



**Commission for the Conservation and Management of
Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean**

**Technical and Compliance Committee
Tenth Regular Session¹**

**Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
25-30 September 2014**

¹ Final version of TCC10 summary report was posted to the WCPFC website on 3 November 2014. This is Revision 1, which includes edits to paragraphs 221, 326, and 340 (as at 11 November 2014)

Table of Contents

AGENDA ITEM 1 — OPENING OF MEETING	3
AGENDA ITEM 2 — WCPFC IUU VESSEL LIST	6
AGENDA ITEM 3 — COOPERATING NON-MEMBER APPLICATIONS	6
AGENDA ITEM 4 — STATUS OF FISHERIES	8
AGENDA ITEM 5 — SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES	12
AGENDA ITEM 6 — COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME	12
AGENDA ITEM 7 — ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	17
AGENDA ITEM 8 — CORE MONITORING, CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE (MCS) ACTIVITIES	19
AGENDA ITEM 9 — DATA PROVISION AND DATA GAPS	43
AGENDA ITEM 10 — INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES	46
AGENDA ITEM 11 — REVIEW OF EXISTING CMMs INCLUDING ANY PROPOSED	53
AGENDA ITEM 12 — PROPOSALS FOR NEW CMMs	65
AGENDA ITEM 13 — OTHER MATTERS REQUIRING TCC ADVICE	68
AGENDA ITEM 14 — ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS	70
AGENDA ITEM 15 — CLEARANCE OF TCC10 RECOMMENDATIONS	74
AGENDA ITEM 16 — CLOSE OF MEETING	74
ATTACHMENT A — LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	77
ATTACHMENT B — PROVISIONAL AGENDA WITH SCHEDULE	89
ATTACHMENT C — WCPFC IUU VESSEL LIST FOR 2014	94
ATTACHMENT D — LONGLINE OBSERVER COVERAGE TABLES	95
ATTACHMENT E — CDS-IWG 2015 Workplan	99

**Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish
Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean**

**Technical and Compliance Committee
Tenth Regular Session**

**25-30 September 2014
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia**

SUMMARY REPORT

AGENDA ITEM 1 — OPENING OF MEETING

1.1 Welcome

1. The Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) Chair, Ms Rhea Moss-Christian of the Federated States of Micronesia opened the Tenth Regular Session of the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC10) with a prayer led by a representative of FSM. The TCC Chair reminded those present of the functions of TCC according to Article 14 of the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPF Convention). These include: i) providing the Commission with information, technical advice and recommendations relating to the implementation of, and compliance with, conservation and management measures (CMMs); ii) monitoring and reviewing compliance with conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission; and iii) reviewing the implementation of cooperative measures for monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement adopted by the Commission.
2. The following members, cooperating non-members and participating territories (CCMs) attended TCC10: Australia, China, Cook Islands, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union (EU), Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Kiribati, Korea, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States of America (USA), Vanuatu and Vietnam.
3. Intergovernmental organisations the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) attended TCC10.
4. Observers representing Birdlife International, Conservation International, Greenpeace, the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA), the Pew Charitable Trusts and WWF also attended TCC10.
5. A list of participants is provided as Attachment A.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda

6. Based on comments received on previously circulated versions and a number of amendments and additions announced by the Secretariat at the opening of the meeting, an agenda for TCC10 as presented in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-02A (rev 2) was adopted (Attachment B). A list of meeting documents was provided in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-05 (rev 5).

1.3 Meeting Arrangements

7. The WCPFC Compliance Manager outlined meeting arrangements including staffing and logistical arrangements in place to support the meeting, new meeting server and security protocols, document management processes, meeting times and details of social events. The Secretariat noted apologies from Canada and French Polynesia. France was unable to attend TCC10 due to flight difficulties.
8. The TCC Chair announced arrangements for four small working groups (SWGs) to meet and report back to plenary: i) developing the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (CMR) (Joanna Anderson, NZ, Samuel Lanwi Jr., RMI), ii) developing responses to non-compliance (IWG – Responses to Non-Compliance Chair, Alexa Cole, USA) iii) assessing the completeness of CNM applications (TCC Vice-Chair, Alexa Cole, USA), and iv) considering the TCC Workplan and Budget (Limanman Helgenberger, FSM).

1.4 Introduction of Proposals: new CMMs or draft amendments to current CMMs

9. The TCC Chair invited CCMs to briefly introduce proposals for new CMMs, directing proponents to develop their proposals with other CCMs with a view to agreement at Agenda item 12, or a note that more work is required.
10. FFA members introduced WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP01, a proposal on port State measures along similar lines to that presented at WCPFC10 (WCPFC10-2013-DP11 rev 3). It takes into account the requirements of CMM 2013-06 and builds upon existing port State resources and facilities, while recognising ongoing developments in MCS frameworks. It aims to address IUU fishing and strengthen port controls in the region in a way that allows FFA members to build capacity before contemplating more rigorous requirements such as the FAO Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. It includes investigation procedures and vessel-of-interest listing. FFA has received comments from some CCMs and invited others to do so to develop the proposal for TCC to recommend to WCPFC11.
11. Australia introduced WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP02 and DP03, a proposal and explanatory note for the establishment of a harvest strategy approach for key WCPFC tuna species. Australia noted its deep concern that recent CMMs agreed by WCPFC have fallen short in managing fisheries for the long term. Australia proposed seeking the agreement of the Commission to an approach whereby agreed rules will be used for determining a management action response to changes in indicators of stock status with respect to agreed reference points. The proposal aims to ensure scientific outcomes are incorporated into a binding management process

so that stocks are managed within sustainable limits. Harvest strategies are considered a best practice approach, providing predictability, transparency and certainty for fisheries managers. The measure sets out a number of principles to be considered, including that the most sustainable outcomes are achieved when stocks are at larger stock sizes. Australia had received comments from a number of members and would engage constructively with CCMs during TCC to further the proposal.

12. The Cook Islands introduced WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP04, a proposal to amend CMM 2010-02 relating to the Eastern High Seas Pocket – Special Management Area (EHSP-SMA), including a proposed transshipment ban. The Cook Islands noted that FFA Ministers had agreed to implement the EHSP closure due to the continuing high level of non-compliance. FFA members expressed concern that the current measure is not achieving the desired effect and highlighted related issues with VMS, sharks and South Pacific albacore and stated that transshipment activities should take place in ports adjacent to the area in order to facilitate inspection and monitoring of compliance with the measure.
13. PNA members introduced a proposal to adopt a target reference point (TRP) for skipjack tuna (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP06), noting that WCPFC10 had agreed to do so at WCPFC11 and had called for certain work to be presented to the third Management Options Workshop (MOW3). The proposal draws on work undertaken over three years for the Commission and PNA by SPC. The measure proposes a skipjack TRP of 50% of the adult biomass without fishing, aiming to cap the depletion of adult skipjack stock biomass at around 50%. It aims to maintain economic conditions for skipjack at current levels, with similar catch rates and catch size distribution. Such a target may require moderate reductions in fishing. The TRP could be used as a basis for work on a Commission-wide purse seine total allowable effort and noted that its proposed CMM would put in place one part of the harvest strategy for key tuna species proposed by Australia in its harvest strategy CMM. The explanatory note addresses questions raised by some CCMs previously and considers the impact of the proposed CMM, especially on Small Island Developing States (SIDS).
14. FFA members introduced a proposal for a new CMM on operational data (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP07). It was noted that failure to provide operational catch and effort data is one of the greatest problems facing the Commission, undermining the science, reducing the quality of advice to the Commission, weakening the effectiveness of measures and concealing IUU fishing, especially by longliners on the high seas. The CMM seeks to clarify CCMs' obligations and provide a clearer basis for the legal changes that they agreed to make as parties to the WCPF Convention. The CMM requires operational data to be provided in accordance with the requirements of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission and removes the reference to domestic legal constraints as a reason not to provide operational data. The proposed CMM requires the Commission to take data provision into account in any allocation under Article 10 of the Convention and requires the Commission to block access to WCPFC data for CCMs that fail to comply with this CMM. The draft CMM's explanatory note addresses CMM 2013-06. FFA members

made the point that all SIDS provide operational level data, both as flag states and coastal states, even those members with the smallest administrations.

AGENDA ITEM 2 — WCPFC IUU VESSEL LIST

15. The WCPFC Compliance Manager, Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott, presented the current WCPFC IUU Vessel List (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-07) and reported that there are no nominations to the list for 2014 and no further information had been received from CCMs in respect of the three vessels on the WCPFC IUU Vessel List.
16. FFA members recommended that none of the vessels be removed from the current WCPFC IUU Vessel List as no further information has been provided by flag states or nominating CCMs. They urged CCMs to closely monitor these vessels where their location is known, and to work together to locate Yu Fong 168. The WCPFC Secretariat was asked to advise other organizations to stay alert for these vessels.
17. RMI noted that it nominated Yu Fong 168 five years ago but has not heard more from the flag state.
18. **TCC10 recommended to the Commission that the existing WCPFC IUU Vessel List remain unchanged. (Attachment C)**

AGENDA ITEM 3 — COOPERATING NON-MEMBER APPLICATIONS

19. The WCPFC Compliance Manager informed TCC10 that seven applications for cooperating non-member (CNM) status for 2015 were received by the Secretariat: Ecuador, El Salvador, Liberia, Mexico, Senegal, Thailand and Vietnam (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-08 (rev 1)). The Secretariat had, further to suggestions from TCC9 and the Commission, developed a standardized form for CNM applicants and all seven applicants used this template. Prior to TCC no applications were received from two current CNMs: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Panama. Belize had advised the Secretariat that it did not wish to renew its CNM status in 2015.
20. During TCC10, the Secretariat advised that an application from Panama was received.
21. SPC was asked about Thailand's provision of cannery data and confirmed it receives such data every quarter from canneries involved in an ISSF program. The Secretariat undertook to produce a report summarising that information for WCPFC11.
22. In response to a question from Japan, Vietnam reported that directly after WCPFC10, the delegation conveyed to its government the Commission's concern about over-capacity issues in the Convention Area. This report was shared with other agencies within government for their knowledge and cooperation.

23. FFA members made the point that CNMs must pay a contribution to the Commission commensurate with the benefits they receive from the fishery and should share the costs of managing and conserving it. These CCMs maintain the position that no application will be endorsed by their membership if assessed contributions are not paid, and assessed contributions for previous unpaid years need to be added to assessed contributions for 2014.
24. The TCC10 Vice-Chair, Alexa Cole (USA), was asked to lead a SWG which would consider the completeness of the applications for CNM status, who reported back to the group with draft recommendations.
25. Japan requested that, given concerns raised by CCMs during a capacity discussion under Agenda item 11.3, consideration should be given to the possibility of amending paragraph 7 of CMM 2009-11 on cooperating non-members which provides that caution shall be used regarding the introduction into the Commission of excess fishing capacity from other regions. It states that caution shall be used regarding the introduction into the Commission of fishing capacity, not excess fishing capacity.
- 26. TCC10 provides the following decisions and recommendations to WCPFC11:**
- i. TCC10 has reviewed the following CNM applications and is forwarding them to WCPFC11 for consideration: Ecuador, El Salvador, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Senegal, Thailand and Vietnam.**
 - ii. TCC10 thanked the Secretariat for the development of the CNM application template which assisted the process greatly.**
 - iii. TCC10 notes with appreciation the attendance and participation of Ecuador, El Salvador, Thailand and Vietnam at this year's meeting and encourages other CNM applicants to attend TCC meetings in the future.**
 - iv. TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 take into consideration the Compliance Status of all CNM applicants in making its decision on the CNM applications and participatory rights. Furthermore, TCC10 recommends that CNM applicants provide any information requested during the CMS process 30 days in advance of WCPFC11.**
 - v. Some CCMs noted their strong reservations in forwarding the applications of Panama, Mexico and Senegal to WCPFC11 for consideration due to the failure to submit a complete and timely Annual Report or failure to make a commitment to make a financial contribution.**
 - vi. Some CCMs recommended that WCPFC11 agree that, in addition to this year's financial contribution, CNMs should be required to make any past financial contributions that remain outstanding.**
 - vii. TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 that if conditional grants of cooperating non-member status are given, that there be a clear process for how the final determination will be made.**
 - viii. TCC10 notes that three CNM applicants (Ecuador, El Salvador and Mexico) have expressed an interest in becoming full members and**

recommends that WCPFC11 consider whether to invite them to become members.

- ix. TCC10 notes the following gaps in the applications for individual applicants and encourages applicants to rectify them if possible by WCPFC11:**
- a. Mexico – TCC10 notes that Mexico has not provided a commitment to make a financial contribution. TCC10 further notes that Mexico has not agreed to accept High Seas Boardings and Inspections, however, Mexico currently has no vessels operating in the Convention Area. In addition, SPC noted that there may be some remaining data gaps in Mexico’s historical data.**
 - b. Panama – TCC10 noted that Panama submitted its Annual Report Part I and II during TCC and consequently it was not able to be assessed, and strongly encourages it to submit its Annual Reports on time in future years. SPC notes that it is receiving some transshipment data from Panama, but believes there remain some gaps in these data.**
 - c. Senegal – TCC10 notes that Senegal has not provided a commitment to make a financial contribution.**
 - d. Thailand - SPC notes that it is receiving some transshipment data from Thailand, but believes there remain some gaps in these data.**
 - e. Vietnam – SPC notes with appreciation the continuing improvement in data submission by Vietnam, but notes there remain some gaps in logbook data.**

AGENDA ITEM 4 — STATUS OF FISHERIES

27. Dr John Hampton of SPC presented the status of tuna fisheries and stocks in the WCPO in 2014, based on data available through 2013. This information was presented to the Tenth Regular Session of the Scientific Committee (SC10) and has been updated where relevant in the intervening period. The following points were highlighted:
- The estimated total catch of the four main target tuna species (skipjack, yellowfin, bigeye and albacore tuna) was approximately 2.6 million mt in 2013, similar to the record catch in 2012.
 - The 2013 purse seine catch of nearly 1.9 million mt and skipjack catch of nearly 1.8 million mt were both records.
 - The number of purse seine vessels operating in the fishery (excluding exclusively domestic vessels in Philippines and Indonesia) had reached almost 300 by 2013, and is likely to further increase in the coming years.
 - It appears that the tonnage of 80 new purse seiners currently being built as reported in a number of WCPFC Circulars in early 2014 is considerably in excess of the tonnage of vessels to be replaced, and the excess is equivalent to approximately 40 new vessels.

- Purse seine effort in 2013 is estimated to have been a record. Effort in 2014 as indicated by VMS is tracking similarly to 2013.
 - Since 2012, purse seine effort during non-FAD closure months has had a lower component of associated sets (~40% of the total sets) compared to the three years prior to 2012, when associated sets were generally 40-65% of total sets on a monthly basis. During the FAD closure months, the proportion of total effort attributable to associated sets is generally around 10%.
 - Total associated sets in 2013 were lower than in 2011 and 2012, with increases in unassociated sets occurring in recent years.
 - Purse seine catches of bigeye tuna during the 2013 FAD closure, and in 2013 generally, were somewhat higher than in previous years. This appears to be due to higher catch rates.
 - Longline catch and effort for 2013 appeared to have fallen sharply from levels in recent years. However these estimates are provisional and may be due to incomplete data in the last quarter of 2013.
28. New stock assessments for skipjack, yellowfin and bigeye tuna were conducted in 2014 and presented to and discussed at SC10. Skipjack spawning biomass is estimated to be about 50% of the average 2002-2011 level that would have occurred in the absence of fishing. This is well above the agreed limit reference point of 20% and within the range (40-60%) currently being considered as a target reference point for skipjack. The stock is in a healthy state.
 29. Yellowfin catch has been fairly stable since the late 1990s and has probably reached its exploitation potential. Spawning biomass has declined to 38% of the average 2002-2011 unexploited level, still well above the limit reference point of 20%. Fishing mortality remains beneath the level providing the maximum sustainable yield (MSY).
 30. Bigeye tuna spawning biomass is estimated to have declined to 16% of the average 2002-2011 unexploited level, and has therefore breached the agreed limit reference point of 20%. Fishing mortality remains well above the MSY level.
 31. South Pacific albacore was last assessed in 2012. Annual catches have increased dramatically over the past 20 years and now exceeds 80,000 mt. Most of the catch is of larger adults, and therefore spawning is able to commence before significant exploitation occurs. This engenders a degree of biological resilience in the stock. Spawning biomass is estimated to have been reduced to approximately 65% of the unexploited level and the biomass of larger albacore vulnerable to the longline fishery to about 50% of the unexploited level. This has impacted catch rates, and along with other factors has caused economic difficulties for a number of fleets targeting albacore.
 32. South Pacific swordfish was last assessed in 2013. The spawning biomass is estimated to have declined to approximately 50% of unexploited levels and the fishing mortality remains below the MSY level.

33. During discussions after the presentation, the EU expressed concern at the significant increase in latent capacity (around 50,000 mt) indicated by the large number of notifications by CCMs under paragraph 50 of CMM 2013-01 of the construction of replacement vessels. Concern was expressed about the new builds equivalent to 40 new vessels. The EU noted that during the intersessional period it had requested the Secretariat to compile a summary of the movements of capacity which were taking place.
34. In response to a request from one CCM, the Secretariat noted that it had sought to summarise some of the movements of capacity in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-IP07, which is a summary of reporting under CMMs 2012-01 and 2013-01 for bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack tuna in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean. The Secretariat noted that Table 7 taking note of relevant paragraphs in CMM 2013-01, excludes advice from CCMs of new large-scale purse seine vessel builds where the notifications stated that the new vessel would be flagged to a SIDS CCM or Indonesia. The Secretariat offered to expand the information included in Table 7, and sought advice from CCMs if more specific details should be included in the version of IP07 that will be updated for WCPFC11.
35. The EU noted that it attached a lot of importance to the management of global fishing capacity, and referenced a recent meeting in Thessaloniki where the EU and ministers from USA, Japan, Philippines, Colombia and the Republic of Indonesia signed a Joint Statement committing to reduce global capacity. The EU noted that in the Pacific region developing states wanted legitimately to develop their fisheries and this needed to be taken into account. The EU queried whether members would find it useful to participate in a workshop or discussion in 2015 on the management of capacity and transfers of capacity in the region. It would be willing to contribute funds to organise such a workshop or discussion in 2015, for SIDS and non-SIDS to begin the process of agreeing on longer term capacity management of the region compatible with the aspirations of developing states in the region. The EU reminded TCC10 that paragraph 54 of CMM 2013-01 makes reference to the management of capacity in the region but up to now nothing has been done.
36. New Zealand reported a dramatic decline in its domestic yellowfin industry and asked SPC whether not having access to all operational data from the high seas longline fishery affected the stock assessment. SPC responded that in its most recent assessments, they used as much operational data as were available to construct CPUE indices. This was mostly provided by coastal states which licence longline vessels; however, that didn't capture the substantial amount of fishing in the adjacent high seas for which SPC does not have operational data. SPC would like to have complete operational level data, in order to better model CPUE in all regions.
37. SPC explained that it calculated an equivalent of 40 new vessels by using the average tonnage of the replacement vessels that had been notified. One CCM queried whether WCPFC needs to consider setting tonnage as a metric, rather than number of vessels.

38. Several CCMs expressed concern about purse seine bigeye catch, with one CCM observing that there were still FADs set during the closure period, and there was a spike in the fourth month of the closure period. This CCM asked why a large reduction in the other months was not evident. SPC noted that there would have been FAD setting in October 2013 by CCMs which opted for overall control on sets rather than closure. In response to a second question, SPC also noted that levels of purse seine effort, as indicated month-by-month in 2014 by VMS, were largely the same as in 2013 – an increase over previous years, especially 2010 levels.
39. In response to a question about higher purse seine bigeye catches, SPC noted that 2013 data are provisional as they are based on observer data. While more observer data should become available, higher catch rates generally are apparent from most sources. SPC further noted that one of the plots appears to show slightly higher bigeye catches using unassociated sets, something not seen before. Current SPC data shows a strong decrease in both catch and effort in 2013.
40. In response to concerns that had been expressed earlier in the meeting about lack of operational catch and effort data impacting on CPUE analyses used in stock assessments, Japan stated that aggregated data by areas of EEZs and high seas were submitted to the Commission. SPC responded that aggregating data by high seas or EEZ was not typically done for stock assessments, which use spatial areas – for example, for bigeye and yellowfin nine regions are used, covering both high seas and EEZs areas. Noting a dramatic decline in New Zealand’s domestic yellowfin industry, Japan asked SPC whether range contraction of yellowfin and skipjack could be taking place. SPC noted that there was considerable discussion of this at SC10. Dr Hampton offered the personal view that there is not strong evidence either way.
41. Japan also stated some CCMs carried out its obligations under CMM 2008-01. It urged that the Commission should consider it when discussing further measures for bigeye in the future.
42. In response to a question from one CCM about purse seine bigeye catch estimates in 2013, SPC explained that the estimate of purse seine catch by species uses a methodology extensively documented over the last several years in SC. Some fleets provide reliable estimates of bigeye catch through logsheets and, in some cases, port sampling.
43. In response to a question about whether a breakdown between high seas and EEZs was available for swordfish catch, SPC explained that five degree square data was, for most fleets, the main data available, although some countries’ data can be attributed to EEZs or the high seas. While those CCMs do not provide full operational level catch and effort data, some of these CCMs do provide a breakdown between high seas and EEZs.
44. PNA members noted purse seine catch has increased despite reported decreases in the number of FAD sets and urged the adoption of measures including banning pre-dawn sets, FAD identification and electronic tracking, and stopping tender vessel operation during the closure period. They observed that longline bigeye catches are at levels seen prior to the adopted reductions in CMM 2008-01. Improvements to

the effectiveness of longline measures were needed, including longline operational data provision, bans on at-sea frozen bigeye transshipment, preventing circumvention of manual reporting, and reductions in longline effort and catches.

AGENDA ITEM 5 — SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES

45. TCC10 briefly discussed the special requirements of developing states.
46. FFA members underlined the significance to SIDS of CMMs 2013-06 and 2013-07, which operationalise the principles contained in Article 30 of the Convention. FFA members tabled WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP08 which articulates the special requirements of SIDS and encouraged developed CCMs to respond in a timely manner. CCMs were directed to the FFA paper, which indicates areas where assistance from development and fishing partners would help increase SIDS' participation in WCPFC and the fishery.

5.1 Review effectiveness of Resolution 2008-01 on Aspirations of Small Island Developing States

47. There was no discussion under this agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 6 — COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME

48. This is the fourth year of implementation for the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme. WCPFC10 adopted CMM 2013-02 Conservation and Management Measure for Compliance Monitoring Scheme, which applies for 2014 only.

6.1 Review of draft Compliance Monitoring Report

49. Prior to beginning the draft CMR review, the TCC Chair invited comments on whether or not the session should be open to observers or held in closed session as in previous years.
50. The EU reiterated its view from the previous year that the CMR process should be open to observers as this would best ensure transparency. This CCM acknowledged concerns about confidentiality of data but felt a confidentiality agreement could cover it and took the view that participating in the session did not mean observers were 'accessing' the non-public domain data.
51. Some CCMs noted that the CMM designates the dCMR and provisional CMR as non-public domain data and there is a formal process under the data rules to release such information to observers. Some CCMs also noted a recent breach of confidentiality by an observer at the NC10 meeting.
52. WWF recalled that TCC has discussed this issue in previous years and cited the exchange of several letters on the topic of transparency, including one signed by nine NGOs, IGOs and industry bodies. WWF stated that there are clear obligations under the WCPF Convention about achieving transparency and noted that observers had worked hard to build a relationship of trust with members. WWF urged TCC to

develop guidelines to allow for observer participation in the CMR process and suggested the Chatham House Rule could apply, including around data.

53. As there was no unified position, the TCC Chair suggested that TCC10 continue the working group in closed session as in previous years and formulate clear recommendations to the Commission on how to conduct future compliance reviews. This may include refining or amending parts of the relevant measure.
54. TCC10 conducted the CMR discussions in closed session.

6.2 Provisional CMR for 2013 and Executive Summary

55. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 discuss the difference in interpretation of paragraph 3 of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission, as a priority concern with a view to resolving this as soon as possible.**
56. **TCC10, as with TCC9, found conducting the review on an obligation by obligation basis both useful and informative. TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 agree that improvements to this process continue to be made, taking into account the recommendations of this report.**
57. **Due to difficulties experienced in the interpretation of some CMMs, TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 that all new CMMs need to be drafted with clear criteria as to the nature of the obligation and how compliance with that obligation will be assessed.**
58. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 strongly encourages CCMs to submit information as early as possible, before the deadline of 30 days before the annual meeting, to the Secretariat for compilation of the draft CMR.**
59. **TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 agree that CCMs will confirm if they have nothing to report on obligations when completing Annual Reports to make it clear to the Secretariat that this obligation has been considered.**
60. **Noting that a number of CNMs have high levels of non-compliance, TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 consider the compliance status of CNMs in the granting of CNM status and their participatory rights for 2015.**
61. **CCMs consider that exceeding catch and effort limits and non-provision of Annual Reports are priority issues for the Commission to consider in the CMR. Therefore, TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 agree that in future reviews, non-compliance with these obligations should be assessed as “priority non-compliant”.**
62. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 agree that in future reviews where there are technological constraints in implementing a measure, an assessment of “non-compliant” is appropriate.**
63. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 agree to prioritize the obligations that will be assessed.**
64. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 adopt the recommendations referred in Table 3 of this pCMR as listed here:**

- i. **TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 that the Intersessional Working Group – ROP (IWG-ROP) should encourage discussion to develop processes to facilitate the provision of data, including observer reports, from the observer providers and placement information from Flag States to the Commission.**
 - ii. **TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 that the IWG-ROP should discuss and provide guidance to WCPFC12 on the definition of the responsibilities of the flag states in respect of obligation CMM 2007-01 Attachment K Annex C paragraph 4.**
 - iii. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 should discuss the interpretation of paragraph 10 of CMM 2012-01 with respect to the obligations and how those obligations should be assessed for compliance.**
 - iv. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 should discuss the interpretation of paragraph 48 of CMM 2013-01 with respect to the obligation to provide the necessary catch and effort data and how these obligations should be assessed at TCC11 for compliance.**
 - v. **TCC10 recommends that WCPFC11 provide advice to CCMs on interpretation of paragraph 8 of CMM 2009-03.**
 - vi. **TCC10 requests that WCPFC11 forward the matter of interpretation of CMM 2007-01 paragraph 9 to the IWG-ROP.**
65. **TCC10 adopted the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report and forwarded it to the Commission for consideration at WCPFC11.**

6.3 Target capacity assistance to areas of need identified by CMR process

66. Noting that the CMR review process would also capture capacity needs, members were invited to comment on a working paper prepared by the Secretariat (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-10) detailing requests for assistance (Table 2):
- determining and planning for achieving 5% longline coverage under the ROP (CMM 2007-01 Att K Annex C)
 - development of seabird NPOA and reporting (CMM 2007-04)
 - sea turtles – reporting and implementation of CMM (CMM 2008-03)
 - development of sharks NPOA (CMM 2010-07)
 - VMS audits – assistance from FFA (CMM 2011-02)
 - reporting under CMM on oceanic whitetip sharks (CMM 2011-04)
67. FFA members expressed the view that identified targeted assistance should be included in the CMR so it was clear what assistance was needed. They noted the CMS currently has binary assessment criteria, compliant or non-compliant, so even CCMs who need assistance to implement WCPFC obligations can be assessed non-compliant. They requested that “implementation assistance” be used as an

additional criterion; Next steps could be “assistance required” or “assistance rendered and ongoing” and would demonstrate progress towards compliance.

68. The TCC Chair confirmed that areas identified by CCMs as requiring technical or capacity assistance would be captured by this year’s CMR process, including what specific types of assistance might be required, and that the new Annex 1 will provide the basis for the compliant/non-compliant assessment. The Provisional CMR SWG meeting to be convened on Sunday 28 September 2014 would consider issues raised under Agenda items 6.3 and in the Secretariat paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-10.

6.4 Recommendations to revise CMMs prioritized by CMS process which were ambiguous or problematic (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

69. The Compliance Manager drew TCC’s attention to WCPFC-TCC10-2014-10 Table 3 which contains paragraphs of CMMs which may warrant further discussion or clarification by TCC.
70. FFA members noted instances in the draft CMR where the Secretariat raised implementation or interpretation issues, or deficiencies with specific measures – for example, determining whether observer trips were under the ROP or not. They appreciated the Secretariat highlighting these issues and suggested a format needed to be identified so it can be done in a way that does not suggest non-compliance.
71. The TCC Chair noted that some measures were found to be problematic last year and at least one area had been clarified. The Provisional CMR SWG meeting was asked to take up these issues and others raised in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-10.

6.5 Recommendations to refine CMM 2013-02 *Compliance Monitoring Scheme* (WCPFC9 para 296)

72. FFA members recommended revisions to CMM 2013-02 relating to: i) duration: it would be prudent to refine the CMS process and have it well understood, including its implications, by CCMs before being made a permanent measure; and ii) provisional assessment of compliance status: currently a CCM may “block” TCC from assessing it as non-compliant, which FFA members see as undermining the CMS process. They propose that a CCM not be allowed to veto its own assessment.
73. The TCC Chair requested that the TCC Vice Chair convene a SWG meeting on Monday 29 September to discuss refinements to the CMS measure (CMM 2013-02).

Outcomes from the SWG on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme measure (CMM 2013-02):

74. The SWG on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme measure (CMM 2013-02) discussed a number of issues and potential changes related to the current CMS measure. In particular, the group focused on:
 - the need to more clearly define the meaning of each compliance status
 - consideration of refinement of the categories of non-compliance

- clarification as to the application of the “next steps” from Annex I
- the need to refine the measure to allow the Commission to specify which measures should be assessed the following year, in order to streamline and prioritize TCC’s review, and
- consideration of whether the CMS working group should operate in open or closed session. The SWG also noted the comments provided by FFA on the existing measure.

75. TCC10 recommended that CCMs provide the United States with any additional comments on the CMM 2013-02 by 29 October 2014. The United States will provide a draft revision of CMM 2013-02 for consideration by WCPFC11 in advance of that meeting.

6.6 Report from IWG Chair: developing a systematic analysis, prioritization and response mechanism for non-compliance (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

76. The TCC Chair invited TCC10 to consider the development of responses to non-compliance, noting that an intersessional working group was established by the Commission for this purpose through paragraph 24 of CMM 2013-02 and this has previously been identified as a TCC Workplan priority task.
77. Alexa Cole (USA), Chair of the intersessional working group, reported that some informal discussions would commence during TCC10 on responses to non-compliance. She noted that in some ways through CMM 2013-02, TCC is expected this year to be starting to work on responses to non-compliance by its tasking in Annex 1 to propose “next steps”, where an assessment of non-compliant or priority non-compliant had been made. A range of possibilities for progressing responses to non-compliance are being considered, including amendments to the current measure or propose a companion measure.
78. FFA members gave full support for the development of responses to non-compliance and noted that the nature and intent of non-compliance must be considered, with responses accounting for the magnitude of the breach and whether it is a first occurrence or ongoing. Defining precise requirements to ensure non-compliance is addressed is necessary, and responses must be graduated, providing opportunities for assistance and capacity building which take into account the special requirements of SIDS, before moving towards more severe penalties.
79. The TCC Chair requested that the TCC Vice-Chair, in her capacity as Chair of the IWG on Responses to Non-Compliance, might also lead discussions on the matter of responses to non-compliance during the SWG meeting on refinements to CMM 2013-02.

Outcomes on discussions related to responses to non-compliance in the CMS process from discussions during the SWG on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme measure (CMM 2013-02)

80. The Chair of the IWG-Responses to Non-Compliance reported back to TCC10. She noted that CCMs who participated in discussions during the Provisional

CMRSWG and the SWG on the CMS measure (CMM 2013-02), had agreed that there was not a need, at this time, to meet separately on responses to non-compliance. It was noted that some of the revisions to the current measure (CMM 2013-02) would have impacts on that processes related to responses to non-compliance, and it was suggested by some CCMs that we progress those revisions as a top priority, given that the measure needs to be extended or made permanent this year.

- 81. TCC10 recommends that the IWG continue its work intersessionally building upon the revisions to the CMS measure and taking into account the continuing work of the CMS working group. TCC10 recommends that CCMs provide the United States with any comments, recommendations or proposals on the responses to non-compliance process by 29 October 2014, for the continued development of this process.**

AGENDA ITEM 7 — ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

82. In response to a question from the EU about the status of the current Executive Director, the WCPFC Chair, Dr Charles Karnella, informed TCC10 that Glenn Hurry's contract ended on 25 September 2014. For the past two months Hurry was using leave and working for WCPFC from Canberra, finalising a GEF project which will bring extra funding to the Commission. Hurry's contract was extended for one month to do this and to be available on an as-needed basis. As of 25 October 2014 Hurry will no longer be in the position, at which time the Chair will appoint senior Commission staff in acting executive director roles, taking turns in a staged process, mindful of upcoming critical meeting times. The job advertisement for a new Executive Director closes on 6 October 2014. The Chair expressed concern about the number and overall quality of the applicant pool so far. There is no contingency for a situation where a panel does not have a suitable applicant among them. The Chair urged CCMs to consider this potential situation. The Chair suggested that an intersessional meeting may be required to address this prior to the regularly scheduled session on the Commission in Apia.
83. The Compliance Manager, as the designated officer acting as the Executive Director's representative, highlighted progress on key issues for the Secretariat, including budgetary issues, relating to WCPFC MCS programs over the past year, and noted it was the second year that the Secretariat has prepared this report for TCC (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-12). The paper consolidates the main findings and recommendations from technical and operational papers prepared by the Secretariat for TCC. All 13 staff in the WCPFC MCS Compliance section (four professional staff and nine locally recruited staff), remain in place. There are also two consultants with the Secretariat: Kerry Smith, seconded from the Australian Fisheries Management Authority to progress E-monitoring and E-reporting work, and Legal Adviser, David C. Angyal. A list of the MCS/compliance-related

meetings and training activities which were supported by WCPFC staff are provided on page 21-22 of the paper.

84. The online reporting systems were well used by CCMs and the Secretariat in the past year, and the investment the Commission has made in the WCPFC Integrated-MCS Information Management System (IMS) has clearly strengthened the CMR process and reporting by the Secretariat to TCC. It was noted it would not have been possible with current staff and resources to do a 5000+ row review of the dCMR without the support of the WCPFC online dCMR and Annual Report Part 2 reporting systems.
85. The Compliance Manager overviewed a number of important work areas for the MCS/Compliance section which will be covered in detail under specific agenda items. 2014 highlights include the successful implementation of RFV SSPs (CMM 2013-03), the current work underway to integrate VMS data with the RFV/IMS, implementation of improvements to the EHSP and high seas transshipment databases, and work to develop analytical and display IT tools. ROP data and HSBI information was able to be used to support reviews in draft CMR. Compliance with reporting deadlines was also included in the reviews. It was noted that the size of the dCMR has increased considerably and the Secretariat asked TCC and CCMs to consider ways in which the current dCMR report could be more focused and whether there could be ways to prioritise. Although the Secretariat was successful in meeting the deadlines in CMM 2013-02, it was noted that the current annual reporting and dCMR timelines did not leave much to chance and requires careful planning from April to the TCC meeting. For example, the current one week period for reviewing replies from CCMs to their draft CMRs currently overlaps with the target dates for TCC paper finalization, requiring long working hours to meet the tight dCMR turnaround times along with preparing the required TCC reports.

14.2 Administration of the Data Rules and Procedures, including Report on WCPFC Security Audit 2013/14

86. The Compliance Manager introduced the administration of WCPFC data access rules and procedures annual report, including the WCPFC security audit (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP07), noting that there had been 67 requests from CCMs in 2013 for specific WCPFC data, some of which were for multiple types of non-public domain data. In 2014 (at the time of writing) there have been 25 data requests received from members. The internal protocols and data request review procedures continue to work well, and no known breaches have occurred. A new initiative implemented in 2014 was the website's secure individual country pages, accessible only by the CCM, which supported the provision of additional information to CCMs to support draft CMRs.
87. The Secretariat updated TCC on the review of the integrity of WCPFC's VMS data, IMS and RFV security, which is conducted annually as required under paragraph 6.10 of the WCPFC VMS SSPs (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP08 (rev 1)). The review was conducted by Deloitte (Guam) and the report is available to all CCMs on the secure side of the website. The security of the website was improved to what Deloitte considers a good standard, and the reviewers were satisfied with the

complementary security and server arrangements implemented as part of the virtualised server network. Many of the issues which were highlighted in the previous year's review were rectified by the Secretariat. The Secretariat has formed an internal IT security committee, which will review the recommendations in the Deloitte report, and develop a plan of work to address them, and will look at disaster recovery for the online systems and databases.

88. FFA members reinforced the importance of the integrity and security of data held and disseminated by the Commission and noted that CCMs who do not provide all the data required by the Commission, particularly operational level data, continue to have access to the data held by the Commission. Paragraph 28 of the 2007 Data Rules and paragraph seven of the 2009 Data Rules state that access will be denied to Commission data in cases where a CCM has not provided required data for two consecutive years.
89. In response to FFA's concerns, several CCMs noted the importance of operational level catch and effort data for scientific purposes, but stated that not providing operational catch and effort data itself does not constitute non-compliance as long as aggregated catch and effort data had been provided under section 3 of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission. These CCMs reminded TCC that they were working with SPC on provision of operational data under cooperative analysis for Pacific-wide bigeye stock assessment, with discussions underway.
90. One CCM asked those members with domestic legal constraints to advise TCC on the work that is being done to overcome the legal constraints cited, however this received no response. FFA members noted that the provision in the Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission decision, was to give CCMs time to overcome domestic legal constraints to providing operational data and further noted that this provision was adopted some time ago, at WCPFC2 in 2005.
91. **TCC10 noted the Annual Report of the Executive Director and the Administration of the Data Rules and Procedures Report, including the WCPFC Security Audit 2013/14.**

AGENDA ITEM 8 — CORE MONITORING, CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE (MCS) ACTIVITIES

8.1 Vessel Monitoring System (VMS)

92. The Compliance Manager overviewed the annual report for the Commission VMS (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP01 (rev 1)), an overview of the data received and types of units approved for use in the system. The Commission VMS services are provided by FFA through the Pacific VMS and the VMS database is hosted at the Macquarie Data Centre in Sydney. The Commission VMS SLA costs have remained stable at around 400,000 p.a.. Currently there are 3,500 vessels reporting to the VMS system either directly or through position transfers from the FFA VMS.
93. In 2013/14 the WCPFC and FFA Secretariat have continued to work collaboratively on VMS matters. The Compliance Manager and VMS Manager

participated in the FFA VMS tender review process in early 2014. No final decision has been made on the tendering process except that FFA will continue with the current VMS arrangements. As was noted in the review undertaken of VMS arrangements two years ago there probably remain some possibilities for further cost efficiencies with VMS services, and this remains an ongoing area of work between the two Secretariats.

94. Some highlights related to WCPFC VMS work for 2014 included implementing the Vessel Tracking Agreement Format (VTAF) database module on the IMS, which among others supported this year's dCMR reviews of VTAF information submission. The Secretariat has implemented the VMS manual position reporting but acknowledged that there are probably some internal procedural issues that need to be refined in management of records related to advice between WCPFC and flag CCMs of non-reporting. Current work to align the RFV and the WCPFC VMS databases is expected to assist the Secretariat with improving its support to implementation of the VMS manual reporting procedures. Since TCC9 no further "flick the switch" notifications have been received (for application of the WCPFC VMS to WCPFC members' national waters). A number of CCMs have conducted high seas MCS operations, which the Secretariat continues to support through appropriately approved WCPFC data requests.
95. FFA members noted there is currently no direct link between the data in the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels, hosted in the Commission building in Pohnpei, and the WCPFC VMS database. They supported efforts so far and encouraged the Secretariat to continue to work closely with the FFA Secretariat to address this and other issues which may improve the efficiency and effectiveness of both tools. They expressed concern that some vessels delayed providing their manual reports until urged to do so by their flag states and asked the Secretariat to provide more detail than is contained in Annex 2 of the VMS report, specifically: how long a vessel provided manual reports for; on what frequency; and which ALC type, to support FFA members' ability to determine the extent and reasons for manual reporting. FFA members noted that the provisional SSPs for manual reporting expire in March 2015 and supported an extension for more than one year.
96. The TCC Chair noted FFA's request to the Secretariat on manual reporting.
97. FFA members noted that linking the WCPFC VMS with the RFV will provide WCPFC with the capability to develop and use the IMS-based reporting tools to better monitor and administer the VMS manual reporting requirements. They urged the Secretariat to make it a high priority task as it would help determine which manually reporting vessels may have problematic MTUs.
98. One CCM suggested that, as WCPFC9 endorsed Northern Committee members' commitment to implement VMS in the northwest quadrant of the Convention area (Convention Area north of 20N and west of 175E), the VMS now covers all WCPFC high seas areas and TCC should recommend to Commission that the VMS CMM be revised to reflect this. When questioned on the role of TCC in this respect, this CCM expressed the view that it falls under TCC's purview because it would seek to amend a CMM to achieve clarity in the scope of the VMS and,

consequently, compliance. Japan requested some time to check whether the proposal was consistent with the function of TCC as provided in article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Others supported it because it relates to a technical issue and suggested paragraph three of measure should simply be struck out. The CCMs met in the margins.

99. Noting WCPFC9's endorsement of Northern Committee members' commitment to implement VMS in the northwest quadrant of the Convention area, TCC10 recommended CMM 2011-02 should be revised. TCC10 welcomed United States initiative to submit revised proposal to WCPFC11.

100. The Secretariat thanked FFA Secretariat and other members for their support for its current work to align the RFV and WCPFC VMS data, and that they look forward to continuing its work to integrate WCPFC VMS data into the WCPFC IMS databases during late 2014.

(a) Expiry of VMS manual position reporting requirements on 1 March 2015 (VMS SSPs, Section 5)

101. TCC discussed briefly whether the VMS manual reporting provisions should be extended, and whether a date should be assigned.

102. TCC10 agreed to recommend to WCPFC11 that manual reporting provisions be extended until 1 March 2017.

(b) Review SLAs with Mobile Satellite Providers, develop ALC type approval process – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

103. The WCPFC Compliance Manager directed TCC to WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP01 and noted that the Commission has SLAs with SatComms, Vizada and CLS-Argos. The costs of these SLAs to support have changed only marginally; it is about 95,000 a year and these arrangements cover about half of the vessels reporting to the WCPFC VMS (the other half of the vessels report to WCPFC VMS through the FFA VMS). The VMS service provider has not been able to provide gateways for 39 vessels with the DMR 800D MTU on board, and it appears from recent information that the units are being phased out. The Secretariat advises that CCMs whose vessels have those units on board will still need to meet the Commission's VMS requirements.

104. TCC10 noted the Review of SLAs with Mobile Satellite Providers.

105. Japan stated that during 2013 some of its vessels were reported not to be detected on the WCPFC VMS system, although the national VMS was able to detect them, and reported the main reason of these unfits was that its VTAF information were not provided by the Secretariat to the service provider. Japan asked that the Secretariat ensure that the issue does not arise again next year.

106. FFA members suggested that it would be useful if, on weekly basis, the Secretariat provided flag CCMs a daily VMS status report for their flagged-vessels, which could include a daily count of the number of VMS reports received by the

Commission VMS. It would highlight potential reporting anomalies and keep CCMs informed of the VMS reporting status of their vessels. FFA advised those CCMs whose vessels are also in Good Standing on the FFA Vessel Register that such weekly reports are sent to the vessel operators by the FFA Secretariat and are also posted on the FFA website. They made the point that vessel operators will not be aware of non-VMS reporting to the Commission VMS unless advised.

107. The WCPFC VMS Manager, Albert Carlot, confirmed that the Secretariat provides a weekly report to flag states of anomalies, along with a request to investigate. Vessels with faulty units are also requested to manually report.

8.2 Regional Observer Programme

108. The WCPFC Observer Programme Coordinator, Karl Staisch, briefly introduced the sixth ROP Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP02) and noted a number of highlights:

109. Section 6, a new section, details whale shark, turtle and seabird interactions from available observer data in 2013, and as is required in the relevant CMMs.

- Sections 10 and 11 detail purse seine and longline observer coverage. Purse seine coverage is around 100% with most of it supplied by the Pacific Island ROP. There is a continual need for observer training.
- Section 12 contains tables on transshipments.
 - The Secretariat noted that TCC9 agreed to continue discussions on the need for notification requirements for fish carrier vessels and transshipment observers at TCC10. It was noted that paragraph 12.9 contains suggestions to help with the monitoring of fish carriers. Currently, the Secretariat can only record information from fish carriers of which it is aware. The Secretariat sees merit in knowing more about the intentions of other carriers and suggested that the issue could be referred to the IWG-ROP for further discussion.
- Section 18 contains information about the “observer trip monitoring summary”.
 - Table 4 shows the number of yes’s from 641 observer trips from across all fishing fleets. The ROP CMM 2007-01 Annex B paragraph 1 (c) requires timely notification by the observer of comments about the vessel’s operations. Developing a procedure to achieve this, and its timing, has not been agreed and the Secretariat suggested that this issue be forwarded to the IWG-ROP for further discussion and direction.
- Section 19 contains information about observer credentials.
 - The Secretariat presented a list (at paragraph 19.2) of information which could be required on the front and back of each card. Some could be considered minimum required information; others might be optional.

- Section 21 contains information about corruption and directs CCMs to WCPFC-TCC10-2014-14, which seeks to identify mechanisms to prevent it.
 - Section 22 contains information on a booklet of CMMs the Secretariat has completed. The Secretariat noted that quotes of 5,000-36,000 to make printed copies were cited, and sought direction about whether CCMs required it to be printed, noting that it would require extra budget. The booklet is ~200 pages.
110. The Secretariat noted that the IWG-ROP which was formed last year has no Chair.
 111. The EU noted it had been its own suggestion to prepare a booklet and felt that something more streamlined would better assist the observers. The EU reminded TCC that the booklet would need to be reprinted every year as CMMs are added. EU suggested that a more focused booklet, available online, would be preferable.
 112. The USA noted that training of observers for cross-endorsement was last held in May 2013 and, while further training was intended for late 2014, due to the IATTC trainer's lack of availability it was delayed until early 2015. USA had utilised them on various occasions and emphasised the need for the supply of cross-endorsed observers. It was noted that WCPFC went to the effort to developing an MOU with IATTC and asked the Secretariat to make sure the training takes place in 2015.
 113. FFA members noted that the safety and well-being of observers is paramount and expressed concern about the number of compliance issues involving mistreatment or interference with observers by vessel operators. They called on CCMs to act swiftly to address these incidents and ensure adequate penalties are imposed on vessels found to be guilty of interference or maltreatment with observers.
 - 114. TCC10 recommends to WCPFC11 that the data field International Maritime Organisation (IMO) number or Lloyd's Register number required as per CMM 2013-04 be added to the list of minimum standard data fields an observer is asked to collect from vessels that are more than 100 GT or GRT.**
 115. One CCM noted that the flag State requirement to provide IMO numbers would be effective from the start of 2016.
 116. A discussion took place about observer identification cards. Japan requested the WCPFC logo be optional because its observer program covers all tuna RFMOs and multiple logos would not fit on one card. Japan also sought the Secretariat's explanation of the necessity of a signature as a minimum requirement. In response, the Secretariat suggested that the WCPFC logo should be somewhere on the card to identify the person as a ROP observer, and the flag or logo of observer providers should also be on the card, and clarified that the current proposal is that a signature would be optional.
 117. After discussions about whether some requirements were "minimum" or optional, the TCC Chair noted that while the Secretariat's suggested language was "minimum requirements," the Secretariat has revised its proposal taking into account the discussion for TCC10 to recommend these as "guidelines" and that the IWG-ROP might appropriately advise on the fields that should be minimum standards. One CCM stated that "minimum" did not mean "mandatory", and some

CCMs noted that there should be some required fields. One CCM expressed the view that the cards should look somewhat alike, and name and program might be a minimum standard.

118. The TCC Chair noted that the IWG ROP would discuss the guidelines in detail, including minimum standards.
- 119. TCC10 recommends that the Commission adopt as guidelines the list of information contained in 19.2 of the Regional Observer Programme Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP02) for ROP Identification Cards.**
- 120. TCC10 recommends that the Commission task to IWG ROP to look further into the minimum required information for the ROP identification cards.**

(a) Measuring and monitoring ROP longline coverage (TCC9 para 117)

121. The Compliance Manager presented WCPFC-TCC10-2014-13_rev1 which is a joint WCPFC/SPC paper that provides an update on the development of clearer guidelines for CCMs to satisfy the required 5% level of ROP longline observer coverage. It was noted that some CCMs are not aware of what they need to achieve in order to satisfy the obligation for 5% ROP coverage in the longline fishery. Meeting the 5% observer coverage requirement is a flag State responsibility, and depending on the nature of the each CCMs longline fisheries, flag CCMs may also need to work with other CCMs, including those CCMs who are observer providers, to ensure the observer coverage requirements are met and that the observer data is provided to WCPFC. Presently the WCPFC Secretariat does not have sufficient information to review implementation by flag CCMs of longline ROP coverage requirements and by observer providers of ROP data submission requirements
122. TCC9 considered this issue, and agreed that further work was needed on a joint WCPFC/SPC paper proposing guidelines. WCPFC10 referred this matter to the IWG-ROP. The paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-13_rev1 provides updated information from that provided to SC10, of the advice from CCMs on the metric for achieving 5% ROP longline coverage.
123. The TCC Chair reminded CCMs of the responsibility to meet ROP coverage levels and noted there is a clear indication from the annual reporting that some CCMs still need assistance to meet their obligations. The CMM organises ROP coverage on the basis of trips, but it was noted that there is also an issue of representativeness of ROP coverage, both from a science and compliance perspective.
124. The Secretariat reported that SC10 also recognised the issues of determining ROP longline coverage and convened an informal small group during SC10 which suggested a way forward for TCC10 (attached as Annex 1). The joint recommendations from WCPFC/SPC to clarify actions needed by CCMs to meet 5% ROP longline observer coverage are provided on paragraph 15 of the paper.
125. FFA members expressed concern that many vessels which don't fish in and out of FFA ports have little or no observer coverage. They note that in the selection of the principal metric it is important that it is useful for MCS and independently

verifiable and preferred “days-at-sea.” They agreed that the WCPFC Scientific/Data service provider should compile estimates of total activity of each fishery for each metric, and agreed with the timeframes proposed.

126. In response to a question about deadlines for compiling estimates, SPC conveyed that the intention was to use 2013 as an example, with time to add 2014 information in preparation for SC and TCC in 2015.
127. FFA members supported the Secretariat’s compilation of information on longline observer coverage reported by CCMs, and the information included in tables 2 and 3 at future SC and TCC meetings. They note that certain fisheries are aggregated in the TCC10 tables. While understanding the need to rationalise the number of fisheries, and group together those with similar operational characteristics, they encourage the Secretariat, SPC and specific CCMs to keep this table under review to ensure that different fisheries are suitably identified.
128. USA reported that its national standard is based around providing a statistically reliable bycatch estimate and that for reasons of improved confidence intervals its observer programme is managed on the basis of trips. It has observer coverage on 20-100% of its longline fleets, and so has no problem meeting the 5% coverage requirement. From their experience, planning of observer coverage by number of trips is more statistically reliable. It was noted that often the number of days that a vessel will fish during a trip is not always known, but acknowledged that days fished might be a useful metric for after the fact reviewing the implementation by flag CCMs of ROP longline observer coverage.
129. Japan asked the purpose of reporting longline observer coverage, including coverage calculated by metrics not used in its observer program, in the proposed template (Table 3). SPC responded that it would be used to compile information already provided on observer coverage and put it into a table for review. SPC noted that all CCMs need to do is to decide on a metric, then indicate how much observer activity was conducted by the fleet.
130. A number of CCMs voiced concern about particular terms in table 1. The TCC Chair stated that TCC10 was not ready to approve the guidelines in the table and directed those CCMs to raise their issues with SPC.
131. There was some discussion about the Science/Data service provider and information received under 2 (a) and 2 (b). SPC confirmed that it would compile the information and put it into the template and would include the template in the papers it normally produces.
132. Japan enquired about the deadline in (iii) of paragraph 137 of this report and noting that it is still calculating its observer coverage in 2013. It noted it could accept it if it can revise its observer coverage submitted in its Part 1 report at TCC.
133. SPC explained that there is an allowance for revisions at TCC and when the information is compiled in (iii) that will be reflected. It is related to (ii), and whatever happens in that section will requires (iii) to be compiled and updated accordingly.

134. In response to a query from some CCMs about the best metric to be used for compliance purposes (subsection (iv)), SPC clarified that they are looking for one nominated metric and the Compliance Manager noted that this recommendation was originally drafted presuming that TCC10 may have discussed issues around providing recommendations on the best metric, but noting that this was not discussed the Secretariat recognises that upon reflection the current drafting is not appropriate. EU agreed but asked that in the future SPC could provide advice on what the best metric would be to ensure compliance. Further, PNG asked for advice on the potential implications of cutting the number of possible metrics down to one. SPC noted that there was much discussion at SC on metrics and there is quite a range of metrics CCMs wanted to nominate and noted that there may not be one particular metric and suggested further discussion in the future.
135. One CCM noted that a comparison of the different metrics is needed to decide which is the most appropriate to use and ensure CCMs are operating on a level playing field.
136. EU suggested that perhaps next year SPC could advise on how this will work.
- 137. TCC10 recommended that the Commission:**
- (i) Approve the proposed guidelines for ROP longline coverage by fleet/fishery described in Attachment D Table 1, noting that it should be open to review and adjustments at future TCC meetings;**
 - (ii) Approve the proposal for CCMs to**
 - a. Decide on the observer coverage metric and then compile the observer coverage using this metric for their fleet activity in 2013 (as required in Attachment D Tables 2 and 3) and submit this information to the WCPFC Secretariat before 28 February 2015, and**
 - b. (for subsequent years) Compile and include this information in their respective Annual Report Part 1 to be submitted from 2015 onwards, noting that revisions can be provided at the annual TCC meeting.**
 - (iii) Approve the recommendation that the WCPFC Science/Data service provider compiles estimates of total activity of each fleet for the nominated metric (outlined by the SC10 ISG7) to be included in the proposed template (Attachment D Table 3)**
 - a. For 2013 activities, this information should be combined in the template (Attachment D Table 3) with the observer coverage provided by the CCMs (deadline 28th February 2015) and made available by 30th March 2015.**
 - b. For subsequent years, this information should be combined in the template (Attachment D Table 3) with the observer coverage provided by the CCMs (in their Part 1 reports) and made available for SC and TCC;**
 - (iv) Approve the recommendation that the WCPFC Secretariat (with assistance from the Science/Data service provider) compile the information reported by CCMs on longline observer coverage and report**

the information included in Attachment D Tables 2 and 3 in papers tabled for future SC and TCC meetings.

138. TCC10 requested that SPC and Secretariat undertake more work on this for TCC11.

139. SPC explained the changes it had made to the tables in the paper as a result of discussions in the margins with CCMs at TCC10 and these were accepted by TCC10. A sample report format was provided as guidance to assist CCMs with future reporting (Attachment D Table 4).

140. TCC10 agreed to Tables 1, 2 and 3 in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-13 (rev 1), as amended. (Attachment D)

(b) ROP and addressing corruption concerns (TCC9 para 184 and 204)

141. WCPFC Observer Program Coordinator, Karl Staisch, introduced a working paper on observer-related corruption (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-14), explaining that it was written following direction from TCC9 and WCPFC10. Emphasising that there was no evidence that it was a widespread problem, and that it involves a small number of observers, vessel captains and crew, the Secretariat has suggested some steps which could remove incentives for corruption and prevent or deter observers becoming involved in corruption. The WCPFC Secretariat has identified four ways to reduce or eliminate observer related corruption:

- Improve observer standards for technical training, Codes of Conduct, and professionalism as well as standards to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of observers stationed on board vessels
- Eliminate the incentives for corruption by making the risks greater than the rewards and providing positive incentives for good behavior
- Eliminate the source of corruption through regulations or other measures that are more easily enforced independently of an observer
- Creating carefully and well thought out CMMs, so that they do not open the ROP to potential fraud.

142. Observer providers should have procedures in place so that information is quickly reported to the debriefing supervisor, and a designated law enforcement authority if needed. The paper discusses other possible solutions including positive incentives for observers to report corruption rather than be part of it, increasing salaries, using two observers, E-monitoring and E-reporting as well as having strong legislation domestically. Paragraph 25 of the paper contains suggestions for TCC's consideration.

143. Japan noted that during debriefing conducted under its observer program, observers are asked if there were any corrupt or problematic activities..

144. One CCM expressed the view that while corruption is a problem, it is a small problem. This CCM stated that incentive schemes to compensate observers for reporting attempted corrupt activities or corruption on vessels (sub-paragraph (f)) is

a slippery slope at best and bad practice at worst and shouldn't be forwarded for consideration.

145. FFA members noted that it was in the interest of all CCMs, either flag States or as observer providers, to eradicate the risk of corruption. Corruption affects both the industry and MCS entities and noted that when dealing with corruption issues, as is the case with IUU practices more broadly, it is important to avoid producing negative public perceptions of the fishery itself. FFA members further noted that the focus appears to be on the observers. However, while most who responded to the Secretariat's Circular on the issue indicated that they had "no problems with corruption" and allegations of corruption in the paper may be hearsay, they noted that the ROP Annual Report indicates that observers reported cases of intimidation as well as requests to not document incidents by crew members at a frequency of 5.5% of trips. FFA members supported the recommendations of the paper as guidelines and held the view that issues of corruption or observer misbehaviour should be dealt with between the flag state and the observer provider in the first instance. The Secretariat's audit role ensures that the observer providers meet the minimum standards for the ROP authorisation, which includes a Code of Conduct, training, and a mechanism for measuring the performance of individual observers. All authorised ROP providers have been audited and met standards set by the Commission for professional integrity. FFA members further noted the development of the PIRFO professional development framework, which provides protocols for observers and career incentives for observers to maintain their integrity. FFA stated that its emphasis over the past year on developing debriefing procedures and capacity in the region has led to an improvement of observer data quality and expressed the view that the increased use of observers as a principal tool to detect compliance incidents of the host vessel risks the integrity of observers being questioned. They noted that the benefits gained from inducing an observer or for an observer to extort crew is weakened and the likelihood of detection increased when there are known other tools monitoring vessels and reminded TCC that E-monitoring and E-reporting trials are currently being undertaken by FFA members.
146. The WCPFC Observer Program Coordinator introduced a Secretariat paper proposing a minimum standard for mechanisms to prevent and stop misconduct of observers (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-14A). This was a request from TCC9, following complaints from observer providers, captains and crew masters about misconduct. It was stressed that misconduct has diminished significantly with the inception of the ROP 8 years ago, though a small number of problems remain. It was discussed at TCC9 and WCPFC10 and the Secretariat was tasked to develop a minimum standard. Table 1 details mechanisms to prevent and deter alcohol-related misconduct of observers mechanisms, which were ideas discussed at the SPC/FFA Regional Observer Coordinators Workshop, held in Noumea in March 2014, as well as other suggestions received by the Secretariat. It was stressed that not all misconduct involved alcohol. TCC was directed to Table 1 and paragraph 22 which could be used as a standard, with the suggestion that further discussion at the IWG ROP may be preferable.

147. FFA members welcomed the development of mechanisms to mitigate misbehaviour by observers, considering the guidelines for best practices for administration and management of observer programmes. These CCMs are implementing administrative practices within their national agencies to increase their observers' professionalism. They note that, in practice, many accusations are received by providers as hearsay from operators. To deal with misbehaviour of observers a documented complaint should be made to the provider, for example on the PIRFO "Vessel Report on Observer" form, as per the service agreement between the provider and the operator. FFA members are not aware of the formal submission of complaints using these forms. In contrast, observer providers have formally taken cases of observer mistreatment to flag States. It was suggested that the Secretariat could be an arbitrator between provider and flag state if necessary.

148. TCC10 noted the suggestions at paragraph 25 of WCPFC-TCC10-2014-14A.

149. TCC10 requested that the IWG-ROP discuss the suggested mechanisms outlined in Table 1 of WCPFC-TCC10-2014-14A.

(c) Notification requirements for monitoring observer coverage on carriers involved in high seas transshipment activities (TCC9 para 177)

150. TCC10 was invited to discuss and as appropriate make recommendations on the need for notification requirements for fish carrier vessels and transshipment observers at TCC10. The TCC Chair directed TCC to consider the suggested actions to establish notification requirements for monitoring observer coverage on carriers intending to be involved in high seas transshipment activities included in paragraph 29 of Secretariat paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP02.

151. In response to a question from one CCM, the TCC Chair confirmed that the proposed recommendation was that within 4 months (120 days) of disembarkation ROP providers would send the required information to the Secretariat.

152. One CCM asked how the workbooks would be forwarded. The Secretariat confirmed that the process would be similar to how information is currently sent to SPC.

153. In response to a query about assistance with meeting the deadline, the Secretariat noted that it could have discussion with Kiribati and Vanuatu for costings for a budget submission for the Commission meeting.

154. The FFA Secretariat recalled discussions last year, and the language that was settled on was to "encourage best endeavours" and noted that this proposal sets a different standard.

155. The FFA Secretariat also asked what happens when observer reports are submitted to SPC and whether SPC filtered the information – we are only talking about the ROP parts of the data. The WCPFC Secretariat noted that the discussions here are in relation to ROP reports related to transshipment, and as per CMM 2009-06 all transshipment reporting and monitoring of high seas transshipment activities, so all

observer data would all be ROP data, making there no need to differentiate the data. The Secretariat confirmed that the information goes to the Commission not SPC, noting that SPC has no database for transshipment observer data. WCPFC Secretariat has plans to develop a transshipment observer database as a future IMS development, and noted that e-reporting initiatives might usefully assist here.

156. **TCC10 agreed to recommend to WCPFC11 that ROP providers which place observers on fish carrier vessels that transship on the high seas are strongly encouraged to send the completed data forms, workbooks, reports and journals of the observer to the Commission Secretariat where possible within 120 days of the disembarkation of the observer from the carrier.**
157. **TCC10 recommends to the Commission that paragraph 12.9 in TCC10-2014-RP02 (page 8) on transshipment notification rules (a) to (d) be forwarded to the IWG-ROP for further discussion and direction.**

(d) Annual list of changes required to observer training programmes (TCC8, para 33) and observer handbook of CMMs (TCC9 para 206)

158. The Secretariat provided an update on its preparation of a CMM handbook for observers (TCC9 report para 206) and TCC10 was invited to discuss and as appropriate make recommendations on this.
159. One CCM asked that hyperlinks be included in the electronic version of the booklet.
160. One CCM queried how the budget would be impacted by this tasking. The Secretariat confirmed that costs of printing the ~200 page document was 5,000-36,000 for 1500 copies to be printed; a cost which would increase over the years. Airfreight of the booklets to the 23 different ROP programs would cost around 6,000 a year. It would probably 12,000-15,000 to have it printed and distributed if all CMMs are included; cutting it back to contain only that required by observers would reduce the costs, but not by much.
161. One CCM noted that it would lessen the compliance burden if observers were educated on the CMMs through a printed booklet, and asked whether booklet would be printed in multiple languages. The Secretariat noted that the language of the Commission is English and without language capability in the Secretariat there would be delays and extra costs involved and probably wasn't practical.
162. Some CCMs noted that observers already have a lot of work to do and they should stay focused on what they have to do, so the CMM booklet should be observer-related. All CMMs are available online already for anyone who requires them. It was noted that the current beta copy could be retained on the website in booklet form with all CMMs. One CCM noted that some national programs may already be using electronic forms. The TCC Chair noted that it could be available on request to ensure booklets in excess of demand were not printed. It was noted that a 2014 version would expire soon so there should be a 2015 version, to be put in place after WCPFC11 with an electronic version on website.

163. One CCM asked if, for those members requesting capacity building, the Secretariat could visit CCMs and give a pep talk on the CMMs when furnishing the booklets and if that could be captured in the budget. The Secretariat confirmed that there is budget for in-country discussions and training; it comes out of a separate budget line and is covered.
- 164. TCC10 recommended to WCPFC11 that it task the Secretariat to produce a ROP observer-specific CMM booklet commencing in 2015. TCC10 recommends that this ROP Observer CMM booklet, should be updated on a yearly basis. Based on requests from ROP authorized observer programmes, the Secretariat should arrange for the printing and distribution of the ROP-focussed Observer CMM booklet. An electronic version of the observer-specific CMM booklet and a booklet containing a complete set of current CMMs should also be made available on the WCPFC public website for download.**
- 165. TCC10 recommended that the Secretariat continue to allocate a budget for in-country discussions and training on CMMs and ROP matters.**
- (e) Mechanism for observer data to be provided to the Master/Vessel Operator/Captain – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)**
166. TCC10 was invited to discuss this priority project specific task which was included in the approved TCC Workplan 2013-2015. It was noted that CMM 2007-01 (1) (c) calls for timely notification from observer providers. The TCC Chair noted that this has been an ongoing discussion for some time; the context is agreed but not the timing. The CMM states that the captain and vessel operators should be allowed to see the information in observer reports from the trip but not while the observer is on board. Currently there can be a long period of time between a trip and the captain knowing about any possible violations which occurred of that trip. It was suggested that issues of intimidation and confidentiality need to be discussed thoroughly and this and other issues could be more fully discussed at the IWG ROP, with guidelines perhaps being developed.
167. FFA members emphasised that safety was paramount. Ensuring independence, and the veracity of information collected, was critical. They noted the ROP Annual Report observer trip monitoring summary cites 35 incidents of intimidation and 38 incidents of requests by crew for the observer to not report an event.
168. FFA members emphasised that provision of non-public domain data should be through the requirements of the data rules and procedures, and provision of information pertaining to possible infractions should be through the observer provider and the flag state, via the WCPFC Secretariat. FFA members agree that paragraph 1 (c) in CMM 20017-01 in Attachment K Annex B is inconsistent with the data rules and procedures and the rights of observers to work unhindered in a safe environment. These CCMs seek to remove this right of vessel captains.
169. EU considered it important for the captain of a vessel to provide additional info but in a way that doesn't affect the impartiality of the observer. It was common practice

to do this once a trip was finished. It was agreed that the captain should have the opportunity to comment on the report.

170. The Secretariat noted that in some RFMOs the observer presents the report before the observer leaves the vessel and the captain signs off on the data – however, that is for scientific programs, not those related to compliance. It was noted that the ROP is all-encompassing, covering compliance, science and environmental issues. The EU pointed out that in the majority of RFMOs, the observer reports are used for both scientific and compliance purposes.
171. The TCC Chair suggested that there was no agreement to move this to an IWG which meant there would be no recommendation on the issue. The USA reiterated its request that it be moved to IWG for discussion rather than simply noted. The EU stressed that it was a very important issue and supported the USA view, wanting to ensure that the discussion moves forward the before TCC11. It further suggested that this information should be provided at the end of a trip, either immediately or very soon afterward. Too long and it loses its relevance.
172. Japan noted that this issue came up during the CMR review and queried how flag states could assess observer reports to achieve their flag state responsibility when its vessel was alleged to have infringed WCPFC CMMs. It supported further intersessional discussions. Another CCM noted that it is up to the flag state to ensure compliance against CMMs, and the information the flag state needs is available through the data rules. This CCM stated that the safety of observers was very important, and noted circumstances where observers are asked by captains to make multiple trips without a chance to debrief.
173. One CCM suggested that the Secretariat and SPC develop some kind of mechanism to speed up the provision of information to flag states, who can then use it to discuss issues with vessel masters and operators. EU supported that, and suggested an IT tool or platform could make it easier and timelier for CCMs to access observer report data concerning their vessels. EU reminded CCMs that flag states can always request them, but if there was a standard procedure or tool to allow them to access them directly that would help in terms of timing.
174. One CCM noted that SPC's ability to generate reports or summaries depended on an ability to get the information and asked whether it would be provided to SPC as a warehouse. Unless there is an arrangement between the flag state and SPC then it is important for the Secretariat to do that. This CCM noted that for those flag states which placing their own observers on their vessels, there is no system at all.
175. The Compliance Manager noted the Secretariats understanding that many observer providers had made their preference clear that, should flag States need to access the observer reports, they should request the information directly from the observer provider. CCMs can access ROP data on request through the WCPFC Rules of Procedure for access to, protection of and dissemination of data (2007 and 2009), but this would only be the ROP minimum data fields, but as noted earlier in the week by many observer providers this would not necessarily be the observer journal. In addition, the Secretariat understands that from the review of draft CMRs that CCMs are comfortable with the approach that was used by the Secretariat in

supporting documentation for draft CMRs of *alleged incidents of possible non-compliance*. The Secretariat understands from the discussions that there is a desire for WCPFC to continue to work with SPC-OFP, as WCPFC Scientific Service Provider, to work on IT mechanisms that might make this summary information related to ROP-related observations *alleged incidents of possible non-compliance* available on a more routine basis, to both flag CCMs and as appropriate relevant coastal CCMs.

176. Some CCMs expressed disagreement with the proposed recommendation, preferring to progress the discussion at the Commission meeting or TCC11.
177. In noting that there was not a unified position in the group on this issue, the TCC Chair reminded CCMs that this was part of the Workplan for this year and an intersessional process can take place without TCC necessarily directing that; CCMs can meet as necessary, however there was no agreement to send the discussion to the IWG ROP. The TCC Chair confirmed that the Commission had agreed to reconstitute IWG ROP but it noted that it has not been tasked yet, it has not met yet, and it does not have a Chair.
178. The TCC Chair summarised the discussions noting that there was no clear directions from TCC on how to move this matter forward.
- 179. TCC10 noted the discussion on this topic.**

(f) Funding or IT capacity in place to maintain observer data provision (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

180. The Compliance Manager explained that this item was placed on the agenda because it is on the TCC Workplan, and directed TCC to the Executive Director's Report which provided an overview of the budget currently committed to ROP data entry. This year's budget is 800,000, which will increase over time as supplementary funding from New Caledonia and New Zealand are wrapping up. Indicative costs for 2015 are expected to be a little over 900,000.
- 181. TCC10 noted that budget was in place for this in 2015.**

8.3 High Seas Transshipment Monitoring

(a) MCS implications of high seas transshipment (TCC9 para 268)

182. TCC10 was invited to discuss the MCS implications of high seas transshipment and CMS process outcomes related to CMM 2009-06 (TCC10, para 268). The WCPFC Compliance Manager introduced the High Seas Transshipment Monitoring Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP03) and reported that in 2013 there were 596 high seas transshipments reported to the Secretariat in accordance with CMM2009-06, with 19 receiving vessels and 231 receiving vessels from 10 CCMs involved. With new cross checks and verification on the annual reporting from CCMs, the completeness of the 2013 data set will continue to improve as responses to dCMRs are received. There was a consistent level of high seas transshipping reporting in

2014 and advance notifications and post-transshipment declarations have improved, though gaps remain in WCPFC data holdings.

183. The Compliance Manager noted there have been some recent changes with the implementation of the RFV and there was an expectation in CMM 2013-03 that flag States shall include a positive determination to be involved in transshipment. CCMs can also report vessels that aren't authorized to transship, however this is only on the CCM accessible full intranet version of the RFV and isn't included on the public side. A question for TCC10 is whether this should be public. The Secretariat regularly receives queries from market states and fishing industry about whether specific vessels are authorised to transship on the high seas, so there is interest in seeing that information within the public forum.
184. Finally, the Secretariat noted there have been a number of in-house developments in 2014 which will assist monitoring of transshipment activities, including i) improvements in capability to monitor and review transshipment reporting by CCMs, with in-house IMS analytical capability and ii) preliminary work, with assistance from NOAA-OLE (Honolulu), to include IT tools for analysing WCPFC VMS data to identify possible transshipment events in the high seas. The Secretariat acknowledged assistance that was particularly beneficial, especially from Bill Pickering and his team in developing the high seas transshipment analysis tools moving forward, building a roll-out plan. It was suggested that ROP high seas transshipment observers would be good candidates for E-reporting initiatives and the point was made that being able to get some information to the Secretariat more quickly enables the Secretariat to better monitor transshipment activities.
185. The TCC Chair encouraged discussions about the recommendations to support the Secretariat in their ongoing work for on transshipment monitoring and E-reporting systems.
186. The USA expressed support for both of the initiatives highlighted by the Secretariat in TCC10-RP03 and supported the idea that high seas transshipment authorisation information should be considered public-domain data, since it is a subset of the broader fishing authorisation information, which is in the public domain. The USA made a further suggestion, noting that while the Secretariat Annual Reports on transshipment are currently limited to information about transshipment on the high seas in the Convention area, that it would be more useful if the reports were expanded to address transshipments throughout the Convention area, using the information required to be reported by CCMs in their annual reports, which is in aggregate form.
187. FFA members continued to advocate that all transshipment activities needs to be carried out in designated transshipment ports with effective monitoring. Transshipment in ports mitigates the risk of unreported activities and supports the timely submission of data and information to authorities. Incidents where transshipment takes place without prior approval and transshipment and operational level data is not provided is non-compliant with the WCPFC Transshipment Regulation and disadvantages CCMs that fully comply, and the Commission process. FFA members understand that there are negative economic repercussions

when transshipment is not authorised to take place on the high seas in the Convention area, as some of our own flagged and chartered vessels are also effected, however continue to believe that the strengthening of fisheries monitoring and management, coupled with additional economic opportunities to SIDS through port usage outweigh these costs.

188. The Secretariat confirmed that it would be willing to expand its annual reporting to include a summary of the information provided by CCMs in Annual Report Part 1 where CCMs have provided reports in accordance with CMM 2009-06 paragraph 11 (fields specified in CMM 2009-06 Annex 2).
189. One CCM confirmed its support for the chartering notification after coming back to the group. The TCC Chair directed that CCMs views on matters related to the confidentiality classification of RFV-related information be held until Agenda 8.5 Record of Fishing Vessels.
- 190. TCC10 agreed to i) provide its support for the continuing work by the WCPFC Secretariat to enhance and expand its IMS capabilities to cross-verify high seas transshipment activity using VMS analysis and ROP data, and to continue to strengthen its systems for monitoring high seas transshipment; and ii) encourage the Secretariat to work with interested CCMs on developing electronic reporting solutions that could be used by CCMs, on a voluntary basis, to report high seas advance transshipment notifications (CMM 2009-06 35 a (iii)), and to report back to TCC11.**
- 191. TCC10 requested that the Secretariat expand its annual transshipment report to include a summary of the information on transshipment activities that CCMs report annually through Annual Report Part 1 (CMM 2009-06 paragraph 11) in aggregate form.**

8.4 High Seas Boarding and Inspection (HSBI)

(a) Review implementation and effectiveness (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

192. The WCPFC Assistant Compliance Manager ‘Ana F. Taholo introduced the HSBI Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP04). Members have continued to notify the Commission of their intention to conduct HSBI, and the latest was Kiribati in March 2014. There was also a recent advice sent out by Circular related to updates to Australia’s details of authorised inspection vessels. In 2013, the Secretariat received 83 reports from seven members conducting HSBI activities and these are shown in Table 2 of the paper. Three vessels were observed to have alleged serious violations (as defined in CMM 2006-08, paragraph 37). In 2014, 37 reports were received from four members conducting HSBI activities. The Secretariat would appreciate working with CCMs to reconcile boarding and inspection reports for the past years in order to complete its records. As noted in the CMR SWG discussions, the full draft CMR includes the HSBI scheme for first time this year, as well as Convention Article 25(2) and 23(5) reporting. The Secretariat requested feedback on improvements on reporting for next year.

193. Some CCMs made reference to paragraph 20d. of CMM 2006-08 which provides that prior to initiating HSBI activities, inspecting vessels shall initiate notice through the authorities of the inspection vessel of the boarding and inspection to the authorities of the fishing vessel. These CCMs also reported that this year some HSBI activities were conducted without prior notification to the authorities of the fishing vessel, and requested that members conducting HSBI comply with the procedure. Noting all alleged infringements of CMM s reported by the authority of inspection vessels in 2013, for this CCM were vessels not detected on WCPFC VMS system, Japan requested again that the Secretariat ensure that provided VTAF information is transmitted from the Secretariat to the VMS provider.
194. Several CCMs expressed concern that contact details for authorities of fishing vessels were not up to date, making prior notification more difficult.
195. FFA members thanked those CCMs which had carried out WCPFC HSBI activities and encouraged those CCMs to share their experiences. These CCMs welcomed Kiribati's notification of its intention to participate in HSBI. FFA members also thanked Japan and Korea for conducting HSBI for the first time in 2013, and expressed appreciation to the US Coast Guard for continuing to carry out HSBI in the high seas adjacent to FFA member countries as well as the opportunity to participate under ship-rider agreements with the US. FFA members noted concerns raised in the Secretariat report about delays in reporting by CCMs at the completion of activities, and the delay in reporting by the flag States of vessels implicated of actions taken.
196. The USA noted that the number of HSBI reports in Table 2 in previous years is not consistent with its internal records, and committed to working with the Secretariat intersessionally to ensure they have all the information. The USA was in full support of both suggestions in paragraph 9 – including a question asking for ALC units (of the Standardized Multi-Language Questionnaire) and establishing a real time process where inspecting authorities can verify if a vessel is transmitting on the WCPFC VMS, either through communications with the Secretariat or directly with the flag State. The USA offered assistance to work with the Secretariat to update the questionnaire and continued to support the development of a technical solution to allow inspecting authorities to query vessel boarding histories, including prior violations, while engaged in MCS activities. It would like to explore ways to keep contacts up to date to avoid difficulties in contacting flag state authorities before boarding.
197. Australia reported that it had conducted its first HSBI this year. It learned many lessons and acknowledged the cooperation and facilitation of the crew and master of the Japanese vessel it boarded.
198. The Secretariat acknowledged CCMs' concerns about out of date contact details for HSBI authority of fishing vessels; these were not new concerns and often the Secretariat has tried to assist inspection authorities by providing copies of official contact details as supplementary contact details in case the authority of fishing vessel contact details are outdated. The Secretariat's hope is that by putting all

contact details in one place on each CCM portal will make it easier for flag CCMs to become aware when their details are out of date and for updates to these details to be made by the flag CCM. The problem is that there is no formal mechanism for the Secretariat to update flag CCMs official contact details for the purpose of the WCPFC High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme currently, and the CMM 2006-08 clearly puts that responsibility on flag CCMs.

199. Australia reminded CCMs that it is up to members to keep the current authority of fishing vessels up to date, not the Secretariat's.
- 200. TCC10 supported the Secretariat continuing to explore options to capture CCMs' contact details of authorities of inspection and fishing vessels to ensure that CCMs' contact information is up-to-date and accessible in accordance with CMM 2006-08.**
- 201. TCC noted the paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP04.**

8.5 Record of Fishing Vessels (RFV)

202. The WCPFC Compliance Manager introduced the RFV Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP05), noting that as at 5 Sept 2014, 28 CCMs (including five CNMs) have submitted 6049 records of their respective fishing vessels to the Executive Director. It was reported that there have been some significant changes to the way CCMs are able to update RFV information. The Secretariat successfully implemented the RFV SSPs (CMM 2013-03) within the deadline of the CMM, and it was completed using funds within the regular IMS budget (100,000). There are two ways: CCMs can log onto the online portal and directly edit their submitted vessels – most commonly as flag CCM, but also as a chartering state for the purposes of paragraph 41 of CMM 2013-10; or submit an excel spreadsheet which contains data in the format and specifications as provided in CMM 2013-03. It was noted that the original version of CMM 2013-03 circulated by the Secretariat was missing a footnote which made it clear that there were minimum fields but CCMs were expected to provide all data in the RFV; this was corrected by the Secretariat in WCPFC Circular 2014/79 22 CCMs had provided updates to RFV and 2044 vessels had been updated since the SSPs were implemented. Most updates were done via the direct entry method. Some CCMs use excel, while others use both methods, possibly due to the size of the update and how quickly they need the updates reflected. Feedback has been positive on both the public website view of the RFV and with the changes to the RFV update methods, and the Secretariat has been successful in assisting many CCMs with both the RFV.
203. The Secretariat noted that there are two groups of fields that flag CCMs are to report in the RFV which are currently not included on the public side of the RFV; high seas transshipment and charter notifications. Noting paragraph 1b of CMM 2013-03, and some prior direction from TCC8, the Secretariat thought it best to err on side of caution and implemented the RFV SSPs with these fields as non-public domain. The Secretariat sought advice on whether TCC wants the TCC8 direction to apply now that the SSPs are implemented.

204. Finally, the Secretariat reminded CCMs of the importance of the Record of Fishing Vessels VID number: which is the internal WCPFC Secretariat system identifier for WCPFC RFV records. The VID provides a necessary check, particularly when updates are being made through the mode of MS Excel file, so as to ensure that the correct vessel records are being updated. The Secretariat emphasised that it is important for flag CCMs, to duly check to make sure that the VID numbers that they provide in MS Excel files are the correct ones. The Secretariat has received MS Excel files from CCMs which have contained incorrect VID numbers, but noted that fortunately the data included in the RFV field was sufficiently different that the file checks rejected the update and records were not mistakenly updated. The Secretariat stressed that the history of vessels was important, given the integrated nature of the developing WCPFC IMS database systems going forward, so any suggestions or changes to the RFV SSPs to mitigate that risk going forward would be appreciated. The Secretariat confirmed that the Secretariat is able to provide CCMs with a list of their previous or current VIDs for their submitted vessels or vessels being reflagged on request.
205. FFA members sought advice from the Secretariat about whether the RFV can be provided to CCMs in a format that allows them to examine trends over time. The current format is only a snapshot, providing information on the status quo, but accessing historical information would increase the utility of the RFV by supporting profiling and more detailed analysis. It could also improve information available to scientists in their work.
206. The Secretariat confirmed that in accordance with paragraph 1 a of CMM 2013-03, the RFV database is capable of depicting the RFV as it existed at any time in the past as the history of each vessel is contained in the individual vessel's record. Right clicking on the vessel via the intranet accesses the vessel's history, including who made changes to the record. The Secretariat accesses this information for its reviews and it is used in current Secretariat analytical tools, for example when looking at the transshipment database they can pinpoint the history and flag of that vessel at the time the transshipment took place. This points to the importance of the VID; it makes sure history of a vessel in WCPFC IMS records is maintained.
207. FFA members expressed support for the newly adopted RFV SSPs, which have improved the quality of the vessel records in RFV database. These CCMs stressed the importance of vessel information provided in the RFV being readily available to CCMs and is complete, up-to-date, accurate, unambiguous and comparable across other vessel listings. Critically, vessel information in the RFV is used for verification purposes by the FFA Secretariat when processing 'Certificate of Registration' applications, which are required of vessel operators when applying for an FFA member EEZ fishing license. Some CCMs have made their best efforts to comply with the minimum required fields as provided in the RFV SSPs, however, other CCMs appear to be implementing the minimum required fields in the WCPFC RFV on an 'as-needed' basis. CMM 2013-03 now requires any new additions to the RFV to include all minimum data requirements. FFA members noted that this does not address the data gaps for vessels entered on to the RFV prior to this. These CCMs recommended that the Commission adopt a process to

ensure that these gaps are filled over time, with a deadline determined for the provision of minimum data requirements that is sufficient to allow flag States to collect additional information to which they may not currently have access.

208. The USA congratulated the Secretariat for completing the work needed to implement the SSPs on time – this represented major changes to the Secretariat’s information systems. This CCM supported the FFA members’ recommendation to establish a date, not too far into the future, when all vessels must have the minimum fields completed in order to remain on the RFV. The USA also reiterated its suggestion that high seas transshipment authorization information and charter notifications be put into the public domain. This CCM supported the Secretariat’s recommendation to revoke CMM 2013-04 as its operative parts have been incorporated into CMM 2013-10 (paragraph 6(s) and footnote 4), making it redundant.
209. The Secretariat confirmed that a footnote has been reinstated into the RFV SSPs as a correction to the published version of CMM 2013-03. This footnote also talks to the completeness of non-minimum required fields being reviewed through the CMS process. Footnote 3 to CMM 2013-03 reads: Although vessels with only the minimum required data will be added to and maintained on the RFV, this does not relieve the responsible CCM of its obligations to provide all the data required under the WCPFC’s applicable conservation and management measures. The consequences of failing to provide such data will be specified outside of these SSPs, such as in the WCPFC’s compliance monitoring scheme.
210. The TCC Chair directed CCMs to paragraph 53 in the Executive Director’s report, wherein the Secretariat sought direction about whether CCMs had intended, once the RFV SSPs was implemented, for specific fields in the RFV to be non-public domain information, and, if so, whether the TCC8 directions to treat Charter Notifications and high seas transshipment authorization information as non-public domain information, should still apply.
211. The EU voiced support for that information being in the public domain.
212. Japan queried whether in the non-public domain section of the intranet CCMs can see all the information included in the charter notification (referencing paragraph 2 of CMM 2012-05), which the Secretariat confirmed was the case. It also asked the Secretariat if publication of information in the charter notifications on the public side of the WCPFC website is consistent with paragraph 9 of the 2007 Data rules for access to, protection of and dissemination of data. This CCM subsequently confirmed the publication is consistent with this rule and supported the recommendation.
213. One CCM said it could support that recommendation regarding chartering notifications if the flag state can only update RFV once they receive authorization from the chartering state as well as Secretariat.
214. The Secretariat confirmed that only the submitting CCM, which is usually the flag State, can update its own vessels on the RFV. With respect to Chartering notifications, in accordance with CMM 2012-05, Chartering CCMs who would like

their chartered vessels to be considered by the Commission as an integral part of their domestic fleet, should advise the Commission of their charters. In accordance with paragraph 3 of CMM 2012-05, the chartering CCM is to advise the Executive Director and the flag State of the charter notification. Once received by the Secretariat, and it is confirmed that the flag CCM has also been advised, the Charter Notification list on the WCPFC Intranet (accessible to CCMs through their secure login), is updated. Only after the flag CCM has received its advice of charter notifications (CMM 2012-05), would there be an expectation by the Secretariat that flag CCMs would update the relevant fields of the RFV for their submitted vessels. Like for other RFV updates, the timeframes for such updates should be based on those in paragraph 7 of CMM 2013-10.

215. One CCM supported the inclusion of charter notifications in the RFV, recognizing the importance of getting a clear picture of chartering. It noted that it receives chartering notifications sometimes quite late.
216. The Secretariat confirmed that timelines are specified in the measures (CMM 2012-05 and CMM 2013-10) and that charter notification and RFV deadlines were covered in the CMR this year. In response to a question, the Secretariat reconfirmed that all CCMs can log onto the intranet to see the database of charter notifications received under CMM 2012-05.
- 217. TCC10 recommended to WCPFC11 that information on charter notifications and high seas transshipment authorizations be treated as public domain data.**
218. The TCC Chair reminded TCC10 that without agreement on the recommendation about revoking CMM 2013-04, it will not go forward.
 - (a) **Secretariat recommended improvements or modifications to RFV SSPs (para 14-15 of CMM 2013-03)**
219. In trying to standardize the RFV so it is more useful, the Secretariat reported that there have been challenges for both CCMs and the Secretariat with implementing the MS Excel file option for submitting RFV updates -- needing exact phrase matches for the longer names of fishing method, fishing gear type and Port of Registry. In respect of the Port of Registry code proposal, the Secretariat has been working collaboratively with SPC and the PNA Office service provider for E-reporting, and the proposal is to continue that work between TCC10 and the Commission meeting. The Secretariat also stressed the importance of the VID – there have been instances when the VID isn't correct – and offered suggestions to provide more checks to improve the quality of the RFV. The Secretariat is working through the issues with CCMs, and sought ideas on how this can be avoided in the future.
220. One CCM noted that the names of some ports are not familiar. The TCC Chair reiterated that was ongoing work around the identification of ports. This CCM noted that it had some technical matters which it would discuss in the margins.
221. The USA supported all of the Secretariat recommended improvements to SSPs except (i) making the IMO number a minimum required field by 1 January 2016. This CCM agreed that a field for IMO number should be included in the RFV as

soon as possible, but considered it would be best to give members a little bit more time before it is made a minimum required field, because the consequence of not providing a minimum required field, would be having that vessel removed from the record, and (ii) the recommended procedures for adding vessels in “relisting” and “reflagging” circumstances. The USA acknowledged the importance of identifying duplicates and avoiding falsely identifying duplicates. However, this CCM was reluctant to proceed with these recommendations because it would require flag CCMs to positively track vessels over time – something that cannot be done in all cases because of the lack of permanent and unique vessel identifiers for all vessels. It was suggested that TCC could recognize the issues underlying the recommendation as problems that need to be addressed and work to find a solution.

222. One CCM requested additional time, perhaps 6 months, to implement – not the usual 60 days after the Commission meeting. If this was possible, this CCM could join consensus.
223. The TCC Chair noted that there was consensus except for three fields which needed more work:
 - i. new data action codes (RELISTING, REFLAGGING)
 - ii. making IMO number as a minimum required field
 - iii. Standard Codes for ports
224. The Secretariat confirmed its willingness to exclude parts of the recommended amendments which CCMs have indicated that they are not comfortable with, or alternatively they could be put in but subject to delayed implementation. The Secretariat would appreciate an opportunity to be able to develop a revised version of the proposed amendments to the RFV SSPs taking on board comments provided here, and to provide this revised proposal to WCPFC11. This may exclude the aspects that TCC was not able to agree on, but the Secretariat would discuss this further with the CCMs that expressed views during the meeting.
- 225. TCC10 tasked the Secretariat to revise Annex 6 of the paper (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP05 rev1) in light of the discussions and report back to the Commission meeting.**

8.6 Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area

226. The Assistant Compliance Manager ‘Ana F. Taholo introduced the EHSP-SMA Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-RP06) which included Entry and Exit reports received by the Secretariat and captured in the current IMS system. The paper also includes entry and exit alerts generated from VMS for vessels entering and exiting the EHSP-SMA. Compliance with the reporting obligation continues to be a problem. The report suggests ways to improve the quality of Entry and Exit reporting.
227. There were no comments or questions for the Secretariat.

228. TCC10 recommended that a) the Commission agree to the development of clearer and consistent specifications to address the issues relating to the reporting of data in this and similar CMMs; and b) the Commission tasks the Secretariat to work with interested CCMs on some joint initiatives that CCMs might use on a voluntary basis, with a view to streamlining the WCPFC data entry processes for EHSP-SMA reporting.

(a) Proposal to amend CMM 2010-02 (Cook Islands)

229. The Cook Islands introduced a proposal to amend CMM 2010-02 (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP04) which was similar to that proposed at WCPFC10. It includes reporting conditions and for names of vessels to be introduced on Entry and Exit reports. The Cook Islands informed the Commission that FFA Fisheries Ministers have agreed to implement the EHSP closure through the Harmonised Minimum Terms and Conditions and have expectations that the Commission applies compatible measures, given the level of non-compliance by CCMs fishing in the EHSP presented in the Annual Report. FFA members are concerned that CCMs fishing in the Eastern High Sea Pocket are repeatedly non-compliant with CMM 2010-02's reporting requirements in the following ways, which undermines the measure and doesn't allow it to achieving the desired outcome to combat IUU activities:
- submitting Entry and Exit reports in formats other than the format required by the measure.
 - providing incomplete Entry and Exit reports
 - providing Entry and Exit reports for areas other than the EHSP
 - reporting catch details, positions and time using varying formats.
230. One CCM expressed general support for the EHSP-SMA and was in general agreement with many terms of the proposed CMM, but noted that it faced some technical issues, especially with the part of the proposal dealing with penalties for non-compliance, which would be significant issues in any CMM, let alone this one.
231. Expressing sympathy toward the concern shown by members, Japan made a number of comments, including technical comments, on the proposal: the application of penalties (inconsistency with paragraph 25 of the Convention), requirement of catch and effort reporting should be applied to all CMMs, duplication with VMS-related measures, IUU listing and boarding and inspection activities etc.
232. The TCC Chair noted that TCC was not ready to adopt this proposal.
233. Cook Islands requested that TCC agree to require the vessel name be included on Entry and Exit reports, explaining that vessels are hard to track using just the VID; with no name or call sign it is a substantial effort to go to the RFV, look up the VID and try to reconcile that with the VMS data. One CCM supported this request, and noted that it was encouraging its flag vessels to do so.

234. TCC10 recommended the Commission amend CMM 2010-02 paragraph 2 to add vessel name to reporting requirements.

AGENDA ITEM 9 — DATA PROVISION AND DATA GAPS

9.1 Impact of gaps in CCM data submission on Commission’s compliance functions (final CMR 2012)

235. New Zealand introduced FFA proposal WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP09, to address implications of data deficiencies on the Commission’s compliance and monitoring functions. Noting that there has been a notable improvement in the amount and timeliness of data provision in general, the lack of provision of operational data from China, Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei continues to impact on the Commission’s ability to carry out its compliance functions. FFA members identified the following impacts:
- i. high seas VMS data cannot be integrated with catch and effort data, such as to ensure interpretation of VMS data is correct, verify manual reporting information and verify operational data against VMS
 - ii. transshipment reporting cannot be verified
 - iii. the volumes of catch reported as transhipped cannot be reconciled with reported catches
 - iv. the effectiveness of different mitigation methods on specific non-target species cannot be determined
 - v. the WCPFC can’t use operational data to ensure that the Commission’s “3 vessel rule” for public domain data is respected, and therefore cannot provide a complete set of catch and effort data for the public domain
 - vi. many aspects of the effectiveness of conservation measures cannot be assessed, especially where there are spatial elements
 - vii. the effects of targeting shifts on catches and catch rates cannot be determined, reducing understanding of the effectiveness of measures, creating exactly the kind of uncertainty seen when evaluating the effectiveness of the bigeye catch limits for bigeye
 - viii. some charter vessel catch attribution issues can’t be resolved, and
 - ix. the inability to distinguish between impacts in EEZs and high seas risks transferring greater burdens to SIDS.
236. FFA members noted they had taken on board useful comments from USA and invited discussion on the points.
237. One CCM strongly supported the statement made by New Zealand on behalf of all FFA member and noted that TCC’s role was to provide advice to the Commission on compliance matters and also on the implementation of cooperative MCS

measures. FFA members noted that continued data gaps impact both of these roles. Given the length of time that has passed for CCMs to overcome their domestic legal constraints, FFA members are left with little alternative but to conclude that flag States may be deliberately hiding known illegal fishing by their vessels in their waters. As outlined in FFA members' 9 points, the key weakness caused by the ongoing non-compliance is the inability to integrate multiple data sets to draw an accurate and verifiable picture of what is happening in the fishery.

238. Japan stated that providing operational catch and effort data itself does not constitute non-compliance as long as aggregated catch and effort data had been provided under section 3 of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission. It requested clearer explanation on the necessity of operational data in compliance issues noting that it had undertaken MCS activities in the Convention area. Some CCMs stated that they were working with SPC on provisional of operational data under cooperative analysis for the Pacific-wide bigeye stock assessment, with discussions underway in addition to the submission of aggregated data divided into EEZs and high seas.
239. The EU stated that this was an extremely important paper, which highlights the impacts on the work of the Commission of not providing complete data.
240. One CCM sought to one of the questions about why the Commission needs operational data given that we also have MCS tools. The CMS has borne out that many of these tools aren't working as well as they could be, including VMS reporting, transshipment measures, observer reports are being submitted late, there is a low coverage of HSBI. Operational data is required for cross referencing to ensure these tools are being properly implemented.
241. FFA members noted that several CCMs gave assurances last year that they would improve their performance in providing operational data. There are some encouraging movements, particularly the quality of aggregated data. They noted the increased practice of CCMs, while not providing operational data, allowing SPC to access it under certain restricted circumstances for stock assessment. While this increases the robustness of the science it does not resolve the compliance aspects. FFA members appreciate the genuine efforts to increase transparency by some CCMs, and call for those efforts to be increased to full compliance. They note that anything short of this must be viewed as a coordinated effort to mask IUU fishing.
242. In response to a request, SPC confirmed that the definition of operational level data is found in Annex 1 of the Standards for the Provision of Operational Level Catch and Effort Data in the Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission.
243. In response to explanation on necessity of operational data in compliance issues, Japan questioned the need to submit all operational data for compliance purposes because article 25 of the Convention provides the flag CCM shall investigate its vessels alleged violation and sanction it, if appropriate. It stated members with legal constraint to provide operational data cooperate as much as possible and progress is made year by year.

244. One CCM asked what the practice is for other tuna RFMOs around operational data. They also have VMS and transshipment measures. Another CCM asked what kind of activities the coastal states were worried about.
245. The TCC Chair asked if the nine points could be forwarded to WCPFC11 as implications of data deficiencies but received objections from some CCMs.
246. One CCM noted that while consensus could not be reached, there was majority support for it to go forward and asked if TCC would consider it going forward as a recommendation with majority support. Several CCMs did not support this.
247. The Cook Islands asked that the record note that the only CCMs to object to this language are the CCMs that don't supply operational data and don't want the impacts to be noted.
248. The USA stated its alignment with the FFA, noting that it had a legal impediment which it overcame, which was the intent of that provision in the data rules.
- 249. TCC10 noted that a majority of members supported the points in WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP09, while China, Japan, Korea and Chinese Taipei did not.**
250. EU recalled the recommendations from SC10 about data gaps, that TCC consider a tiered scoring system to better reflect the magnitude and severity of the implications of the lack of operational data. It would be useful for guidance from SPC to prepare a document to identify to severity of the impacts of the non-provision of certain data, not for the next TCC meeting, which is a whole year away, but for WCPFC11. Such a paper could inform the intersessional discussion and represents an important tool for TCC to improve the MCS scheme and compliance in general.
251. In response to question from one CCM about whether SPC had created such a document, SPC responded that there is a section in the data gaps paper, under "operational data provision" which talks about the impacts for science on the lack of operational data. It was noted that SC's recommendation was that SPC look at levels of severity of certain data gaps and report to WCPFC11.
252. Japan supported this suggestion but noted that the scoring system targets data gaps generally, not provision of operational data. It directed CCMs to WCPFC-TCC10-2014-IP04 (updated scientific data gaps paper from SC10) stating that some CCMs providing operational data do not submit all data in Attachment K, Annex I of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission.
253. The TCC Chair noted that the SC report was related to the non-provision of scientific data, not just operational level catch and effort data.
254. One CCM observed that the nine points in the paper under discussion go some way towards assisting the development of that tiered approach. Another CCM noted that it would help TCC understand the extent of what member do not know.
255. SPC expressed the view that the information in the nine points was a good start to assessing the implications of data gaps.

256. TCC10 requested SPC to develop a working paper on tiered scoring system to reflect the magnitude of implications of data gaps and report back to WCPFC11.

9.2 Purse Seine Catch Composition Data Improvement progress report (TCC9 para 403)

257. The WCPFC Compliance Manager provided a progress report on a project to support improvement of purse seine catch composition data (paragraph 63 of the Executive Director's Annual Report), noting that the Secretariat had 10,000 budgeted for this project but due to other commitments the Secretariat has not been able to complete it yet. The Secretariat sought more guidance about the scope of the work and the project's terms of reference.
258. Japan stated that it was very interested in this project and would like to join discussion in the margins. To this end it would provide a primary contact point.
259. The TCC Chair encouraged CCMs to send their input on the TORs for this project to the Secretariat.

AGENDA ITEM 10 — INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

10.1 E-monitoring and E-reporting initiatives

(a) Report from the Electronic Monitoring and Electronic Reporting Workshop (EmandErW) Chair

260. Ray Clarke (USA) reported on outcomes of the EmandErW held in Honiara, Solomon Islands from 31 March–1 April 2014. WCPFC10 had called for this informal meeting to be held (paragraph 173, WCPFC10 report). Clarke directed TCC to WCPFC-TCC10-2014-15 and WCPFC-EmandErW-2014-05 and the webpage <https://www.wcpfc.int/meetings/e-monitoring-and-e-reporting-workshop>, and expressed gratitude for the assistance the Secretariat had given him when at the last minute the appointed Chair had been unable to attend. Clarke noted that the two consultants (Ian Knuckey and Steve Dunn) were very enthusiastic and supportive. FFA provides facilities and logistical support. 18 out of 28 CCMs had attended the workshop. They worked off two documents – Potential for E-reporting and E-monitoring in the Western and Central Pacific Tuna Fisheries (WCPFC10-2013-16 (rev1)) and Implementation of E-monitoring and E-reporting in the WCPFC - Assessing the possible impacts on employment in SIDS (WCPFC-EmandErW-2014-05). The consultant's report contained 5 strategic recommendations and 32 overall recommendations. Concerns had been raised by CCMs about the possible impacts of E-reporting on SIDS, about which there had then been good discussion in panel discussions, workshop exercises and breakout sessions. Individual participant surveys had been completed. CCMs that had undertaken trials of E-reporting and E-monitoring technologies gave presentations. The working group identified challenges associated with procuring and administering equipment, data

confidentiality, resistance from industry, resistance at the national level, data transmission and storage, training and logistics. SC10 considered the EmandEr workshop report, noted the trials currently underway and asked TCC10 to note the urgent need to develop standards.

261. The EU noted that it couldn't participate for logistical reasons but attached importance to the work being carried out and hoped to provide constructive input as EU is at an advanced stage with these tools and is conducting trials. EU stressed that the different systems that are being implemented should be able to talk to each other. CCMs are operating under a number of different RFMOs and if they are required to utilise different standards it would be confusing. For the EU it is essential to ensure compatibility between the different systems and take into account developments at international level (e.g. FAO).
262. Japan thanked the Secretariat for the workshop and expressed sincere condolences to the people of Solomon Islands as a result of the disaster around the time of the workshop. This CCM reminded TCC that reporting is the responsibility of flag states and as agreed at SC10, validation of data is also very important. It stated the end users (fishermen) and IT experts should be included in the working group. Finally, it pointed out that the socio-economic impact of introducing E-reporting should be taken into account.
263. FFA members supported the development of ToR for a working group, though with the reservation that it must operate in a way that does not disadvantage SIDS. FFA members support development of SSPs as the working group's first priority; that a subgroup of technical experts meet to make recommendations on this then report to the broader group. FFA requests that the ToRs are circulated for comment prior to its establishment.
264. PNG noted that most of the non-compliance highlighted in its dCMR related to reporting gaps. In addition, the CMS is evolving as an annual snapshot of an ever growing list of requirements and obligations. To meet its reporting obligations, PNG has embarked on the development of an integrated information management system to collect, collate and make such information available for both scientific and compliance related purposes noting that the active participation of the fishing industry is key to achieving this. PNG has commenced observer, logsheet and catch documentation E-reporting trials and will share its experiences at WCPFC12.
265. WWF stated that it was supportive of this work and acknowledge that the technology is moving very quickly, with great enhancements coming in the next decade. Equipment, administration and maintenance costs are primary concerns and WWF noted that they can offer technical support. The MCS Emerging Technologies workshop had brought together providers and looked at capability and pricing structures (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-OP02). WWF had conducted a desktop analysis of current costings of E-reporting and E-monitoring tools as well as other MCS technologies (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-OP03).

(b) Reports from CCMs on outcomes and progress with trials and implementation

266. Peter Williams (SPC) presented a preliminary report of the Longline E-monitoring pilot project in the WCPO (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-15). SPC stressed involvement and collaboration with all stakeholders. The main stakeholders in this study were NFD, Tri Marine, Yi Man, Solomon Islands MFMR, FFA, SPC and Satlink (a technology service provider). SPC pointed out that industry wanted to promote sustainable fishing, ensure fish traceability and responsible fishing and their support was critical. The EU's DEVFISH2 project and Tri Marine contributed substantial funds and personnel, and ISSF assisted with coordination. The project uses a Chinese Taipei longline vessels equipped with E-monitoring video equipment, four cameras placed on two vessels which were operational 24/7. All the information was stored on an onboard computer which was loaded and installed, drives were removed after the trip, an observer was independently collecting data as normal using ROP workbooks which corresponded to the ROP minimum data standards. The equipment allowed for transmission of real time low resolution photos back to FFA and E-monitoring analysis was conducted after the trips. This included a comparative analysis collected by an onboard observer. Conducted 70-80 trips at sea. The observers were instructed on the software and each observer analysed the other vessel's video footage. E-monitoring software generated data from the video analysis. Analysis not yet completed but the presenter was surprised at how successful it was. It generated sufficient observer data and identified issues which were useful for the scientists to know. Future challenges included measuring length and hook numbers. SPC hopes to finish the analysis before WCPFC11, and is looking at further enhancements and efficiency gains. They have received interest from CCMs.
267. FFA members support the ongoing trials and developments in EM, but noted that in its implementation consideration should be given to scientific data needs such as biological sampling. They expressed the view that there were limitations and that both human observers and E-monitoring be applied logically and representatively across the defined fisheries, with a cost-benefit analysis a priority in the trials.

(c) Development of electronic reporting standards

268. Kerry Smith, on behalf of the Secretariat, presented WCPFC-TCC10-2014-16, which outlined ways of progressing the development of a draft electronic reporting standard, including for ROP data. The workshop and SC10 agreed that there is an urgent need to develop data standards for the electronic submission of data to support those CCMs that are undertaking trials or have fully implemented electronic reporting as part of their national fisheries programmes.
269. FFA members consider the development of a financial and capacity structure behind E-monitoring and E-reporting as a priority which should be managed through the way that increased E-monitoring and E-reporting are implemented in the fishery. FFA members see progress of E-monitoring and E-reporting as a planned phasing-in of elements involving the logical integration and compatibility of various databases through the development of appropriate SSPs, with

consideration and communication with the developers of systems such as CDS and future CMMs. As per the recommendations in the 2013 consultant's report, FFA members see the role of WCPFC being in the development of standards, and CCMs would develop their own systems that meet these standards.

- 270. TCC10 recommended to the Commission that a working group be established and that the Secretariat be tasked to develop terms of reference for the group, which will focus on the development of E-Reporting SSPs as a priority. Draft ToR should be developed in consultation with interested CCMs taking into account discussions at TCC10 and TCC10-2014-16.**

10.2 Consideration of SC and NC outcomes related to TCC's work

271. The TCC10 Chair noted that issues which arose from WCPFC10, SC10 and NC10 are taken up in the TCC10 agenda separately, and suggested that TCC10 simply note the working paper and address the issues in other places in the agenda.
- 272. TCC10 noted the paper on issues arising from TCC9, WCPFC10 and SC10 (WCPFC-TCC10-204-IP03).**

10.3 Report from CDS-IWG Chair (as per WCPFC9 approved ToR)

273. The CDS-IWG Chair, Alois Kinol (PNG), reported on progress of the Catch Documentation Scheme Intersessional Working Group (CDS-IWG), which was held on 24 September 2014. TCC10 was referred to the Chair's summary report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-17). Seventy participants from 22 CCMs, two intergovernmental organisations, and two non-governmental organisations attended the workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss a consultant's report, WCPFC-2014-CDS-IWG-02, which progressed some of the elements of the 2013 CDS-IWG Workplan. Funding for the consultancy was provided by PNG. FFA members provided a paper, WCPFC-2014-CDSIWG-DP01, which outlined a potential process for developing a WCPFC CDS.
274. The workshop format included a presentation from the consultant, Dr Ian Knuckey and a workshop exercise that sought participant's views on the objectives, scope and framework of a WCPFC CDS. The consultancy assessed those traceability schemes that were in operation in the region and whether or not a WCPFC CDS could use these as a basis. The report concluded that many of the programmes met their specific purpose but further work was required in order for them to meet the needs of a WCPFC CDS. Participants noted the existing systems designed for specific purposes and expressed their interest in minimizing the administrative burden associated with a WCPFC CDS. FFA members noted their strong preference for a CDS to be developed in a manner similar to the ROP – that is, a programme that allows for some flexibility.
275. Discussions focused on the seven recommendations from the consultant's report. There was general support for the objectives proposed by the consultant with some qualifications. FFA members expressed a desire to include a specific reference to

“compliance with national laws”. Discussions concerning the scope noted that there was a difference in the design and the implementation of a WCPFC CDS. Participants expressed a preference for gear and end uses to be the highest priorities to consider when developing a CDS. In terms of gear, participant saw purse seine and longline as the highest priorities to progress. In terms of end uses, there was general consensus that artisanal catches that aren’t exported could be exempt from a CDS.

276. There was strong support for an electronic system integrated with other databases within the WCPFC IMS, noting the need for timely information to support verification. The workshop also noted that other RFMOs have indicated their intention to move to an electronic CDS. There was limited support for adapting the CCAMLR CDS model to meet the needs of a WCPFC CDS as the two fisheries were very different. FFA members generally noted that their preference was that a system be devised using a standards-based model that takes into account the approaches already in place in the region. It was recognized that once the objectives and scope were agreed, there would be benefit in doing a cost benefit analysis on the implementation of a CDS.
277. TCC10 was invited to endorse the CDS-IWG 2014 Workplan (attached at Attachment E) which aims to focus the future discussions of the CDS-IWG and further develop the objectives and scope of a WCPFC CDS which was considered critical to progress it further. It is proposed that the next meeting of the CDS-IWG be held immediately prior to TCC11.
278. Japan stressed that participation from market states in the planned workshops was important.
279. FFA members considered the working group a useful forum to share views in a more focussed manner. It revealed that there were some large differences of views around the room. As per FFA input to the working group, FFA members looked forward to initial discussions which should focus on roles and responsibilities, then the development of regional standards that will sit around the CDS framework.
- 280. TCC10 endorsed the CDS-IWG Workplan for 2015 and recommended it to the Commission. (Attachment E)**

10.4 Potential for the use of Port Coordinators – discussion paper

281. The Compliance Manager introduced a joint proposal between FSM’s National Oceanic Resource Management Authority (NORMA) and WCPFC which for the establishment of a WCPFC Port Coordinators programme (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-18). It was noted that the proposal was circulated to CCMs as WCPFC Circular 2014/36, which was based on a proposal tabled at TCC9 last year. The original TCC9 paper drew on experience from IATTC, and the current version includes some consideration of the circumstances in the WCPFC context. For example, a lot of transshipment takes place in ports and these port coordinators or field officers may be able to assist with some of the data gathering going forward. Page 3 contains some of the responsibilities for observers in the WCPFC. The proposal is

for a program where five of the major ports in the region would be given ability to hire a staff member at local rates and one-off overhead and facility costs (e.g. a laptop), with a total estimated cost of 150,000. It is proposed that the Commission agree to establish a port coordinator program for two years in the main fishing locations and then undertake an evaluation as to whether the proposal should be extended/modified. From discussions that the Secretariat has had with NORMA and other CCMs, it is clear that the development of the terms of reference which clarifies the respective roles and responsibilities of national agencies and WCPFC would be beneficial. The current proposal is currently neutral on whether the proposal would be with a view to establishing new positions or supplement existing positions within the national agencies, and potentially this might differ between the respective ports.

282. FSM extended its appreciation to the Secretariat for its support. In the WCPFC area there are small but active ports. They are challenged for resources to do some of the monitoring work but they also try to facilitate WCPFC requirements. There have been consultations internally. This proposal tries to draw more on WCPFC experience, especially at the national level including working through the national program to find ways to make information available.
283. FFA members agreed that the workload imposed by a number of CMMs is heavy on those with busy ports, particularly those used by foreign vessels. Many FFA members, including those identified in the proposal, have capacity constraints that impact on our ability to fully undertake the work that is expected and they welcome the potential for WCPFC funding assistance to do so. They hold concerns about the efficiency and practicality of the WCPFC employing staff to work in our ports. Our strong preference would be for such posts to be filled by national agencies to better integrate with existing work plans. As such, any funding provided by WCPFC would be better aligned as a SIDS issue rather than part of the TCC work plan. This approach would gel with the FFA proposal for a Port State Measures CMM.
284. EU reminded CCMs that it had circulated views on this proposal in a letter distributed by the Secretariat in WCPFC Circular 2014/47. It is a good idea and the EU supports the nomination of 5 ports for 2 years and then assess the situation. Cooperation between different observer programs and coordination with SPC would avoid the duplication of work; TORs could address these issues. There is a question of how it would be coordinated and EU suggested SPC or the WCPFC secretariat. The EU noted that national agencies should be supported in this new task and there is a need to find a source of funding for national agencies to carry out the work. There are budget implications of this program.
285. FFA members with small administrations noted that they held serious concerns about their ability to absorb new obligations for port monitoring. The transshipment and ROP measures already impose significant duties, and even the “lite” Port States proposal FFA will table at this meeting would add significantly to this. Additional resources from WCPFC to expand our national programs would be welcome, and would probably contribute in other areas such as VMS and the RFV. It would also assist better sharing of that information between port and flag States. Services provided by FFA members’ national programs can benefit flag States, for example

in confirming reporting information to flag States that need to validate the information provided by their vessels. FFA members are interested in entering into agreements with flag States to formalise this relationship and seek additional resources to provide these benefits.

286. Japan pointed out that there is a need to distinguish between the roles of port coordinator and national coordinator and more discussion about how it will accomplish its objectives. This CCM expressed concern about how the flag state will carry out its responsibility for the data if a port coordinator collects logbook data. This CCM requested that the Secretariat prepare some information regarding the number of transshipments which took place in each candidate port stating the information would be helpful when considering prioritising.
287. FSM explained that it would not be WCPFC establishing port coordinators but the national programs doing so – those activities would be done through the national programs, which would be tasked and paid to undertake those activities. It would require extending national programs and making them available to the WCPFC.
288. The TCC Chair noted general support for the establishment of port coordinators that would be national programs and activities funded by WCPFC through the line item relating to SIDS. It would not be a TCC budget item.
289. In response to concerns raised by two CCMs about data submission and data access rules regarding data collected by the port coordinator, the Secretariat noted its understanding of the discussions on the proposal, particularly from the CCMs in whose Ports the port coordinator positions were proposed to be established. The Secretariat has understood from the views expressed here that the preference of the Port CCMs is for the port coordinators to be national agency positions, but which receive funding from WCPFC. If this is the direction that the proposed port coordinator programme would take, this is expected to have no impact on arrangements for WCPFC data submission or data access. Aspects such as the roles and responsibilities of the WCPFC Secretariat with respect to these positions, and those of the National Agencies within the Ports, are likely to be best clarified through the development of terms of reference for the programme. Based on the discussions here, the Secretariat confirmed that their understanding the establishment of the Port Coordinator positions would not change the current pathways for information and data to be provided to the WCPFC (assuming that national agencies have an obligation to provide that data to WCPFC). FSM clarified that normal data rules would apply.
- 290. TCC10 noted the paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-18 and discussions. TCC10 requested that the Secretariat and FSM work on further developing the paper taking into account the discussion at TCC10 and bring a draft proposal with TOR to WCPFC11 for further consideration.**
291. In response to a question from Japan about the number of transshipments taking place in the candidate ports, the Secretariat offered to work with the five CCMs where the ports are proposed, explore what additional information might be furnished related to each of the ports, if that would help progress the proposal.

**AGENDA ITEM 11 — REVIEW OF EXISTING CMMs INCLUDING ANY
PROPOSED**

11.1 South Pacific albacore (CMM 2010-05) – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015 and TCC9 recommendation)

292. The TCC Chair noted TCC9's recommendation that an SPC paper on South Pacific albacore be prepared as a standing item for consideration by SC, TCC and the Commission each year. This agenda item was included in TCC Workplan for 2014.
293. FFA members noted the continued expansion in catch and effort in the albacore fishery and the concurrent decreasing mean weight of longline-caught fish. In recent years, FFA members have seen the economic viability of our domestic albacore fleets decrease to the point where a rising number of domestic vessels are no longer able to run profitably and are now tied up. These CCMs are firmly of the view that the ramping up of effort in this fishery will further erode any remaining profitability in this fishery and support the SC10 recommendation that longline fishing mortality and longline catch need to reduce to avoid further declines in the biomass and the possibility of exceeding the biological reference point. FFA members advised CCMs that before the end of 2014 they will agree upon a zone-based management arrangement for the South Pacific albacore fishery. This will form the platform upon which the South Pacific albacore harvest strategy framework for their EEZs will be implemented. FFA members will propose a new CMM for the South Pacific albacore fishery to WCPFC11 to ensure robust management arrangements across the full extent of the stock and they welcomed opportunities to discuss the revised measure with CCMs on matters including overall and high seas catch limits and innovative transitional arrangements that allow for the gradual restructuring of the fishery to achieve economic and biologically sound target reference points.
294. FFA members stated that they very keen to work with other CCMs to ensure that the South Pacific albacore measure which will be tabled at WCPFC11 is agreeable to CCMs, not confrontational or combative. They welcomed informal and side discussions with other CCMs to explain their ideas and seek views and input.
295. New Caledonia spoke about the critical situation facing South Pacific albacore and the future of this fishery, and referenced papers presented at TCC10. New Caledonia drew the group's attention to Table 7 in IP09 showing indicators of biomass, which suggested possible problems for the future in particular for French Polynesia, New Caledonia and Tonga fleets.
296. In response to a query from USA about the focus of the FFA proposal, noting that it support a total TAC as a concept.
297. FFA noted that they were developing the proposal and considering the issues put forward by other CCMs for WCPFC11.
298. TCC10 noted the work that FFA was doing on a proposal and supported the inclusion of approaches to avoid further decline in the biomass.

299. TCC10 supported the development of a CMM proposal by FFA members for WCPFC11 to give effect to the SC10 recommendations.

11.2 South Pacific swordfish (CMM 2009-03) – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015 priority project)

300. TCC10 discussed South Pacific swordfish, a priority project specific task included in the approved TCC Workplan 2013-2015.
301. FFA members thanked the Secretariat and SPC-OFP for the advice it provided to SC10 after a request made at TCC9, which was informative and useful in the context of recent catch increases of South Pacific swordfish. However, two other areas were recommended by TCC9 and endorsed by WCPFC10 but which have not progressed: distribution of catches between EEZs and high seas; and mitigation measures to help reduce target and bycatch catches to address overfishing. We request that TCC draw attention to these outstanding tasks, and request that this advice be provided to SC11 and TCC11 for consideration.
302. The Secretariat noted that in the earlier discussions under Agenda Item 4 Status of Stocks, SPC had confirmed to the meeting that for most fleets, five degree square aggregated catch and effort data was the main data available, and only some CCMs data could be attributed to EEZs or the high seas. This suggested to the Secretariat that fine scale data is not currently available for all fleets to enable that to be done. Noting that SPC was not present at the time of the meeting, the Secretariat committed to following up to see if there has been any update during the intersessional period.
- 303. TCC10 recommended to WCPFC11 that the Secretariat be tasked to complete two outstanding tasks in the TCC9 recommendations and to present additional information to SC11. These were: (i) distribution of swordfish catches between EEZs and high seas, to the extent possible, and (ii) identify mitigation measures to help address and avoid overfishing.**

11.3 Bigeye, Yellowfin and Skipjack (CMM 2013-01, CMM 2009-02)

304. The WCPFC Chair, Charles Karnella, introduced the tropical tuna CMM agenda item reporting a short discussion at Heads of Delegation: there are not many compliance issues relating to the tropical tuna measure (CMM 2013-01), but there are some pieces of unfinished business: (i) the Commission needs to make sure that the FAD closures next year (the additional month of FAD closure) doesn't transfer a disproportionate burden of conservation onto SIDS; (ii) setting catch limits and reporting requirements for yellowfin tuna in both the purse seine and longline fisheries; and (iii) capacity issues. The Chair noted that in paragraph 53 there is a requirement for the Commission to deal with overcapacity in a way that does not constrain access to the development of tuna fisheries, including on the high seas, by

developing coastal states, especially SIDS, and transfer capacity from developing nations to coastal state fishing members. The Chair noted that paragraph 53 does not have a deadline associated with it and suggested TCC could decide to encourage the Commission to establish a date for that scheme to be developed. Under paragraph 54, non-SIDS are required to jointly develop a scheme to reduce the capacity of LSPSVs to the level of by 31 December 2012 and submit it to WCPFC11. There remains an issue for the tropical tuna CMM for fisheries other than purse seine and longline. The Commission needs to do some work on that this year. The Chair reported that at SC this year the stock assessment for bigeye indicated that the Commission limit reference point had been breached, based on data for 2012. The spawning biomass ratio should have been no less than 0.2 and it was 0.16; not only is there overfishing on bigeye, it is now overfished.

(a) CMM 2013-01 report on additional FAD management options (para 38)

305. A CCM speaking on behalf of PNA countries, which support the proposed working group and recommended that TCC supports the establishment of the working group, as WCPFC must do more on FAD management. PNA reported having worked with the Pew Environment Group on the issue and expressed an interest in providing a PNA representative to Chair the group. PNA members offered suggestions on the ToR, which should include collection of additional data on FADs, and proposed deletion of the words “to prevent FADs becoming marine debris” from paragraph (b). PNA asked for clarification of the purpose of the proposed consultancy to analyse the commercial implications of FAD usage, and expressed the view that if the purpose is to look at the comparative value of catches from FAD and free school sets, taking into account the relative prices of fish by size class, it has already been undertaken by SPC, rendering the proposed consultancy unnecessary. PNA members agreed that options such as limiting FADs deployed and the FAD set limit alternatives need further consideration, though they do not believe SC has sufficient information available to make specific recommendations on these proposals at this session.
306. The USA noted that it had had a FAD management proposal out for a couple of years and took the opportunity to remind CCMs of that proposal, with the suggestion that TCC could look to that proposal for assistance. There is a broader question of compliance with the tropical tuna measure and the USA looked forward to working with other CCMs on a capacity management plan, however was not hopeful that a scheme would be delivered by the time of the Commission meeting. On issue of compliance with the measure, the USA identified that the FAD closure itself needs more investigation and observed that there is still FADs being set during the closure period. The USA asked that CCMs continue to look at the observer reports and see if they are FAD sets made during the closure. It was suggested that there may be a need to further develop the measure to look at whether this is non-compliance or not. The USA noted that the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council recently held a workshop to guide TCC and the Commission more broadly on disproportionate burden and the meaning of the text in the Convention; outcomes of this meeting could be presented to the Chair’s

workshop before WCPFC11. One CCM echoed USA's comments on FADs and added that where the position of the FAD is unclear, monitoring is difficult.

307. The EU concurred and made three additional points: a) there is no capacity management plan in region, for which there is language in the measure. EU reiterated its support for a workshop which could bring in experts, including those from outside the region. The EU could help fund it and it could be organised by WCPFC, alongside another regional meeting; b) work is needed on FAD tracking and marking, and CCMs were directed to the SC10 paper (ST-IP-09) on FADs. A measure such as the EU and USA have proposed in the past, and IATTC has adopted recently, is needed. The proposed working group could look into measures adopted by other RFMOs on FAD management 3) setting on FADs during closures was higher this year than last year, not just in the 4th month but in the whole period.
308. Japan stressed that management of tropical tuna is an issue not only for the tropical area but for the Convention area as a whole because those species are being caught in the northern area and the status of those species could impact management of other species through target shift. In this context, it directed CCMs to agreement of WCPFC on CMM 2013-06 that similar considerations should also be given to small non-SIDS fishing communities. Regarding operational data it stated that they were working with SPC on provision of operational data under cooperative analysis for Pacific-wide bigeye stock assessment, with discussions underway.
309. PNA members reported that they have been working with Pew on FAD registration and tracking. The report attached to WCPFC Circular 2014/60 established the feasibility of receiving via satellite the real-time data already transmitted from FAD buoys to fishing vessels, for management purposes. The PNA Fisheries Information Management System has been developed to receive and use this data, including for identifying when vessels are setting on FADs. The North Atlantic Format is being used as the standard for communications. The purposes of FAD registration and tracking include:
 - ensuring control over FAD fishing
 - provision of scientific data on FADs and on biomass and oceanography
 - monitoring compliance with FAD measures
 - automating verification of “free-school” sets
 - ensuring industry accountability for FADs that are abandoned or wash up on reefs, and
 - eliminating IUU activity related to FAD fishing.
310. The system continues to develop and PNA members believe it is important for WCPFC broadly, and welcomed the Executive Director's proposal that a working group be formed
311. One CCM noted that where the position of the FAD is unclear, monitoring is difficult.

312. One CCM noted that SC10 recommended TCC comment on the constituency of the working group, and this was a good place for discussing recommendations. CCMs, SPC, PNA and industry should be involved in the working group. Another CCM noted their support for industry participation in the proposed working group, but noted their preference that industry participates as a part of national delegations.
313. The TCC Chair drew the group's attention to Secretariat paper (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-19), noting it was drawn up in response to CMM 2013-01 paragraph 38. Several CCMs supported the formation of the working group, including the USA which asked to be participant. USA noted that the paper suggests three main issues, with the third setting appropriate limits and offered the view that it was too early for this, since TCC didn't yet have a good grasp of the problem. The EU noted that TCC lacks information and suggested the ToR could be circulated, though suggestions on the ToR at TCC10 may be premature.
- 314. TCC10 recommended that the Commission establish a Working Group subject to ToRs being agreed by WCPFC11. TCC10 agreed that CCMs should provide input to the Secretariat on those ToR and the scope of the proposed consultancy within 30 days of the Commission meeting. The Secretariat should revise the ToR and the scope of the proposed consultancy based on the points raised, taking into account TCC discussions on TCC10-2014-19 and any additional views received.**
315. TCC10 discussed point 2 of TCC10-2014-19, and while there was some support for the recommendation of a fallback position on an overall limit on FAD sets. However, it was noted that this matter might appropriately be discussed at WCPFC11 as part of broader discussions on possible refinements to CMM 2013-01.
316. TCC10 discussed point 3 of TCC10-2014-19 regarding a proposed limit on FAD sets and buoys, but could not come to an agreement.
317. TCC10 considered suggested recommendation 4 of TCC10-2014-19 and requested CCMs to provide comments on the proposed consultancy to the Secretariat within 30 days of the Commission meeting.
318. One CCM noted that the working group would need to have a chance to review the USA and FFA papers in the future, and new papers submitted as well as relevant information from SC.
319. The TCC Chair confirmed that the Secretariat's understanding is that the working group would not be limited to those papers and could pick up additional work.

(b) Other aspects of CMM 2013-01

320. PNA members plan to submit a revised tropical tuna CMM to WCPFC11 which will be largely based on WCPFC10 delegation paper WCPFC10-2013-DP13 (rev1) and set out what these CCMs believed what have been an effective tropical tuna measure. PNA's analysis indicates that the CMM as was adopted is unlikely to reduce bigeye overfishing and will probably increase it. Additional innovative

elements to improve effectiveness need to be found and in the context of TCC's work, PNA offered the following:

- The single biggest issue for PNA members is the provision of operational data. There is no hope for effective action to improve bigeye stock status when the operations of the fleets that have the biggest impact on that stock are being concealed. That data must be provided completely, openly and accurately. It must be available for stock assessments, management options and compliance monitoring.
 - Other measures are needed to bring the high seas longline fleet under control, including banning at-sea transshipment of frozen bigeye, no manual reporting by longliner vessels when VMS breaks down, as purse seiners cannot report manually during FAD closures. PNA members will propose additional bigeye catch limit reductions for fleets that withhold operational data.
 - The measures to reduce FAD use can be made more effective by banning pre-dawn sets and stopping the deployment of FADs by tender vessels during the FAD closure period. FAD registration and tracking must be considered more closely.
 - PNA expects the scientific analysis to indicate that the cuts in longline bigeye catch limits and FAD use will need to be greater than those in the current CMM, which will require the Commission to make progress in addressing the disproportionate burden on SIDS of measures such as the FAD closure.
321. PNA members noted that this year they have continued to refine the VDS, which is tightening access to PNA and Tokelau waters for purse seine vessels. That process will continue and is being reinforced by increases in the price of vessel days. PNA reported that the minimum benchmark price for vessel days for foreign vessels will rise from 6,000 per VDS day this year to 8,000 per day next year. Days are already selling for next year at over 10,000 per day and there will be further increases. Without the FAD closure, these revenues would be higher. PNA members see these increases as important to the control of fishing capacity in the tropical WCPO purse seine fishery. They are designed to reduce capacity by removing inefficient vessels from the fishery, making the VDS fees a conservation and management measure and an important economic instrument. PNA members called upon flag states to ensure that vessels that cannot secure appropriate access are removed from the fishery and do not engage in IUU fishing. Compatible measures should be applied to the high seas, which will be important for the WCPFC capacity management plan to be prepared under paragraph 53 of CMM 2013-01. PNA members are considering the application of charging mechanisms for FADs. These could either be charges for FAD use as a premium on vessel days, or charges for FAD deployment to deter FAD use in ways that reduce the disproportionate burden on SIDS.
322. FFA members noted that CMM 2013-01 is necessarily complex. It highlights the need for a high degree of transparency by CCMs, particularly in regards to notifying which FAD management option each purse seine fleet is operating under, and providing reports of progress against limits, and reporting against longline

limits, especially given widespread non-compliance on providing operational data. These CCMs noted that the lack of notifications and regular reporting make it difficult for SPC to assess the expected outcome of the measure, and compromises the Commission's ability to assess compliance at the CCM and vessel level. The choice available to flag States about observing an additional FAD closure or a proportionate reduction throughout the rest of the year makes it difficult for a coastal State to determine whether vessels fishing in its EEZ are doing the right thing or not. FFA members will seek to simplify the arrangements and vest greater authority in zone-based measures in the future.

323. FFA looked forward to the results of SPC's evaluation of the expected outcomes of CMM 2013-01 and noted that despite negotiations on the package adopted, 2013-01 is unlikely to reduce fishing mortality of bigeye. FFA members expressed increasing concern about the declining state of the stock. FFA members placed a high priority on strengthening of the measure at WCPFC11; it will now need to go beyond measures required to remove the disproportionate burden. FFA members were strongly supportive of several elements of a comprehensive measure from last year that are likely to be raised again at WCPFC11. These include:
- reducing high seas purse seine effort limits. FFA members provided evidence that the eastern high seas area contributes a disproportionate share of the juvenile bigeye catch; it was noted with disappointment that certain developed CCMs sought and received increased limits under the measure. FFA members stated that the total allowable effort in this area needs to be reduced.
 - longline effort management, either in the form of a closure to match the FAD closure, or some other arrangement to ensure that catch reductions are driven by decreased effort.
 - longline catch limit reductions, to be consistent with the principle outlined in 2013 by FFA members that there should be an equal contribution from longline and purse seine fleets, corresponding with their equal impacts. FFA members expressed disappointment that some developed CCMs argued for smaller reductions, at the expense of the fishery that they benefit from.
 - rights based or other incentive approaches to FAD management and longline catches that provide additional benefit to SIDS while contributing to mortality reduction.
324. FFA members reiterated that they are not the major beneficiaries of the bigeye fishery, and expected that those CCMs with significant interests in the fishery to assume leadership.
325. FFA members further stated that a number of specific measures, which FFA members have previously supported, will need consideration again this year, and noted that the ideas raised (above) contribute to additional mortality reductions and reduce the disproportionate burden of the measure on SIDS and strongly commended these ideas to other CCMs.
326. Noting figures presented which show bycatch percentages in the purse seine fishery area by area, Japan stated that, in future, there may be some option of taking into

consideration spatial management. It also stated that its longline fishery had already fulfilled obligations under the tropical tuna measures, and the Commission should consider it in future discussions.

327. PNA members expressed deep concerned at continuing abuse of capacity provisions in CMM 2013-01 to obstruct the development of members' domestic purse seine fisheries, especially by Chinese Taipei. They stated that this has been happening since the inception of the Commission and noted that the Commission has agreed there is no need for Commission approval of the construction of vessels for SIDS. PNA members stated that CMM 2013-01 says, repeatedly, that the capacity limits in the CMM do not apply to SIDS (paragraphs 7, 49 and 55). Yet still Chinese Taipei uses these provisions to obstruct construction of vessels for SIDS, with support from some other CCMs. Chinese Taipei has the right to apply its domestic regulations, but not to misuse WCPFC measures and processes – a breach of compliance with CMM 2013-07 on the special requirements of SIDS. This undermines the confidence of SIDS in these measures and limits opportunities for the Commission to apply capacity limits in future. PNA members noted that they will be proposing action to address this issue.
328. Tuvalu noted that it is one of those countries being obstructed from construction of a new vessel and recalled that at WCPFC7 it faced the same situation; then, FFA members noted that some CCMs were requiring new builds for SIDS to have prior clearance by the Commission, but the Commission said clearly that there was no need for Commission approval, and confirmed that there is an obligation on members to assist SIDS to develop their fisheries. Tuvalu reminded TCC10 that the adoption of CMM 2013-07 last year on the special requirements of SIDS makes that clearer. Tuvalu supported RMI's proposal that TCC should: i) reaffirm that the construction or purchase of fishing vessels for SIDS is not limited by any WCPFC measure, and does not require any form of notification, advice or approval from the Secretariat or members; and ii) advise CCMs, including Chinese Taipei, not to require any action by the Secretariat or members as a condition for the construction or purchase of vessels for SIDS.
329. Japan echoed the concerns of these CCMs on increase of purse seine capacity and stated that it was important to investigate the reason the situation had occurred.
330. Chinese Taipei made a preliminary response. Its standing policy is to assist those members from SIDS to develop their fisheries. However, noting their experience from 2005 Resolution being directed to Chinese Taipei, this was a basis for taking cautious approach and there is also a need to consider fishing capacity in the region as a whole. Chinese Taipei hence amended its regulations whose purpose was to control fishing capacity for Chinese Taipei's fishing fleet and it is these regulations that are applied consistently to that of other countries. Chinese Taipei encouraged colleagues from SIDS to bilaterally discuss how to deal with these issues for the future.
331. The WCPFC Chair noted that the number of purse seine vessels last year was nearly 300 – there was general consensus at SC10 that that is too many vessels, and was more than were in the area when WCPFC adopted CMM 2008-01, where

WCPFC agreed not to increase capacity. The Chair observed that the Commission needs to roll its sleeves up and develop a scheme. CMM 2013-01 paragraph 53 sets out a job for the Commission, and the sooner this is done the better. The longer the Commission takes to come up with a way to address paragraph 53 in CMM 2013-01 the harder it is going to be to address the growing capacity issue. As the Commission had not devised a timeframe in which paragraph 53 of CMM 2013-01 would be done, TCC could consider recommending a timeframe. The Chair reminded CMMs that EU had offered to help with a workshop.

332. The WCPFC Chair ended by thanking CCMs for their comments which would be duly considered by the Chair in his preparations for WCPFC11 and discussions on the tropical tuna CMM.

11.4 Sharks (CMM 2010-07) – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

333. TCC10 discussed sharks, a priority project specific task included in the approved TCC Workplan 2013-2015.
334. FFA members recognised that WCPO tuna fisheries significantly impact on a number of vulnerable shark species in the region and it is increasingly important that WCPFC adopt more robust shark measures to reduce shark fishing mortality in the longline and purse seine fisheries. As SC10 noted, there are no analyses available for efficacy of the current shark measure (CMM 2010-07), and ambiguity in a number of provisions makes it impossible to determine compliance standards for the measure. FFA members will be seeking substantial amendments to the CMM at WCPFC11, to include provisions for CCMs to choose from a range of proven mitigation methods to reduce unintentional shark mortality, and noted that dozens of experiments have been conducted regionally and elsewhere that demonstrate viable mitigation methods. FFA members stated that it is not a lack of data that is impeding decision making on this important matter. Through FFA's Harmonised Minimum Terms and Conditions, the use of wire traces is prohibited in these CCMs' waters. Under FFA's proposed revisions to the shark CMM, CCMs would similarly ban wire traces, or select another mitigation option to reduce shark interactions, similar in approach to the seabird CMM. FFA will also seek revisions that remove the uncertainty related to the problematic fin-to-weight ratio, such as a requirement to have fins naturally attached and MCS provisions. For any consideration to be given to retaining the fin-to-weight ratio, FFA members reaffirm the SC10 recommendation requesting that CCMs which apply fin-to-carcass weight ratio report to the Commission details of the methods used to estimate the ratio of shark fins to carcass weight. FFA welcomed discussions with other CCMs on the development of a robust WCPO shark management approach.
335. The EU stated that the current measure was not sufficient. The dCMR process had shown that it was extremely difficult to assess compliance as the measure is currently drafted. The EU expressed strong concerns about the 5% fin-to-carcass ratio as it related to compliance and would like to go further than FFA suggests (allowing CCMs to provide more details). The EU preferred to eliminate the criteria

as it has not proven adequate for achieving the objectives of the measure and adopt a fins naturally attached requirement instead. EU wanted to work with other members to develop more robust measures.

336. The USA was encouraged to hear FFA proposing an alternative but couldn't accept a ban on wire leaders as banning lines while keeping weights on lines compromised safety of fishermen. USA noted that the fin-to-carcass ratio creates compliance problems and noted finding several incidences during boardings that authorities at sea were unable to determine the fin-to-carcass ratio and had to rely on port inspections about which the USA was less confident. The USA supported a fins-attached measure.
337. Japan did not support both a fins-attached measure and prohibition of wire leaders. This CCM asked members which did not submit data of key shark species, and wished that the next TCC meeting will see improvement in data submission on this point.
338. One CCM noted that the 5% ratio is too general and doesn't contain technical details to assist in complying with the 5% ratio, and asked for more guidelines.
339. The EU stated that it would like to see a recommendation from TCC that reflects that the 5% ratio has proven ineffective. They expressed their view that based on information presented to SC10 and TCC10, there is evidence that countries who are applying the 5% rule are non-compliant with the measure. The EU noted that a statement that the criterion is not effective and this should be reflected in the TCC10 summary report: it was clear from the scientific advice at SC10 and it was impossible to assess compliance with it.
340. Japan did not support the EU proposal stating that the requirement of fully utilisation of retained catches of sharks is fully implemented in accordance with its domestic law.
341. The USA noted that several speakers had spoken of problems with the 5% ratio, and US experience has demonstrated that the requirement is not enforceable at sea. It asked the Chair if TCC could agree to make a statement that the 5% ratio is not enforceable at sea. Japan stated that it could not support that statement.
342. The TCC Chair observed that more discussion is required on this point and noted proposals will be going forward to WCPFC11 for further discussions.
- 343. TCC10 noted that FFA members will be presenting a draft CMM to revise CMM 2010-07 to WCPFC11.**

11.5 Seabirds (CMM 2012-07)

(a) advice and recommendation (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

344. There were no discussions under this sub-agenda item.

(b) reports from CCMs on practical and technical constraints to seabird mitigation measures (para 10 of CMM 2012-07)

345. FFA members expressed concern at the lack of information on seabird interactions for vessels in the longline fishery, and there was uncertainty about the impact of small vessels on seabird populations. Japan and Chinese Taipei's reports had only come in in the last few days and require consideration. New Zealand's vessels safely use tori lines and line weighting and smaller vessels are not exempt. In the absence of data, WCPFC must err on the side of caution; the exemption for small longline vessels north of 23°N in CMM 2012-07 should be removed.
346. Japan presented a short report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP10) regarding the use of seabird mitigation measures in the North Pacific Ocean. Its research clearly showed that clearly tori lines used with unweighted branch lines effectively reduced seabird attack and bycatch rates in pelagic longline operations in the Western and Central North Pacific as there were different species in the southern hemisphere. Well-designed tori lines are recommended as best-practice seabird mitigation for these fisheries. It also reported many fishing masters complained and concerned to use long streamers, double tori-line and towing devices because these specifications led tori-line entanglement with longline gear in rough sea. Fishing master's concern about deployment style of tori-line related to gear-entanglement also suggests that it should be cautious to decide appropriate designs of tori-line. It expressed its view that more investigation is needed for developing well-designed tori lines noting that the current specifications of CMM 2012-07 cannot apply to Japanese small longline vessels in North Pacific. It also stated that concrete specifications would limit fisher's creative ideas.
347. The USA observed that the key TCC task this meeting was, as directed by the Commission in paragraph 10 of the seabird CMM, to "evaluate the constraints and opportunities for small vessels to employ seabird mitigation measures in the North Pacific", so that the Commission can "consider appropriate seabird mitigation requirements for vessels less than 24m in length in the North Pacific", tasks that were supposed to be completed last year. The USA was encouraged to find in Japan's report that small-vessel respondents in Japan's survey were using tori lines when they didn't have to and half were using weighted branch lines, so many were getting close to satisfying the mitigation requirements in the management measure; thus it may be more a matter of just having to tailor the technical specifications for small vessels. The USA observed that Japan's report didn't address strategic offal discharge, and asked whether small vessels used that mitigation method. The USA noted its understanding that the only constraints identified by the survey respondents were the use of long streamers on tori lines, using double tori lines, and using towed devices at the end of tori lines. The USA noted that none of those are required to be used under the existing measure. Nonetheless the USA understood that tori line technical specifications tailored for small vessels might be appropriate and asked what kinds of flexibility would help Japan.

348. Chinese Taipei noted that it had submitted a report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP-11) on seabirds as requested by TCC last year (TCC9 para 354). Based on 2008-2013 observer data, seabird bycatch was mostly from albacore and bigeye large-scale tuna longline vessels. Tori lines were used. Bycatch of the small-scale tuna longline vessels was very low with no seabirds caught incidentally west of 160°E and south of 30°N in the North Pacific Ocean. Chinese Taipei also surveyed fishermen about mitigation methods and constraints for vessels less than 24m in length operating north of 23°N. There are technical constraints and safety concerns around tori lines and branch line weighting for small-scale longline fishing vessels. Chinese Taipei's E-monitoring trials will collect more information.
349. The USA noted that Chinese Taipei's report on the survey of the 20 fishermen and was limited to a fairly small area, close to shore where fishermen reported to typically not catch seabirds. This CCM reminded the committee that it needs to think about the entire WCPO, not just that one area where the survey was carried out, and that the Committee was tasked with evaluating constraints and opportunities for small vessels to employ seabird mitigation measures. The USA understood that Chinese Taipei's report identified concerns about tori lines sinking and tangling with fishing gear, and safety concerns related to the use of weighted branch lines, and queried whether those concerns were specific to small vessels and, if so, what was it about small vessels that created those concerns.
350. Chinese Taipei explained that its larger scale tuna longliners also had similar constraints on those mitigation measures, however, the fishing areas and the ability to cope with these constraints is different between larger and small vessels. In addition, fishermen reported little or no interactions with seabirds in some areas north of 23 degrees north, it was more difficult to persuade them to implement measures in those areas.
351. The USA emphasised the need for the TCC to complete its evaluation, and suggested that based on the information from Chinese Taipei, Japan and the USA's report presented last year, as well as information from New Zealand, the TCC could report its findings along the following lines: There might be constraints for small vessels related to the use of tori lines of certain designs, and safety concerns associated with weighted branch lines, but no other constraints to employing seabird mitigation north of 23°N. Opportunities might include designing alternative tori line specifications for small vessels and identifying places where seabird mitigation is less important.
352. Japan suggested that TCC should request related CCMs to continue investigating specifications for tori lines in the northern hemisphere, understanding the specifications used in the current CMMs are not applicable for the area.
353. The USA observed that if the TCC does not make its conclusions, it is important to include in the report that TCC has not completed its evaluation as tasked by the Commission.
354. FFA members reiterated the view that WCPFC in the absence of data, TCC should err on the side of caution and remove the exemption for small vessels north of 23N from CMM 2012-07.

355. Japan and Chinese Taipei saw no need for a recommendation to err on the side of caution. Japan stated that these CCMs shall commence implementation of observer programmes for fishing vessels used to fish for fresh fish beyond the national jurisdictions in the area north of 20N no later than 31 December 2014 and would submit its data in the future, perhaps the next SC.
356. Australia suggested that TCC should be asking for more guidance on when Japan's investigation is likely to be concluded and what deadline specifications might arise from that. If not, Australia supported USA's proposal that TCC should report its findings on constraints and opportunities that have been identified for seabird mitigation measures in the area north of 23N.
357. The USA observed that the Japan and USA suggestions could fit together. TCC could identify the constraints and opportunities found and interested members could bring forward alternative technical specifications for small vessels to WCPFC11, as well as any locations identified where seabird mitigation is less important.
358. Chinese Taipei noted that there were some areas where mitigation is less important. Japan did not support the WCPFC11 deadline because specifications used in the current CMM are not applicable to Japanese small longline vessels in North Pacific.
359. The TCC Chair stated that with no clear recommendation TCC Summary Report would simply reflect the views expressed.

11.6 Sea Turtles (CMM 2008-03)

360. There were no comments from CCMs under this agenda item. WWF referred to its position paper (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-OP01) and remained concerned that there has not been full compliance, nor has it been reviewed to ensure effectiveness. WWF asked TCC10 to consider a recommendation to WCPFC11 to improve mitigation and monitoring of the measure.

AGENDA ITEM 12 — PROPOSALS FOR NEW CMMs

12.1 Port State Measures (FFA Members proposal)

361. The TCC10 Chair asked if CCMs had agreed on a Port State Measures proposal.
362. FFA members reported that they had undertaken consultation with CCMs and had posted a revised proposal on port State measures for consideration. Some CCMs continued to confuse the proposal with the FAO Port States Measures Agreement and sought to clarify that they are completely different arrangements. FFA encouraged CCMs to consider the proposal for adoption at WCPFC11, and asked for comments by 20 October 2014 to further revise it in advance of WCPFC11.

363. Japan stated that delicate domestic discussions are underway concerning port state issues and thus it is not in a position to make any comments on the proposal.

12.2 Harvest Strategy (Australia proposal)

364. Australia reiterated that the aim of its proposed CMM is to ensure that scientific outcomes and findings are incorporated into the management process as part of the Commission's evidence-based decision making. Australia considered that a binding CMM will best demonstrate WCPFC's commitment to establishing harvest strategies in accordance with an agreed, clearly articulated framework. Australia reminded CCMs that it presented its draft CMM to SC10, which supported the initiative and recommended that Australia develop it in consultation with other CCMs, with the revised CMM to be presented to TCC10 and WCPFC11. Australia reported on productive discussions with CCMs. A number of CCMs expressed the view that the draft CMM does not raise any technical or compliance issues. Australia will continue discussions intersessionally and present a revised version for consideration at MOW3 and asked that it be included on MOW3's agenda. Australia noted that it had sought TCC's endorsement of the CMM and a favourable recommendation to WCPFC11. As an alternative, Australia suggested that TCC could note SC10's recommendation, find that there are no technical or compliance issues raised, recommend further development of this proposal in consultation with other CCMs, and recommend that the revised proposal be presented to MOW3 and WCPFC11.
365. One CCM appreciated Australia's leadership at SC10 and TCC10 on this issue but queried why Australia was proposing this as a CMM rather than a guideline. Australia reiterated their view that a binding CMM represents the best way of demonstrating WCPFC's commitment on this important issue. Australia welcomed comments from CCMs intersessionally on this matter.
- 366. TCC10 considered the draft CMM on establishing a harvest strategy for key tuna species in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean, proposed by Australia in Delegation Paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP03. TCC10 noted that SC10 supported the initiative and had recommended that Australia continue to develop this CMM in consultation with other CCMs and that the updated CMM be presented to TCC10 and WCPFC11. TCC10 found no technical or compliance issues with the proposal.**
- 367. TCC10 recommended that Australia continue to develop this proposal in consultation with other CCMs and that the revised proposal be presented to MOW3 and WCPFC11 for further consideration.**

12.3 Proposal on target reference point for skipjack Conservation and Management Measure (PNA members + Tokelau Proposal)

368. PNA members and Tokelau acknowledged the short notice with which the proposal had been provided to CCMs but urged their continued consideration in light of the new skipjack stock assessment structure and data presented at SC10. The proposal needs further consideration and PNA members and Tokelau will develop it, in

consultation with interested CCMs. They intend to present it to MOW3 and WCPFC11, along with any additional supporting information.

369. FFA members expressed their full support for the PNA + Tokelau proposal as it sets out a clear strategy to manage the skipjack fishery in a meaningful way. The proposal takes into account socio-economic considerations as well as biological health of the stocks, and is consistent with ensuring the long-term sustainability. FFA members also stated their view that this proposal complements the Australia proposal on Harvest Strategy and look forward to seeing how this proposal evolves and develops in advance of the meetings in Apia.
370. Japan thanked and PNA and Tokelau and shared the view that setting a TRP for the conservation and management of skipjack was important stating that its domestic coastal fishermen reliant on this species. It stated it would like to join the discussion about the proposed CMM intersessionally and at WCPFC11.
371. It was noted that most CCMs found no technical or compliance issues, and had confirmed their view that this proposal complements the Australia proposal on Harvest Strategy.
- 372. TCC10 considered the draft CMM for the adoption of a skipjack harvest reference point being proposed by PNA in Delegation Paper WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP06, noting that the Commission had stated its intention to consider and adopt a TRP for skipjack tuna at WCPFC11. Most CCMs found no technical or compliance issues with the proposal. TCC welcomed the PNA's initiative to develop this proposal in consultation with other CCMs and encouraged PNA to present the updated proposal, along with any additional supporting information, to MOW3 and WCPFC11.**

12.4 Conservation and Management Measure on provision of operational data (FFA Members proposal)

373. FFA members presented a proposal for a draft CMM on the provision of operational data and hoped that the CMM would help those with domestic legal constraints to overcome them. FFA members had received very little feedback and they remained open to making modifications to support and expedite the provision of data to the Commission. They expressed concern that these CCMs appear not to be interested in moving forward. Comments would be gratefully received by 20 October 2014.
- 374. TCC10 noted FFA members' proposal on the provision of operational level catch and effort data (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-DP07) and their intention to provide a revised proposal to WCPFC11. CCMs were asked to provide comments to RMI by 20 October 2014.**

AGENDA ITEM 13 — OTHER MATTERS REQUIRING TCC ADVICE

375. TCC10 discussed priority project specific tasks included in the TCC Workplan 2013-2015.

13.1 Management arrangements for IATTC overlap – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

376. The Compliance Manager noted that the information in the Executive Director's report, that since WCPFC10 there have been no updates related to this matter. However, the Secretariat confirmed that within period of TCC an update was received from Republic of Korea with withdraws their earlier nomination to apply IATTC rules in the overlap area. Apart from this update, WCPFC-TCC10-2014-IP07 (paragraph 12) summarise the status of nominations of rules applying in the overlap area with IATTC which have been received to date. It was noted that there was a previous recommendation by TCC10 with respect to the ROP cross-endorsement training with IATTC.
377. FFA members consider bedding down transparent arrangements for the overlap area a high priority and expressed appreciation for the two Secretariats taking the issue forward. FFA members believe that the WCPFC9 decisions move in the right direction, though greater operational detail is required, particularly on VMS coverage and data reporting to ensure against over- or under-counting of catch and effort limits in the area. It will assist both RFMOs to stay aware of activities in their Convention areas. On that basis, FFA members remain committed to the proposed working group and suggest that these issues be its most important order of business. In addition to Kiribati's participation as an overlapping coastal State, FFA members proposed that Vanuatu be a member of the working group and further nominated the FFA Secretariat to participate in the group in the short term.
378. FFA members suggested the immediate priority for the working group is to devise operational details to simplify and clarify what is required from vessels fishing in the overlap area, and support a possible longer term role for the working group to establish whole-of-stock management arrangements, noting it would be a significant undertaking and one that would require formalisation of the working group and a wider representation. FFA members recommended that this longer term task be deferred until the immediate priorities have been resolved, at which point the membership and mandate of the working group could be revisited.
379. Cook Islands clarified for FFA members, proposing: a) nominating three representatives as spokespeople, though not precluding others – Kiribati, FFA Secretariat and Vanuatu, b) priority to be placed on VMS and data reporting as priority tasks, c) asking the Secretariat to discuss with IATTC the best way to progress.
380. In response to a request for clarification, the Compliance Manager summarized the WCPFC9 decision related to the overlap area (WCPFC9 record paragraph 80) and noted there were two parts to the decision which were intended at the time to occur in parallel: 1) a notification procedure: CCMs who are CNMs in one tuna RFMOs were to apply the CMMs of the Commission of which they are a member, but if a

CCM was a member of both tuna RFMOs they could notify their choice of which Commission's rules would apply in the overlap area between WCPFC and IATTC. Korea's update noted earlier was an example of such a notification; 2) establishing a joint IATTC/WCPFC working group. The WCPFC9 decision had provided a shortlist of priority items which included application and access to VMS data in the overlap area, how WCPFC HSBI procedures should apply in the overlap area, application of procedures in the overlap area when only one of the t-RFMOs has measures on a certain topic, notification procedures and rules for vessels choosing the rules of one of RFMOs and whether there should be default or minimum standard measures such as implementing joint requirements for VMS, observers, and catch reports.

381. The TCC10 Chair asked CCMs whether we want this to be a TCC10 recommendation or a suggestion from members.
382. The USA noted that the issue has been around for a long time, and referenced input it had given in response to Circular 2013/37. The composition and scope of the working group need to be decided upon. The TCC could document CCMs' views about the participation on the working group and its scope.
383. The EU agreed, and supported FFA's views being reflected.

13.2 Development and trials of metrics for measuring fishing effort and capacity – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

384. Secretariat noted that there were no updates to provide, and directed CCMs to a summary of notifications received under paragraph 50 (CMM 2013-01). (see WCPFC-TCC10-2014-IP07 (Table 7)).

13.3 Review of Purse Seine Catch Discard Monitoring arrangements – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

385. The Secretariat noted the TCC Workplan item and introduced information paper (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-IP11) which summarises discard reporting and other relevant measures.
386. FFA members thanked the Secretariat for the paper and for following up on the comments made by FFA members last year about its scope. These CCMs support the intention noted in the paper for discard reporting to be cross-checked against ROP, VMS and logsheet data.
387. USA noted that in the Secretariat's ROP report (page 10, table 4 Lc-D) 49.3% of observer reports collected recorded observations that vessels did not correctly record bycatch, which points to a potential compliance problem.
388. In response to a question from one CCM about USA fleet's high discards in 2013, the USA responded that the regulations to implement the reporting requirement became effective at the beginning of 2013, which explains the sudden increase, which was followed by a decrease. The USA further noted that this is exactly what one would want to see – the Commission puts a requirement in place, then it becomes mandatory nationally, then behaviour changes.

AGENDA ITEM 14 — ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

14.1 Proposed TCC Workplan and budget for 2015–2017

389. WCPFC9 approved the TCC Workplan 2013-2015. WCPFC10 approved the 2014 budget and agreed indicative budgets for 2015–2016. The SWG Chair (Limanman Helgenberger, FSM) introduced the TCC Workplan and budget for 2015-17. The SWG reviewed the current Workplan and budget to better understand the progress to date and determine which activities were ongoing and how budget implications can be linked to projects. The group used a template developed to build on the existing Workplan. Each activity was briefly discussed and progress, and it was noted that all activities for 2013-15 are ongoing. Activities requiring budgets were reflected to accomplish related activities, and the Workplan needs to be updated to include outcomes of meeting. It could be reviewed intersessionally 9 days or more in advance of TCC. The SWG was expected to meet and come up with a Workplan and budget for 2015-2017 to be proposed to the WCPFC FAC. The SWG observed that that is too ambitious – to propose a Workplan without having an understanding of the program and without the Workplan being updated with activities with budget implications agreed at TCC10. The SWG proposed that the Workplan and budget process should be moved to FAC and suggested that an updated Workplan is completed by the Secretariat, incorporating the outcomes and needs flowing from this meeting. It was noted that there were activities in the budget that are not reflected in the current Workplan, for example, the capacity needs which were identified at TCC10. The SWG noted that there exists an approved Workplan for 2015, and updates for 2015 and planned activities for forward years are still ongoing. It was suggested that TCC10 can come up with a 2016-18 Workplan.
390. The Secretariat thanked FSM for its leadership of the TCC Workplan and Budget SWG and asked for clarification about the proposed tasking of the Secretariat, and expressed an understanding that the TCC Workplan and budget 2013-15 is “owned” by TCC. It guides the work and priorities of the TCC meeting. The Workplan guides the TCC process and is in some ways a separate but a guiding document for the budget. FAC’s role is to review the budget provided by the Secretariat. The proposal from SWG seems to be suggesting that TCC would now like to be more involved in the development of the 2.3 section of the WCPFC budget, and maybe this is based on the current process which the SC uses. . A number of items within part 2.3 of the budget which are directly related to the Secretariat’s activities that may relate to the TCC Workplan and may complement it, but they are not necessary always the same. In response to the suggestion that the Secretariat be asked to undertake some updates to the TCC Workplan document, the Secretariat sought further clarification from TCC/SWG about whether the Workplan was proposed to be a TCC Workplan or a Secretariat Workplan.
391. The SWG Chair responded that the intention was to ensure TCC was budgeting for activities that need to be completed.

392. The TCC Chair noted that the suggestion was to take the existing Workplan and budget and make it a more useful document going forward. There were items on the TCC10 agenda that had not been ready for discussion or were completed, so there was some merit in looking at the Workplan to ensure the work TCC is doing is relevant and useful. The TCC Chair expressed the view that it needs to be TCC's document, to guide the work of TCC and guide the Commission accordingly. It is a combination of issues and activities, and they would not necessarily change in the Workplan each year. Depending on the year there might be specific activities related to work which might need to be budgeted for. Since this is a new approach, it was suggested that TCC accept the 2015 budget and ask the Secretariat to update it, based on the outcomes of this meeting and provide an indicative budget for FAC. Going forward, next year a Workplan could be developed; this change would shift the years of the Workplan. It was noted that TCC would not have anything beyond 2015.
393. The USA sought clarification, expressing the view that TCC should have ownership of the Workplan and noting that there are always more tasks than TCC has time to do. TCC needs to evaluate those tasks and decide priorities for next year.
394. The TCC Chair noted that a 2015 TCC Workplan and budget had already been adopted. With something in place for next year, it was suggested that TCC11 could spend time adopting something for the following three years
395. A number of CCMs suggested amendments. It was suggested that the Workplan be updated to reflect TCC10 outcomes, and be further amended in 2015.
396. The TCC Chair clarified that after TCC meetings the Secretariat takes the taskings and activities and provides budget against it. The Secretariat does not add it to the Workplan, so the two documents do not line up perfectly. So there is a mechanism for outcomes of TCC to be reflected at least in the budget – the Workplan is a product of TCC discussions and contains TCC-identified priorities. The TCC Chair noted that the current discussion represents a new approach.
397. The Secretariat undertook to prepare overall figures and ensure the budget is balanced and can take on suggestions for placeholders in the usual FAC documents.
- 398. TCC10 recommends that the Commission maintain the existing 2015 TCC Workplan. The Secretariat's normal practice of preparing draft budget for 2015 and indicative budgets for 2016-2017 will continue.**

14.3 Report on Secretariat IMS and website development and online reporting systems (2013 – 2015)

399. The Secretariat provided a report on IMS enhancement for TCC10 to consider, referencing page 19 of the Executive Director's Annual Report (WCPFC-TCC10-2014-12). In 2012, the Commission approved the development of the WCPFC online systems for Annual Report Part 2 and for CMR, and a workplan for the development of the WCPFC integrated MCS Information Management System. Towards this initiative the Commission has committed 100,000 per annum for IMS

development and 18,000 for online website tools. During 2014, these funds have supported the continued development IT tools for analysing transshipment and EHSP reporting, implementation of the RFV SSPs, including upgraded public display of the RFV, and CCM portals. Alongside this the Commission has also invested in associated IT infrastructure, which has improved efficiencies and effectiveness of the Information Management System and the online reporting tools, and work has commenced on integrating WCPFC databases under a single data warehouse framework. The Secretariat expects that this work will continue to provide enhanced capability for the Secretariat to undertake MCS and compliance reviews that will better support the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme, and potentially better support WCPFC member MCS non-public domain data requests. All of the Required Reports which are tabled at TCC10, and the draft Compliance Monitoring Report and related-work, have benefitted and have been supported by the IMS developments to date.

400. To help develop a plan for progressing IMS developments by the Secretariat, the Secretariat hosted a 13-14 June internal workshop of WCPFC officers, with a number of invited experts from FFA, SPC, CCAMLR, NOAA-OLE (Honolulu) and FSM. The workshop was a valuable beginning of an exchange on learning from experiences and approaches that other organisations have taken for GIS display in their IMS, or with integration of fisheries data and reporting.
401. Referring members to bottom of page of 20 of the Executive Director's Annual Report, the Secretariat noted that it has and expects to receive some additional voluntary contributions. These are expected to support four priority work areas which have been identified by the Secretariat for future IMS development within the Secretariat:
 - i. support ways to improve the collection of accurate and timely data, including through electronic reporting (ER) and electronic monitoring (EM);
 - ii. continuing to expand the analytical capability and business intelligence of the WCPFC IMS, including adding a GIS/map for displaying and integrating various WCPFC data;
 - iii. improving the access and capability of the Secretariat to review ROP observer data, and ensure that the Secretariat's internal MCS operating procedures and IMS systems adequately cater for record-keeping, handling of evidence and notices to CCMs of possible violations;
 - iv. review procedures and propose tools, including through the website, so that the Secretariat is better equipped to provide timely access to MCS-relevant information in support of member MCS activities and to share MCS data with CCMs, in accordance with the WCPFC data rules and procedure.
402. These priority work areas align closely with many of the ideas and proposals that have been discussed elsewhere throughout the TCC10 agenda. An overall project plan for the Information Management System and website proposed developments is currently under development.
403. FFA members appreciated the enhancement work done so far on the WCPFC website and WCPFC IMS, and encouraged the WCPFC Secretariat to:

- ensure these resources are equally accessible to FFA members with bandwidth constraints
 - continually refine the IMS, particularly for Annual Report Part 1 and 2 submissions, to enable members to submit their reports as easily as possible
 - continue to engage with FFA and SPC on ongoing IMS initiatives at the regional and national level to minimise duplication and ensure all members benefit
 - engage with FFA and SPC on discussions around “single sign-on” capabilities between the various IMSs so members can log on once to any IMS and thereby have access to the other available IMS resources.
404. FSM suggested engaging with national authorities as well as FFA and SPC.
405. Kiribati expressed support for the Secretariat’s work on IMS development and looked forward to further workshops. Noting that the Secretariat typically invites those with IMSs in place, but suggested CCMs with limited IMSs including those from small islands should participate. Kiribati expressed interest in being part of the workshop. Kiribati supported the FFA views which had been expressed, noting that such assistance would help members with bandwidth constraints to understand the system better and meet reporting deadlines.

14.4 Election of officers

406. The TCC Chair noted that the term of the Vice-Chair finishes this year and asked for nominations.
407. Japan proposed that Alexa Cole (USA) be nominated for another term for her outstanding performance. Australia seconded Japan’s nomination.
- 408. TCC10 agreed to recommend to WCPFC11 that Alexa Cole (USA) continue as Vice Chair of the TCC for a second term.**
409. TCC chair sought nominations for IWG ROP Chair and Ad Hoc Data Task Group Chair.
410. PNG nominated Ray Clarke (USA) as Chair of the IWG ROP Chair and Chinese Taipei seconded this proposal, with FSM also lending support.
- 411. TCC10 agreed to recommend to WCPFC11 that Ray Clarke (USA) be appointed as chair of the IWG ROP.**
412. The EU queried appointing a Chair for the proposed working group on FADs, but suggested it may be premature.
413. The TCC Chair stated that would be left to CCMs, but that it might be something the Commission would take up.

14.5 Next meeting

- 414. TCC10 agreed to recommend to WCPFC11 that TCC11 be held in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia on 24-29th September 2015.**

AGENDA ITEM 15 — CLEARANCE OF TCC10 RECOMMENDATIONS

415. The TCC Chair noted that the provisional CMR includes recommendations in the main body of the Provisional CMR Executive Summary (paragraph 56) and in Table 1 of that document that have now been agreed as part of the Provisional CMR report that would be forwarded to WCPFC11. Noting that discussions had taken place in closed session, the Chair sought confirmation as to whether those recommendations could be placed in the public domain. No CCMs objected.
416. TCC10 adopted the recommendations of the TCC10 Summary Report. A complete version of the report will be circulated subsequent to the meeting, when comments on discussion text would be requested from CCMs by 24 October 2014.

AGENDA ITEM 16 — CLOSE OF MEETING

417. The TCC Chair expressed her gratitude to the following people: the Secretariat for the multitude of meeting arrangements undertaken, with particular thanks to the support staff who looked after IT, internet and power, morning and afternoon teas, and papers which were circulated and posted to the server speedily. The Compliance Manager, Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott, and her team for preparing the papers for this meeting, which were excellent and allowed TCC to discuss the substantive issues were specially thanked, and the new rapporteur, Dr Jane Broweleit for the timeliness of drafts. CCMs were thanked for their support; they worked many hours, especially on the compliance review. The TCC Chair appreciated the hard work and effort of TCC, including from the Secretariat in preparing the dCMRs. The Chairs of the SWGs were thanked for their efforts in contributing to the completion of TCC's work.
418. Japan recognised the outstanding Chairmanship of the meeting by the TCC Chair in successfully getting the meeting through a long TCC agenda and also expressed gratitude to the Secretariat for its support for the Committee's work. On the other hand it explained that it is with regret that they have to indicate discomfort with some of the outcomes of this TCC meeting, noting that the TCC Chair had progressed several serious items with complex procedures, including a provisional assessment of each CCM's Compliance Status, without giving confirmation toward non-English speakers. They felt that some discussions occurred too fast. It also pointed out that some recommendations were discussed without both ensuring enough time to review the draft and giving a hard copy. It stated that the arrangement was unfair to non-English speakers. It requested that the TCC Chair take these concerns into consideration in arrangements and chairmanship for the next TCC meeting.
419. FFA members offered gratitude to the TCC Chair for her guidance as TCC moved through a difficult agenda. They offered their gratitude to the Compliance Manager and the Secretariat staff for a job well done, particularly in supporting the CMR process. While FFA members would walk away from this meeting disappointed on some, particularly regarding data provision, they also recognise positives coming from this meeting and going into WCPFC11. Their proposals on albacore, tropical

tuna, including the target reference point for skipjack, data, and harvest strategies remain high priorities for these CCMs, and they will work with other CCMs on them. FFA members looked forward to Apia.

420. The Compliance Manager expressed her gratitude the TCC Chair and Vice-Chair for their support over the last months as the Secretariat undertook preparations for the dCMR, noting that it was well directed and benefited from those discussions. The Compliance Manager noted the pleasure of working alongside them at this meeting. The Compliance Manager thanked all the Secretariat staff and rapporteur by name and wished all meeting participants a safe flight home.
421. TCC10 was closed at 5:25pm on 30 September 2014.



**The Commission for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish
Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean**

**Technical and Compliance Committee
Tenth Regular Session**

**25-30 September 2014
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia**

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A. List of Participants
- Attachment B. Agenda for Tenth Regular Meeting of the Technical and Compliance Committee
- Attachment C. WCPFC IUU list
- Attachment D. Longline Observer Coverage Tables
- Attachment E. CDS-IWG 2014 Workplan

ATTACHMENT A — LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



**Technical and Compliance Committee
Tenth Regular Session (TCC10)
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
25-30 September 2014**

CHAIR

Rhea Moss-Christian

Fisheries and Economic Adviser
Congress of the Federated States of Micronesia
Palikir, FM 96941
Tel: 691.320.2325
rhea.moss@gmail.com

Zhao Gang

Deputy Secretary General
China Overseas Fisheries Association
admin1@tuna.org.cn

Xiao Mengjie

Deputy Director of Highseas Fisheries
Department
China Overseas Fisheries Association
admin1@tuna.org.cn

AUSTRALIA

Jenny Baldwin

Assistant Director, Regional Fisheries and
Treaties
Department of Agriculture

+61 2 6272 3756
jenny.baldwin@agriculture.gov.au

Fraser McEachan

Manager, Foreign Compliance Policy
Australian Fisheries Management Authority
+61 02 6225 5308
fraser.mceachan@afma.gov.au

Holly Matley

Assistant Director, Regional Fisheries and
Treaties
Department of Agriculture
+61 2 6271 6319
holly.matley@agriculture.gov.au

CHINA

Wan Chen

Assistant Director, Division of Distant Water
Deepsea Fishing
Bureau of Fisheries and Fisheries Law
Enforcement
Ministry of Agriculture
bodwf@agri.gov.cn

COOK ISLANDS

Andrew Jones

Director Offshore Fisheries
Cook Islands Ministry of Marine Resources
00682-27821
a.jones@mnr.gov.ck

EUROPEAN UNION

Angela Martini

International Relations Officer
European Commission
angela.martini@ec.europa.eu

Stamatis Varsamos

International relations officer
European Commission
stamatios.varsamos@ec.europa.eu

Ignacio De Leiva Moreno

Fisheries attache
European Commission
juan-ignacio.de-leiva-moreno@eeas.europa.eu

**FEDERATED STATES OF
MICRONESIA**

Eugene Pangelinan

Deputy Director
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
eugene.pangelinan@norma.fm

Naiten Bradley Phillip Jr.

Chief of Research
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
bradley.phillip@norma.fm

Limanman Helgenberger

Chief, Management & Development
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
liman.h@norma.fm

Alfred Lebehn Jr

IT & Statistics Manager
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
alfred.lebehnj@norma.fm

Justino Helgen

VMS/Compliance Manager
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
justino.helgen@norma.fm

Miorida Yee Ting

Manager Licensing
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
miorida.yeeting@norma.fm

Tosuo Irons Jr.

Observer/De-briefer
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)
(691) 320-2700/5181
itosuo@yahoo.com

Kastor Naich

Observer Coordinator
National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority (NORMA)

(691) 320-2700/5181
kastor.naich@norma.fm

Caroline Rugero

Assistant Attorney General
Department of Justice, Federated States of
Micronpartment of Justice
Palikir, Pohnpei, FM 96941
+691 320 2111
cru.fsm@gmail.com

Tim Koroi

Maritime Surveillance Advisor
FSM National Police Maritime Wing
6913204746
msamicronesia@gmail.com

John Waayan

Chairman, Board of Directors
Diving Seagull, Inc.
(691) 350-4796
car@mail.fm

Leelkan Dabchuren

Legal Counsel
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

Clement Mulalap

Legal Counsel
Diving Seagull, Inc.
(691) 350-4796
car@mail.fm

Charles Falmeyog

Board of Directors
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

Falownug Kenmed

Board of Directors
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

John Fathal

Board of Directors
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

Carmen Kigimnang

General Manager
Diving Seagull, Inc.

(691)350-4796
car@mail.fm

Pete Lipanovich
Vessel Manager
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

Vincent Tafileluw
Board of Directors
Diving Seagull, Inc.
691-350-4796
car@mail.fm

Marko Kamber
Assistant General Manager
Caroline Fisheries Corporation, Inc.
cfc@cfctuna.com

Peter Sitan
President/CEO
National Fisheries Corporation
(691) 320-2529
psitan@mail.fm

Nicholson Solomon
President
Pohnpei Shipping company, Inc.
(691) 320-8011
nis@mail.fm

Derrick Wang
Vice President
Luen thai Fishing Venture, Ltd.
wangderrick@aol.com

FIJI

Anare K. Raiwalui
Principal Fisheries Officer
Fisheries Department

+679 3301011 (EXT: 104104), +679 9 711 939
raiwalui.anare@gmail.com

Jone Amoe
Senior Fisheries Officer
Fisheries Department, Ministry of Fisheries and
Forests
679 3301011
amoe.jone@gmail.com

Leba Raketekete
Fisheries Officer
Ministry of Fisheries & Forests
+679 3301 611

raketekete.leba@gmail.com

INDONESIA

Saut Tampubolon
Deputy Director for Fisheries Resource in
Indonesia EEZ and High Seas
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No.16, Gedung Mina
Bahari II, 10th Floor Jakarta Pusat 10110
s.tampubolon@yahoo.com /
sdi.djpt@yahoo.co.id

Yayan Hernuryadin
Assistant Deputy Director for Fisheries
Resources in Indonesia EEZ and High Seas
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Jl. Medan Merdeka Timur No.16, Gedung Mina
Bahari II, 10th Floor Jakarta Pusat 10110
62-21-3453008
boyan_nuryadin@yahoo.co.id /
sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

JAPAN

Yujiro Akatsuka
Assistant Director
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo Japan
81-3-3502-8459
yuujirou_akatsuka@nm

Sho Kasuya
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo Japan
81-3-3502-8459
syo_kasuya@nm.maff.go.jp

Mako Iioka
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo Japan
81-3-3502-8459
mako_iioka@nm.maff.go.jp

Keisuke Satoh
National Research Institute of FarSea Fisheries
5-7-1 Orido Shimizu Shizuoka, Japan
81-54-336-6043
kstu21@fra.affrc.go.jp

Kikuo Chiyo
Deputy Director, International Division
Japan Tuna Fisheries Cooperative Association
2-31-1 Eitai Koto-Ku 135-0034, Tokyo Japan
81-3-5646-2382
gyojyo@japantuna.or.jp

Toru Kitamura

Assistant Manager, Yokohama Office
Japan NUS Co., Ltd.
Queen's Tower-A 26F, 2-3-1 Minato Mirai,
Nishi-ku, Yokohama 220-6001, JAPAN
81-45-682-8111
tkitamura@janus.co.jp

Michio Shimizu

Executive Secretary
National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association
81-3-3294-9633
mic-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp

Kazuhiko Nagao

Managing Director
Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
81-3-3564-2315
japan@kaimaki.or.jp

Sakae Terao

Executive Secretary
Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
81-3-3564-2315
japan@kaimaki.or.jp

Takashi Nagura

Resident Representative
Overseas Fishery Cooperation Foundation
FSM Office
691-320-8581
nagura@mail.fm

Takashi Shibata

Company president
Cubic-i LTD.
2-15-9 Nishi-Gotanda, Shinagawa-ku Tokyo,
Japan
81-3-3779-5506
shibata@cubic-i.co.jp

KIRIBATI**Mbwenea Teioki**

mbweneat@mfmrd.gov.ki

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**Bang Jonghwa**

Deputy Director
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Government Complex Sejong, 94, Dasom 2-Ro,
Sejong Special Self-governing City
82-44-2005342

bjh125@korea.kr

Woo Young Seok

Assistant Director
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Government Complex Sejong, 94, Dasom 2-Ro,
Sejong Special Self-governing City
82-44-200-5343
yswoo@korea.kr

ILkang Na

Assistant Manager
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association
82-2-589-1614
ikna@kosfa.org

Jihyun Kim

Advisor
Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Institute
821067719094
zeekim@ififc.org

HyeJin Hwang

Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Institute
hijwang11@korea.kr

Jung Yul Kim

Director
KSFA
82-10-6550-3171
jykim112@hanmail.net

Jung Jong IL

Staff
SAJO Industries Co., Ltd.
+82 10 2384 0809
nick@sajo.co.kr

Lee Kyung Soo

General Manager
SAJO Industries, Co., Ltd.(KOFA)
+ 82 10 4163 3656
kslee@sajo.co.kr

Anthony Kim

SILLA CO.,LTD.
#286-7 Seokchon-Dong, Songpa-Gu, Seoul,
Korea
822-3434-9717
jhkim@sla.co.kr

Henry Young Taek Lee

Staff
SILLA CO.,LTD.
82-10-9557-7654
ytleee@sla.co.kr

Jae Yeong(Rachel) Lee
Assistant Manager
Dongwon Industries co., ltd.
82-2-589-3306
rachelles0130@dongwon.com

SangJin Park
Director
Dongwon Industries co., ltd.
82-2-589-3078
sjpark@dongwon.com

REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

Glen Joseph
Director
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
PO Box 860 Majuro, MH 96960
+692 625 8262
gjoseph101@gmail.com

Samuel Lanwi Jr.
Deputy Director
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
P.O. Box 860, Majuro MH 96960
+692 625 8262
blanwi@gmail.com

Tion Nabau
Legal Advisor
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
P.O. Box 860, Majuro MH 96960
+692 625 8262
tion.nabau@gmail.com

Orlando Paul
Deputy Manager
Koo's Fishing Company LTD
P.O. Box 321 Majuro MH 96960
625-5310
opaul29@gmail.com

NAURU

Murin Jeremiah
Oceanic Manager
Nauru Fisheries Marine Resources Authority
(NFMRA)
mhzjere@gmail.com

Rutherford Jeremiah
Licensing Officer
Nauru Fisheries Marine Resources Authority
(NFMRA)

rujejeremiah@gmail.com

NEW ZEALAND

Joanna Anderson
Senior Policy Analyst
Ministry for Primary Industries
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington 6140
+4 894 6481
joanna.anderson@mpi.govt.nz

Andrew Wright
Advisor
The Ministry for Primary Industries, New Zealand
0064 4 8194757
andrew.wright@mpi.govt.nz

Shannon Tau
Legal Adviser
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
shannon.tau@mfat.govt.nz

Damian Johnson
Adviser, Pacific Fisheries (MCS & Enforcement Analysis)
New Zealand - Ministry for Primary Industries
03 9431798
damian.johnson@mpi.govt.nz

Don Syme
Senior Policy Analyst
Ministry for Primary Industries New Zealand
0064+48194634
don.syme@mpi.govt.nz

Andy Smith
Operations Manager
Talleys Group Ltd
6421337756
andy.smith@nn.talleys.co.nz

NIUE

James Tafatu
Fisheries Manager
Ministry of Natural Resources
jtafatu@gmail.com / james.tafatu@mail.gov.nu

PALAU

Nannette Malsol
Director, Bureau of Oceanic Fisheries Management
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism

6804884394
dillymalsol@gmail.com

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Gisa Komangin

Executive Manager Monitoring Control and
Surveillance
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
11th Floor, Deloitte tower, Douglas Street, Port
Moresby
6753090444
gkomagin@fisheries.gov.pg

Philip Lens

Observer Manager
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
P.O. Box 2016, Port Moresby
6753090444
philiplens70@gmail.com /
plens@fisheries.gov.pg

Alois Kinol

CDS Manager
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
alois.kinol@gmail.com /
akinol@fisheries.gov.pg

Brian Kumasi

Tuna Fisheries Manager
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
11th Floor, Deloitte tower, Douglas Street, Port
Moresby
6753090444
bkumasi@fisheries.gov.pg /
bjkumasi@gmail.com

Augustine Galuwa

Licensing Officer
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)
11th Floor, Deloitte tower, Douglas Street, Port
Moresby
6753090444
agaluwa@fisheries.gov.pg /
agaluwa@gmail.com

FL Sang

South Seas Tuna Corporation
POM Office
sstcflsang@gmail.com

Harry Chen

South Sea Tuna Corporation
Wewak office, No. 1 Wharf Road, Wewak, East
Sepik Province, Papua New Guinea
PO Box 543.
sstcharry@gmail.com

Charles C.P. Lee

Manager
Fair Well Fishery
675-3200685
charlescplee@gmail.com

PHILIPPINES

Severino Escobar, Jr.

Supervising Fishing Regulations Officer,
Fisheries Regulatory and Quarantine Division
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
(BFAR)
PCA Compound, Elliptical Road, Diliman,
Quezon City
632-929-9597

Elaine Garvilles

Aquaculturist II
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
(BFAR) /National Fisheries Research and
Development Institute
PCA Compound, Elliptical Road, Diliman,
Quezon City
632-929-9597

Phillip Andrew Yu

Manager
NH Agro Industrial Corporation

Rosanna Bernadette B. Contreras

Executive Director
Socksargen Federation of Fishing and Allied
Industries, Inc.
2nd Flr. SAF14 Bldg., Magsaysay Ave. General
Santos City Philippines
639177212634
fishing.federation@gmail.com

Laurent Dezamy

VMS / FMC / ERS Expert
laurent.dezamy@gmail.com

SAMOA

Joyce Samuelu-Ah Leong

Assistant CEO
Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries
685-23863
joyce.ahleong@maf.gov.ws

Ueta Faasili Jnr.

Principal Fisheries Officer, Fisheries Division

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
ueta.faasili@maf.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Sylvester Diake
Under Secretary/Fisheries
MFMR
sdiake@fisheries.gov.sb

Charles Tobasala
Chief Fisheries Officer (Compliance)
MFMR
ctobasala@fisheries.gov.sb

Amanda Hamilton
Senior Manager - Trade & Economics
National Fisheries Development
ahamilton@trimarinegroup.com

Nollen Leni
National Fisheries Development Limited
Honiara, Solomon Islands
677-30991
nlennie@trimarinegroup.com

CHINESE TAIPEI

Ding-Rong Lin
Director
Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture
dingrong@msl.f.gov.tw

Chi-Chao Liu
Section Chief
Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture
chichao@msl.f.gov.tw

Joseph Chia-Chi Fu
Secretary
Overseas Fisheries Development Council
joseph@ofdc.org.tw

Jerhyn Chu
Secretary
Taiwan Tuna Purse Seiners Association
8130740
jerhyn@ttdpsa.org.tw

Shih-Chieh Fang
Officer
Coast Guard Administration, Executive Yan
gunshot@cga.gov.tw

Wen-Ying Wang
Specialist

Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture
wenying@msl.f.gov.tw

Yun-Hu Yeh
Instructor
Dept. of Maritime Police, Central Police
University
una108@mail.cpu.edu.tw

TONGA

Losaline Loto'avea
Head of MCS (Fisheries Officer)
Fisheries Division (Tonga)
21399
losalinelotoavea@gmail.com

Martin W. Finau
Fisheries Officer - Offshore Resource
National Tuna Data Coordinator Fisheries
Division
P.O. Box 871, Nukualofa Tonga
676-21399
finau.martin@gmail.com

TUVALU

Solomua Ionatana
Principal Fisheries Officer
Tuvalu Government
68820814
tualen@gmail.com

Afasene Hopi
Managing Director
TTFH
Funafuti, Tuvalu
afahop@gmail.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Michael D. Tosatto
Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service-Pacific
Islands Office
808-725-5001
michael.tosatto@noaa.gov

Raymond P. Clarke
Fishery Biologist
National Marine Fisheries Service - Pacific
Islands Office
808-725-5031
raymond.clarke@noaa.gov

Alexa Cole
TCC Vice Chair / Deputy Chief, Enforcement
Section
NOAA Office of General Counsel
301-427-8286
Alexa.Cole@noaa.gov

Bill Pickering
Special Agent in Charge
NOAA Office of Law Enforcement
808/725-6100
bill.pickering@noaa.gov

Terry Boone
VMS Manager
NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement, Pacific
Islands Division
7632
terry.boone@noaa.gov

Thomas R. Graham
Fishery Policy Analyst
National Marine Fisheries Service - Pacific
Islands Office
808-725-5032
tom.graham@noaa.gov

Emily Crigler
Fishery Policy Analyst
National Marine Fisheries Service - Pacific
Islands Office
808-725-5036
emily.crigler@noaa.gov

Eric Kingma
Intl. Fisheries, Enforcement, NEPA Coordinator
Western Pacific Fishery Management Council
808 522 8141
eric.kingma@noaa.gov

Linda M. B. Paul
Director
Ocean Law & Policy Institute, Pacific Forum
CSIS
815 Pahumele Place, Kailua, Hawai 9734
808-262-6859
linpaul@aloha.net

Eric Roberts
Fisheries Enforcement Specialist
U.S. Coast Guard
808-535-3265
eric.t.roberts@uscg.mil

Rula Deisher
Fisheries Enforcement Officer
U.S. Coast Guard
808-535-3370
rula.f.deisher@uscg.mil

Brian Hallman
Executive Director
American Tunaboat Association
1-619-888-4960
bhallmanata@gmail.com

Michael Goto
Commissioner
US
1131 N.Nimitz Hwy Honolulu, HI 96871
808-927-4477
mgoto@unitedfishingagency.com

VANUATU

Jason Raubani
Manager- Management & Policy Division
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
678 7742101
3jraudinbani@gmail.com

Wesley Obed
Principal MCS / Acting Manager, Compliance
Division
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
678-7741318
weobed@gmail.com / wobed@vanuatu.gov.vu

PARTICIPATING TERRITORIES

NEW CALEDONIA

Regis Etaix-Bonnin

Deputy Head
Fishery and Environment Service
Maritime Affairs Department
687-270693
regis.etaix-bonnin@gouv.nc

TOKELAU

Feleti Tulafono

Offshore Fisheries Officer -
MCS/VDS/Licensing
EDNRE
(wk) +690 3134 / (hm) +690 3248
ftulafono@gmail.com

Tiga Galo

Offshore Fisheries Officer - Policy & Planning
EDNRE
tigagalo@gmail.com / tiga.galo@live.com

Department of Fisheries,
(662)5620543,6687-6811218
pirochas@hotmail.com

Sarayoot Boonkumjad

Fishery Biologist, Professional level
Department of Fisheries
(662)5797947, 6689-9229701
sboonkumjad@yahoo.com

VIETNAM

Doan Manh Cuong

Programme Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
+84-4-3734 7086
doanmanhcuong@gmail.com

Nguyen Quoc Anh

Official
Directorate of Fisheries
+84-904 272 803
quocanh74hn@yahoo.com

COOPERATING NON-MEMBERS

ECUADOR

Rafael Trujillo

Director Executive
National Chamber of Fisheries
Av 9 de Octubre 424 af.802 Guayaquil
ECUADOR
(593) 4 2566346
direjec@camaradepesqueria.com /
rtrujillo57@gmail.com

EL SALVADOR

Oscar Gustavo Alvarez

Executive
CENDEPESCA
c/Loma Linda - 251 San Benito - San Salvador,
EL SALVADOR
00 503 2244 4800
ogacvm@gmail.com

THAILAND

Pirochana Saikliang

Senior Expert on Marine Fisheries

OBSERVERS

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Karen Baird

Seabird Advocate
BirdLife International
+64 9 4226868
k.baird@forestandbird.org.nz

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL

Geoff Hart-Davies

MCS lead
Conservation International
+61 413 615500
ghd@maritimesafety.com

PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY (FFA)

Wez Norris

Deputy Director-General
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
wez.norris@ffa.int

Pamela Maru
Fisheries Management Adviser
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
pamela.maru@ffa.int

Ramesh Chand
Manager Vessel Monitoring System
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+(677) 21124 ext 213
ramesh.chand@ffa.int

Timothy Park
Observer Programme Manager
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
timothy.park@ffa.int

Noan Pakop
Director, Fisheries Operations Division
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
noan.pakop@ffa.int

Apolosi Turaganivalu
Compliance Policy Officer
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
apolosi.turaganivalu@ffa.int

Manu Tupou-Roosen
Legal Counsel
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
+677 21124
manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int

Gavin Baker
Surveillance Operations Officer
Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, P.O. Box 629 Honiara
677 749 6262
gavin.baker@ffa.int

GREENPEACE

Karli Thomas
Senior Oceans Campaigner
Greenpeace
6421905582
kthomas@greenpeace.org

INTERNATIONAL SUSTAINABLE SEA FOOD FOUNDATION (ISSF)

Claire van der Geest
Strategic Policy Advisor
ISSF
+61 403707105
cvandergeest@iss-foundation.org

THE PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS

Angelo Villagomez
Manager
The Pew Charitable Trusts
avillagomez@pewtrusts.org

Dave Gershman
Senior Associate, Global Tuna Conservation
The Pew Charitable Trusts
dgershman@pewtrusts.org

PACIFIC ISLANDS TUNA INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION (PITIA)

Naitilima Tupou
Secretariat
Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association
P.O. Box 1704, Nuku'alofa Tonga
676 8763117
secretariat@pitia.org

PARTIES TO THE NAURU AGREEMENT (PNA)

Les Clark
Adviser
PNA Office
85 Innes Rd.
64 3 3562892
les@rayfishresearch.com

Patricia Jack
Vessel Day Scheme Manager
PNA Office
P.O. BOX 3992; MAJURO, MH 96960
6926257626
patricia@pnatuna.com
***SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC
COMMUNITY (SPC)***

John Hampton

Chief Scientist, Oceanic Fisheries
Programme
SPC
B.P. D5, Noumea, New Caledonia
687-260147
johnh@spc.int

Peter G. Williams
Principal Fisheries Scientist - Data Mgmt.
SPC
B.P. D5, Noumea, New Caledonia
peterw@spc.int

***WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE
(WWF)***

Alfred "Bubba" Cook
WCP Tuna Programme Manager
WWF
+679 903 5008
acook@wwf.panda.org

WCPFC SECRETARIAT

Charles Karnella
WCPFC Chairman and International Fisheries
Administrator
NOAA - National Marine Fisheries Service
1601 Kapiolani Blvd. , Suite 1110, Honolulu HI
96814
808-944-2206
charles.karnella@noaa.gov

Lara Manarangi-Trott
Compliance Manager / Officer in Charge
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
lara.manarangi-trott@wcpfc.int

Ana F. Taholo
Assistant Compliance Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
ana.taholo@wcpfc.int

Albert Carlot
VMS Manager
WCPFC

Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
albert.carlot@wcpfc.int

Karl Staisch
Observer Programme Coordinator
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
karl.staisch@wcpfc.int

Jane Broweleit
Rapporteur
jane.broweleit@daff.gov.au

David C. Angyal
Legal Advisor
P.O. Box K3150 Kolonia, Pohnpei FSM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
davidangyal@gmail.com

Kerry Smith
Consultant
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
kerry.smith@wcpfc.int

Shelley Clarke
ABNJ Tuna Project Technical Coordinator -
Sharks and Bycatch
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
shelley.clarke@wcpfc.int

SungKwon Soh
Science Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int

Samuelu Taufao
ICT Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
samuel.taufao@wcpfc.int

Aaron Nighswander

Finance & Administration Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int

Angela Abolhassani
Intern
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
angela.abolhassani@wcpfc.int

Lucille A. Martinez
Administrative Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
lucille.martinez@wcpfc.int

Arlene Takesy
Executive Assistant
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
arlene.takesy@wcpfc.int

Milo Abello
VMS Operations Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
milo.abello@wcpfc.int

Donald David
Data Quality Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
donald.david@wcpfc.int

Glenn Jano
Compliance Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993

glenn.jano@wcpfc.int

Rose George
Support Staff
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
rose.george@wcpfc.int

Virgilio San Jose
Support Staff
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, P.O. Box 2356 Kolonia,
Pohnpei FM 96941
691-320-1992/1993
vsanjose26@yahoo.com

ATTACHMENT B — PROVISIONAL AGENDA WITH SCHEDULE



TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Tenth Regular Session

25 - 30 September 2014

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

TCC10 INDICATIVE SCHEDULE WITH DOCUMENTS

WCPFC-TCC10-2014-02A_rev2²
24 September 2014

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25

8:30 - AGENDA ITEM 1 - OPENING OF MEETING

1.1 Welcome

1.2 Adoption of agenda.

TCC10-02, TCC10-03, TCC10-02A

1.3 Meeting arrangements

1.4 Introduction of Proposals: new CMMs or draft amendments to current CMMs

* DP01: Port State Measures (FFA Proposal) (*Agenda 12.1*)

* DP02 / DP03: Harvest Strategy (Australia Proposal) (*Agenda 12.2*)

* DP04: Proposal to amend CMM 2010-02 (Cook Islands) (*Agenda 8.6a*)

* DP06: PNA Members + Tokelau – proposal on target reference point for skipjack Conservation and Management Measure (*Agenda 12.3*)

* DP07: FFA Member's proposal on a Conservation and Management Measure on provision of Operational Data (*Agenda 12.4*)

9:15 - AGENDA ITEM 2 - IUU LIST

TCC10-07

9:30 - AGENDA ITEM 3 - CNM REQUESTS

TCC10-08

9:45 - AGENDA ITEM 4 - STATUS OF FISHERIES PRESENTATION (SPC)

IP10

10:00-10:30 – MORNING TEA

10:30 - AGENDA ITEM 5 - SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF DEVELOPING STATES

5.1 Review effectiveness of Resolution 2008-01 on Aspirations of Small Islands Developing States

TCC10-08 DP08 (FFA)

11:30 - AGENDA ITEM 6 - COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME

TCC10-10

IP01 IP02 IP04 IP05 IP06 IP07 IP08

² Includes i) addition of Agenda items in response to new papers/proposals: 10.1c (ER standards); 12.3 (PNA + Tokelau) and 12.4 (FFA Operational level data), and
ii) movement of Agenda 14.2 so that it can be considered with Agenda 7 (EDs report).

(Agenda Items 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 will be introduced prior to 6.1)

6.1 Review of draft CMR (*Review of the draft CMR and discussion of provisional CMR will be held taking into account the confidentiality of information (CMM 2013-02 para 14)*)

Resume after completion of 6.1

6.2 Provisional CMR report and Executive Summary – **TO BE TAKEN UP ON MONDAY**

6.3 Target capacity assistance to areas of need identified by CMR process – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

6.4 Recommendations to revise CMMs prioritised by CMS process which were ambiguous or problematic – (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

6.5 Recommendations to refine CMM 2013-02 *Compliance Monitoring Scheme* - (TCC Workplan 2013-2015)

6.6 Report from IWG Chair: developing a systematic analysis, prioritization and response mechanism for non-compliance (TCC workplan 2013-2015, WCPFC10 para 270)

12:30-1:30 – LUNCH BREAK

1:30 – 5:00 – AGENDA ITEM 6.1 (AFTERNOON TEA @3:00)

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26

8:30-5:00 – AGENDA ITEM 6.1 REVIEW OF DRAFT CMR

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 26

8:30 - AGENDA ITEM 7 - ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ED – *Highlights of WCPFC Secretariat administering of MCS and Compliance Programmes* **TCC10-12**

14.2 Administration of the Data Rules and Procedures, including Report on WCPFC Security Audit 2013/14 **RP07 RP08_rev1**

8:45 - AGENDA ITEM 8 - CORE MCS ACTIVITIES - discussion of technical issues or requirements

8.1 Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) (Annual Report) **TCC10-12 / RP01**

(a) Expiry of VMS manual reporting position reporting requirements on 1 March 2015 (VMS SSPs, Section 5)

(b) Review SLAs with Mobilise Satellite Provider, develop ALC type approval process – (TCC workplan 2013-2015)

9:45 - 8.2 Regional Observer Programme (Annual Report) **TCC10-12 / RP02**

(a) Measuring and monitoring ROP longline coverage (TCC9 para 117) **TCC10-13**

(b) ROP and addressing corruption concerns (TCC9 para 184 and 204) **TCC10-14**
TCC10-14A

(c) Notification requirements for monitoring observer coverage on carriers involved in high seas transshipment activities (TCC9 para 177) **TCC10-12 / RP02**

(d) Annual list of changes required to observer training programmes (TCC8, para 33) and observer handbook of CMMs (TCC9 para 206) **TCC10-12 / RP02**

(e) Mechanism for observer data to be provided to the Master/Vessel Operator/Captain – (TCC workplan 2013-2015) **TCC10-12 / RP02**

(f) Funding or IT capacity in place to maintain observer data provision (TCC workplan 2013-2015) **TCC10-12 / TCC10-20**

10:00-10:30 – MORNING TEA

10:30 – 8.2 ROP continued

11:30 - 8.3 High Seas Transshipment Monitoring (Annual Report) TCC10-12 / RP03
(a) MCS implications of high seas transshipment (TCC9 para 268)

12:00-1:00 – LUNCH BREAK

1:00 - 8.4 High Seas Boarding and Inspection (HSBI) TCC10-12 / RP04_rev1
(a) Review implementation and effectiveness (TCC workplan 2013-2015)

1:30 - 8.5 Record of Fishing Vessels (RFV) TCC10-12 / RP05_rev1
(a) Secretariat recommended improvements or modifications to RFV SSPs (para 14 – 15 of CMM 2013-03)

2:00 - 8.6 Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area (EHSP-SMA) TCC10-12 / RP06
(a) Proposal to amend CMM 2010-02 (Cook Islands) **DP04 (CK)**

2:30-3:00 – AFTERNOON TEA

3:00 - AGENDA ITEM 9 - DATA PROVISION AND DATA GAPS

9.1 Impact of gaps in CCM data submission on Commissions compliance functions (final CMR 2012) **IP04 / DP07 (FFA) / DP09 (FFA)**

9.2 Purse Seine Catch Composition Data Improvement project progress report (TCC9 para 403) **TCC10-12**

4:00-5:30 - AGENDA ITEM 10 - INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES TCC10-12

10.1 E-monitoring and E-reporting Initiatives

- (a) Report from EmandErW Chair **TCC10-15**
- (b) Reports from CCMs on outcomes and progress with trials and implementation **DP05**
OP02 / OP03
- (c) Development of ER Standards **TCC10-16**

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29

- 8:30** - 10.2 Consideration of SC and NC outcomes related to TCCs work **IP03**
- 8:45** - 10.3 Report from CDS-IWG Chair **TCC10-17**
- 9:15** - 10.4 Potential for the use of Port Coordinators – discussion paper – WCPFC Circular 2014/36
TCC10-12 / TCC10-18

9:30 – AGENDA ITEM 11 – REVIEW OF EXISTING CMMs INCLUDING ANY PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

- 11.1 South Pacific Albacore (CMM 2010-05) – (TCC workplan 2013-2015 and TCC9 recommendation) **IP09 / IP06**

10:00-10:30 – MORNING TEA

- 10:30** - 11.2 South Pacific Swordfish (CMM 2009-03) – (TCC workplan 2013-2015 priority project) **IP10 / IP06**

- 11.3 Bigeye, Yellowfin and Skipjack (CMM 2013-01, CMM 2009-02)
(a) CMM 2013-01 report on additional FAD management options (para 38) **TCC10-12 / TCC10-19**
(b) Other aspects of CMM 2013-01 **IP07 / IP08 / IP10 / IP06**

- 11.4 Sharks (CMM 2010-07) – (TCC workplan 2013-2015) **IP06**

- 11.5 Seabirds (CMM 2012-07) **IP06**
(a) advice and recommendation (TCC workplan 2013-2015)
(b) reports from CCMs on practical and technical constraints to seabird mitigation measures (para 10 of CMM 2012-07) **DP10 / DP11**

- 11.6 Sea Turtles (CMM 2008-03) **IP06**

12:00-1:00 – LUNCH BREAK

1:00 - AGENDA ITEM 12 - PROPOSALS FOR NEW CMMs

- 12.1 Port State Measures (FFA Proposal) **DP01**
- 12.2 Harvest Strategy (Australia Proposal) **DP02 / DP03**
- 12.3 PNA Members and Tokelau – proposal on target reference point for skipjack Conservation and Management Measure **DP06**
- 12.4 FFA Member’s proposal on a Conservation and Management Measure on provision of Operational Data **DP07**

1:30 – RESUME AGENDA ITEM 6 – COMPLIANCE MONITORING

3:00-3:30 - AFTERNOON TEA

3:30 - AGENDA ITEM 13 - OTHER MATTERS REQUIRING TCC ADVICE

TCC10-12

13.1 Management arrangements for IATTC overlap – (TCC workplan 2013-2015)

13.2 Development and trials of metrics for measuring fishing effort and capacity –
(TCC workplan 2013-2015)

13.3 Review of Purse Seine Catch Discard Monitoring arrangements - (TCC
workplan 2013-2015)

IP11

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30

8:30 - AGENDA 14 - ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

14.1 Proposed TCC Work Plan and budget for 2015 - 2017

TCC10-20

10:00-10:30 – MORNING TEA

10:30 - 14.3 Report on Secretariat IMS and website development and online reporting
systems (2013 – 2015)

TCC10-12

14.4 Recommendation on election of officers

TCC10-03

14.5 Next meeting

TCC10-03

12:00-2:00 – LUNCH BREAK (REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS)

2:00-5:00 - AGENDA 15 - CLEARANCE OF TCC10 RECOMMENDATIONS

(As per usual practice TCC10 report will be cleared intersessionally)

AGENDA 16 – CLOSE OF MEETING

ATTACHMENT C — WCPFC IUU VESSEL LIST FOR 2014

(WCPFC10 agreed to maintain the WCPFC IUU Vessel List for 2013 as the WCPFC IUU Vessel List for 2014)

Note: Information provided in this list is in accordance with CMM 2010-06 para 19

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on WCPFC IUU Vessel List	Flag State Registration Number/ IMO Number	Call Sign (previous call signs)	Owner/beneficial owners (previous owners)	Notifying CCM	IUU activities
Neptune	Georgia	10 Dec. 2010	C-00545	4LOG	Space Energy Enterprises Co. Ltd.	France	Fishing on the high seas of the WCPF Convention Area without being on the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (CMM 2007-03-para 3a)
Fu Lien No 1	Georgia	10 Dec. 2010	IMO No 7355662	4LIN2	Fu Lien Fishery Co., Georgia	United States	Is without nationality and harvested species covered by the WCPF Convention in the Convention Area (CMM 2007-03, para 3h)
Yu Fong 168	Chinese Taipei	11 Dec. 2009		BJ4786	Chang Lin Pao-Chun, 161 Sanmin Rd., Liouciuo Township, Pingtung County 929, Chinese Taipei	Marshall Islands	Fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the Republic of the Marshall Islands without permission and in contravention of Republic of the Marshall Islands's laws and regulations. (CMM 2007-03, para 3b)

ATTACHMENT D – LONGLINE OBSERVER COVERAGE TABLES

Table 1. Observer coverage targets for Longline fleets active in the WCPFC Area

CCM Fleet	Fishery	ROP Longline coverage required	See Note(s)
AUSTRALIA	Domestic	5%	1, 3
BELIZE	Distant-water	5%	2, 5
CANADA	Distant-water	5%	2, 5
CHINA	Ice/Fresh	5%	1, 4
	Frozen	5%	2, 5, 6
COOK ISLANDS	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 4
EUROPEAN UNION	Distant-water	5%	2, 5, 6
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 4
FIJI	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 4
FRENCH POLYNESIA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
INDONESIA	Domestic	5%	1, 3
	Distant-water	5%	2, 5, 7
JAPAN	Ice/Fresh, short-trip	5%	2, 4, 6
	Frozen, long-trip	5%	2, 5, 6, 7
KIRIBATI	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
MARSHALL ISLANDS	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 8
NAURU	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
NEW CALEDONIA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
NEW ZEALAND	Domestic	5%	1, 3
NIUE	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 8
PALAU	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 8
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
PHILIPPINES	Distant-water	5%	2, 5, 7
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Distant-water	5%	2, 5, 6, 7
SAMOA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 8
SOLOMON ISLANDS	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
TONGA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3
TUVALU	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 4
CHINESE TAIPEI	Small longline fishery- STLL	5%	1, 3, 4, 6, 7
	Distant-water – DWLL	5%	2, 6, 7
USA	HAWAII and California-based	5%	1, 3
	AMERICAN SAMOA	5%	1, 3
VANUATU	Pacific Island-based, short trip	5%	1, 3, 4
	Distant-water	5%	2, 5, 6, 7
WALLIS AND FUTUNA	Pacific Islands	5%	1, 3, 8

Notes

1. Most (if not all) vessel trips (and therefore most days-at-sea) would be non-ROP trips since mostly restricted to waters of national jurisdiction. For the Pacific Island countries, the ROP trips that are conducted outside the waters of national jurisdiction will normally be covered by Observer providers from the coastal state (i.e. PIC Observer providers other than the flag state)
2. All vessel trips (and therefore days-at-sea) would be defined as ROP trips.
3. The DOMESTIC Observer provider would normally cover a component of this fleet.
4. Pacific Islands Observer provider(s) would normally cover this fleet.
5. The Observer provider(s) covering these trips are not known.
6. The FLAG-STATE Observer provider(s) may be covering these trips
7. “Distant-water” vessels have very long trips and since some fleets tranship at sea, there has been no obligation to define a trip in this context, and this type of information is mostly unavailable nonetheless. The unit of coverage should therefore be “days-at-sea” for these situations.
8. Currently this CCM does not have flagged longline vessels on the Record of Fishing Vessels

ATTACHMENT D: Table 2. The metric used to calculate the percentage of 2013 longline observer coverage, as provided by CCMs in their Annual Report Part 2 (as at 8 September 2014)

Flag CCM	Advice on metric used to calculate the percentage of longline observer coverage in 2013 (in AR Pt 2 2014)
Australia	% of total hooks deployed in the fishery which were monitored by observers
Belize	
Cook Islands	Vessel sea days compared to observer sea days
China	Number of fishing vessels as the basis to arrange observer ³
European Union	
Federated States of Micronesia	Number of observed trips compared to total trips by fleet
French Polynesia ¹	The ratio of total hooks reported in observers' reports and the total number of hooks raised for the entire fleet.
Fiji	Number of observed trips against the total trips by national fleet
Indonesia	
Japan	Total observed fishing days / total fishing days
Kiribati	
Korea	Vessel sea days compared to observer sea days
Republic of Marshall	
New Caledonia ¹	Number of observed sets , compared to the number of sets for the fleet
New Zealand	Vessel sea days compared to observed sea days
Papua New	
Philippines	
Solomon	
Chinese Taipei	Days-at-sea of observers to days-at sea of vessels (DWLL) STLL – still to be confirmed, maybe based on vessel trips
Tuvalu	
United States of America	Number of trips to calculate the percentage of longline observer
Vanuatu	

³ This metric is yet to be considered and will be reviewed by SC11

⁴ CCM confirmed that all longline trips by this fleet in 2013 were domestic trips (within their EEZ).

ATTACHMENT D Table 3. Proposed template for future reporting of Longline observer coverage by CCM

CCM Fleet	Fishery	No. of Hooks			Days Fished			Days at Sea			No. of Trips			See NOTES
		Total estimated	Observer	%										
AUSTRALIA	Domestic													
BELIZE	Distant-water													
CANADA														
CHINA	Ice/Fresh													
	Frozen													
COOK ISLANDS	Pacific Islands													
EUROPEAN UNION	Distant-water													
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA	Pacific Islands													
FIJI	Pacific Islands													
FRENCH POLYNESIA	Pacific Islands													
INDONESIA	Domestic													
	Distant-water													
JAPAN	Ice/Fresh, short-trip													
	Frozen, long-trip													
KIRIBATI	Pacific Islands													
MARSHALL ISLANDS	Pacific Islands													
NAURU	Pacific Islands													
NEW CALEDONIA	Pacific Islands													
NEW ZEALAND	Domestic													
NIUE	Pacific Islands													
PALAU	Pacific Islands													
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	Pacific Islands													

CCM Fleet	Fishery	No. of Hooks			Days Fished			Days at Sea			No. of Trips			See NOTES
		Total estimated	Observer	%										
PHILIPPINES	Distant-water													
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Distant-water													
SAMOA	Pacific Islands													
SOLOMON ISLANDS	Pacific Islands													
TONGA	Pacific Islands													
TUVALU	Pacific Islands													
CHINESE TAIPEI	Small longline fishery-STLL													
	Distant-water – DWLL													
USA	HAWAII and California-based													
	AMERICAN SAMOA													
VANUATU	Pacific Island-based, short trip													
	Distant-water													
WALLIS AND FUTUNA	Pacific Islands													

Table 4. Example for future reporting of Longline observer coverage by CCM

CCM Fleet	Fishery	No. of Hooks			Days Fished			Days at Sea			No. of Trips			See NOTES
		Total estimated	Observer	%	Total estimated	Observer	%	Total estimated	Observer	%	Total estimated	Observer	%	
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	Distant-water							23,632	1,575	6.6%				

ATTACHMENT E — CDS-IWG 2015 Workplan

Resource documents to be carried forward: 2014-CDS-IWG-02 (consultancy report) and 2014-CDS-IWG-DP01 – FFA paper

1. What would be the key elements of future discussions by the CDS-IWG?

(Secretariat to circulate topics and request members to provide views intersessionally. The views collated/considered in papers would be prepared for the next meeting of CDS-IWG)

- * identify roles and responsibilities for: vessel operators; coastal States; flag States; WCPFC Secretariat; market states; other stakeholders
- * commence the development of standards, specifications and procedures, including verification
- * DP01 –FFA paper – comments could be provided to FFA, and with a view to consider at the next CDS-IWG
- * objectives: use sub-elements of consultant’s recommendation 1 as a basis for further discussion (note may need to revisit as roles and responsibilities are clarified)
- * scope: use consultant’s recommendation 2 as a basis for further discussion

2. How should the next meeting of the CDS-IWG be structured?

- * review discussion papers that are prepared based on the intersessional discussions on the key elements
- * involvement of market states as participants in discussions during next workshop is important
- * CDS-IWG meeting will occur immediately prior to TCC11