



---

## UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> IPHC PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

PREPARED BY: IPHC STAFF (S. KEITH & D. WILSON; 10 JANUARY 2017)

---

### PURPOSE

To provide the Commission with an opportunity to review and update the current status of implementation for each of the recommendations arising from the Report of the 1<sup>st</sup> IPHC Performance Review Panel (PRIPHC01).

### BACKGROUND

In response to calls from the international community for a review of the performance of Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs), the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) agreed in 2011 to implement a process of Performance Review. The IPHC contracted with CONCUR, Inc., a U.S.-based firm, to undertake the review. CONCUR performed its work independently of IPHC Commissioners and staff, and concluded its report to the Commission in April 2012.

In undertaking the Performance Review, the contractor relied on the following approaches to assess the Commission's work and practices, track effectiveness, and gauge the need for revised approaches:

- 1) Conducting a set of 43 in-depth interviews with a representative and diverse set of stakeholders;
- 2) Observing the 2011 Interim and 2012 Annual Meetings and reviewing Commission background materials;
- 3) Reviewing practices at other regional fishery management organizations; and
- 4) Drawing on its professional judgment and experience.

In 2012, the contractor published a report outlining 12 recommendations (containing 39 parts) to improve the functioning of the IPHC ([McCreary & Brooks, CONCUR, Inc. 2012](#)).

In January 2014, the Commission issued a Progress Report, documenting the Commission's response to the 1<sup>st</sup> IPHC Performance Review ([PERFORMANCE REVIEW 2012: A Progress Report](#)).

### DISCUSSION

At the 92<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission held in January 2016 (AM92), Contracting Parties noted the status of implementation of each of the recommendations arising from the report of the 1<sup>st</sup> IPHC Performance Review.

Following the Commission Work Meeting held in September 2016, it was agreed that a revised format could be developed by the IPHC Secretariat to facilitate improved tracking of implementation of the Performance Review recommendations.

Noting the above, the Recommendations arising from the 1<sup>st</sup> Performance Review of the IPHC are provided at [Appendix A](#), with responsibilities, updates, timelines for implementation, and proposed priorities, incorporated for the Commission's consideration.

**RECOMMENDATION/S**

That the Commission:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IPHC-2017-AM093-17 which details the status of each of the recommendations from the 1<sup>st</sup> IPHC Performance Review (PRIPHC01).
- 2) **REVIEW** and **FINALIZE** the status table, including the Program of Work with proposed timelines and priorities for each recommendation.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**: Update on progress regarding the implementation of the 1<sup>st</sup> IPHC Performance Review recommendations

## APPENDIX A

UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> IPHC PERFORMANCE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

GOVERNANCE	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<p><b>1. Adopt clear and comprehensive protocols / rules of procedure</b></p> <p>1.1 Update and expand the existing Rules of Procedure for the Commission, Secretariat and each current stakeholder body (PAG, Conference Board and RAB).</p>	<p><i>Commission, IPHC Staff, Advisory Bodies</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing:</b></p> <p><b>Commission:</b> The Commission's Rules of Procedure were updated in 2014 and incorporate a requirement for review and revision every two (2) years. A proposed revision will be tabled at the IM92 (2016), for adoption at AM093 in 2017.</p> <p><b>PAG:</b> Rules of Procedure were developed for the PAG, which were endorsed by the Commission in 2014</p> <p><b>CB:</b> Rules of Procedure were developed for the CB, which were endorsed by the Commission in 2015.</p> <p><b>RAB:</b> Draft Rules of Procedure were developed for the RAB in 2013, but these have not been formalized or endorsed by the Commission. At the 2016 RAB meeting (RAB18), the RAB agreed to a process for developing draft Rules of Procedure for the RAB, to be presented to the Commission for adoption.</p> <p><b>MSAB:</b> Rules of Procedure have been drafted for the MSAB in 2015 and 2016, and will be considered by the Commission for adoption at AM093 in 2017.</p>	<p>2013-2014 - 2016/2017</p> <p>2013/2014 – 2016/2017</p> <p>2014/2015 – 2016/2017</p> <p>2012/2013 – 2016/2017</p> <p>2016/2017</p>	<p>High</p>

<p><b>2. Improve Commission transparency</b></p> <p>2.1 Conduct the bulk of the Commission's deliberations at the Interim and Annual meetings in public.</p>	<p><i>Commission</i></p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commission decided to treat all meetings as open unless specifically closed (meetings pertaining to personnel or financial discussions are expected to be closed). This would include the opportunity for attendees and web audience participants to engage the Commission in two-way dialogue during the meeting.</p> <p>These changes were put into effect on a trial basis for the 2012-2013 public meeting cycle. The agendas for those meetings were changed to incorporate more time for public comment and discussion, and the web broadcast was modified to allow submission of comments and questions from the on-line audience.</p> <p>In addition, more meeting materials and updates were posted, and posted earlier, at the IPHC website than had been previous practice. This greatly increased the information available to the public before, during, and after the meetings.</p> <p>The Commission also directed the CB and PAG to open their meetings to the public.</p>	<p>2012 +</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>2.2 The Commission should retain the flexibility to conduct Commission-only retreats to foster candid deliberations on its own internal mechanisms and effectiveness.</p>	<p><i>Commission</i></p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commissioners meet daily at the Annual and Interim Meetings for brief planning Sessions. In addition, the Commissioners meet once per year for a 2-day closed Work Meeting to plan for the Interim and Annual Sessions.</p>	<p>2013 +</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>2.3 Discussion summaries from any in camera sessions – whether as part of the Interim/Annual meeting cycle or as a separate retreat – should be produced and made available (within four to six weeks) to any interested party. Exceptions should be made for those items (i.e., personnel and contractual matters) appropriately deemed confidential.</p>		<p><b>Partially complete &amp; Ongoing:</b></p> <p>Although the Commission produces 'Minutes' for its annual and interim meetings, these are not made available unless after the subsequent annual or interim meeting (12-month delay).</p> <p>No minutes/Report are currently being made public from the annual Commission Work Meeting.</p> <p>Revisions to meeting reporting formats and timelines are being implemented by the IPHC Secretariat in conjunction with the 2016-2017 meeting cycle.</p>	<p>2013 +</p> <p>2016 +</p>	<p>High</p>

<p>2.4 Refrain from taking policy actions in executive session. Aside from personnel matters, contractual issues and/or pending litigation, the Commission should refrain from taking policy actions in executive session.</p>	<p><i>Commission</i></p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commissioners reserve the right to hold closed Sessions when discussing all sensitive matters. However, wherever possible, the rationale for making decisions in closed session is communicated during public sessions.</p>	<p>2013 +</p>	<p>High</p>
<p><b>3. Revisit Stakeholder Engagement Structure</b></p> <p>3.1 Adopt a multi-step process over the next two years to transition the current stakeholder advisory arrangement into a unified, integrated body.</p>	<p><i>Commission; IPHC Secretariat</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing:</b> Many comments were received regarding this recommendation, and the majority did not support the recommendation related to one integrated advisory body, although there was limited support for alternatives similar to the U.S. council process advisory bodies with limited participation. There was some support for other elements of the recommendation, including updating rules of procedure, improved accreditation processes, public comment periods, and national section voting, with a range of views expressed on these subjects.</p> <p>The Commission assessed that it would be better served by retaining the current CB, PAG, and RAB structures, and decided against consolidating its advisory bodies into one. CB, PAG, and RAB were asked to recommend improvements to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of their processes.</p> <p>In addition, the Commission decided to expand its advisory structure by adding the MSAB and SRB to meet particular new and specialized advisory needs.</p> <p>For the future, the Commission expects that improvements to advisory body functionality will be made in the efforts to improve transparency and to develop their rules of procedure and define roles and responsibilities per Recommendations #1 and #2.</p>	<p>2013 +</p>	<p>Medium</p>

RESEARCH	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<p><b>4. Develop Strategic Approach to Research</b></p> <p>4.1 Develop a strategic Five Year Research Plan that links research projects to Commission objectives, with an accompanying and predictable budget. The Research Plan should address the specific organizing questions that structure the research, as well as the timeline of projects and deliverables. The Research Plan should also address specific objectives of cooperative research. Some specific topics to address may include size at age, migration, and impacts of bycatch, but these should be revised and confirmed as the Research Plan is drafted.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> The IPHC Secretariat continues to refine the Commission's research planning and execution, to include clear linkage between the 5-Year Research Plan and annual planning. In addition, the annual research planning process is being revised to add rigor and strengthen its connection to long-term research goals and priorities.</p>		High
<p>4.2 Bolster and formalize RAB. The RAB currently lacks any written Protocols/Rules of Procedure nor does it have any formal composition. Consistent with the steps outlined above to have clear guidelines and balanced participation, we recommend the Commission take steps to formally establish the RAB with associated objectives, participation criteria and other operational aspects.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> As noted at the discussion for Recommendation 1, at its 2016 meeting (RAB18) the RAB agreed to a process for developing draft Rules of Procedure for the RAB, to be presented to the Commission for adoption, which will include these elements.</p>		High
<p>4.3 Consider periodic peer review. As the Commission moves forward, it should consider the need for periodic peer review of its long-term and annual research plan. We also recommend it expand commitments to pursue cooperative research.</p>		<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commission conducted a one-time stock assessment scientific review for 2012. At the 2013 Annual Meeting, the Commission approved the long-term scientific review process, including an annual review of the stock assessment, and the formation of the SRB. The SRB provides an independent scientific review of Commission science products and programs, and supports and strengthens the stock assessment process.</p>		Medium

STOCK ASSESSMENT	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<b>5. Strengthen Stock Assessment Process</b>				
5.1 Foster regular peer review of stock assessment model and outputs, as well as the associated apportionment process. 5.2 Ensure adequate time and predictable process for stakeholder and Commissioner discussion of proposed changes to the assessment model and the associated apportionment methodology.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Completed:</b> The Commission has instituted the SRB as a regular ongoing peer-review mechanism, and has adopted a regular sequence of annual SRB meetings to support the assessment, the management strategy evaluation, and the research program.  As an indication of the state of IPHC science, IPHC scientists are regularly invited to present and instruct on assessment modeling and methods at international conferences.		
5.3 Augment Secretariat assessment staff.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Completed:</b> Since the 1 <sup>st</sup> Performance Review, the Secretariat has hired top-level assessment and harvest policy scientists. The Commission has also brought in the services of graduate interns at appropriate points in the analytical process, and has budgeted for programming support of the management strategy evaluation.		
CONVENTION	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<b>6. Expand Commission Composition</b>		<b>Completed:</b> Aside from incremental improvements to the Commissioner orientation process incorporating the feedback and experience of new Commissioners, the Commission does not intend to take further action on this recommendation.		
6.1 Add alternates to broaden representation on Commission.		<b>Completed:</b> The Commission does not anticipate any expansion of the Commission at this time, which is a matter for the Contracting Parties and would require renegotiation of the Convention governing the IPHC.		

<p>6.2 Articulate Commissioner recruitment criteria.</p> <p>6.3 Press national government for more timely appointments.</p> <p>6.4 Incorporate continuity as a consideration in revising Commission appointments.</p>		<p><b>Completed:</b> This is a matter for the Contracting Parties. The Commission notes that the Contracting Parties are cognizant of the need for timely appointments and succession planning, and that the Commission will make all possible effort with both Canada and the United States to ensure timely appointments, as well as to facilitate smooth transitions through succession planning. The Commission also notes that both Contracting Parties have introduced changes to their processes for selecting and appointing Commissioners.</p>		
<p>6.5 Revise Rules of Procedure to accommodate alternates.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> To be incorporated in the revision of the Rules of Procedure to be tabled at IM92 (2016), for adoption at AM93 in 2017</p>		
<p><b>PLANNING</b></p>	<p>RESPONSIBILITY</p>	<p>UPDATE/STATUS</p>	<p>WORKPLAN/TIMELINE</p>	<p>PRIORITY</p>
<p><b>7. Build Long-Term Strategic Plan</b></p> <p>7.1 Articulate Overarching Goals and Objectives. Develop a concise statement of goals and objectives that takes the Commission forward over the next decade and beyond.</p> <p>7.2 Identify implementation strategies to fulfill Overarching Goals and Objectives. Develop an Annual Plan and budget that fits within the framework of the longer-term strategic plan.</p> <p>7.3 Identify milestones and performance measures to track progress.</p> <p>7.4 Consider budgetary implications of priorities identified in the strategic planning process.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> The Commission postponed action on this recommendation until after higher-priority activities were complete.</p> <p>A number of new Commissioners have seated since the 1<sup>st</sup> Performance Review, and most of the Secretariat's management team has turned over since then as well. The Secretariat intends to act on this recommendation during 2017, for presentation to the Commission during the 2017-2018 meeting cycle.</p>		



ADVICE	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<p><b>8. Structure Staff Advice to Strengthen the Delineation Between Scientific Analysis and Policy Options</b></p> <p>8.1 Clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of Commissioners and staff for each step of the analysis and policy development cycle.</p> <p>8.2 Present options for Commission consideration.</p>		<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commission noted that the approach to delineation between science advice and policy options should follow accepted national and international best practices, and that as a first step towards implementation, an approach should be developed for risk-based harvest advice.</p> <p>The Commission adopted a new structure for harvest advice proposed by the IPHC Secretariat, including a decision-table presentation format to support risk-based decision-making, beginning with the advice for 2013. The 2012 Interim Meeting and the 2013 Annual Meeting featured detailed presentations of the purpose and use of the new harvest advice structure, and there was extensive public discussion during both meetings by the Commission and stakeholders. As a measure of progress in this area, the decision table and its elements have entered the lexicon of the stakeholder community and form the basis for catch limit dialogue and decision-making.</p> <p>The Commission has implemented an MSE process to better inform its policy analysis and choices, and chartered the MSAB in 2013 to oversee the MSE process and to advise the Commission and IPHC Staff on the development and evaluation of candidate objectives and strategies for managing the fishery. The MSE process will help the Commission develop and thoroughly test alternative management procedures prior to actually implementing any management changes for the fishery.</p>		

LEADERSHIP	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<p><b>9. Commissioners Should Seek and Take Advantage of Opportunities to Model and Exert Leadership</b></p> <p>9.1 Take an active role in articulating a vision for the IPHC and engaging in actions to carry out that vision.</p> <p>9.2 Exercise and model a stance of principled negotiation in deliberations over Commission matters.</p> <p>9.3 Provide clear guidance to Commission executive staff on functions ranging from conducting assessments, to developing options for catch limits, to providing advice to member governments and other organizations.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> The Commissioners agreed that their role is to exercise leadership with regard to the work of the IPHC, and as such are demonstrating leadership through key initiatives described elsewhere in this report.</p> <p>The Commissioners noted that the clarification of roles and responsibilities in response to recommendation #1 will also affect this area.</p> <p>The Commission met with the IPHC headquarters staff at the time of the 2012 Interim Meeting, to follow up on their comments on the performance review.</p> <p>The Commission intends to continue to lead and make progress on key initiatives, as determined in consultation with stakeholders.</p>		
COMMISSION STRUCTURE	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY

<p><b>10. Elevate the Importance of Tribes and First Nations</b></p> <p>10.1 Ensure any revamping of the Commission structure, including but not limited to the industry advisors, RAB and Commissioner seats, accommodates tribal and First Nations participation along with other interested parties.</p> <p>10.2 Actively include First Nations and tribal scientists in structured peer reviews of the current assessment and apportionment methodologies, in particular when considering implementation of Recommendation #5.</p> <p>10.3 Ensure that Commission recommendations and consultations by national sections are consistent with the spirit and letter of U.S. and Canadian law and any associated rights of tribes and First Nations.</p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> The Commission notes the importance of Tribes and First Nations within the domestic processes of Canada and the United States, and that issues pertaining to Pacific halibut and these groups are domestic responsibilities of the two Governments. The Commission noted that the Contracting Parties consult directly with the Tribes and First Nations. The Commission also stressed that the Tribes and First Nations have a very important existing participatory role in Commission processes, along with other stakeholders, and that it continues to value their participation, and to consider the interests of the Tribes and First Nations in its actions. The Commission notes that the effort to define roles and responsibilities (in response to recommendation #1) should help articulate the current avenues of engagement and the relationship of the IPHC to U.S. and Canadian domestic processes. The Commission welcomes suggestions on how its interaction with Tribes and First Nations can be facilitated and improved.</p>		
MEETING CYCLE	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<p><b>11. Strengthen Interim and Annual Meeting process</b></p>		<p><b>Ongoing:</b> Beginning with the 2012 Interim Meeting and the 2013 Annual Meeting, the Commission decided to open both meetings to the public as much as possible, including steps noted in the sub-items below. The Commission instituted these changes on a trial basis for the 2012-2013 meeting cycle, and solicited feedback from the on-site and web audiences, noting that development of appropriate and workable formats and procedures for public participation is an iterative process.</p>		
<p>11.1 Add a third meeting to the Annual Meeting cycle.</p>		<p><b>Completed:</b> The Commission decided not to add the proposed third meeting to the annual cycle at present.</p>		

11.2 Foster stronger internal preparation for public meetings	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> The Secretariat continues to refine its internal processes and timelines in order to develop and publish meeting materials as far in advance of meetings as possible.		
11.3 Provide meeting materials as early as possible, even if that means posting materials in batches on-line rather than waiting until a comprehensive set of back-up documents can be produced in a single comprehensive package.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> The Commission now posts all meeting materials for the public except for financial and administrative documents. Meeting materials are posted as they are developed. Meeting materials from previous Interim and Annual Meetings remain available to the public at the IPHC website.		
11.4 Expand the existing “Navigating the IPHC Meeting This Week” document to flesh out meeting objectives and protocols.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> Meeting handouts are reviewed each year with an eye to making them more informative and useful for meeting participants. The Bluebook meeting handout is being re-designed for the 2017 Annual Meeting to make it a more useful guide for meeting participants.	2012 +	
11.5 Increase opportunities for public comment.		<b>Ongoing:</b> The Commission opened all of its sessions at the Interim and Annual Meetings except the Finance and Executive sessions to public attendance and interactive webcast. All advisory body sessions at the Annual Meeting are now also open to the public. Beginning in 2014, the Commission has held the Interim Meeting in a larger venue to accommodate public attendees. Before then, the Interim Meeting had been held at the IPHC offices in Seattle, limiting the number of people who could attend. Time and agenda space have been added to both the Interim and Annual Meetings to accommodate additional public comment and discussion.		
11.6 Make greater use of webinars to streamline meetings.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> All Interim and Annual Meeting sessions except the Finance and Administration sessions are webcast. The webcasts at both meetings have been expanded from their previous one-way broadcast format to include the ability for the web audience to submit questions or comments during the proceedings.		

COMMUNICATION	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	PROG. OF WORK / TIMELINE	PRIORITY
<b>12. Improve Communications</b>				
12.1 Improve timeliness and use of meeting summaries – both in real-time and post-meeting.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> Little progress has been made to date in this area, but beginning with the 2016-2017 meeting cycle, the IPHC Secretariat is introducing a revised meeting reporting format to produce more timely and useful meeting summaries. Meeting reports are now approved and made available to the public within weeks of the meetings.		
12.2 Develop agreed upon written policy to guide staff comment – in writing or in testimony – on policies under consideration before other bodies.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> The Secretariat has begun development of information papers and internal guidance for comment, testimony, or written inputs to outside organizations or meetings.		
12.3 Improve outreach to and discussions with non-traditional constituencies such as bycatch users and sport fishermen.	<i>IPHC Secretariat</i>	<b>Ongoing:</b> The IPHC Commissioners and Staff have continued to reach out to users of the Pacific halibut resource outside the commercial fishery. The Commission is extensively engaged with the North Pacific Fishery Management Council on bycatch issues, at both the scientific and the management levels.  IPHC Secretariat staff members, including managers and senior scientists, make regular visits to ports from Oregon to Alaska to meet with the fishing community. Staff members are regularly invited to present to industry groups, and the IPHC also participates in a number of sport and fishing industry trade shows.		

<p>12.4 Explore opportunities to make better use of technologies – including from RSS feeds to social media forms such as Twitter and/or Facebook – to keep interested stakeholder apprised of recent IPHC-related news.</p>	<p><i>IPHC Secretariat</i></p>	<p><b>Ongoing:</b> The IPHC Secretariat has developed a robust social media protocol and makes extensive use of Facebook and Twitter to reach stakeholders. The “live tweeting” of the Annual Meeting has become the favored means for news organizations to gather data for their reporting. The Staff is also engaged with other fishery organizations at the regional and national levels in development of scientific communications in support of fishery management.</p>		
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--