered for inclusion on an IUU vessel lists participate in the discussions leading to a listing.

15. In another single tuna RFB, developments included: (a) new modifications on a comprehensive catch documentation scheme; (b) a stricter approach to positive and negative vessel lists, including the possibility of including member countries in the IUU vessel list; and (c) encouraging non-members to join and comply with conservation and management measures.

16. The effectiveness of an IUU vessel list that is maintained by a further RFB for contracting and non-contracting parties was described. Other new developments in that organization include the adoption of measures that deal with the control of nationals, a policy of cooperation for capacity building in respect of both trade documentation and cooperation for contracting parties and non-contracting parties.

17. In one region, controlling access into national zones was used as a RFB compliance tool. This requires good standing on a regional register prior to entry and prohibiting access if a vessel has carried out IUU activities on the high seas such as illegal catch or transshipment. The need for investment in various MCS tools has been highlighted, including strengthening members capacity to conduct joint high seas patrols, addressing cross-jurisdictional issues relating to observers, and commissioning a study of the MCS capacity of all RFB members in the region, with a view to developing the next set of tools. In this regard, one of the options proposed is a regional MCS centre.

18. A RFB with eleven members, three of which are least developed countries, faced a lack of resources and capacity as a key constraint. In addressing this situation, the RFB Members agreed that one Member should take the lead in advancing progress to combat IUU fishing in the region, and as a result two regional fora have been held and regional organizations have been mobilized. A plan of action is being prepared to address the feasibility of setting up a regional MCS centre. Concerted efforts are being made to examine the special requirements of developing countries, and discussions are taking place on how to address this at the resumed session of the Technical Consultation to draft a legally binding agreement on port State measures, with a focus on training and capacity development.

19. The RSN recognized that one of the most important challenges for small scale fisheries is traceability of catch and product. In this respect, there is a strong need for capacity building, especially in monitoring, surveillance and compliance enforcement.

20. The RSN noted the success of a bifocal approach which herds vessels flying flags of non-compliance from the area of an RFB's competence in combination with the introduction of an IUU vessel list where listed vessels are prohibited from receiving services in areas where two or more RFBs cooperate. In addition, the importance has been highlighted where a port State control system requires flag State verification that a vessel has been licensed, has been allocated a catch quota and has been fishing legally.

21. The RSN noted that the minimum size limit of vessels eligible for inclusion on an IUU vessel list should be extended from vessels 24 meters in length to vessels less than 24 meters that are capable of fishing on the high seas. A clear definition of IUU fishing would be needed to confirm that such fishing can occur anywhere, and not just in zones under national jurisdiction as some countries currently assert. With respect to the various procedures adopted by different RFBs for including vessels on IUU vessel lists, it was acknowledged that the current lack of a single, unified vessel list could be problematic in the future establishment of a Global Record of fishing vessels.

22. In addressing compliance enforcement, the successes of one RFB were attributed to proper planning, the building of experience through the exchange of enforcement personnel, use of modern IT for coordination of enforcement efforts and regional cooperation.

23. The RSN agreed that good planning and adequate coordination are essential for effective MCS and compliance enforcement. It was also noted that effective cooperation and planning were key, and that problems arose with the breakdown of compliance at the vessel base and not necessarily by the flag State. The RSN reiterated that funding and coordination are fundamental in effective compliance enforcement.

24. The Chair summarized the discussion, and identified in order of priority the following areas that had repeatedly been addressed.

- Capacity building: the need for the right tools and people to do the job.
- The need for MCS cooperation with respect to information sharing and coordination of activities.
- The clear fact that political mobilization has been helpful, noting that comprehensive information sharing and political mobilization are interdependent.
- The need for transparency. Irrespective of how vessels are listed, publicly available information on vessels facilitates informed judgments by operators. Major factors include public access to information, making available information on RFB IUU vessel lists as well as on vessel identification. Such information would also facilitate recognition by RFBs of the IUU vessel lists of other RFBs.
- Targeting of the operators: knowing who is responsible for the vessels concerned supports compliance processes, including traceability.
- For coastal States, the requirement for fishing vessels to be in good standing offers a means of controlling access for responsible vessels only.

The RSN concurred with this summary.

25. Mr. Stephen Stuart, Global Record Project Manager Fishing Technology Service, FAO outlined FAO development of a Global Record of Fishing Vessels. He explained that the Record was being designed as a tool to combat IUU fishing, and recalled the Expert Consultation on the Development of a Comprehensive Global Record of Fishing Vessels held in Rome, Italy from 25 to 28 February 2008 (FAO Fisheries Report) and programme of work endorsed by the Twenty-eighth Session of COFI. He underlined the importance of assessing MCS in a wider group of user needs, and reported that the experts had agreed that a Global Record would only be useful if a unique vessel identifier were adopted this

would offer increased transparency and traceability. In this regard he expressed interest in the work of the tuna bodies, and an intention to collaborate with the work they have undertaken. Mr. Stuart stated that the ultimate outcome would be a technical report to outline a range of matters, especially costs and benefits and recommendations on development of a comprehensive Global Record.

26. In discussion, it was noted that the Global Record could cover fisheries support (i.e. refrigerated transport and supply) vessels, as well as fishing vessels. The RSN noted that the outcomes of the meeting of tuna RFMOs to be held in June in San Sebastian, Spain (Kobe 2) relating to work on a unique vessel identifier could be seen as a component of a pilot project to test the Global Record's implementation.

27. The potential role of the CWP in combating IUU fishing was noted, including its service as a mechanism for global coordination and data sharing, and for ensuring consistency of data. It was noted that the CWP could provide a forum to address information requirements for a unique vessel identifier, and less urgently the requirements for data to be reported correctly to facilitate the implementation of port State measures. Ms Sachiko Tsuji, Secretary, Coordination Working Party on Fishery Statistics (CWP), specifically requested the RSN to consider using the CWP to develop information systems, especially for the Global Record. The RSN noted that, in terms of end use of information, CWP has an extremely important role to play.

28. The Chair drew attention to the issue of catch documentation harmonization as an outcome of the Eleventh Session of the Sub-Committee on Fish Trade, Bremen, Germany, 2-6 June 2008 (RSN/II/2009/Inf.6) and endorsed by the Twenty-eighth Session of COFI. He noted that harmonization of the documentation schemes is still an objective of the FAO. While there has been limited commitment to changing the reporting forms with respect for catch documentation and certification schemes, the use of electronic data has improved sharing and harmonization of data largely attributable to the contemporaneous nature of the data. It was noted that modification of individual schemes would not be required as long as similar categories of information were collected. The Session identified the information that would be needed, and FAO has been asked to develop harmonized procedures in that regard.

29. The RSN noted that harmonized catch document information is necessary for verification and certification of:

- catches;
- landings
- transshipments;
- export and import operations;
- fish caught for farming purposes; and
- landings for domestic consumption.

30. The Chair drew attention to the Sub-Committee's discussions on ecolabelling, and to the conclusions and recommendations of COFI (COFI-28 Report, Paragraphs 26-32). It was noted that some developing countries may have concerns on the question of ecolabelling.

**(c) Overcapacity**

31. The RSN noted the IPOA on the Management of Capacity, and that the ongoing work on the matter is important to sustainable fisheries management. It was recognized that IATTC is the only RFMO that has a strict capacity limitation regime in place.

32. In one region, overcapacity has been identified as a driver of other problems including IUU fishing. However, tackling this in the context of small-scale fisheries would require balancing overcapacity mitigation with considerations of community livelihoods. It would be important to continue sending the message to governments that sustaining overcapacity is doing no favours to fisheries management in the long term. In this regard, the RSN acknowledged the importance of capacity building, outreach and education.

33. The RSN noted that overcapacity will be addressed by the tuna RFBs meeting Kobe 2 in the form of a special workshop. The RSN also noted that tuna RFBs are addressing socio economic impacts. A key consideration in this regard is how capacity restrictions impact on coastal states wishing to develop tuna fisheries.

**(d) UNGA Resolution 61/105**

34. Mr. Andre Tahindro, Secretary of the Informal Consultations of States Parties to the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (UNFSA), provided information on behalf of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (DOALOS) to highlight developments in the work of DOALOS that are directly relevant to the work of RFBs. He reported on the status of UNSFA and on the forthcoming UNSFA Review Conference in 2010, the eighth round of informal consultations of States Parties to UNSFA, implementation of UNGA 61/105 and the informal consultative process on oceans and the law of the sea. The full text of Mr. Tahindro's statement is in Appendix E.

35. The Chair recalled the availability to developing States of the assistance funds from Part VII Trust funds of the UNFSA. He also noted that RFBs will be called on to contribute to the Secretary General's report for the UNFSA Review Conference. The RSN acknowledged the importance of RFB input to the Conference.

36. The RSN again emphasized the vital role of capacity building and attendance at meetings for developing member countries, and it was considered important that different options be made available to support such activities. The RSN urged RFBs to bring information on the use of Part VII funds to the attention of their members.

37. The RSN recalled that information on the Network's activities had been presented in 2005 to the informal consultations of States parties to UNFSA (ICSP). It noted the positive benefits for the RSN in continuing such communications. It agreed that the RSN should provide a statement for presentation at ICSP-8 (16 to 19 March 2009 in New York, USA). The statement is attached as Appendix F and will be delivered by the incoming Chair of the RSN.

38. The RSN agreed that a report of its 2009 meeting would be presented to ICSP-9 in 2010. It was agreed that the continuity of RSN information presentations to the ICSPs should be continued.

**RESPONSIBLE FISHERIES AND MANAGEMENT IN AQUATIC, PARTICULARLY MARINE, ECOSYSTEMS**

39. The Chair encouraged an open discussion on responsible fisheries and management in aquatic, particularly marine, ecosystems. He recalled a range of issues that have been discussed including the need to strengthen high seas governance through implementation of UNGA Resolution 61/105 on sustainable fisheries, port State measures, flag State performance and the Global Record of Fishing Vessels. He drew attention to discussions on discards, the results from the High Level Conference on Food Security in June 2009 and the meeting of parties to the Regional Seas Convention from 25-27 November 2008. Additional considerations included a global approach to marine protected areas (MPAs)

and their designation, developments to regulate bottom fisheries, vulnerable marine ecosystem designation and management, monitoring bycatch of nontarget dependent and related species, implementation of the IPOA- Sharks and threats to fisheries by climate change. He noted the relevance of RSN-2 documents 6, 9, 11 and information documents 8 and 15 (see Appendix C).

40. In addressing the ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF), the RSN pointed out that Members may wish to consider the role of new technologies in facilitating ecosystem management. One tuna RFB reported their work in this regard, noting developments in scoping activities and priorities for stock assessment and capacity building.

41. The need for a global approach to MPAs was suggested, noting that the emphasis should be on fisheries management as this is sometimes not taken into account. Other impediments to establishing MPAs include cultural restrictions and management of non-target species.

42. A further MPA issue relates to promoting area networks without due regard to alternative employment for fishers, and those which establish no-take fishing zones where sustainable fishing is possible. In this regard the RSN took note of the value of MPAs as a tool for fisheries management, but encouraged a deeper understanding of the complexities and consequences of their establishment. The important role of scientific advice in this regard was emphasized.

43. The RSN acknowledged that its regional seas counterparts favour initiatives to form a representative network of MPAs, but that more dialogue with fishers should be undertaken. For example, one RFB finds it more useful to declare closed areas establishing measures for the whole ecosystem. Dialogue with other organizations (e.g. IMO and ISA) focusing on the marine environment is being undertaken.

44. One Programme reported on regional MCS initiatives, including the January 2008 Chittagong Resolution on MCS, which included plans to develop a regional MCS action plan. This Programme includes the formulation of a regional plan on sharks and a global project on safety at sea to link marine safety considerations with fisheries management.

45. The broad understanding of EAF attributed to one RFB considered it necessary to plan and support capacity building initiatives among its members.

46. The RSN underscored the difficulty for some RFB members, especially developing countries, to understand the EAF. In this regard, it agreed that it would be a high priority to improve understanding through outreach, education and capacity development.

47. One RFB reported on the scientific discovery of vulnerable marine areas that overlap with intensively fished areas. This situation is likely to be addressed later in 2009.

48. The RSN noted that FAO is about to declare a large marine ecosystem (LME) project for the Bay of Bengal, and that the Nansen Institute has initiated a number of EAF related projects in southwest Africa in cooperation with SWIOFC.

49. The provision of scientific advice to fisheries managers by ICES on a wide range of topics is evolving, and the need for more clarity of scientific information in the context of multiple objectives was underscored. The increasing importance of scientific advice on climate change was reported, as well as development of advice on good environmental status indicators for fisheries and ecosystem management as well as interactions between predators and prey.

50. An RFB noted, it is essential that an EAF be pursued for the sustainable management of salmon. The RFB concerned has developed a plan of action on habitat, and salmon aquaculture was considered to be an important issue, particularly in relation to the transmittal of genetic abnormalities, disease and parasite impacts.

51. For marine mammals, the multispecies aspects of management were underlined by another RFB. The interaction among predators and prey is being studied, and bycatch monitoring activities are being considered as important.

52. An ecosystem risk study is being undertaken by one RFMO, and is likely to be completed by the end of 2010. This RFB has adopted binding measures relating to seabirds, sharks and sea turtles. Efforts have been made to address the catching of non-target finfish species and fishing with long driftnets has been prohibited. Two high seas areas in the West and Central Pacific will be closed to tuna fishing from 1 January 2010. These encompass 450 000 square kilometres of ocean. Another two areas are under consideration.

53. In another region, activities were described where the objectives of the RFB Convention concerned provide guidelines relating to the EAF and application of precaution in the face of uncertainty. Related measures include a ban on driftnets and gillnets and a prohibition on the taking of sharks. A process of bioregionalization to identify specific areas by their biotic and abiotic character has been undertaken. The examination of potential areas for MPAs, including multiple use MPAs, is under evolution. Measures have been promulgated on bottom fishing, including definitions of vulnerable marine ecosystems. The requirements of UNGA Resolution 61/105 on vulnerable marine ecosystems had been met and six areas have been closed to fishing. Bycatch measures have also been initiated. Climate change is being addressed, and account is being taken of potential interactions between predators and prey where prey are also fishery target species. In the latter respect, management measures have allowed for escapement of prey species where these are targeted by both fisheries and predators.

54. The RSN acknowledged progress and the high levels of consistency in measures adopted to mitigate seabird bycatch by fisheries. It noted that there is still a need for ongoing research on the effectiveness of some measures and development of new mitigation techniques.

55. The RSN noted that ACAP had reported that it was entering into MOUs with RFBs to facilitate the exchange of information on seabird distribution, and the need to develop sea-based observer programmes targeting seabird bycatch. The RSN reemphasized the ongoing need for information exchange on seabird bycatch mitigating measures between relevant RFBs.

56. In summary, the Chair noted that issues arising from general discussion highlighted the lack of uniform understanding of what is meant by an EAF. He also noted that financial and human resource capacity limitations are being faced by a number of RSN members in addressing the EAF and in providing for the mitigation of potential impacts of fisheries on non-target species.

## **ROLE OF REGIONAL FISHERY BODIES – THEMATIC SESSION**

### **(a) Presentation of the new FAO Fisheries Circular on the Role of RFBs**

57. Ms. Florence Poulain, Fishery Liaison Officer, International Institutions and Liaison Service, Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, FAO, presented background to the publication by FAO of Fisheries Circulars since the 1980s that provide information on RFBs. She explained that the latest publication, in 2003, had also provided an analysis of emerging trends in fisheries governance by RFBs, and an updated version was currently under preparation on the basis of responses to questionnaires that

had been distributed to forty-one RFBs in 2009. Ms. Poulain reported that thirty-one responses had been received, and that the updated Circular was expected to be published in the coming months.

58. The Network noted this development and encouraged those RFBs that had not yet responded to the FAO questionnaire on RFBs to do so.

**(b) RFMO/RFB performance enhancement**

59. Mr Kjartan Hoydal, Secretary of NEAFC and Chair of the theme session relating to RFMO/RFB performance enhancement, reported on the outcomes. Six fisheries organizations (NEAFC, ICCAT, IOTC, CCAMLR, NASCO, and CCSBT) reported that they have already concluded performance reviews and many others have started with the process (e.g. GFCM, NPAFC, IATTC, ICES). NAFO has just finalized a comprehensive reform process and intends to review its performance after most elements of the reform have been implemented. WCPFC is only 3 years old and anticipates a full performance review in a few years time. SEAFDEC reported that it is responsible for scientific assessment and advice only and has not yet initiated a performance review. All final reports are accessible through the public web pages of the organizations. The UN DOALOS representative communicated his satisfaction at this progress.

60. The theme session noted the many similarities of the procedures set up by the different organizations. In all cases the review process focused on similar areas including the efficiency and adequacy of management and conservation measures, scientific assessment and advice, compliance and control, and finance and administration. In some cases the review panel also assessed the cooperation with other organizations as well as transparency and public relations. Furthermore, all reviews compared the performance of the organization with the requirements formulated by international agreements such as UNCLOS, UNFSA, Code of Conduct and relevant UNGA Resolutions.

61. Each review process involved external experts who were either tasked to carry out the assessment or who reviewed the assessment carried out by an internal panel (CCSBT). NASCO reported that its review was actually performed by stakeholders and NGOs who during dedicated meetings gave feedback on their perception of how well the organization was performing in different areas. Opportunities were also provided to question Contracting Parties on their implementation of and compliance with NASCO measures. The results of the reviews differed considerably among organizations – some were found to operate quite satisfactorily, others are faced with substantial recommendations for improvement. All representatives reported that their organizations were committed to take on board the suggestions made by the review panels even if that involved serious consideration of amending the Convention (as in the case of IOTC).

62. The RSN agreed that the approaches to performance review needed to be flexible. Each RFB is in a different position with respect to the Parties involved, their interaction with organization, the species managed, the NGO community involved, the other stakeholders and the nature of its remit. As long as there is a real element of an independent outside view of what the organization is achieving or not achieving, the RSN believed that each performance review should have its own characteristics.

63. The RSN also recommended that FAO produce a summary report of all performance reviews carried out by regional fisheries organizations. This would enhance transparency and comparability of the process and could prove very useful for a future assessment of the effect the global review process has had on the efficiency of managing and preserving the fishery resources.

64. Mr Hiromoto Watanabe, Fishery Liaison Officer, International Institutions and Liaison Service, FAO, informed the RSN that funds were available to prepare a FAO Fisheries Circular summarising the

outcomes of the various performance reviews. The RSN welcomed this information and agreed on the benefits of an analysis of outcomes as well as a compilation of information. The analysis should refer to areas such as the terms of reference of the performance review, common generalities, conservation and management, science, financial administration, dispute resolution and decisionmaking.

65. The RSN agreed that the publication of the document should be undertaken in 2009 if possible.

66. In addition, Mr Ichiro Nomura indicated that thought was being given to producing an information document for COFI on the performance review process. He emphasized that it would be very important for COFI to be notified of the action being taken by RFBs because it would provide information for those which have conducted reviews and encouragement for those which have not yet done so. He undertook to consult with members of the RSN on the content of the paper.

**(c) Small-scale and inland fisheries and aquaculture**

67. Mr Simon Funge-Smith, Secretary of APFIC presented information on small-scale and inland fisheries and aquaculture. He referred uncertainty in identifying small-scale fisheries, and suggested that the RSN may be able to assist in clarifying the concept. Interactions with inland fisheries, aquaculture and the impacts of climate change were elaborated.

68. The RSN noted that the parallel session had emphasized the problem of undervaluation of small-scale fisheries in terms of national planning and policy. It examined issues that related to the work of the RSN and linkages to RFMOs and to inland fisheries where FAO could play a role in the sensitization of the agriculture sector for fisheries, market chains and value chains. It stressed that food quality is undervalued, especially in the context of nutritional value and market activities. The interlinkages between these sub-sectors and fisheries access, IUU fishing and port State measures were noted, and the RSN agreed that RFBs have a major role in outreach and advising in this context. For example, they could explain how measures such as catch documentation will affect small-scale fisheries and aquaculture relating to the work of the RSN. It was suggested that the RSN website portal could reflect the special interests of small-scale fisheries and aquaculture. For aquaculture, it was suggested that RFBs have a major role in promoting risk assessment and a precautionary approach. An outline of the session's presentation of its conclusions is in Appendix G.

69. The RSN expressed deep appreciation for the comprehensive and highly informative presentation. It underscored the continuum of increasing interaction among fisheries and aquaculture sub-sectors from deepwater fishing to inland rivers. The RSN agreed that it would be very constructive to identify mechanisms for interaction among the sub-sectors of small-scale fisheries and aquaculture. The RSN took note that the sub-sector of recreational fisheries should be given further consideration in the future.

70. The RSN acknowledged that the EAF is inordinately difficult to address in the context of the above sub-sectors and emphasized a need for education and future strategic, and projection, planning to be undertaken.

71. The RSN also expressed deep appreciation for the opportunity to attend thematic sessions, but noted that both themes addressed at this meeting were of significant interest to some of the participants and the choice of session was difficult. It was agreed that consideration should therefore be given to holding thematic sessions in the future, but not necessarily in parallel. Further discussion is under Agenda item 9.

## **STATUS OF FIRMS AND CWP DEVELOPMENTS**

72. Mr Marc Taconet, FIGIS Officer, Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistic Service, FAO, presented recent developments in the Fishery Resources Monitoring System ( FIRMS), and drew attention to cooperation with its partners and objectives stated on its webpage, <http://firms.fao.org/firms>. He described the marine inventory (fishery fact sheets), explained FIRMS geographic coverage, and demonstrated features on the webpage. He noted that extra budgetary funds were available to assist partners to fill information gaps and fulfil reporting responsibilities, and sought feedback from RFBs.

73. The RSN noted that the number of visitors to the FIRMS website has doubled in the past year and visitors are spending less time on the content. It acknowledged that there is room for improvement and that identification of the FIRMS target audience, along with ways to adapt FIRMS products to its target audience, was under review.

74. The RSN advised that, while generally pleased with progress, it would prefer FIRMS to focus on fisheries management at present in order that an authoritative and reliable source of information for fisheries management can be developed. In this regard, the RSN agreed that priorities should be to generate comprehensive fishery fact sheets and expand the partnerships.

75. It was recalled that ownership in a reporting system was identified as important to RFBs at their first meeting, and an element of the early process was the goal of producing biennial reporting on the status and trends of fisheries. The RSN noted that a FAO fishery officer had been recently recruited to address this, and it was emphasized that this should continue to be a goal. The information provided by RFBs should be linked as closely and transparently as possible to ownership of the FIRMS process by RFBs.

76. The RSN noted that the concept of FIRMS as a one-stop, global, fishery information shop was welcomed by their members, but that RFBs could do more in promoting the attached benefits of having the facility available. The RSN encouraged FIRMS to send ebulletins in a timely manner to all RFBs in the Network, updating them on new developments.

77. Ms Tsuji reported on three major developments in CWP: (a) the establishment of an aquaculture group and, when procedures and terms of reference are amended, of an independent group on capture fisheries that is expected to be formalized in 2010; (b) the current focus of activities is the revision of a handbook for the aquaculture component to reflect emerging requests for data reporting, including for the EAF, and for the format of reporting (the importance of participation by members was emphasized in this regard); and (c) a mechanism for the integration into one place of existing statistics on the catch database. In the process experiments with IT technology are being undertaken to guarantee automatic updating of the FAO catch database.

78. The RSN noted that both the FIRMS steering committee and CEP will meet in February 2010.

## **RSN WEBPAGE**

79. Mr Hiromoto Watanabe, Fishery Liaison Officer, International Institutions and Liaison Service, FAO, referred to paragraph 99 of the RSN-1 Report which mandated FAO to circulate a concept note on establishment of an RSN webpage to be used as a common platform for RSN intersessional discussion. He announced that Japan has provided extrabudgetary funding to elaborate a pilot webpage, which was presented by Mr Aureliano Gentile, Fishery Information Management Officer, Fisheries and Aquaculture Information and Statistic Service, FAO. The online presentation showed the webpage, which was restricted for RSN members pending a decision by the Network.

80. The RSN complimented FAO, Mr Watanabe and the others for their good work. It agreed that the RSN webpage should be publicly available and reflect the informal nature of the RSN. It was agreed that the content should be crisp and concise, avoid duplication, provide links to other websites wherever possible and should not be expanded in the short term. Further, a system for updating information would be crucial. The RSN encouraged RFBs to create links to the RSN Network webpage on their respective websites.

#### **ADVICE AND FUTURE WORK**

81. The RSN agreed that the theme-based discussions had been highly valuable at the current meeting, and this approach should continue on the basis of cross-cutting themes. The RSN considered that a session on IUU fishing would allow discussion of some fundamental definitions, particularly in relation to the term IUU. The scientific aspect of fisheries in the management process was also considered, especially in terms of sources, processes and the interface between science and management, acknowledging that all organizations are different in the way they generate scientific advice and present it to managers/decision-makers.

82. Noting the extensive discussion that had taken place on best practices at the current meeting, it was suggested that best practices be considered in terms of science, MCS, environmental mitigation (such as the impact of fishing activities, pollution, incidental bycatch, bycatch, marine mammals), decisionmaking, transparency and implementation of the ecosystem and precautionary approaches. RFB performance reviews would also be important.

83. It was agreed that the membership of the RSN should remain as it currently stands, considering the growing importance of the global agenda for fisheries governance, and that RSN meets for a short period of time every two years. In this regard, it was recognized that the opportunity for interaction among RFB Secretariats must be maximized if the RSN is to fulfil its objectives. However, the Meeting endorsed the concept of inviting key organizations to make presentations on relevant agenda items to inform the members from time to time.

84. The RSN acknowledged that, as a Network, funds regrettably would be unavailable for interpretation during meetings, which would be conducted in English. It was agreed that this should be made clear to the Network prior to each meeting.

#### **ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIRS**

85. The RSN acclaimed the nomination of Kjartan Hoydal, Secretary of NEAFC, as the Chair of RSN, and the leaders of SEAFDEC and LVFO as the two Vice-chairs.

#### **DATE AND VENUE OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE REGIONAL FISHERY BODY SECRETARIATS NETWORK (RSN-3)**

86. Most RFBs indicated they would be unable to attend RSN-3 if it were convened separately from COFI, primarily due to constraints of time and budget. Several RFBs also indicated they would be unable to attend if COFI is rescheduled for late 2010 because of conflicts with their annual sessions and UN meetings. The RSN agreed that the interests of the network would be served if the Meeting remained adjacent to COFI but that the timing of COFI would significantly impact on Network's work and representativeness.

87. In this context, the RSN aligned itself with the COFI-28 Report, paragraph 105, and agreed that it could be useful for RFB Secretariats to contact their members encouraging them to seek a more favourable decision from the FAO Conference on the timing of COFI sessions and that this should remain unchanged from the current practice. In this way, maximum participation would be promoted both in COFI and the RSN.

#### **OTHER MATTERS**

88. Ms Joanna Fischer, Executive Secretary of NAFO, stated that she would be leaving NAFO and, noting the great strides of the Network over the past six years in which she has attended meetings, stated that she would remain interested in its work.

89. On behalf of the Network, Mr Victor Restrepo, Assistant Executive Secretary of ICCAT, thanked the Chair for his unselfish dedication to the RSN over the years. He drew attention to the great body of work achieved by the RSN under the Chair's guidance, and stated that all colleagues pay tribute to him for his excellent leadership. In response, the Chair noted that the world of fisheries management is full of challenges and reflected that it has been rewarding to observe the strong single network which has evolved where issues may be considered and easily communicated among colleagues. He also thanked Ms Swan and Mr Watanabe for all their support over the six years he had been in the Chair.

#### **ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

#### **CLOSE OF MEETING**

90. The Chair closed the Meeting at 1430 hours on 10 March 2009.