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Background: The need for performance reviews

- Many RFMO/As pre-dated modern international fisheries instruments such as the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement (the Agreement) and the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (the Code)
- Continuing decrease in the overall status of global fish stocks
- Ongoing questions regarding the performance of RFMOs in ensuring the long-term sustainability of fish stocks and implementing the provisions of the Agreement and the Code
Early efforts in international fora

• In 2005, the need for RFMO/As to review their mandates and performance was highlighted in a number of fora:
  – FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI)
  – Fourth meeting of Regional Fishery Bodies
  – Conference on the Governance of High Seas Fisheries and the Agreement
  – Sixth meeting of the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea (ICP)
Initial legislative mandates

- UNFSA article 13
- 2005 General Assembly resolution on sustainable fisheries
  - Encourages States, through their participation in regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, to initiate processes for their performance review, and welcomes the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in the development of general objective criteria for such reviews (para. 60)
- 2006 Review Conference on the Agreement
  - Urge those regional fisheries management organizations of which they are members to undergo performance reviews on an urgent basis, whether initiated by the organizations themselves or with external partners; encourage the inclusion of some element of independent evaluation in such reviews; and ensure that the results are made publicly available. The reviews should use transparent criteria based on the Agreement and other relevant instruments, including best practices of regional fisheries management organizations; (para. 32(j))
Common criteria and methodology

• Kobe I (January 2007)
  – Joint meeting of five tuna RFMOs in Kobe, Japan
  – Course of Actions for RFMOs

• ICSP-6 (April 2007)

• Kobe II (2009)
  – Assessment of progress
Subsequent developments

168. Urges States, through their participation in regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements that have not done so, to undertake, on an urgent basis, performance reviews of those regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements, initiated either by the organization or arrangement itself or with external partners, including in cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, using transparent criteria based on the provisions of the Agreement and other relevant instruments, and taking into account the best practices of regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements and, as appropriate, any set of criteria developed by States or other regional fisheries management organizations or arrangements, and encourages that such performance reviews include some element of independent evaluation and propose means for improving the functioning of the regional fisheries management organization or arrangement, as appropriate;
# Performance reviews (2005-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Year (s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Year (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCAMLR</td>
<td>2008 and 2016/7</td>
<td>IPHC</td>
<td>2012 and 2018/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSBT</td>
<td>2008 and 2014</td>
<td>NAFO</td>
<td>2011 and 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRFM</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NEAFC</td>
<td>2006 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFCM</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RECOFI</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATTC</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>SEAFO</td>
<td>2010 and 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCAT</td>
<td>2008 and 2016</td>
<td>SPRFMO</td>
<td>2018/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTC</td>
<td>2009 and 2015/6</td>
<td>WCPFC</td>
<td>2012/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

• The historical evolution of RFMO performance review processes suggests that:
  – Performance reviews are seen as an important tool for strengthening implementation of the provisions of the Agreement
  – International instruments, including the Agreement, the Code of Conduct, the recommendations of the Review Conference and General Assembly resolutions provide standards and criteria used for assessing RFMO performance
  – The Review Conference, ICSP and the General Assembly, together with FAO processes and external processes have all contributed to strengthen the basis for performance review processes over time