



---

## Update on actions arising from the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Research Advisory Board (RAB018)

PREPARED BY: IPHC SECRETARIAT (26 JANUARY 2018)

---

### PURPOSE

To provide the RAB with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the inter-sessional period, in relation to the recommendations and requests of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Research Advisory Board (RAB018).

### BACKGROUND

At the RAB018 meeting, a series of actions were agreed upon for implementation by the IPHC Secretariat. These action items and progress made on their implementation are detailed in [Appendix A](#).

### DISCUSSION

Noting that best practice governance requires the prompt delivery of core tasks assigned by the Commission, at each subsequent session of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, attempts will be made to ensure that any recommendations and requests for action are carefully constructed so that each contains the following elements:

- 1) a specific action to be undertaken (deliverable);
- 2) clear responsibility for the action to be undertaken (i.e. a specific Contracting Party, the IPHC Secretariat, a subsidiary body of the Commission or the Commission itself);
- 3) a desired time frame for delivery of the action (i.e. by the next session of an subsidiary body, or other date).

This involves numbering and tracking all action items (see [Appendix A](#)) from the RAB, as well as including clear progress updates and document reference numbers.

### RECOMMENDATION/S

That the RAB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IPHC-2018-RAB019-03 which provided the RAB with an opportunity to consider the progress made during the inter-sessional period, in relation to the recommendations and requests of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Research Advisory Board (RAB018).
- 2) **AGREE** to consider and revise as necessary, the actions, and for these to be combined with any new actions arising from the RAB019.

### APPENDICES

**Appendix I:** [Update on actions arising from the 18<sup>th</sup> IPHC Research Advisory Board \(RAB018\)](#)

## APPENDIX A

Update on actions arising from the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the Research Advisory Board (RAB018)

Action No.	Description	Update
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
RAB18-01 ( <a href="#">para. 11</a> )	<p><b>Survey expansion</b></p> <p>The RAB18 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IPHC Staff develop an information paper associated with the survey expansion, which details the likely implications of periodic survey expansion on the stock assessment and apportionment, taking into consideration potential population variability of Pacific halibut in expansion areas which are infrequently surveyed.</p>	<p><b>Completed:</b> Presented to the IM093 (IPHC-2017-IM093-07).</p> <p>For the latest update see the AM094 paper: <a href="#">IPHC-2018-AM094-07</a> Space-time modelling of IPHC fishery-independent setline survey data (R. Webster)</p>
RAB18-02 ( <a href="#">para. 27</a> )	<p><b>Bycatch handling practices on all fleets catching Pacific halibut</b></p> <p>The RAB18 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IPHC Staff undertake a project to develop 'Best practice handling guidelines' for each of the primary gear types which catch Pacific halibut, both directed and non-directed.</p>	<p><b>In progress:</b> Endorsed by the Commission as AM093-Rec.10.</p> <p>The IPHC is currently conducting a research project evaluating handling practices associated with physiological condition and survival of discarded Pacific halibut in the longline fishery that will produce, as deliverables, best practice handling guidelines for the reduction or control of discard mortality rates by late 2019.</p>
RAB18-03 ( <a href="#">para. 37</a> )	<p><b>IPHC Closed Area review</b></p> <p>The RAB18 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that as the IPHC Closed Area was designated to protect juvenile Pacific halibut, there is no scientific justification for retaining the closure in its current form. Thus, the IPHC Closed Area should either be removed, noting that it would be unlikely that much longline fishing would occur in the area as most fish are below the legal size limit, or it should only apply to gear which would interact with juvenile Pacific halibut.</p>	<p><b>In progress:</b> Considered at the AM093 and AM094. AM094 deferred direct action until 2019.</p>
RAB18-04 ( <a href="#">para. 53</a> )	<p><b>Chalky Pacific halibut</b></p> <p>The RAB18 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IPHC Staff undertake research to answer the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What causes chalky flesh in Pacific halibut? Are there particular environmental signatures (temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.) that characterize areas with incidence of chalky flesh?</li> <li>Why does the occurrence of chalky flesh in Pacific halibut appear to be reappearing</li> </ol>	<p><b>In progress:</b> The IPHC is in the process collecting information from stakeholders regarding the incidence of chalkiness in Pacific halibut.</p>

Action No.	Description	Update
	<p>after a period of limited occurrence in regulatory areas 3A and 3B?</p> <p>c) Are there differences in the occurrence of chalky flesh in males and female, as well as fish of different sizes?</p>	
RAB18-05 ( <a href="#">para. 59</a> )	<p><b><i>The report of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the IPHC Research Advisory Board (RAB18)</i></b></p> <p>The RAB18 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from RAB18, provided at <a href="#">Appendix IV</a>.</p>	<b>Completed:</b> Considered at the 93 <sup>rd</sup> Session of the Annual Meeting in 2017.
<b>REQUESTS</b>		
Nil	Nil	N/A