

Group Discussions

In Sessions 1, 2 and 3, twelve groups, each with 14–15 participants, moved to different venues to discuss questions allocated (Tables 1 and 2). The questions had been framed previously by Keynote Speakers, i.e. Session 1 — John Dean; Session 2 — Carl Walters; and Session 3 — John Caddy, to reflect material presented to the Workshop.

Group leaders (Table 1) arranged for rapporteurs to present verbal summaries at the end

of each Session (see Kayt Raymond) and later expanded them for use in these Proceedings. Since each question was debated by two, occasionally three, groups, summaries have been combined to give a wider view of each question.

The conclusions presented are not intended to represent the corporate views of ASFB/FARMAA — they are just some of the outcomes of spirited debate between represent-

Table 1. Discussion groups and questions allocated

No.	Colour Code*	Discussion Leaders	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3
1	Yellow/black	Ray Clarke Heather Brayford	Q1	Q5	Q1
2	Red square	Neil Loneragan David McGlennon	Q5	Q3	Q4
3	Yellow	Bruce Wallner Laurie Gwynne	Q4	Q2	Q4
4	Brown	Libby Sterling Tim Ward	Q1	Q3	Q6
5	Green/black	Jane Borg Rebecca Metzner	Q2	Q1	Q1
6	Blue	Noel Taylor-Moore Patrick Coutin	Q3	Q4	Q5
7	Green	David Pollard Alex Wells	Q5	Q6	Q5
8	Purple	Rick Fletcher Murray MacDonald	Q5	Q2	Q6
9	Red circle	Mike Dredge Sylvia Francis	Q1	Q4	Q3
10	Black	Jean Chesson Rosemary Lea	Q3	Q5	Q2
11	Orange	Ian Halliday Rik Buckworth	Q4	Q6	Q2
12	Pink	Nick Caputi Darren Cameron	Q2	Q1	Q3

* Colour code provided for easy identification by participants

atives of fisheries science, management and administration, sometimes with members of the fishing industry and parliamentarians. Nor is there any intention of actual or implied criticism of fisheries negotiations or negotiators.

Session 1 Questions make reference to a Bureau of Resource Sciences definition of Stock. The reference is

McLoughlin, K., B. Wallner and D. Staples (Eds) (1995). *Fisheries Status Reports 1994 — Resource Assessments of Australian Commonwealth Fisheries*. Bureau of Resource Sciences: Canberra.

The definition of stock reads:

Stock — *group of individuals of a species which can be regarded as an entity for management or assessment purposes. Some species form a single stock (e.g. southern bluefin tuna) and other species are composed of several stocks (e.g. albacore tuna in the Pacific Ocean, where there are separate northern Pacific and southern Pacific stocks). The impact of fishing on a species cannot be determined without knowledge of this stock structure.*

Table 2. Group discussion questions

Session 1 What is a stock?

1. Does the definition of a stock (as outlined in the Bureau of Rural Sciences Status Report 1995) meet current management needs?
2. Can the BRS definition of a stock be supported technically and scientifically and what level of certainty is required for technical and scientific acceptance?
3. What are the advantages, disadvantages, strengths and weaknesses of the BRS

definition of a stock? Can the strengths and weaknesses be addressed technically?

4. What processes and projects are underway to address the weaknesses of the definition, if any? If none, what processes should be undertaken to address the weaknesses?
5. With the increasing emphasis on management of fisheries as mixed fisheries or as components of large ecosystems, is the issue of stock resolution important? Explain your position(s).

Session 2 Stock assessment and research

1. If you have a shared stock, what should you monitor and how much monitoring do you need?
2. Under what circumstances should Australia not attempt sustainable management at all?
3. How would collaborative tagging programmes be conducted with nations that have limited resources for applying and recovering tags?
4. Should science and management policy be developed by independent commissions that put fish first, with nations agreeing to binding limits?
5. How should stock assessment advice be introduced into international sharing negotiations?
6. Should very large marine reserve areas be used as a basic conservation tool in shared fisheries, even for highly migratory stocks?

Session 3 Allocation and management of shared stocks

1. Have you established what are your own industries' rights to the shared stocks in your zone before entering international (or national) negotiations on the same stock? (Unresolved conflicts within a delegation are seriously prejudicial to the successful outcome of a negotiation). If no, how would you do this?
2. What are the respective roles of government and industry in deciding on the resource sharing process and in the negotiation with other party or parties?
3. How would you go about negotiating access rights with other parties, and reconciling longer-term plans for limited licensing and fleet renewal, and are there situations where some limited access for the other side to your exclusive economic zone may have some mutual advantage?
4. What would be your priorities for negotiating harmonized fisheries regulations and common provisions for enforcement that take socio-political differences and differing national objectives of the negotiating parties into account?
5. What would be the trade-offs that could resolve socio-political objectives and/or differing state or national objectives to the extent possible, and what side payments may be possible that could best fulfil the requirements of the (two or more) sides?
6. Should fisheries negotiations be strictly separated from those on other bilateral issues? If yes, why? If no, why?