



**International cooperation (transparency; relationship to non-Contracting Parties;
cooperation with other RFMOs)**

PREPARED BY: IPHC SECRETARIAT (D. WILSON, J. PLANAS; 31 MAY 2019)

PURPOSE

To provide the PRIPHC02 with information regarding the Performance Review Criteria 6: *International cooperation (transparency; relationship to non-Contracting Parties; cooperation with other RFMOs)*

BACKGROUND

Criteria 6: *International cooperation* (transparency; relationship to non-Contracting Parties; cooperation with other RFMOs)

- i. Transparency
 - Extent to which the IPHC is operating in a transparent manner, as reflected in UNFSA Article 12 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.1.9.
 - Extent to which IPHC decisions, meeting reports, scientific advice upon which decisions are made, and other relevant materials are made publicly available in a timely fashion.
- ii. Relationship to non-Contracting Parties
 - Extent to which the IPHC facilitates cooperation among Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties which exploit the Pacific halibut stock, including through the adoption and implementation of procedures for granting Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status.
 - Extent of fishing activity by vessels of non-Contracting Parties that are not cooperating with the IPHC, as well as measures to deter such activities.
- iii. Cooperation with other RFMOs
 - Extent to which the IPHC cooperates with other RFMOs, including through the network of Regional Fishery Body Secretariats.
 - Extent to which IPHC works intra-regionally to adopt common regulatory principles, standards and operational schemes, and processes where appropriate, e.g. observer coverage, gear management, access rules and appropriate financial mechanisms.
- iv. Participation
 - Extent to which all fishing entities active in the Convention area, and the stock range, discharge their obligations in line with the UNFSA.

DISCUSSION

The information currently available relating to Performance Criteria 6 are provided at [Appendix A](#).

RECOMMENDATION

That the PRIPHC02 **NOTE** paper IPHC-2019-PRIPHC02-08 which provides information related to the Performance Review Criteria 6: *International cooperation (transparency; relationship to non-Contracting Parties; cooperation with other RFMOs)*

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Performance Review Criteria 6: *International cooperation (transparency; relationship to non-Contracting Parties; cooperation with other RFMOs)*

APPENDIX A

PERFORMANCE REVIEW CRITERIA 6: *INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (TRANSPARENCY; RELATIONSHIP TO NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES; COOPERATION WITH OTHER RFMOs)*

i. Transparency

- Extent to which the IPHC is operating in a transparent manner, as reflected in UNFSA Article 12 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.1.9.

This item is addressed in the various materials contained on the IPHC website and in other papers.

- Extent to which IPHC decisions, meeting reports, scientific advice upon which decisions are made, and other relevant materials are made publicly available in a timely fashion.

All report from meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies are now required to be published within 15 days of the close of the respective meeting. This rule was included in the 2017 version of the IPHC Rules of Procedure.

Since that time, publication time for IPHC meeting reports has continuously been reduced, with the most recent Report of the 95th Session of the IPHC Annual Meeting (AM095) being published on the same day as the meeting closed.

At each subsequent session, an Actions Arising paper is published, detailing progress made during the inter-sessional period. In 2017, numerical tracking of actions was introduced for the first time, to facilitate tracking and reporting. An example from the recent AM095 meeting of the Commission: <https://www.iphc.int/uploads/pdf/am/2019am/iphc-2019-am095-03.pdf>

All papers for meetings of the Commission or its subsidiary bodies are required to be published 30 days prior to the commencement of a meeting. This rule has been adhered to for all meetings since it was introduced in the 2017 version of the IPHC Rules of Procedure. See Rule 8 – Order of Business, of the [IPHC Rules of Procedure \(2019\)](#).

ii. Relationship to non-Contracting Parties

- Extent to which the IPHC facilitates cooperation among Contracting Parties and non-Contracting Parties which exploit the Pacific halibut stock, including through the adoption and implementation of procedures for granting Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status.

There are three non-Contracting Parties who exploit Pacific halibut, Russia, Rep. of Korea and Japan. Both the Rep. of Korea and Japan harvest Pacific halibut as a very minor incidental trawl catch. To date we have been unable to obtain landing figures. Russia however has a significant fishery landing Pacific halibut, in excess of 2,000 metric tons annually. The IPHC has engaged Russia both on a scientific and management/policy level in the past with mixed engagement success. Most recently we have engaged Russian scientists working on Pacific halibut through PICES.

Russian managers and scientists intermittently participate in the IPHC process, an example being the 1993 Annual meeting, among others: <https://www.iphc.int/uploads/pdf/am/iphc-1993-am069-r.pdf>

We are also in the process of organising a joint scientific working group meeting on Pacific halibut at the upcoming [PICES meeting](#) in October 2019, and we plan on the participation of Russian and Japanese scientists, in addition to scientists from the US and Canada.

- Extent of fishing activity by vessels of non-Contracting Parties that are not cooperating with the IPHC, as well as measures to deter such activities.

There are no vessels from non-Contracting Parties fishing in the IPHC Convention Area. This is enforced by the Coast Guards of the Contracting Parties. Russia has previously fished in USA water under access agreements, however this arrangement was terminated in the 1960s.

iii. Cooperation with other RFMOs

- Extent to which the IPHC cooperates with other RFMOs, including through the network of Regional Fishery Body Secretariats.

The Secretariat regularly interacts with other RFMOs in a number of forms. This includes with the International Fisheries Commissions based in Canada and the USA via annual joint meetings, and also via joint meeting of the Secretariat staff. A recent example includes a day-long session between the Pacific Salmon Commission and the IPHC Secretariat's to share ideas and resources.

The IPHC Secretariat also participates in the Regional Fishery Body Secretariats, and at COFI meetings.

- Extent to which IPHC works intra-regionally to adopt common regulatory principles, standards and operational schemes, and processes where appropriate, e.g. observer coverage, gear management, access rules and appropriate financial mechanisms.

The IPHC works closely with the domestic agencies of the Contracting Parties, both at the Halibut Advisory Board in Canada, and the Fishery Management Councils in the USA.

- North Pacific Fishery Management Council: <https://www.npfmc.org/>
- Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC): <https://www.pcouncil.org/>
- Halibut Advisory Board: <https://www.pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/consultation/ground-fond/hab-ccf/index-eng.html>

Further information on collaboration will be provided in Session.

iv. Participation

- Extent to which all fishing entities active in the Convention area, and the stock range, discharge their obligations in line with the UNFSA.

See paper IPHC-2019-PRIPHC02-06 for the Contracting Parties. Regarding non-Contracting Parties harvesting Pacific halibut, little is currently known of the discharge of their obligations.