



OUTCOMES OF THE 6th TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 1 FEBRUARY 2024

PURPOSE

To inform participants at the 7th Technical Committee on Management Procedure (TCMP07) of the outcomes of the 6th Session of the Technical Committee on Management Procedure (TCMP06), held on 5th to 6th May 2023, relating to the work of the TCMP.

BACKGROUND

The TCMP06 meeting reviewed progress and results of the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) work on major IOTC tuna species, discussed elements of the Management Procedures that require a decision by the Commission, and included the presentation of MSE results. The Technical Committee on Management Procedure was intended as a formal communication channel to facilitate the exchange of information and views between fishery scientists and managers. The Report of the 6th TCMP provided the following recommendations:

- (Para. 79) The TCMP **NOTED** the recommendation by the SC that it is advisable to have focused dialogue with managers on those MSEs which are more advanced such as that for SKJ and SWO. The TCMP therefore **RECOMMENDED** that a virtual TCMP is convened early in 2024 with a special focus on the MSEs for SKJ and SWO and that it be held back-to-back with the WPM(MSE) meeting.

DISCUSSION

The TCMP also discussed the workplan and future direction of TCMP, the actions for next iteration of management procedure development. The following extracts from the TCMP06 Report are provided here for the consideration:

- (Para. 39) The TCMP **NOTED** that the MP testing (for skipjack) included a maximum change of 15% in TAC setting, and further **NOTED** that it would be useful to consult with CPCs when discussing what is the appropriate level of the TAC change in light of that the catch for skipjack is quite variable. The TCMP **AGREED** to consider four scenarios for the maximum TAC change: (1) a symmetric 15% (2) a symmetric 25% (3) asymmetric 25% (upward) and 15% (downward) (4) asymmetric 15% (upward) and 10% (downward). The TCMP also **AGREED** to consider stability clauses that are disabled when biomass falls below certain safety values (e.g. Blim).
- (Para. 47) The TCMP suggested the following maximum change in TAC setting (for swordfish) be included in the MP testing for swordfish (1) symmetric 15% change (2) symmetric 10% change (3) asymmetric change of 15% (upward) and 10% (downward). The TCMP again **REQUESTED** to consider stability clauses that are disabled when biomass falls below certain safety values (e.g. Blim).
- (Para. 48) The TCMP **NOTED** that the data-based MP considered for skipjack and swordfish MSE are considerably different. The slope-based data MP for swordfish has a long history in IOTC whereas the hockey-stick data MP tested for skipjack is a novelty. The TCMP **AGREED** that using similar MP or a common approach will help the managers to better understand the MSE process. However, the consideration of MP should also take into account the differences in biological characteristics of species resulting in different approaches being more appropriate for some species. TCMP suggested that consistency would be preferable in MP design, but it may also be species specific when appropriate.
- (Para. 52) The TCMP discussed and **AGREED** that there was no need to continuously recondition an operating model, unless the most recent stock assessment showed that the stock currently falls outside the range of plausible scenarios estimated within the MSE.
- (Para. 54) The TCMP **NOTED** that there were significantly differing scientific views on the use of MSY and depletion-based reference points and approaches in MSE testing and MP development (in general across species) and noted some of the technical challenges and uncertainties associated with estimating MSY. The TCMP **REQUESTED** that the WPM(MSE) continue to discuss and consider this issue in the further progression of its work.



The TCMP also noted CPCs views both for and against the idea of seeking that future MSE testing of MPs for each species should explore utilization of multiple operating models approaches.

- (Para. 55) However, the TCMP **NOTED** that using two different sets of reference points across different MPs could lead to confusion for managers and the TCMP were not able to agree on which would be most suitable, so the TCMP **REQUESTED** that the WPM(MSE) continue to discuss the use of the two reference points for the outputs of the MPs for all species.
- (Para. 60) The TCMP **NOTED** that the guidelines for the provision of exceptional circumstances for IOTC species MPs are available from Appendix 6A of IOTC-2021-SC24-R_Rev1 and **AGREED** to continue with this approach for future MP development and implementation. The management actions by the Commission have yet to be specified.
- (Para. 71) The TCMP **NOTED** that the current timeline agreed for MP development only runs until 2024. In addition, there have been delays in the development of MPs for YFT and ALB and advancement in that for SWO. As such the TCMP **AGREED** that a revision of the current timeline is required.
- (Para. 77) The TCMP **REQUESTED** that the developers should reduce the technical details in their presentations to the TCMP and limit these details to the appropriate forums such as the WPM(MSE).
- (Para. 78) The TCMP **REQUESTED** that the Commission, at S27, consider ways to further improve the TCMP functioning.

RECOMMENDATION/S

That the TCMP:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IOTC–2024–TCMP07–03 which outlined the outcomes of the 6th Technical Committee on Management Procedure, and **AGREE** to consider how best to provide the commission with the information it needs, in order to satisfy the Commission’s requests, throughout the course of the current TCMP meeting.