

**JOINT IATTC AND WCPFC-NC WORKING GROUP
FIFTH CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME TECHNICAL MEETING
(CDS-05)**

Kushiro, Japan
09:00 – 12:30, 10 July 2024

Options for Budgetary and Administrative Consideration for the Development of CDS

IATTC-NC-CDS05-2024/02

1. Background

At the 3rd CDS Technical meeting of the JWG, the participants agreed to establish a small working group that will review the budgetary and administrative considerations for the development of the ePBCD system. Canada, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Korea and United States joined the small working group.

At the 4th CDS Technical meeting of the JWG, the participants reviewed information regarding development of CDS at CCSBT and IOTC based on the paper produced by Japan.

Considering such developments in other RFMOs and foregoing discussion at this CDS Technical meeting, the participants discussed some options for the budgetary and administrative issues for the development of ePBCD based on the paper offered by Japan. The participants had general agreement on some of the issues, while other issues need further consideration based on additional input.

The participants also agreed to request the Secretariats of IATTC and WCPFC to review the discussion and results of this meeting and provide their questions, comments, and concerns to the small working group. Both Secretariats kindly sent its comments to the small working group.

Comments from the IATTC Secretariat (Attachment 1) included the result of discussion at the IATTC plenary session held last year. Concern was raised by a CPC regarding procedural issue, regarding how to make a joint decision at the CDS Technical Meeting and then JWG regarding ePBCD, while ensuring proper decision-making process at the IATTC. IATTC Secretariat also provided its comments and questions to each element of the budgetary and administrative consideration, emphasizing that formal consideration as the IATTC should be made by the CPCs of IATTC.

Comments from the WCPFC Secretariat (Attachment 2) reported the result of discussion at the annual meeting held last year, in which two CCMs welcomed the progress made at the 4th CDS Technical meeting of JWG. WCPFC Secretariat also provided its comments and questions to each element of the budgetary and administrative consideration. The WCPFC Secretariat emphasized the importance of clear demarcation of roles and responsibilities between IATTC and WCPFC for the development of ePBCD. It also commented that it is essential to hire a specialist officer in the WCPFC Secretariat to facilitate the development work of the joint tuna RFMO eCDS.

Japan would like to offer some update to the options for the budgetary and administrative issues for the development of ePBCD for further discussion at the 5th CDS Technical Meeting, considering the development since last year and comments from IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats.

2. Options for Budgetary and Administrative Consideration

(1) Basis of the system development (Updates from last year in blue font)

Options	Situation in other RFMOs	Consideration
a. Use resources from ICCAT eBCD as a basis of development	ICCAT eBCD: Operational since 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. In operation for years. System expected to be stable. ii. Functions developed in harmony with ICCAT specific MCS measures, designed for unique fishing and farming operations in the Mediterranean iii. Program developer (Tragsa) based in Spain
b. Use resources CCSBT e-CDS as a basis of development	CCSBT e-CDS: Under testing by members of CCSBT. Full implementation scheduled in 2025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Under development, but a trial version is already available. ii. Functions developed in harmony with CCSBT specific MCS measures (e.g. tagging of individual fish), but relatively simpler. iii. Program developer (Shore Informatics) based in Canberra iv. Developed using database platform TUFMAN2 (developed by SPC), familiar to WCPFC Secretariat <p>Participants of the 4th CDS/TM tentatively agreed on option b, with a potential to draw inspiration or elements from ICCAT.</p>
c. Develop IATTC/WCPFC's own e-CDS system from the scratch	ICCAT spent approx. 4.5 years and 1.2 million Euro for initial development. CCSBT expects approx. 5 years and approx. 0.2 million AUD before full implementation. IOTC consultant report estimated 1.5 million USD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Systems to be developed in harmony with the needs of IATTC/WCPFC ii. Time-consuming and costly

(2) Location of the system

Options	Situation in other RFMOs	Consideration
A cloud-based system	ICCAT eBCD: A cloud server is provided by a private service provider (Amazon Web Service) CCSBT e-CDS: A cloud server is provided by a private service provider (Microsoft Azure)	i. No need to select physical location of the server between IATTC and WCPFC ii. Need to decide which RFMO administrates the system Participants of the 4th CDS/TM agreed to use a cloud-based system.

(3) Use of external company in development and maintenance of the system

Options	Situation in other RFMOs	Consideration
<p>a. An external company is contracted for the development and maintenance of the system. Secretariat coordinates communication between the company and members.</p>	<p>ICCAT eBCD: External company (Tragsa) has been contracted.</p> <p>CCSBT e-CDS: External company (Shore informatics) has been contracted.</p>	<p>i. Minimize the increase in workload of the Secretariat(s)</p> <p>ii. Could be cost efficient, in particular in short-term, because the development phase is considered to be the peak of the resources demand.</p> <p>iii. Advisable to contract with the same external company, if resource from ICCAT/CCSBT system is used as a basis of development.</p> <p>Participants of the 4th CDS/TM agreed to pursue option (a) of contracting an external company with general preference for the one for CCSBT e-CDS, considering option (b) of hiring a specialist officer within the Secretariat if there is an expansion in the scope of the system (i.e. species coverage) in the future.</p>
<p>b. External company is not contracted, and the Secretariat staff (s) will engage.</p>	<p>IOTC consultant report suggested that a position for CDS officer should be created.</p>	<p>i. Expected to increase the burden of the Secretariat significantly.</p> <p>ii. Could be costly – by requiring new officer (s) hired for the CDS.</p>

(4) Demarcation of responsibility between IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats in the operational work for the development and maintenance of the system.

Options	Situation in other RFMOs	Consideration
a. Both secretariats have equal responsibility, and work collaboratively through consultation.	No preceding example	<p>i. No need to decide which Secretariat will take a lead.</p> <p>ii. Decision making could be difficult because of equal responsibility and consultative nature.</p> <p>iii. Responsibility could be demarcated between the two Secretariats (i.e. by area of catch).</p> <p>Participants of the 4th CDS/TM agreed to generally support option (a) of having both the IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats take on responsibilities on an equal basis, acknowledging the need for further discussion to materialize demarcations of responsibility such as management of the system based on the area of the catch.</p>
a-bis. Each RFMO establishes its CDS separately and each Secretariat has a responsibility to develop and manage its own CDS system.	No preceding example	<p>i. No need to decide which Secretariat will take a lead or demarcation between two Secretariats.</p> <p>ii. Decision making could be easier because each RFMO can make its decision in accordance with relevant rules of the RFMO.</p> <p>iii. Coordination will be necessary (e.g. through the CDS/TG and JWG) to have some consistency between two CDS system of two RFMOs.</p> <p>iv. No need to consider cost sharing between two RFMOs. But it could be costly in total because of the necessity to develop and maintain two separate systems.</p>
b. One secretariat has a leading responsibility, while the other	No preceding example	<p>i. Need to decide which Secretariat will take a lead.</p> <p>ii. An MOU could be considered to clarify the demarcation and process.</p>

has a right to comment where appropriate through.		iii. Members of “the other” RFMO may have concerns.
c. One secretariat has the full responsibility, under the conditions agreed by the other RFMO.	No preceding example	i. Need to decide which Secretariat will have the full responsibility. ii. An MOU could be considered to clarify the demarcation and process. iii. Members of “the other” RFMO may have concerns.

(5) Cost Sharing between IATTC and WCPFC and/or among CPCs of each RFMO

Options	Situation in other RFMOs	Consideration
a. Equal division	In the case of ICCAT, additional contribution for the support, maintenance, and functionality development of eBCD system is collected from Contracting Parties that catch and/or trade bluefin tuna, with following formula: (a) basic fee of 700 USD from each Contracting Party (b) variable fee: i. 30% in proportion to the Contracting Party's round weight of bluefin tuna catch ii. 40% in proportion to Contracting Party's total number of trades in the system iii. 30% in proportion to Contracting Party's overall volume of import	(Cost sharing between IATTC and WCPFC) i. Advisable to agree on a formula to divide the cost between IATTC and WCPFC. ii. Advisable to have simple formula such as a. or b, to make the prediction of the budget easier.
b. Proportionate to PBF catches		(Cost sharing within each RFMOs and among CPCs) i. No need to have a common formula between IATTC and WCPFC ii. Each RFMO can decide a best formula for the organization, and ICCAT formula can be used as a reference.
c. Proportionate to PBF transactions recorded in		<p>Participants of the 4th CDS/TM agreed to further consider the possible formula to calculate contributions between the WCPFC and IATTC, and members within each RFMO.</p>
d. Combination of a.-c.		

IATTC Questions and Comments re: IATTC-NC-CDS04-02

One of the outcomes of the 4th CDS Technical Meetings held in July 2023, was a request that the Secretariats of IATTC and WCPFC review the paper IATTC-NC-CDS04-02, as well as the discussions of this paper during CDS04, and then provide their questions, comments and concerns to the small working group. IATTC staff have reviewed the paper and discussion notes from CDS04 and compiled our comments, but we also presented these results to the IATTC Members during the 101st meeting of the Commission in August 2023 in order to solicit the views and comments of IATTC Members. This paper transmits both sets of comments to the CDW WG for its consideration.

Comments of IATTC Members

IATTC staff presented the contents of IATTC-NC-CDS04-02 and summarized the discussions and preferences expressed on the same by the participants of CDS04.

The delegation of China expressed the view that as a market for PBF, they need any e-CDS system to be capable of operating swiftly and efficiently. They also shared the opinion that the cost of implementing an e-CDS for PBF should be recovered from PBF importers based on the catch and quantity of trade. Finally, China noted that they would need at least 1-year between adoption of an E-CDS and the start of implementation in order to be able to see to their domestic regulatory process.

The European Union raised a procedural issue, expressing concerns about trying to advance this issue within the context of the CDS Technical Meetings and the Joint Working Group when there have been no discussions on this issue so far within the IATTC. They believe that the development of a joint e-CDS for PBF might have implication for the possible future development of IATTC CDS for species other than PBF, and that IATTC Members needed to have a more thorough discussion about CDS amongst themselves before the discussions on an e-CDS for PBF in the context of the JWG get too advanced. Mexico responded to the European Union comment to note that so far most points of discussion are preliminary and that the considered having the participation of the IATTC secretariat in both the CDS Technical Group and the informal, intersessional working group to be very important. Japan noted that the next meetings of the JWG and the CDS Technical Group would be held in Japan in July or August of 2024 and encouraged the EU and any other interested IATTC Members to participate in those meetings.

Comments of IATTC staff

IATTC staff offers the following questions and comments, following the order and content of the Options for Budgetary and Administrative Considerations contained in IATTC-NC-CDS04-02, taking note of the discussions on these topics in the context of CDS04 and JWG08

Topic 1 - Basis of the system development

Current momentum appears to be behind the development of an IATTC-WCPFC e-CDS on the basis of the system that has been developed by CCSBT. Participants expressed many reasons for preferring the CCSBT system, but among them was a note that the CCSBT system was simpler and, by extension, cheaper to develop and implement when compared to the ICCAT model. One participant explained that the ICCAT system was necessarily more complex because it reflected some of the complex multi-flag harvest and the transfer of BFT into harvest pens for rearing before processing, sale and possible export. To our knowledge, CCSBT does not need to deal with transfer of live fish to pens and then subsequent rearing and sale. However, although the situation is not as complex as what takes place in the Mediterranean, live capture and transfer of PBF to rearing pens does take place in the IATTC area, and so IATTC staff are looking to confirm that a CCSBT e-CDS-type system would be capable of adapting to handle the capture, transfer to pens, rearing and sale of PBF that is part of the current business practices of the Mexican industry harvesting PBF.

Topic 2 – Location of the system

IATTC notes that the current preference of participants is to use a 3rd party, cloud-based server to host the system rather than use a server that would be physically located in the headquarters of one of the Secretariats. IATTC staff think that this arrangement makes sense, especially if the preference under Topic 4 continues to be for a shared, equal responsibility of both secretariats in terms of operational work, etc., because having a cloud-based system is location neutral. However, the opinions of our Members would be most important in this respect and based on the comments received at our annual meeting in August 2023, we cannot speculate whether they would share this preference.

Topic 3 – Use of external company in development and maintenance of system

The working group participants seem to be in favor of contracting a third-party company to develop and maintain an eCDS for PBF, and that if the preference for a system based on CCSBTs eCDS is maintained, then Shore Informatics, the company which helped develop the CCSBT system, would be the logical choice. IATTC staff does not disagree with this logic. Also, as was noted by the WG previously, the location of the system in a cloud server and the possibility of 3rd party maintenance arrangements does not preclude the possibility that a CDS officer might need to be hired at one or both commissions- especially if there is eventually an expansion of the scope of the CDS beyond PBF.

Topic 4 – Demarcation of responsibility between IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats in the operational work for the development and maintenance of the system

IATTC staff are comfortable with the currently preferred option where both secretariats would share equal responsibility, requiring collaboration and consultation. We also acknowledge that

choosing a straight-forward way of demarcating responsibility would be an important component of this approach- for example, demarcating secretariat responsibility for individual transactions based on area of catch seem reasonable at first glance. However, we must again stress that the IATTC Members must have say on this matter.

Topic 5 – Cost sharing between IATTC and WCPFC and/or among CPCs of each RFMO

Of all five topics, this one seems the least certain. IATTC notes that many Joint WG participants spoke in favor of a hybrid formula where some portion of the system costs are divided equally between the two Commissions, and then the remainder apportioned in terms of some metric such as amount of catch, amount of trade, or number of transactions, while also contemplating that some of these costs might be recovered from users of the system. There seemed to also be an expectation that the costs apportioned to each RFMO would likely be borne by those CPCs that catch or trade in PBF, and not the from the general commission budgets. The IATTC staff does not have any substantive comments at this time, but notes that the negotiation of contribution formulas can be time-consuming negotiations, even within a single commission.



Comments and Questions re: CDS04-02 and CDS04-00

1. In response to Paragraph 7 of the Chair's Summary report of the 4th JWG IATTC-WCPFC CDS Technical Meeting on 3rd July 2023, the WCPFC Secretariat reviewed the five tables in Section 2 of paper CDS04-02, which outlines the options for budgetary and administrative considerations for the development of CDS. We provide our questions, comments, and concerns to the small working group.

7. The participants also agreed to request both Secretariats to review the discussion and results of this meeting and provide their questions, comments, and concerns to the small working group.

Comments of WCPFC Members

2. The below comments of WCPFC Members are based on the feedback from the Commission meeting after the JWG CDS-WG Chair's presentation at WCPFC20 in December 2023. We note that only two CCMs commented during the WCPFC20 plenary discussion (Paragraph 3 below), one of which represents 17 FFA Member CCMs. It is noted that there was no discussion recorded in the Summary Reports of JWG and NC19, following presentation of the JWG CDS-WG Chair's update in 2023.

3. Regarding the progress of developing the e-PBCD, Korea acknowledged the hard work of the PBF CDS Technical Committee Chair and looked forward to working further with other CCMs in the PBF CDS Working Group next year. The Marshall Islands, on behalf of FFA CCMs, thanked the Chair of the PBF CDS Technical Committee for the progress report and commended the WG's effort in advancing the development of a Catch Documentation Scheme for Pacific bluefin tuna. While the scheme was in its early development stages, FFA CCMs were encouraged by the progress made thus far and looked forward to receiving further updates in future meetings of the Commission.

4. The outcome from WCPFC20 was that the Commission noted the update from the Chair of the Joint IATTC-NC PBF CDS Technical Meeting, Mr. Shingo Ota (Japan), on progress in 2023 to develop a catch documentation scheme for Pacific bluefin tuna.

Comments of WCPFC Secretariat

5. As requested by the JWG, the Secretariat provides the following comments on each of the five options for budgetary and administrative considerations.

Topic 1 - Basis of the system development

Three options were presented for consideration by the JWG:

(a) Use resources from ICCAT eBCD as a basis of development

(b) Use resources from CCSBT eCDS as a basis of development

(c) Develop IATTC/WCPFC's own eCDS system from scratch

CDS04-WG conclusion: *The participants tentatively agreed on option (b) to use resources from the CCSBT e-CDS as a basis for development, and potentially draw inspiration or elements from the ICCAT eBCD as described in option (a).*

6. The Secretariat notes the tentative preference from the CDS04-WG to use the database platform of CCSBT eCDS and the interest in potentially drawing in elements from the ICCAT eBCD that might be relevant to the JWG e-PBCD. When developing an e-PBCD for WCPFC, the Secretariat sees merit in drawing from experiences of the existing (ICCAT) and nearing completion (CCSBT) eCDS systems of other tuna RFMOs and other RFBs e.g., CCAMLR.

7. The Secretariat notes there is also familiarity and considerable experience in the WCPO with the use of database platform TUFMAN2, given that it is a platform that was developed by WCPFC's Scientific Services Provider (SPC-OFP). The WCPFC Secretariat has seen various demonstrations of the TUFMAN and TUFMAN2 platforms and understands it to be a respected scientific data management tool used by many CCMs national fisheries departments and also by CCSBT as a catch and effort database, catch and effort reporting and fishing trip verification tool.

8. To date the WCPFC Secretariat has had limited direct experience with TUFMAN2, because alternative mechanisms have been established to provide WCPFC with reports, information and data that are needed for Annual Report preparation and analytical queries. In addition, the Secretariat's current data analytical work is developing additional mechanisms that facilitate access to the data that is needed to support cross-checking and developing reports and information that are needed to support the Commissions work. From prior discussions with SPC, the Secretariat understands that additional technical work is needed to facilitate WCPFC Secretariat access to TUFMAN2, for its use as a tool by WCPFC to view and query WCPFC operational catch and effort data.

9. Based on technical discussions with SPC-OFP database staff and with CCSBT data manager, the Secretariat expects that the TUFMAN2 code can provide a suitable basis for development of the JWG e-PBCD. Additional work would be necessary to include any enhancements required to support the specific needs of the JWG e-PBCD and to ensure that the data is routinely accessible to the WCPFC in a form that can appropriately support cross-checking with other WCPFC datasets and for developing reports and information that are needed to support the Commissions work.

Topic 2 – Location of the system

One option of a cloud-based system was presented, and it was also noted that both ICCAT eBCD and CCSBT eCDS are hosted in a cloud servers provided by different private service providers.

CDS04-WG conclusion: *The participants agreed to make use of a cloud-based system.*

10. In principle, the WCPFC Secretariat support a cloud-hosted e-PBCD system, and this would be consistent with the approach used for other WCPFC online tools that support CCMs work.

11. In early work to develop the JWG e-PBCD system, it will be important to further discuss the administrative arrangements for the development, ongoing hosting, maintenance and support arrangements, as well as clarification of roles and responsibilities, between IATTC and WCPFC.

Topic 3 – Use of external company in development and maintenance of system

Two options were presented for consideration by the JWG:

(a) An external company is contracted for the development and maintenance of the system. Secretariat coordinates communication between the company and members.

(b) External company is not contracted, and the Secretariat staff (s) will engage.

CDS04-WG conclusion: *The participants agreed to pursue option (a) of contracting an external company for the development and maintenance of the ePBCD system with general preference for the one for the CCSBT e-CDS, considering option (b) of hiring a specialist officer within the Secretariat if there is an expansion in the scope of the system (i.e., species coverage) in the future.*

12. Noting the tentative agreement by CDS04-WG with regard to the basis of the system, it seems sensible that an arrangement is considered to access to the experience and expertise of the external company that was contracted to develop the CCSB eCDS system using the TUFMAN2 code. This would be important to assist the IATTC and WCPFC in better understanding the range of development considerations that the IATTC and WCPFC must decide on as part of specifying the development plans for the JWG e-PBCD.

13. As was noted above, in early work to develop the JWG e-PBCD system, administrative arrangements for the development, ongoing hosting, maintenance and support arrangements, as well as clarification of roles and responsibilities, between IATTC and WCPFC will need further discussion. In the WCPFC context, the development and maintenance arrangements would also need to consider how and the extent to which the proposed e-PBCD system could be expanded to cover other WCPFC tuna and billfish species, and broader needs for WCPFC/IATTC routine access to data for review and inclusion in management and monitoring analyses, including with other data sources.

14. Based on the experience of ICCAT and CCSBT eCDS, the development of an eCDS is a considerable and complex task, and in the case of the JWG e-PBCD, this would have added

complexity because it involves two RFMOs. The WCPFC Secretariat considers it essential that consideration is given early in the development process to hire a specialist officer within the WCPFC Secretariat to facilitate the development work on the joint tuna RFMO eCDS. IATTC might similarly find it important to have a dedicated specialist on staff.

Topic 4 – Demarcation of responsibility between IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats in the operational work for the development and maintenance of the system

Three options were presented for consideration by the JWG:

- (a) Both secretariats have equal responsibility and work collaboratively through consultation*
- (b) One Secretariat has a leading responsibility, while the other has a right to comment where appropriate though*
- (c) One Secretariat has the full responsibility, under the conditions agreed by the other RFMO.*

CDS04-WG conclusion: The participants agreed to generally support option (a) of having both the IATTC and WCPFC Secretariats take on responsibilities on an equal basis, acknowledging the need for further discussion to materialize demarcations of responsibility such as management of the system based on the area of the catch.

15. The WCPFC Secretariat expects that Option (a) in the document CDS04-02, which proposes that both secretariats have equal responsibility and work collaboratively through consultation, would be the approach that would be most acceptable to the broader WCPFC membership and appropriately reflects that the responsibility for conservation and management of Pacific Bluefin is shared between WCPFC and IATTC.

16. We also suggest developing an MOU to outline the general principles of collaboration and dispute settlement between the two RFMOs. The MOU may have an Annex section that provides specific guidelines on the demarcation and process for resolving any issues that may arise during its implementation. The Annex can be revised and updated annually.

17. These aspects should be included in the tasks of the dedicated specialist officer/s hired to support the development of the e-PBCD, because the arrangement agreed between IATTC and WCPFC would need to be taken into consideration when the specifications and design of the plan for the system is finalised, and in considering how the ongoing operation of the e-PBCD should be expected to work.

Topic 5 – Cost sharing between IATTC and WCPFC and/or among CPCs of each RFMO

Four options were presented for consideration by the JWG:

- (a) Equal division*
- (b) Proportionate to PBF catches*
- (c) Proportionate to PBF transactions recorded in*
- (d) Combination of a.~c.*

There were also comments about considerations for cost sharing between IATTC and WCPFC: (i) Advisable to agree on a formula to divide the cost between IATTC and WCPFC. (ii) Advisable to have simple formula such as a. or b, to make the prediction of the budget easier.

And comments about considerations for cost-sharing within each RFMO and among CPCs/CCMs (i) i. No need to have a common formula between IATTC and WCPFC (ii) Each RFMO can decide a best formula for the organization, and ICCAT formula can be used as a reference.

CDS04-WG conclusion: *The participants agreed to further consider the possible formula to calculate contributions between the WCPFC and IATTC, and members within each RFMO.*

18. More complexity in the formula for apportioning the costs, both between RFMOs and within RFMOs, would increase administrative burden for Secretariats to calculate and determine the assessed contributions towards the development and maintenance of the system.

19. Within the WCPFC context, it is necessary to consider the principle in the WCPFC Convention that “Any extraordinary cost incurred for the work of the [Northern] committee shall be borne by the members of the committee.”