



**WCPFC10**

**Tenth Regular Session**

2<sup>th</sup> December – 6<sup>th</sup> December 2013

Cairns, AUSTRALIA

---

**FFA MEMBERS: LETTER ON SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS OF SMALL ISLAND  
DEVELOPING STATES**

---

**WCPFC10-2013-DP02**

**5 November 2013**

**BY FFA MEMBERS**



1 November 2013

Glenn Hurry  
Executive Director  
Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission  
PO Box 2356 Kolonia  
Federated States of Micronesia

Dear Glenn,

### **Special Requirements of Small Island Developing States**

In our recent discussions, FFA Members have reiterated the importance of this matter. In particular, there were two areas that we would like to draw to the attention of the Commission:

- (i) the list of SIDS' specific requirements, and
- (ii) "giving teeth" to our previous interventions that the Commission consider the impacts on SIDS whenever a new proposal is tabled.

On the first point, for the early attention of Commission members, we set out our latest list of SIDS' priority areas for assistance. As we have noted previously, the intention is to ensure that targeted assistance is provided by developed Commission members in implementing the Commission's obligations under the Convention, in particular Article 30. We will raise these under the SIDS Agenda Item, and they will also be further elaborated during the relevant agenda items. These are as follows:

- ensuring in the revision of CMM 2012-01 that there is no disproportionate burden of bigeye conservation on SIDS;
- ensuring that the south Pacific albacore CMM contributes to protecting and increasing the participation of SIDS in the WCPO tuna fisheries;
- ensuring SIDS are able to implement obligations arising out of the Commission and assisted in doing so, such as SIDS' flag State compliance, and targeted capacity development including for science and bioeconomic analysis work, and in the development and implementation of IMS, and analysis of data at the national and regional level;
- providing an additional budget for the participation of chairs and vice-chairs of subsidiary bodies who are SIDS nationals, and an additional SID member in Commission-related meetings;
- facilitating the use of the Regional Observer Program Support Fund to assist SIDS in developing electronic reporting; and ensuring that priority for ROP funding be given to the national observer programmes and to developing port sampling programs related to transshipment; and

- ensuring a rationalisation of Commission workloads, including a prioritisation of issues and streamlining agendas.

On the second point, we have previously argued that it is crucial that whenever a new proposal is tabled for consideration, the Commission must consider the impacts on SIDS. This is to ensure that checks are made beforehand to assess whether SIDS can indeed implement obligations arising out of such proposal. This approach also firmly recognises that SIDS can only implement decisions commensurate with their capabilities, and assistance mechanisms may need to be put in place.

Further, this style of consideration has already been agreed to by WCPFC. Specifically, WCPFC 7 agreed to a template that is attached to the WCPFC Strategic Plan 2011-2013 (WCPFC7-2010-FAC4/15 Rev15 dated 10 December 2010) for use by CCMs when nominating measures/activities for consideration at the Commission or subsidiary bodies. In particular, such considerations shall include benefit to/impacts on SIDS. Nonetheless, it is fair to say that this mechanism has not been fully utilised, and particular to SIDS, these need to be elaborated as we suggest below.

Therefore, FFA Members have developed the following questions that must be asked whenever the Commission considers a new proposal:

- Who is required to implement this proposal? (All CCMs, flag States, coastal States, SIDS etc)
- Which SIDS would this impact on, to what proportion and what ways/how?
- Is this impact positive (benefit) or negative (cost) for SIDS?
- Does the proposal protect development options for SIDS?
- Does the proposal create a disproportionate burden on SIDS, and in what way? If so, what are the options for avoiding or mitigating such burden?
- What are the resources, including financial and capacity, implications of this proposal?
- What assistance mechanisms, funding sources etc and associated timeframe, including training and financial support, needs to be in place before such proposal is implemented?

This list is not intended to be exhaustive but be used as a basis to consider the impacts on SIDS of any new proposal. We see this type of evaluation as essential to provide surety to SIDS and therefore to expedite the work of the Commission by ensuring that proposals can be adopted.

FFA Members also propose that such questions be placed in a CMM to ensure that these important considerations are made before decisions are adopted. At TCC9, FFA Members stated that we will be seeking to strengthen Resolution 2008-01 by turning it into a CMM. Ideally this is where we would place such questions and work is currently underway led by RMI to put together a draft SIDS' CMM to submit to Commission members at the earliest opportunity.

Ahead of this work being completed and a Commission decision on such draft CMM, **we request Commission members to include these questions as a decision of the Commission in the WCPFC10 meeting record.**

We would appreciate this letter being circulated to all Commission members as well as being placed into a FFA Members' Delegation Paper for WCPFC10.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Diake', written in a cursive style.

Mr Sylvester Diake  
Chair  
Forum Fisheries Committee