

High Seas Boarding and Inspection

The Commission tasked the Secretariat to make the list of vessels previously inspected under the HSBI scheme, published <https://www.wcpfc.int/ccm/hsbi-report>, exportable in MS Excel and CSV format to authorised CCM users.

TCC14 'plastic bottle' free

429. The Commission agreed to the TCC13 recommendation that TCC14 be 'plastic bottle' free.

TCC13 Summary report

430. The Commission adopted the report of TCC13 (**WCPFC14-2017-TCC13**).

AGENDA ITEM 10 – COMPLIANCE MONITORING SCHEME

10.1 Consideration and Adoption of the Final Compliance Monitoring Report

431. The Commission considered the provisional Compliance Monitoring Report recommended by TCC13 and additional information provided by CCMs. WCPFC14's consideration of the provisional Compliance Monitoring Report took place in a small working group led by the TCC Chair, which compiled the final Compliance Monitoring Report for adoption.

432. The TCC Chair provided a report to the Commission on the outcome of the SWG and the following points were highlighted:

- WCPFC14 undertook its seventh annual review of compliance by CCMs against an updated priority list of Commission obligations agreed to at WCPFC13 for 2016 – 2018. (Attachment I to WCPFC13 Summary Report).
- WCPFC14 and TCC13 conducted its review in accordance with the revised Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS) adopted at WCPFC12 – CMM 2015-07. Unlike past versions of the CMS, the current CMS did not require an overall assessment of each CCM, but only asked WCPFC to identify a compliance assessment for each specific obligation.
- A number of CCMs provided additional information between TCC13 and WCPFC14. A small working group met in closed session during WCPFC14 to review and evaluate the additional information, and was chaired by TCC Chair Alexa Cole (United States). The small working group considered all additional information, including for CCMs not present at the working group meetings.
- After considering the additional information, the small working group was unable to assess five obligations for certain CCMs contained in the following measures: CMM 2009-03, para 2, CMM 2015-01, para 14, CMM 2014-02, paras 9a and SSPs 2.8, Convention Article 25 (2), and SciData 03.
- In accordance with Annex I of the CMS CMM, the following statuses were considered in making the assessments: Compliant, Non-Compliant, Priority Non-Compliant, Capacity Assistance Needed, Flag State Investigation and CMM Review.

433. The TCC Chair expressed her gratitude to Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott and 'Ana Taholo from the Secretariat and to Peter Williams and Graham Pilling from SPC, noting their significant contribution to the implementation and development of the compliance scheme over many years. She

observed that it was important to note that when considering the future of the CMS and in the development of a revised measure, that CCMs did not lose sight of the significant progress the Commission had made over the years and especially how delegates had transformed into very sophisticated and highly engaged participants in the scheme, compared with early meetings.

434. The Chair acknowledged the work of the Secretariat and SPC, and further thanked them and the TCC Chair on their continued collective efforts to drive the compliance process forward and find efficiencies.

435. The European Union sought clarification on some aspects noting that it was unable to participate in all sessions of the CMR-SWG due to its small delegation. New Zealand noted that FFA Members would also welcome the opportunity to talk with the TCC Chair about a couple of issues in the final draft CMR.

436. Canada provided a general comment on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme and its outcomes. They noted their primary interest is in the Northern stocks and confirmed that there were no Canadian flagged fishing vessels in the Convention Area for 2016. In reflecting on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme outcomes, Canada admitted that on occasion being somewhat puzzled and perplexed at the outcomes. Canada despite having no fishing vessels operating in the Convention Area was deemed non-compliant. In making this point, Canada confirmed that it does accept this outcome, because the non-compliant scores related to missed reporting deadlines and recently there have been some fields on the RFV that are incomplete. Canada noted though that the outcome for the WCPFC VMS requirements also provides a puzzling outcome in the Compliance Monitoring Scheme. The requirements for VMS are clearly specified in the Convention in Article 24 (paragraphs 8 and 9) and they are clearly a flag State responsibility. Yet the four elements that are reviewed in this year's Compliance Monitoring Report (covering 2016 activities) have either provided CCMs with fully compliant scores or the Commission has not been able to assess the obligations. These outcomes in the final CMR is despite there being data and information that was discussed openly here at this meeting, that confirmed that some MTU units that are presently being used in the region have a delay of up to 14 hours. It also is aware of information that confirms that vessels have been inspected on the high seas and were confirmed to be using a VMS that is not reporting to WCPFC VMS. Considering these points, Canada urged that when the review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme is further examined, that the Commission should look more broadly at how the Commission is doing its business in general, and the Compliance Monitoring Scheme CMM necessary to be able to support the decisions of the Commission, and for this Commission to be able to provide clear advice on monitoring, control and surveillance.

437. Vanuatu noticed that it is still listed in the Final Compliance Monitoring Report with a "capacity assistance needed" score. It confirmed that its capacity need has been addressed, and it asked that the final report is corrected to reflect this.

438. The Commission adopted the Final Compliance Monitoring Report (**WCPFC14-2017-finalCMR**), and the Chair thanked the TCC Chair for her work in leading the SWG.

439. The Commission accepted the Final Compliance Monitoring Report (**WCPFC14-2017-finalCMR, Attachment U**).

10.2 Update on the Independent Review of Compliance Monitoring Scheme

440. The Chair opened discussions, noting that the Secretariat had provided paper **WCPFC14-2017-25A**, *Update on the Independent Review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme*, as an update on the progress of the Independent Review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS). The paper was noted to contain a suggested process to facilitate and support the CCMs consideration of the Report

from the CMS Review, following the Reports submission at the end of February 2018 and before it is tabled at WCPFC15.

441. The Chair referred the meeting to **WCPFC14-2017-25B** *Independent Review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme: Substantive Progress Report by the Review Panel*, which updated Members on the progress of the Review and a large number of issues that have been identified.

442. The Independent Review Panel, Chair Mr Don Mackay, Dr Chris Rogers and Mr Andrew Wright were then invited to present an update on the independent review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme. The Panel confirmed its understanding from the terms of reference that the expected output from the Review would be “an assessment of the efficacy of current structure of the CMS, and to be forward looking in providing suggestions for improvement”. The Review commenced work in June, and undertook research and initial consultations through August, including holding a meeting that was supported by the Secretariat and where some conference calls with key CCM representatives were arranged. During September the Don and Chris observed the TCC13 session, and had consultation with a number of participants. In December, the Review panel observed the WCPFC14 session and had continued consultations with participants. In March 2018 the Report is to be submitted. Each of the Review Panel members then contributed to the presentation, which intended to present some initial thoughts of the Panel as contained in **WCPFC14-2017-25B** as well as some ideas to stimulate further consultation and encourage further input. The Panel was also looking to participants to assist them in identifying gaps and issues in the report to date.

443. Andrew Wright presented an overview of the Panels understanding of how the CMS is contributing to the work of the Commission. Points that were noted in the presentation of matters related to contributions made included: improved submission of Annual Reporting since the commencement of the CMS; information sharing/shared appreciation of challenges associated with obligations; greater attention to CMM drafting to be clearer about matters of interpretation and strengthening of reporting deadlines; improved information/data availability for example operational level catch and effort data submission had improved; better utilisation by the Commission of data submitted under CMMs and other CMS sanctioned sources of information. The capacity development plan and flag State investigation scores were noted to be positive recently included components of the CMS, but it was noted that capacity development plans need to be appropriately resourced and harmonised with other similar initiatives. Institutionally, the CCMs were receiving positive support through the commission in the form of the Information Management System (IMS), and there was demonstrated significant investment at the national level to monitor, report and engage in the CMS process. Secretariat was noted to be very responsive and proactive in servicing CCMs’ CMS requirements, and their hard work and efforts deserve acknowledgement.

444. Chris Rogers presented an overview of the Panel’s findings in respect of issues that have arisen in the discussions to date, including CCMs concerns. The presentation was divided into three areas, and questions set out for each area: *i) Effectiveness – does the current CMS enable the WCPFC to achieve its conservation and management objectives?* Some of the points identified included: the potential of the CMS appears yet to be realised as many CMM requirements have changed since CMS was introduced, it was difficult to gauge the impact of Capacity Development Plans and there may be other factors, such as the absence of consequences for non-compliance, that mask the capacity-related compliance deficiencies. *ii) Efficiency – are the resources that are applied to the current CMS sufficient to achieve objectives? Are the resource demands excessive or incorrectly applied?* Some of the points identified included: the current CMS is resource demanding, the number of CMMs and level of detail subject to audit is resource/time consuming, lack of focus of the CMS on most serious issues of non-compliance, focus on detailed assessments precludes strategic focus on major issues, and holdover of unresolved CMS matters from the TCC meeting impacts the work of the Commission. *iii) Procedural fairness – are CCMs assessed fairly and consistently with regard to compliance with CMM obligations? Does the outcome of the CMS process assist all CCMs in achieving compliance?* Some of the points identified included: some significant challenges in assessing compliance in certain situations; ambiguity in CMM interpretation; adequate notices of potential compliance deficiencies

and opportunity to prepare responses; practicality of implementation of a CMM and expected remedial response; inconsistent compliance assessments across CCMs with similar situations and clarity needed in expectations for reporting Flag State Investigation status.

445. Don MacKay concluded with some of the considerations of the Panel in looking forward. First, it was noted that the Commission needed to reduce the burden of material that CCMs need to provide, particularly where duplicates information already provided and focus should also be on information which contributes to management decisions. It was important to reduce the volume of material to be discussed in TCC and focus on what is important, rather than minutiae, and consider the introduction of a pre-screening process as in ICCAT. Second, it was important to clarify the requirements under CMMs, including reporting requirements and to provide a longer development time for CMMs, including drafting processes. Part of the work that should be started is a review of existing CMMs for relevance, and clarity, with a 2-year moratorium on new (non-urgent) CMMs to provide time for this. Third, in respect of capacity building proposals, it was clear that the present system and implementation need to be improved and further consideration needed to be given to other proposals to enhance training and assistance. Fourth, fairness, effectiveness and efficiency issues at a broader level, requires common standards and means of assessment across all fisheries. There is an issue of procedural fairness (“natural justice”) and CCMs need to be clearly and fully informed about allegations of non-compliance, given opportunity fully to put their case, against previously established criteria for assessment and given a fair “hearing” by others, without unfairness or bias, and on a consistent basis with all. Finally, there was a need to address responses to non-compliance and a suggestion at least as an interim measure of a CCSBT Quality Assurance Review (QAR) type system in response to serious or systemic failures. Such an approach would both assist CCMs in question to identify any issues, and be a process for recommendations to be made, and be done with a view to assisting CCMs rather than “sanctioning” them. The Panel concluded noting that the presentation and the table in **WCPFC14-2017-25B** were still a work in progress and they welcomed feedback and further thoughts.

446. The Chair reminded delegates that the Final Report of the Independent Review Panel would be submitted in March 2018 which was in the Commission’s intersessional period. Accordingly, there was a need to consider how CCMs wanted to take this forward. The Chair welcomed comments on this work but reiterated that the Panel was available in the margins of this meeting if CCMs had specific comments to be incorporated into the Review Panel Report.

447. Canada thanked the Panel for the information provided in the interim report and found the presentation useful. Canada considered this organisation as a teenager; on the process side there was a fairly solid process running, but at the strategic level there was much opportunity to make progress. This valuable work put the organisation in a good position to move ahead and better plan for the future. On the issue of how the Commission should consider the Panel’s Final Report, it suggested assigning that work to the next TCC meeting for consideration. TCC14 could also assess and develop a work plan to address various recommendations coming from the Review Panel which could then be considered at WCPFC15.

448. Tokelau on behalf of FFA Members thanked the Panel for their hard work on the review of the CMS and for their progress report. FFA Members provided their preliminary views in **WCPFC14-2017-DP06** prior to the submission of the progress report. FFA Members confirmed that they had submitted another Delegation Paper **WCPFC14-2017-DP28** setting out their detailed response to some of the issues raised in the progress report by the Panel (**WCPFC14-2017-25B**). They outlined the following general comments:

- The need to explicitly cover audit points in the design of each CMM, resource considerations, clear reporting requirements and how compliance will be assessed;

- It was essential for the Scheme to recognise and address two key fundamental areas (i) the need to build capacity, and to do so in a manner that complements existing national processes and (ii) the need to ensure that the Scheme was procedurally fair and produced fair outcomes;
- There was a clear need to improve the CMS in order to ensure that it was robust, fair, transparent and efficient, and produced meaningful assessments in a timely manner to inform management decisions;
- The current CMS has become a long, drawn out process and unsustainable, and it would be critical to revisit the timing of review processes and the current list of obligations to be assessed;
- It was essential to clarify the scope of the Scheme such that it properly and fairly assesses implementation of CCM obligations, including meeting flag State responsibilities; and
- That a process needs to be set up to commence the development of remedial responses which help countries work towards compliance.

Furthermore, in looking at the operation of the existing process over the last few years, it was clear to FFA Members that some of these points would demand redesign of the CMS that goes beyond mere tweaks to the existing measure. FFA members confirmed that they looked forward to further discussions with the Panel to ensure CMS improvements.

449. WWF on behalf of WWF, ISSF, International Pole and Line Foundation, International Environmental Law Project, Pew Charitable Trusts, Greenpeace and Sustainable Fisheries Partnership thanked the consultants on the comprehensive amount of work completed to date, and they appreciated the opportunity to provide feedback into the process. They were curious as to whether consultants had considered some of the issues of transparency in the process and particularly the admission of observers into the process. They said that there has been a spirit of consideration to look into processes, and noted there has been a bit of backsliding in the process of developing the tropical tuna measure and the compliance monitoring scheme in general. It welcomed the Review Panels consideration and recommendations on these aspects for the CMS and the Commission going forward.

450. Don McKay responded that the Panel had received comments on the need to develop a possible way forward to address the need for greater transparency in this organisation and there is a section in the paper providing a suggestion of how this might be addressed. Comments were received confirming support for greater transparency, on the other hand there were comments received suggesting that the system needed to develop further before it could be fully open. The Panel's advice was that it was important to address the issue of transparency, in recognition that civil society organisation made an important contribution to an organisation over time and over a number of areas. One possibility identified by the Panel in the paper was a suggestion for CCMs to include members of civil society on their delegations. It was noted that whilst such a suggestion was not formally transparent and only in a limited area, in practice there was significant level of transparency that could be provided. The Panel looked forward to receiving further feedback on that approach as well as others.

451. Australia thanked the Panel for the comprehensive initial report and looked forward to their Final Report. Regarding Canada's proposal on what TCC might need to consider next year. On behalf of FFA Members, it advised that these CCMs were hoping next year's TCC would consider what a future WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme might start to look like. It clarified that this was the basis for FFA Members' suggestion that a reduced list of obligations be considered at next year's TCC, with a view to freeing up space to consider what a draft CMS CMM might look like. It urged that this meeting consider the process of how a draft measure for CMS would be developed over 2018 and in advance of TCC, rather than only considering a process of considering the recommendations of the Panel's final report.

452. New Zealand further noted that FFA Members had been discussing what such processes might look like mindful of the timeframes agreed to at the next Commission meeting. WCPFC14 could

appoint a CCM to develop and distribute a draft CMM to members before SC14. Advice could then be incorporated for formal consideration at TCC13. FFA Members would like to have the Republic of the Marshall Islands considered to lead that process.

453. The European Union also thanked the Panel, though it was still of the opinion that the Review was premature as the current CMS CMM had not been in place for long. It was therefore difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of the measure because some concepts within it were still relatively new. Postponing the review for one more year might have been better as there had been three CMS CMMs developed in the last five years. Now there was a proposal from FFA Members to develop another measure at the next meeting, which seemed rushed.

454. The European Union could clearly support the intention to improve the CMS. It also attached a lot of importance to the issue of transparency. It also supported consideration of the Panel's final report recommendations as suggested by Canada, but noted this process needed to be guided. TCC14 could look into the findings of the report thoroughly, and then a discussion paper could be tabled at WCPFC15.

455. The United States thanked the Panel for the helpful analysis of the issues heard around the room over the year. The United States was sensitive to the comments of the European Union and FFA Members, and thought the Commission needed to give some priority to developing a solid CMS measure. The work to revise the CMS should at least begin this year and should not wait until the final report was submitted to the Commission formally at the next annual session. It appreciated the offer of Republic of the Marshall Islands to lead that work.

456. The Republic of the Marshall Islands appreciated the Panel's work. It welcomed guidance by other CCMs on how to proceed as the current CMS CMM was due to lapse. Moving forward there needed to be an acknowledgment that the measures adopted over the years had not been a level playing field and had been quite challenging for SIDS. Any new or revised measures should be designed specifically for the unique challenges of this Commission to ensure the fishery was well managed. It was thankful for the nomination from New Zealand and other FFA Members, and while shy about leading this work it was an issue very important to them.

457. The Republic of Korea expressed deep gratitude to the Panel for its very well-structured progress report. It was pleased its views were reflected in that report and that a comprehensive analysis had been provided covering eleven areas. It suggested that it would be helpful if a gap analysis of individual legal systems to implement existing CMMs and other obligations could also be incorporated.

458. The Chair summarised that based on the discussions to date there were two options that had received support. First that the TCC is tasked to consider the Review Report recommendations. Second that an intersessional working group is tasked with developing a draft CMM for consideration at TCC.

459. Australia expressed their preference for the second option and noted that under this approach, it felt that the Review Report would likely receive consideration through the intersessional working groups work as well as during TCC at the time that the IWG presents its report of progress. It felt that this provided the best opportunity to ensure that a draft CMM on the CMS would be developed through 2018.

460. Canada confirmed that an intersessional discussion would be a helpful way to consider the priorities and approaches to addressing the issues identified in the Review.

461. The Commission agreed to establish an Intersessional Working Group on the Review of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMS IWG). The tasks of the Intersessional Working Group will be to facilitate consideration of the Report from the Independent Review of the

Compliance Monitoring Scheme (due by March 2018) and develop a proposed Conservation and Management Measure for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme for consideration at WCPFC15. The Commission also decided that Republic of Marshall Islands would lead the Intersessional Working Group.

10.3 Expiry of CMM 2015-07 at the end of 2017

462. The Chair opened discussions on the expiration of CMM 2015-07 on the Compliance Monitoring Scheme which expires at the end of 2017, and noted that TCC13 discussed this but did not have a consensus recommendation, with a majority recommending to extend the existing measure.

463. The Republic of Marshall Islands noted it was regrettable that TCC13 could not agree on a recommendation to WCPFC14 on the expiration of CMM 2015-07 at the end of 2017. It inquired in absence of consensus, what would be the options moving forward.

464. The Chair reiterated the need for the Commission to decide on a way forward with this measure as it would expire at the end of December 2017. TCC13 discussed the issue but could not agree on whether to extend the measure for 2018 though a majority of CCMs supported a one-year extension.

465. The European Union strongly supported the continuation of the current measure. It expressed that it would be very worrying if the Commission did not have a framework to continue its compliance monitoring.

466. Australia on behalf of FFA Members referred to the views of FFA members that are contained in **WCPFC14-2017-DP06** *Views on Independent Audit of the Compliance Monitoring Scheme*. FFA Members could agree to rollover CMM 2015-07 for one year only based on two conditions. Firstly, that far less time, preferably one day, was given to the CMR process at TCC14 to assess a much-reduced and high-priority set of CMMs including: the Record of Fishing Vessels; Vessel Monitoring System; Regional Observer Programme; transshipment; tropical tuna; south Pacific albacore; Pacific bluefin tuna; Scientific Data rules. This would allow for a reasonable amount of time to prioritise work on a revised CMS measure, taking into account the recommendations of the independent review. Secondly, that the duplicative reporting burden specific to scientific data was addressed at this Commission meeting. FFA Members sought the support of all Commission members in addressing these key criteria. In the more detailed delegation paper **WCPFC14-2017-DP28**, CCMs were asked to take due note that FFA members have highlighted the significant concerns they have with the current system and they requested that CCMs take due note that FFA support to a decision to allow a one-year roll-over has come at significant discomfort. FFA stated that it is incumbent on all CCMs to approach the redesign of the CMM next year in an open manner to address the concerns so as not to risk cessation of the Scheme beyond 2018.

467. Japan noted that it was one of the CCMs that blocked consensus at TCC13. It clarified that its intention at TCC13 was not to stop the Compliance Monitoring Scheme, rather it opposed a simple roll-over because a review was necessary. After reviewing the Independent Panel consultant report, it confirmed that it was able to join consensus for the rollover of the scheme. Regarding FFA members conditions for the rollover, Japan supported focusing only on high priority set of CMMs for the CMR process at TCC14 noting that it saw benefit to both SIDS and all CCMs. As far as the proposal was for one-year application, Japan confirmed it could support the proposed approach of FFA members. On the second condition, it indicated some discomfort with CCMs not submitting Annual Report Part 2. This report was seen as an important record that all CCMs should submit annually as a declaration confirming the CCMs annual implementation of measures.

468. Solomon Islands delivered a statement on behalf of PNA members, in support of the FFA position in DP06. PNA members agree to a one-year roll-over of CMM 2015-07, on condition that the CMR work at TCC13 is much reduced and the reporting burdens are reduced.

469. The European Union was concerned about the statements from PNA and FFA members. It seemed that either WCPFC14 agreed to their conditions or there could be no agreement to allow for the measure to rollover. It reminded CCMs that it was important to have a CMS measure in place.

470. The United States shared the sentiments expressed by Japan and to a certain extent by the European Union. It was comfortable with the list of obligations proposed for inclusion in the CMS next year in the FFA paper as it made sense to reduce the time spent on the CMS process. The United States could not agree to the discussions being limited to only one day, but it could consider a more limited list of obligations for 2018 CMS, noting that this would likely reduce the length of time ordinarily spent at TCC for CMR reviews. It was concerned with the second condition of the rollover that the duplicative reporting requirements be eliminated, whilst it could see that reporting was burdensome to SIDS, they are also burdensome to all other CCMs, to the Secretariat to SPC-OFP and to TCC. Given this, it proposed that some work be undertaken to address duplicative reporting and that this be a recommendation from this meeting to ensure that progress is made. It indicated that some specific language that provided softer consideration in recognition of the burdensome nature of reporting to SIDS could be considered, but confirmed that the language set out in DP06 was too broad based and unclear for it to be acceptable in its current form. It was open to further discussions, but needed clearer language to be formulated.

471. Samoa responded by noting there were several implications of the CMS on the small islands developing states and the intention was to provide an opportunity to address those implications. The idea being that over the next twelve months small islands developing states would require adequate time to fully address those issues of concern.

472. The Chair noted there was broad support for the extension of the measure. The Chair explained that the idea was to create sufficient time during TCC14 to allow for the consideration of the CMS review report and the development of a CMS measure. The Chair also acknowledged that the duplicative reporting requirements was a key issue to resolve and she asked that FFA provide a list and some suggestions around how this might be addressed to provide further clarity around the recommendation so that other CCMs can further consider this.

473. The Commission agreed that FFA members would provide some further detail on the duplicative reporting aspect and for CCMs that had comments on the list of obligations provided in DP06, to communicate their edits to Australia who would provide an update.

474. Australia briefly introduced the document related to the list of obligations and in this respect it noted that **WCPFC14-2017-DP06_rev1 attachment 1** had been circulated and provided a revised draft list of obligations to be reviewed by the CMS in 2018. The revised list was adopted following further discussions that took place in the meeting margins.

475. The Republic of the Marshall Islands introduced revised **WCPFC14-2017-DP29** which provided some points in respect of addressing duplicative reporting and the rollover of CMM 2015-07 (**WCPFC14-2017-DP29**). The recommendation relating to duplicative reporting and the rollover of CMM 2015-07 was adopted.

476. The Commission agreed to adopt CMM 2017-07 Conservation and Management Measure for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme (**Attachment W**), which will be effective for 2018 only.

477. The Commission adopted a revised list of obligations to be assessed by the Compliance Monitoring Scheme in 2018 (**Attachment V**), which will replace the multi-year list of obligations that was adopted at WCPFC13.

478. The Commission noted that in submitting **WCPFC14-2017-DP29**, FFA member CCMs had provided an initial analysis and reiterated their view expressed during TCC13 that the essential scientific information already provided as operational level catch and effort data submissions earlier in the year must be recognised as meeting obligations to provide a number of required reporting obligations specified to be included in Annual Report Part 1. It was also expressed that rather than have CCMs submit duplicative information there must be improvements made to facilitate access to data that is already made available to the Commission.

479. The Commission agreed to task the Secretariat, in consultation with SPC, to review the Commission's reporting requirements to minimise duplicate reporting by CCMs, with a particular focus on streamlining the provision and accessibility of scientific data to the Commission, as well as to prioritise the enhancement of the Commission's information management system in response to that review, and report back to WCPFC15.

480. The Commission encouraged CCMs to submit their Annual Report Part 1 in a timely manner, and note this is linked to TCC's efforts to minimise verbal reports to the CMR process.

AGENDA ITEM 11 – ADOPTION OF THE 2018 IUU VESSEL LIST

481. The Chair introduced **WCPFC14-2017-26** *WCPFC IUU Vessel List for 2018*, which presented for the consideration of WCPFC14 the relevant information for a decision on the 2018 WCPFC IUU Vessel List.

482. Australia drew attention to three key TCC13 recommendations regarding the need for the Commission to seek cooperation and information from relevant CCMs, flag States, and other relevant bodies for additional information on IUU fishing activities in the Convention Area. Australia requested that the Executive Director write to the Regional Plan of Action to Promote Reasonable Fishing Practices (RPOA-IUU), and to Asian colleagues as reasonable port state countries that may have some additional information to share with the Commission regarding IUU activities in the WCPO.

483. The Commission adopted the 2018 WCPFC IUU Vessel List (**Attachment X**).

484. The Commission agreed to seek the cooperation of those CCMs or flag States to whom the vessel was flagged at the time the vessel was placed on the WCPFC IUU Vessel List and other CCMs' cooperation to actively find out any information about these vessels and inform the Commission.

485. The Commission requested that CCMs provide prompt advice to the Commission by all CCMs if the vessels have been located or, if there are any known changes to name, flag or registered owner, including any action that the port States have taken such as denial of port entry and services to those vessels or any information from the cannery States of any landings made by these vessels.

486. The Commission tasked the Executive Director to write a letter to other RFMOs and relevant bodies conveying this same message for cooperation to locate these vessels. The