

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE**

**NINTH REGULAR SESSION**

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

6-14 August 2013

|  |
| --- |
| **INFORMAL SMALL GROUP (ISG)** |

**WCPFC-SC9-2013/ISG**

Facilitators will lead their relevant ISG according to their schedules and approaches.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISG Tasks** | **Proposed Facilitator** |
| **~~ISG 1 [Update of Part-1 Template]~~**   * ~~WCPFC9 adopted an addendum to Annual Report –Part I template. Subject to the decision by the HOD, SC9 may review the template and consider incorporating the addendum into the main template~~ * ~~Suggested draft revision is prepared for distribution, subject to the HOD’s decision.~~ | ~~TBD~~ |
| **ISG 2 [Develop a Guidelines for safe release of encircled animals, including whale sharks and cetaceans]**   * WCPFC9 noted the need to continue development of such science-based guidelines through discussions at SC and TCC, including establishing field tests to assess handling, post-release mortality, practicality and effectiveness. | Kiyofuji-san  hkiyofuj@fra.affrc.go.jp |
| **ISG 3 [Review of scientific aspects of the Commission’s Independent Performance Review]**   * TOR for SC9: SC9 will review the science portion of the Performance Review matrix (Paragraph 429 of the WCPFC9 Summary Report).   + Ask conveners to provide SC’s responses by Saturday.   + Have ISG-3 meeting on Monday to compile all response   + Then present it to the plenary under the Agenda 11.3.2 * Suggested “SC responses” are posted on the website together with SC9-GN-WP-06 | SC Chair and ED |
| **ISG 4 [Record of SC Work Programme] – Steve Brouwer**   * Review the Record of SC Work Programme (SC9-GN-WP-05) * Review of a Beta database Access that Tony developed (to refine design and contents) * Selection of high priority themes and projects for funding support [using unobligated budget for 2013]  1. Establish a Research Sub-Committee [RSC, SC Chair, Secretariat, Theme Conveners and Expert Advisors] for the process and implementation intersessionally in the future 2. Develop project title, objectives and scope and tasks of the work 3. Present to SC Plenary for finalization 4. Tentative time schedule proposed by the Secretariat 5. End of August – advertise Information Package to call for proposals 6. End of September – call for proposals closed; all proposals shared with the Research Sub-Committee 7. Mid October – Proposals selected for funding support finalized by the RSC 8. Contracts drafted and sent in November 9. Project outputs be submitted to SC10  * Subject to the HOD’s decision, review the existing procedure (Attachment P, SC5 Summary Report) for recommendation to the Plenary for revision | Stephen Brouwer |
| **ISG 5 [SC work programme and Budget for 2014-2016]**   * SC Chair will facilitate this ISG, assisted by ED. * Refer to Draft budget template for 2014-2016 (**Annex A**)  1. Four theme conveners are requested to provide any new projects with indicative budget, if they have, to be included for 2014-2016 Work Programme and Budget 2. Compile all those projects into the draft budget template 3. Convene ISG meeting to finalize the budget 2014-2016 and report to the Plenary | SC Chair and ED |
| **ISG 6 [Seabird mortality]**   * SC9 will assess to the extent possible the implications of the North Pacific small-vessel exemption on seabird interaction rates and make any appropriate recommendations (Para10, CMM 2012-07) * For this work, ISG may need seabird interaction by small vessels and total number of vessels in the North Pacific * As an alternative, a rough estimate of seabird interaction rates in the North Pacific may be considered through the analysis of seabird interactions for small vessels ≤ 24 meters in the South Pacific * Review Part 1 reports which include Tables in Annex 2 of CMM2012-07, if available, to estimate seabird mortality in all fisheries in the Convention Area (Para 9, CCM 2012-07) * US provided their number of longline vessels <24m and ≥24m fishing in the North Pacific portion of the WCPF area | Valerie Chan (US) |
| **ISG 7 [Review of Strawman - MOW]**  TOR to be prepared   * + Following initial work undertaken at Management Objectives Workshop (MOW) 1 in Manila 2012, an expert panel was tasked to finalise development of Management Objectives, Performance Indicators and Reference Points.   + Following a small meeting in Honolulu and extensive consultation a strawman document has been drafted and is posted as MI-WP-05.   + This document will be reviewed by SC9 (and NC and TCC) for comments and suggestions which will be appended to the document before presentation at NC9 and ultimately presentation at the MOW 2 in Cairns immediately prior to the WCPFC10.   + The facilitator Ian Cartwright will present the document, and will attend the ISG and be available to respond to questions and indeed seek clarification from delegates.   + Anticipated output from ISG7: List/Table of comments, additional information and suggestions for approval by SC9 plenary. | TBD |
| **ISG 8 [FAD Data Fields]**  See the **Annex B** for details. | Karl Staisch |

**Annex A**

**SC work programme for 2014-2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| List of Scientific Committee work programme titles and budget for 2013, and indicative budget for 2014–2015, which require funding from the Commission’s core budget (in USD). | | | | |
| **Research Activity / Project with priority** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Project 14. WPEA Project | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Project 35. Refinement of bigeye parameters | 70,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | ? |
| Project 42. Pacific-wide tagging project | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | ? |
| Project 57. Limit reference points | 30,000 | - | - | - |
| Project 66. Target reference points | 0 | - | - | - |
| Project 63. Harvest control rules | 0 | - | - | - |
| Project 60. Purse-seine species composition | 75,000 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Any other projects arising from SC9*  *At Convener’s meeting, ask conveners to provide their projects and budget implications if they have* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Additional stock assessment by SPC (see below for SPC’s 2014 stock assessment plan)* |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bigeye MFCL | 40,000 | - | - | - |
| Additional resourcing SPC | 160,000 | 160,000 | 160,000 | - |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  |
| UNOBLIGATED BUDGET | 83,000 | 83,000 | 83,000 | 83,000 |
| SPC-OFP BUDGET[[1]](#footnote-1) | 871,200 | 871,200 | 871,200 |  |
| **GRAND TOTAL** | **1,364,200** | **1,224,200** | **1,224,200** |  |

SPC’s 2014 stock assessment:

1. Bigeye
2. Yellowfin
3. Skipjack
4. SP blue shark, subject to SC9 guidelines
5. NP mako shark – join ISC
6. SP mako shark – data analysis and stock assessment subject to feedback from 2014 PAW

**Indicative plan of the SPC-OFP science services for 2013–2015 (From SC8 Summary Report)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Species** | **Stock** | **Last assessment** | **Comments** | **Proposed assessment** | | |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |
| Bigeye tuna | WCPO | 2011 | Review recommendations to implement with priority on analysis of tagging and longline catch per unit effort data. Not all recommendations will be complete by 2013. Good to do tropical tunas together for the purpose of examining management options. | Analysis of tagging data and longline catch per unit effort data and complete the model  Within the services budget | Stock assessment  2014 | No |
| Pacific-wide |  | Suggested that this not be conducted until the WCPO stock assessment updated. | N/A | N/A | yes |
| Skipjack tuna | WCPO | 2011 | Will benefit most from PTTP data for which more data is now available. Good to do tropical tunas together for the purpose of examining management options. | 1. Analysis of tagging data and complete the model. | Stock assessment  2014 but start earlier in 2013 | No |
| Yellowfin tuna | WCPO | 2011 | Many bigeye tuna recommendations will also benefit yellowfin tuna. Good to do tropical tunas together for the purpose of examining management options. | Analysis of tagging data and longline CPUE data and complete the model | Stock assessment | No |
| Albacore | S. Pacific | 2012 | Next assessment would benefit from the implementation of sex-structure in MFCL. Recent fishery developments suggest closer monitoring. |  |  | SA |
| Striped marlin | SWP | 2012 | Just updated after several years. Next assessment 2017 |  |  |  |
| NWP | 2011–2012 | Just updated after several years. Next assessment 2017 |  |  |  |
| Blue marlin | Pacific-wide | 2002 | Would appropriately be conducted collaboratively; SC noted this is a pacific wide stock and request ISC to present assessment to SC in advance. SC requested assurance that ISC assessment would be submitted to WCPFC | ISC 2013 |  |  |
| Swordfish | SW-Pacific | 2012/13 | Update underway | SA be finish by SC9 2013 |  |  |
| Silky shark | WCPO | 2012 | SC8 request for an updated assessment to address some input data issues | Stock Assessment  2013 |  |  |
| Pacific-wide |  | Collaboration with IATTC. Not to be conducted until after the revised assessment for the WCPO stock. | Following WCPO Assessment |  |  |
| OWS | WCPO | 2012 | First assessment conducted this year |  |  | Next  assessment 2015 |
| Blue shark | S. Pacific |  | Currently scheduled for 2012/2013 | 2013 Pacific wide assessment |  |  |
| N. Pacific |  | Currently scheduled for 2012/2013. ISC has initiated some work on this stock. It is not an official northern stock. |
| Mako shark | S. Pacific |  | Currently scheduled under the Shark Research Plan for 2012/2013 | No decision pending agreement on future funding | | |
|  | North Pacific |  | Currently scheduled under the Shark Research Plan for 2012/2013. |  | | | |

**Annex B**
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|  |
| --- |
| **ISG-8 Discussion Paper**  **Review of FAD Data Fields** |

**WCPFC- SC9-2013-ISC8**

**Secretariat**

**Introduction**

A request was made by NZ, to set up an ISG to discuss and recommend reviewing current data field used for monitoring FADs. The Small group if required will also discuss new fields that may be proposed for observer and vessels to collect. In line with this request the “Small Group” is to review the current Minimum Standard Data fields on FADs collected by ROP observers as agreed at TC5 and WCPFC6. The review will look at data fields that may not be required and also data fields that could be added to enhance the data information on FADs.

**Background**

Currently FAD information is being collected by ROP Observers when a floating object is encountered on purse seine trips. The information observers collect include the minimum standard data fields required to be collected by member countries when an observer is on a ROP trip. (ROP Observer trips are defined in CMM 2007-01 and the Convention Article 28.) It should be noted that this does not prevent any member country requiring extra information on FADs to be collected when an observer is in their waters.

The SPC/FFA Regional Purse Seine log sheet used by most purse seine vessels collects limited information on association of the catch/set with floating objects.

**Data Collection - Observers**

ROP Observers are asked to collect information when a vessel encounters any man made or natural floating object or a combination of both objects, that is capable of aggregating fish.

Table 1 contains the Minimum Standard Data fields required by the Commission to be collected by ROP observers.

The data fields recommended at WCPFC 6 can be reported in any format, with the FFA and SPC “FAD Payao Floating Object Information Record GEN-5 being the most widely used format by ROP observers on purse seiner vessels. The GEN-5 contains all the Minimum Standard Data Fields as required by the Commission but have two fields extra that are not required by the Commission, this extra information is linked to other data collected by Observers. Table 2 shows the extra fields collected in the FFA/SPC GEN-5 Format.

Given that Observers have many tasks and roles in collecting information the following is suggested

* Review all fields that are collected by observers and determine fields (if any) that may not be required.
* Discuss new fields to be collected by observers that could be useful to assist in a better understanding of FAD reporting.

**Data Collection -Vessel Log Sheets**

Most Purse seine vessels use the SPC/FFA “Regional Purse Seine Log Sheet”, this log in its current paper format is extremely limited in what could be added to the form because of space. Table 3 shows the current limited information given by a vessel on FADS. To expand the amount of reporting on FADs by a vessel; if it was to continue as a paper format a separate paper FAD reporting log would need to be created, however with the development of “Electronic Reporting’ the extra reporting if required may not be a problem.

The Purse Seine fleet is covered 100% 20N -20S by observers who report using the current minimum standard data fields on FADs and their attributes. Therefore it would be ideal if additional fields to be reported by vessels were difficult for an observer to collect or verify, such as the ownership, markings, and numbers on FADs etc. This information could be linked to the observer data base for verification purposes. To promote discussion on this matter Table 4 has suggested fields that may assist where a vessel could give information on FADs.

**Suggestion**

* Vessel log sheets in respect to FAD information are reviewed and if Observer Data already collected is not sufficient to give the appropriate information required, a Vessel FAD Reporting Format be developed.

**FAD Data Entry**

Because of the importance of FAD information for FAD closure periods, FAD Management Plans and other scientific research. There has been a suggestion that FAD data should be prioritised for data   
entry on arrival of the information and be entered first for each trip. This suggestion is included here in case there is comment on this matter. Currently observer data is generally entered in the order that the Workbooks are set out and FAD data would be one of the last items entered.

**Outcomes**

Consider all current fields/information collected on FADs

* Withdraw fields not considered useful;
* Add new fields for observer data collection;
* If deemed necessary create fields and a “Vessel Reporting Format”, for information to be collected by Purse seine vessels.
* Prioritising FAD data entry.

**Table 1**. **Minimum Standard FAD Data Fields for the ROP as agreed at WCPFC6**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **General** | **Data fields to be collected by observers for FAD information** | **Comment on Observer Reporting of the Fields** |
| 1 | Observer Name | Standard to all Forms |
| 2 | Vessel Name | Standard to all Forms |
| 3 | Vessel Call Sign | Standard to all Forms |
| 4 | Observer Trip Number | Standard to all Forms |
| 5 | No of pages collected | Standard to all Forms |
| **FAD Information** |  |  |
| 6 | Date information collected | Date using Ships Calendar |
| 7 | Time information collected | Time using Ships Time |
| 8 | FAD Activity | Observers indicate using pre determined codes whether vessels, do the following   * Set on FAD, * Servicing FAD, * Vessel drifts beside FAD trying to attract fish away from FAD for a Set. * Vessel sets very close to the FAD, observers are to estimate distance if this occurs. * Investigates the FAD * Deploy or retrieve electronics/buoy * Deploy or Retrieve FADs |
| 9 | Longitude | Observers get positions from GPS and try to record to nearest 1/1000 of a minute |
| 10 | Latitude | Observers get positions from GPS and try to record to nearest 1/1000 of a minute |
| 11 | How the FAD was detected | Observer indicate how the FAD was detected using predetermined codes   * Seen from Helicopter / Helicopter Report * Found using electronics /GPS beacon /radio buoy/ lights * Bird or Navigation Radar * Sonar Depth Sounder * Information from other Vessel * Known Anchored position * Flock of Sea Birds * First seen in Purse net * Other please describe * Unknown |
| 12 | FAD Markings if any | Observers are to Report whether the FAD has a number or other identification on the FAD |
| 13 | Is the FAD - Anchored or Drifting | Observers indicate whether the FAD is a free drifting FAD or is anchored. |
| 14 | What type of materials is the FAD constructed from | Observers report what materials are the main materials used in the FAD most are listed below   * Logs/Trees/Branches * Timber/planks/pallets/spools * PVC or plastic tubing/ plastic drums/plastic sheeting * Metal Drums i.e 44gal drum * Philippine FADs -Drums /Payao * Bamboo, Cane , Corks, Floats. * Floating Dead or Alive Animals * Unknown (describe in comments ) |
| 15 | What type of Electronics is associated with the FAD | Observers are to note the electronics associated with the FAD and whether these electronics have any visible marking showing possible owner ship.   * Radio Buoy identified or unidentified * GPS Buoy identified or unidentified * Sounder buoy identified or unidentified * Light buoys * Other describe * Unknown describe in comments |
| 16 | Origin of the FAD | Observers are to try and identify original origin of the FAD; vessel is to Set on.   * Originally deployed by the vessel the observer is aboard. * Other vessel –consent, no consent or unknown consent. * Drifting and found by vessel * Deployed by FAD auxiliary vessel * Origin unknown. * Other describe |
| 17 | FAD as Found  and as left | These fields’ help explains the description of a FAD found, it also helps to describe if a FAD was changed by the Vessel before they depart the area. |
| 18 | Max estimated Depth of netting or other materials hanging from the FAD | Observers are asked to report in a Data field the maximum estimated depth of any objects hanging below the FAD such as streamers netting and any other objects. FAD anchor ropes and Chains are not to be included in this estimation |
| 19 | Max Length and Width of FAD | Observers are to estimate the size of the FAD |
| 20 | Observers are asked to draw a diagram with estimated measurements | Observers are to draw simple diagrams explaining the estimated Dimensions and any attachments etc, |

**TABLE 2: Fields on SPC/FFA Form Gen-5 not required by the Commission**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Extra information on FFA/SPC Form Gen-5 not part of the Minimum Standards Data Fields for the ROP.** | | |
| 21 | Set Number | The FFA/SPC ask that each Set is numbered in order of their occurrence on their daily activity Form PS-2 - This field reflects the number of the Set on FFA/SPC Form PS-2 that the vessel is involved with a floating object . |
| 22 | Species of Special Interest Trapped on the FAD or its extensions. | FFA/SPC Observers fill out a Species of Special Interest form Gen-2 when there is any interaction with the vessel or its gear.  This field has been added to their FAD Form Gen-5 to help identify the FAD that the SSI was observed. |

**TABLE 3: Fields on Vessel log Sheets re FAD information.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SPC/FFA Regional Purse seine Logsheet** | | |
|  | School Association Code | The only field on the Vessel Log Sheet that indicates that set was carried out on a floating object (FAD) is the School Association Code |

**Table 4: FAD fields that may be helpful if supplied by the vessel**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Suggested Fields that may be helpful if the information was supplied by the Vessel** | |
| FAD deployed or retrieved by Vessel | Did the vessel deploy or retrieve a FAD |
| Date Time and Position Deployed or Retrieved | Date time and position of each FAD deployed or retrieved |
| Anchored or drifting | Did the vessel anchor the FAD or was it deployed as a drifting FAD |
| Type and design of FAD | What design was the FAD when deployed? i.e. Bamboo or PVC Raft, Drums, Corks, etc, or a combination of different materials. |
| Identification Marks | Any marks or identification on the FAD and also identification marks on electronics attached to the FAD |
| Changes since Deployed | When the Vessel originally deployed the FAD was there any changes since it was deployed. |
| **Suggested fields if a vessel locates a floating object and decides to do a set** | |
| Date Time and Position located | Date time and position of FAD Set |
| Anchored or drifting | Did the vessel set on a anchored FAD or was it a drifting FAD? |
| Type and design of FAD | What design was the FAD when set? I.e. Bamboo, PVC Raft, Drums, Corks, etc, or a combination of different materials. |
| Identification Marks | Any marks or identification on the FAD and also identification marks on electronics attached to the FAD |

1. Details of the SPC-OFP science services for 2013–2015 are tabulated below. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)