COMMISSION
ELEVENTH REGULAR SESSION
Faleata Sports Complex, Apia, SAMOA
1 - 5 December 2014

KOBE QUESTIONAIRE

WCPFC11-2014-IP13_rev1
3 December 2014

Circulated by the Secretariat at the request of the Kobe Steering Committee Chair

The Kobe Steering Committee, which is comprised of the Chairs, Vice Chairs and Executive Directors of the five tuna RFMOs and the past Chairs of the three Kobe meetings, decided that it would be useful to prepare the attached Questionnaire on the extent to which each of the tuna RFMOs has addressed the various recommendations that were adopted at the three Kobe meetings. They also agreed that the Questionnaire should be reviewed and updated by the membership of each of the tuna RFMOs on an annual basis. The most recent version of the Questionnaire is attached. CCMs are asked to review it and provide any comments to the Secretariat by **February 15, 2015**.

KOBE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
June 9, 2014
Rome, Italy

KOBE RECOMMENDATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
SCIENCE					
Data Sharing and the Provision of Scientific Advice					
1. Improve the request for scientific advice to clearly articulate risk and uncertainty to decision makers. [i.e. Kobe II Strategy Matrix] (Kobe II Course of Actions)	O[i]	O	O[1I]	O[1]	O (and F)
2. Efforts should be undertaken so that basic data used in stock assessment (catch, effort and sizes by flag and time/area strata) provided by members should be made available via the websites of tuna RFMOs or by other means. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[2]	O
3. All documents, data and assumptions related to past assessments undertaken by tuna RFMOs should be made available in order to allow evaluation by any interested stakeholder. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	X[ii]	O[1]	O	O[3]	O
4. Standardized executive summaries should be developed for consideration by all tuna RFMOs to summarize stock status and management recommendations. These summaries should be discussed and proposed by the chairs of the Scientific Committees at Kobe 3. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	NR[iii]	F	O	O[4]	F
5. The application of the Kobe 2 strategy matrix should be expanded and applied primarily to stocks for which sufficient information is available. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[iv]	O[2]	O[2I]	O[5]	F
6. Tuna RFMOs should develop mechanisms to deliver timely and adequate information on their scientific outcomes to the public. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[6]	O
7. Chairs of Scientific Committees should establish an annotated list of common issues that could be addressed jointly by tuna RFMOs and prioritize them for discussion at the Kobe 3 meeting. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	X	F	O	O[7]	F
8. When useful to support scientific and MCS purposes, cooperate with other tuna RFMOs to develop protocols for exchanging data, including provisions for data confidentiality. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O[v]	O	O[3I]	O[8]	O

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
9. Recognizing that the five tRFMOs have different data confidentiality rules, and noting this might curb the exchange of data across tRFMOs, tRFMO Secretariats cooperate to develop common data confidentiality rules and a draft protocol for data sharing. The protocol will specify the types of data to be shared, how it can be used, and who can have access to it. (Kobe III)	O[vi]	O[3]	X	X	O[1]
Data Reporting					
1. Provide accurate, timely and complete data, and adopt measures to address the current low rate of compliance by RFMO participants with the obligations for data provision under the rules of each RFMO and any other relevant international instrument. (Kobe II Course of Actions)	O	O	O	O[**9**]	O[2]
2. All members of t-RFMOs are called upon to give a top priority to the provision of data of good quality in a timely manner, according to the existing mandatory data requirements of tuna RFMOs, in order to facilitate the work of tuna RFMOs scientific bodies in the provision of scientific advice based on the most recent information. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[**67**]	O
3. Lags in the submission of fishery data should be reduced making a full use of communication technologies (e.g. web based) and efforts should be undertaken that basic data formats are harmonized. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[**10**]	O
4. Fine scale operational data should be made available in a timely manner to support stock assessment work, and confidentiality concerns should be addressed through RFMOs rules and procedures for access protection and security of data. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[vii]	O	O[4I]	O[**11**]	O
5. All RFMOs establish strong requirements for the provision of accurate data and information to secretariats so that the status of tuna stocks can be accurately assessed. All RFMO members and cooperating non-members should make a firm commitment to provide these data on a timely basis, and it should be cross-checked with market, landings and processing establishment data under the competency of tuna RFMOs. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O	O[**12**]	O[3]
Data Gathering and Analysis					
1. Tuna RFMOs should ensure adequate sampling for catch, effort and size composition across all fleets and especially distant water longliners for which this information is becoming limited. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[viii]	O	O[5I]	O/F[**13**]	O
2. Tuna RFMOs should cooperate to improve the quality of data, in particular for methods to estimate: (1) species and size composition of tunas caught by purse seiners and by artisanal fisheries and (2) catch and size of farmed tunas. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O[6I]	O[**14**]	O

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
3. Tuna RFMOs should use alternative sources of data, notably observer and cannery data, to both validate the information routinely reported by Parties and estimate catches from non-reporting fleets. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[15]	O (and F)
4. Regular large scale tagging programs should be developed, along with appropriate reporting systems, to estimate natural mortality growth and movement patterns by sex, and other fundamental parameters for stock assessments. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[ix]	O	O	O[16]	O
5. Archival tagging should be an ongoing activity of tagging programs as it provides additional insights into tuna behavior and vulnerability. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[17]	O
6. Spatial aspects of assessment should be encouraged within all tuna RFMOs in order to substantiate spatial management measures. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[18]	O (and F)
7. The use of high-resolution spatial ecosystem modeling frameworks should be encouraged in all tuna RFMOs since they offer the opportunity to better integrate biological features of tuna stocks and their environment. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O / NR[x]	X	F	O[19]	F
8. Tuna RFMOs should promote peer reviews of their stock assessment works. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O[7I]	X[20]	O
9. Tuna RFMOs should use more than one stock assessment model and avoid the use of assumption-rich models in data-poor situations. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O	O	O	O[21]	O
10. Chairs of Scientific Committees should jointly develop checklists and minimum standards for stock assessments. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	NR[iii]	O	O	O[22]	X
11. Tuna RFMOs should actively cooperate with programs integrating ecosystem and socio-economic approaches such as CLIOTOP to support the conservation of multi-species resources. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	NR[xi]	O	F	X	F
12. RFMOs should assess the impact of fisheries for tuna, tuna like and other species covered by the conventions on bycatch by taxon using the best available data. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xii]	O	O[8I]	O[24]	O (and F)
13. RFMOs should consider adopting standards for bycatch data collection which, at a minimum, allows the data to contribute to the assessment of bycatch species population status and evaluation of the effectiveness of bycatch measures. The data should allow the RFMOs to assess the level of interaction of the fisheries with bycatch species. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xiii]	O	O[9I]	O[25]	O (and F)

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
14. Encourage the participation of appropriate scientists in relevant T-RFMO working groups to conduct and evaluate bycatch assessments and proposed mitigation strategies. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O	O	O	O[26]	O
15. Evaluate the effectiveness of current bycatch mitigation measures, and their impact on target species catch and management, and identify priorities for action and gaps in implementation, including enforcement of current measures and capacity building needs in developing states. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xiv]	O	O[10l]	O[27]	O (and F)
16. Identify research priorities, including potential pilot projects to further develop and evaluate the effectiveness of current or proposed bycatch mitigation measures, working with fishers, fishing industry, IGOs and NGOs, universities and others as appropriate, and facilitate a full compendium of information regarding mitigation techniques or tools currently in use, e.g. building on the WCPFC Bycatch Mitigation Information System. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xv]	O	F	O[28]	O (and F)
17. As a matter of priority, establish a joint T-RFMO technical working group to promote greater cooperation and coordination among RFMOs with the attached Terms of Reference. The RFMOs are encouraged to expedite the formation of the joint working group. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O	F	O	O	O
18. Actively develop collaborations between relevant fishing industry, IGOs and NGOs, universities and others as appropriate, and RFMOs to assess the impact of bycatch on the five taxa, study the effectiveness of bycatch mitigation measures, and further the understanding of population dynamics of species of conservation concern. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xvi]	F	O[11l]	O[29]	O (and F)
19. Emphasizing the potential of the Kobe II Strategy Matrix (K2SM) to communicate efficiently among all stakeholders and to assist in the decision-making process according to different levels of risk, but also recognizing that substantial uncertainties still remain in the assessments, the Scientific Committees and Bodies of the tRFMOs develop research activities to better quantify the uncertainty and understand how this uncertainty is reflected in the risk assessment inherent in the K2SM. (Kobe III)	O[xvii]	O[4]	O	O	O (and F)
20. Recognizing that a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) process needs to be widely implemented in the tRFMOs in the line of implementing a precautionary approach for tuna fisheries management, it is recommended that a Joint MSE Technical Working Group be created and that this Joint Working Group work electronically, in the first instance, in order to minimize the cost of its work.	O[xviii]	O[5]	O	O	O

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
MANAGEMENT					
Management Measures, Decision-making, and RFMO functioning					
1. Consistent with the FAO IPOA-Sharks, establish precautionary, science-based conservation and management measures for sharks taken in fisheries within the convention areas of each tuna RFMO, including as appropriate: o Measures to improve the enforcement of existing finning bans; o Prohibitions on retention of particularly vulnerable or depleted shark species, based on advice from scientists and experts; o Concrete management measures in line with best available scientific advice with priority given to overfished populations; o Precautionary fishing controls on a provisional basis for shark species for which there is no scientific advice; and o Measures to improve the provision of data on sharks in all fisheries and by all gears. (Kobe II Course of Actions)	NR[xix]	O	O	O[30]	O
2. RFMO measures should reflect adopted international agreements, tools and guidelines to reduce bycatch, including the relevant provisions of the FAO Code of Conduct, the IPOAs for Seabirds and Sharks, the FAO guidelines on sea turtles, the best practice guidelines for IPOAS for seabirds, and the precautionary approach and ecosystem approaches. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O	O	O	O	O
3. For populations of concern including those evaluated as depleted, RFMOs should develop and adopt immediate, effective management measures, for example, prohibition as appropriate on retention of such species where alternative effective sustainability measures are not in place. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xx]	O	O	O[31]	O (and F)
4. Seek binding measures or strengthen existing mitigation measures, including the development of mandatory reporting requirements for bycatch of all five taxa across all gear types and fishing methods where bycatch is a concern. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	X[xx] / O[xxi]	O	O	O[32]	O
5. Due to the conservation status of certain populations and in accordance with priorities in the RFMO areas, expedite action on reducing bycatch of threatened and endangered species. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xx]	O	O	O[73]	O
6. Adopt the following principles as the basis for developing best practice on bycatch avoidance and mitigation measures and on bycatch conservation and management measure: binding, clear and direct, measureable, science-based, ecosystem-based, ecologically efficient (reduces the mortality of bycatch), practical and safe, economically efficient, holisitic, collaboratively developed with industry and stakeholders, and fully implemented. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O / X[xxii]	O	O	O	O

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
7. Develop the long-term capacity of T-RFMOs to coordinate and cooperate for data collection, assessment of bycatch, outreach, education, and observer training, including establishing a process to share information on current bycatch initiatives and potential capacity building activities. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	X[xx]	F	F	O[33]	O (and F)
8. Ensure that the effectiveness of all conservation and management measures is not undermined by exemption or exclusion clauses. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O	O[34]	O
9. Ensure that all conservation and management measures are implemented in a consistent and transparent manner and are achieving their management goals. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O	O[35]	O
10. Ensure that all stocks maintained at sustainable and optimal levels through science-based measures. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O[xxiii]	O	O	O[36]	O
11. The tRFMOs consider the decision-making framework guidelines outlined in Annex 3 [of the Kobe III report]. (Kobe III)	O	O[6]	O	O	X
12. Tuna RFMO members should provide input to the Steering Committee through the Chair(s) of their respective RFMO(s) and during the annual review at the RFMO meeting(s).	O[xxiv]	X	X	O	X
Capacity and Allocation					
1. The participants agreed that global fishing capacity for tunas is too high, and that this problem needs to be urgently addressed. The participants recognized that in order to address this problem it is imperative that members of RFMOs collaborate at a global level, and that each flag State or fishing entity ensure that its fishing capacity is commensurate with its fishing opportunities as determined by each tuna RFMO, including through a fair, transparent, and equitable process for the allocation of fishing opportunities among its members. The participants agreed that this problem should be addressed in a way that does not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries, including on the high seas, by developing coastal States, in particular small island developing States, territories, and States with small and vulnerable economies. (Kobe II Course of Actions)		O	O	O[37]	F
2. Tuna fishing capacity should not be transferred between RFMO areas and, as appropriate within RFMO areas, unless in accordance with the measures of the RFMOs concerned. (Kobe II Course of Actions)	NR[xxv]	O	O (intra) X (inter)	O[38]	O
3. As appropriate, RFMOs include only vessels on their active vessel register in any scheme for reducing capacity by eliminating vessels. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	NR[xxvii]	O	O BFT X rest	O[39]	X

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
4. Review existing capacity against the best available scientific advice on sustainable levels of catch and implement measures to address any overcapacity identified. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O[xxvi] / NR[xxvii]	O	O	O[68]	O (and F)
5. Each tuna RFMO consider implementing where appropriate a freeze on fishing capacity on a fishery by fishery basis. Such a freeze should not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries by developing coastal States. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	X / NR[xxvii]	O	O	O[40]	O
6. Develop measures of capacity and, in the absence of an agreed capacity definition, adopt the FAO definition "The amount of fish (or fishing effort) that can be produced over a period of time (e.g. a year or a fishing season) by a vessel or a fleet if fully utilised and for a given resource condition." (Kobe II Management Workshop)	X[xxvii]	O	X (meth. Definition)	O[41]	O
7. Review and develop management regimes, based inter alia on the concept of fishing rights for fisheries under the RFMOs' competence. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O[xxviii]	O	O	O[42]	O
8. Consider using right-based management approaches and other approaches as part of a 'tool box' to address the aspirations of developing states, overfishing, overcapacity and allocation. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O[xxviii]	O	O	O[43]	O
9. The tuna RFMOs should ensure a constant exchange of information with regard to the capacity of fleets operating within their zones as well as the mechanisms to manage this capacity. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O[xxix]	O	O	O[44]	O (and F)
10. Each tRFMO Secretariat annually measure existing capacity in tuna fisheries under its jurisdiction and monitor where that capacity is used and by whom. The results of this work should be referred to the respective Commission for its consideration. (Kobe III)	O[xxvi] / NR[xxx]	O[7]	F	O[69]	F
11. By 2013 each tRFMO establish a record of vessels, by gear type, actively fishing for stocks under its jurisdiction, and that all tRFMO Secretariats coordinate the establishment of a common vessel database linked, to the extent possible, to the existing consolidated list of active vessels, taking into account the requirements of each tRFMO for vessel registration. (Kobe III)	O[xxxi]	O[8]	O	O[70]	X[4]

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
12. Developed fishing members freeze large-scale purse-seine capacity under their flag. Based on the status of the stocks, each tRFMO should consider a scheme for: • Reduction of overcapacity in a way that does not constrain the access to, development of, and benefit from sustainable tuna fisheries, including on the high seas, by developing coastal States, in particular small island developing States, territories, and States with small and vulnerable economies; and • Transfer of capacity from developed fishing members to developing coastal fishing members within its area of competence where appropriate. (Kobe III)	NR[xxxii]	O[9]	O (for some species only)	O[73]	O (and F)[5]
Capacity Building					
1. Enhance the ability of developing coastal States, in particular small island developing States, territories, and States with small and vulnerable economies, to conserve and manage highly migratory fish stocks and to develop their own fisheries for such stocks; enable them to participate in high seas fisheries for such stocks, including facilitating access to such fisheries; and to facilitate their participation in the work of tuna RFMOs and relevant technical Workshops. The Workshops agreed will consider how to address this principle. (Kobe II Course of Actions)		O[10]	O	O[**45**]	O
2. Where determined by a Tuna RFMO, a review of the effectiveness of capacity-building assistance already provided should be undertaken. Reviews of tuna scientific management capacity in developing countries, within the framework of the respective RFMO may also be conducted at their request. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	NR	F	O	O[**46**]	X
3. Developed countries should strengthen in a sustained manner their financial and technical support for capacity-building in developing countries, notably small island developing States, on the basis of adequate institutional arrangements in those countries and making full use of local, sub-regional and regional synergies. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[xxxiii]	F	O	O[**47**]	O (and F)
4. Tuna RFMOs should have assistance funds that cover various forms of capacity-building (e.g. training of technicians and scientists, scholarships and fellowships, attendance to meetings, institutional building, development of fisheries). (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[xxxiii]	O[11]	O	O[**48**]	O
5. Tuna RFMOs, if necessary, should ensure regular training of technicians for collecting and processing of data for developing states, notably those where tuna is landed. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	O[xxxiii]	O	O	O[**49**]	O
6. The structural weaknesses in the receiving mechanism for capacity building within a country should be improved by working closely with Tuna RFMOs. (Kobe II Science Workshop)	X	F	O	O	X

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
7. Provide technical assistance and capacity building support to assist developing countries in implementing existing CDSs and any expanded CDS, including ensuring that capacity building funds that currently exist in RFMOs can be used for this purpose. (Kobe II MCS Worksop)	O[xxxiii]	O[12]	X	NR[50]	X
8. Acknowledging the additional or new requirements of bycatch mitigation and the need to build further capacity for implementation, in carrying out the [Kobe II Bycatch Working Group recommendations], consider capacity building programs for developing countries to assist in their implementation. Establish a list of existing capacity building programs related to bycatch issues to avoid duplication where possible and facilitate coordination of new capacity building programs. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	X	O[13]	X	X	O
9. tRFMOs, developed States, and NGOs accelerate efforts to provide capacity building assistance through various means, including workshops, to implement CDS, port state measures, and data collection and to participate in the scientific work. (Kobe III)	O[xxxiii]	O[14]	O (psm = F)	O[75]	F (and X)[6]
COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT					
Compliance					
1. The implementation of a robust compliance review mechanism within each RFMO recording the actions by the Parties and non Contracting Parties	O	O	O[12I]	O[51]	O
2. The tuna RFMO Secretariats continue their collaboration to advance implementation of a combined vessel register that incorporates a unique vessel identifier (UVI). The Secretariats will advance this through meetings of their members and on-going collaboration with the competent organizations concerned	O	O	O	O[52]	O
3. To start work between RFMOs on harmonising and making compatible the procedures and criteria for the listing and delisting from the respective RFMO IUU list	O[xxxiv]	F	O[13I]	O[76]	X
4. Develop a consistent enforceable regime for sanctions and penalties	O[xxxv]	X	F	X	XF
5. The tRFMO Secretariats continue their efforts on the development of a consolidated list of authorized vessels, including the implementation of unique vessels identifier (UVIs). Coordinate these efforts with the Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nation's (FAO) effort to develop and implement a global record of fishing vessels, refrigerated transport vessels, and supply vessels. (Kobe III)	O[xxxvi]	F	F	O[71]	O (and F)[7]
6. The tRFMOs establish a common format for assessing compliance with data reporting requirements. Furthermore, to facilitate compliance, all tRFMOs streamline and harmonize their reporting formats, procedures, and timing. (Kobe III)	X[xxxvii]	F	O	X	X

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
Eliminate IUU fishing					
1. The establishment of a global Register of active vessels, with contributions by the five RFMOs. This list will not be understood as providing individual or collective fishing rights. It will be without prejudice to any system of rights provided for in the existing RFMOs. The preparation of this list will be coordinated by the Secretariats of the tuna RFMOs. (Kobe II Course of Actions)	X[xxxviii]	F	O	O[**53**]	F
2. Develop publicly available authorised and active vessel (to be determined by individual RFMOs) lists for all gears. These lists will include small-scale fishing vessels that are capable of catching significant amounts of fish under the competency of tuna RFMOs. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O (SWO-BFT)[14I]	O[**54**]	O
3. Encourage secretariats to continue their work on the global list of tuna vessels, including the assignment of a unique vessel identifier. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O[15I]	O[**55**]	O
4. tRFMOs cooperate to harmonize illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) vessel listing criteria, processes, and procedures, to the maximum extent possible, and move towards adopting principles, criteria, and procedures for cross-listing IUU vessels that are listed on the IUU list of other tRFMOs, taking into account the principles in Annex 5. (Kobe III)	O[xxxiv]	F[15]	O	X	F[8]
Advance Performance in MCS, Vessel Monitoring Systems, Transhipment					
1. Review and strengthen their MCS framework to improve the integrity of their management regime and measures. (Kobe II Management Workshop)	O	O	O[17I]	O[**57**]	O
2. Where they do not already exist, establish standards for the format, content, structure and frequency of VMS messages. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	NR[xxxix]	NR	O[18I]	O[**58**]	O
3. Ensure there are no gaps in geographic coverage in regional VMS programs, and all relevant vessel types and sizes participate in VMS programs while on the high seas. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	F	O[19I]	O[**59**]	O
4. Cooperate with other tuna RFMOs to standardize transhipment declaration forms so that they use, to the maximum extent possible, the same format and include the same required data fields, as well as develop minimum standards for the timeframes by which such Declarations are submitted to RFMO Secretariats, flag States, coastal States, and port States. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	O	O	O[**60**]	O[9]

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
5. Establish that advance notifications must be provided to the relevant tuna RFMO Secretariat for those high seas transshipment activities that are permitted by that RFMO's measures (for example, 36 hours in advance of the transhipment operation taking place). (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	O	O	X[61]	O
Observers					
1. RFMOs are encouraged to support the establishment of regional observer programs which could be built on existing national programs. It is the responsibility of each RFMO to clearly establish the purpose and scope of the information collected by its regional observer program, such as whether it will be used to support scientific or monitoring functions, or both, and then define the specific observer tasks and duties appropriate for that particular purpose and scope. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	X[xl]	O	O[20l]	O[62]	O
2. There are specific aspects of observer programs that could benefit from the development of minimum standards or procedures that if utilized by tuna RFMOS could promote comparable observer-generated data.		O	O	O[63]	O
3. Where appropriate and practical, subject all gear types in high seas fishing operations to observer coverage while adopting a minimum of 5% coverage as an initial level. Observer coverage rates should be evaluated and may be adjusted depending on the scope and objectives of each observer program or particular conservation and management measures. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	O	O	O[64]	O
4. Exchange information and examples of the standards developed in each program. These should include: a) Training material and procedures; b) On-board reference materials; c) Health and safety issues; d) Rights, and responsibilities of vessel operators, masters, crew and observers; e) Data collection, storage and dissemination including where appropriate between RFMOs; f) Debriefing protocols and procedures; g) Reporting formats – especially for target and by-catch species; h) Basic qualifications and experience of observers. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	NR[xli]	O	O	O	O (and F)
5. Implement/enhance observer and port sampling programs with sufficient coverage to quantify/estimate bycatch and require timely reporting to inform mitigation needs and support conservation and management objectives, addressing practical and financial constraints. (Kobe II Bycatch Workshop)	O[xlii]	O	X	O[72]	O
Port State Measures					

LEGEND The following letters correspond to the descriptions indicated: **O =** "In progress/Complete"; **F =** "Planned or agreed to commence in the future"; **X** = "Limited or no progress at the present time and future work yet to be determined"; **NR** = "Not relevant or of little relevance to this RFMO at the present time". Additional footnotes are provided where necessary.	**CCSBT**	**IATTC**	**ICCAT**	**IOTC**	**WCPFC**
1. Encourage RFMO Members to consider signing and ratifying the FAO Port State Measures Agreement at their earliest opportunity. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	X[xliii]	X	X	O[77]	O
2. Where they do not already exist, where appropriate, adopt port State control measures that are consistent with the FAO Port State Measures Agreement, and that take into account the specific characteristics and circumstances of each RFMO. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O[xliv]	F	F	O**[65]**	O (and F)
Catch Documentation Schemes (CDS)					
1. Establish or expand the use of CDS to fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species and sharks not currently covered by an existing CDS and to which current conservation and management measures apply, taking into account the specific characteristics and circumstances of each RFMO. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O[xlv]	O	O[21I]	X**[66]**	O[10]
2. Ensure compatibility between new or expanded CDS and existing certification schemes already implemented by coastal, port and importing States. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	NR[xlvi]	F	X	NR	O
3. Develop a common/harmonized form for use across RFMOs and the use of electronic systems and tags to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and utility of a CDS. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O / NR[xlvii]	X	F	NR	F
4. Take into account fish caught by purse seine fisheries and delivered to processing plants when implementing an expanded CDS. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	NR	O	O	NR	O
5. Consider a tagging system for fresh and chilled products to improve the implementation of new or expanded CDS. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	O	O CPCs level X institutional	NR	F (and O)
6. Develop a simplified CDS form to cover catches by artisanal fisheries that are exported (see Appendix 3, EU form that could serve as an example). (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	NR[xlviii]	X	X	NR	F (and O)
7. Provide technical assistance and capacity building support to assist developing countries in implementing existing CDSs and any expanded CDS, including ensuring that capacity building funds that currently exist in RFMOs can be used for this purpose. (Kobe II MCS Workshop)	O	F	X	NR	F (and O)

KOBE RECOMMENDATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE
FOOTNOTES

Footnotes for CCSBT

[i] The CCSBT has not yet used the Kobe II Strategy Matrix, but its recent requests for advice and the scientific advice provided have included the main elements of the Strategy Matrix, including alternative time frames and the probability of meeting targets under different management regimes.
[ii] The majority of documents and much of the data are publicly available. However, fine scale data used in generation of indices and some other data and documents are not publicly available for confidentiality reasons. The Scientific Committee has recommended that it would be valuable to seek ways of addressing this issue to make the data used in the assessment more transparent.
[iii] This is of more relevance to other TRFMOs which are dealing with numerous species and stock assessments. The CCSBT conducts assessment for a single stock only. These are detailed assessments and a checklist or "standardized" executive summaries are not likely to be of significant value to the CCSBT.
[iv] Most of the relevant information for this is available through the CCSBT Management Procedure work, but not in the specific Kobe matrix format. The precise format is not a major issue for the CCSBT due to the single species nature of the CCSBT.
[v] Exchange of data and information is already happening in relevant areas, including: Exchange of authorized vessel details for the CLAV; The transhipment monitoring program, in which information is shared between ICCAT and CCSBT, and IOTC and CCSBT; Provision of high level SBT catch data and assessments by CCSBT to the other tuna RFMOs and FAO; and the MOU between CCSBT and WCPFC that includes exchange of data. Furthermore, the Draft Rules and Procedures for the Protection, Access to, and Dissemination of Data Compiled by the CCSBT contain provisions for the confidentiality of data shared with other RFMOs.
[vi] CCSBT's confidentiality rules were agreed in 2010 and used both ICCAT's and WCPFC's rules as the baseline for CCSBT's rules. Consequently there is already significant compatibility of rules between these RFMOs. Sharing of data with ICCAT and IOTC occurs for the transshipment monitoring program and between all the tRFMOs for the consolidated list of authorized vessels. There is currently no sharing of confidential data.
[vii] Data for stock assessments is provided in a timely manner. CCSBT has rules and procedures in place for access to, protection and security of data, but has not yet reached agreement on the necessity for provision of fine scale operational data. In the interim, cooperative practises operate between Member scientists to enable necessary analyses to be conducted. This includes Members with access to necessary fine scale data conducting analyses on those data requested by other Members.
[viii] CCSBT Members are working to improve existing data collection, particularly the coverage and representativeness of observer programs. Significant improvement in observer coverage levels have occurred since Kobe 3, with most Members reaching the 10% target level.
[ix] The current CCSBT program continues to collect tags, but large scale tagging activities finished in 2007.
[x] Aspects of integrating environmental and spatial modelling are important. Work on interpreting CPUE in relation to these aspects are being pursued within the CCSBT, particularly in relation to spatial fleet dynamics. Spatial ecosystem modelling may be examined in the future by individual Members.
[xi] However, if the Extended Scientific Committee or Secretariat was approached by programs such as CLIOTOP, consideration would be given within the constraints of its available resources.
[xii] Work is progressing. Aggregated observer data is now exchanged between Members on Ecologically Related Species (ERS) and risk assessments for SBT fishing on seabirds have been conducted. Further work on sharks, in particular Porbeagles, is now commencing.
[xiii] The Ecologically Related Species Working Group (ERSWG) have produced a revised draft of CCSBT's Scientific Observer Program Standards that focuses on ensuring collection of the required ERS data.
[xiv] CCSBT Members have conducted significant work evaluating the effectiveness of current bycatch mitigation measures. The ERSWG is further progressing this with the formation of a technical group to provide advice to the ERSWG on feasible, practical, timely, and effective technical approaches for measuring and monitoring the effectiveness of seabird mitigation measures in SBT longline fisheries.

[xv] Identification of research priorities is part of the ongoing work of the CCSBT Ecologically Related Species Working group. It should also be noted that the priorities for certain research differs between Members depending on their particular circumstances.
[xvi] Within the CCSBT, the research is conducted by the Members (not the RFMO), and the Members develop such collaborations as appropriate to their work.
[xvii] CCSBT does not use the K2SM but it actively addresses uncertainty in its assessments.
[xviii] The joint MSE group has been formed. CCSBT has conducted its own management strategy evaluation and has implemented a Management Procedure for recommending TACs. Joint work with other tRFMOs is a low priority for the CCSBT itself, but CCSBT scientists have agreed to be involved in the joint work on a cooperative basis. Work in this area will also be conducted as part of the GEF funded ABNJ project.
[xix] CCSBT does not have a Convention Area, nor a mandate for management of sharks unless caught as a bycatch to SBT fishing. Nevertheless, CCSBT has adopted the shark related measures of ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC for when fishing in those Convention Areas.
[xx] Instead of different specific measures of its own, the CCSBT has adopted a "harmonized" approach requiring its Members to comply with all binding and recommended bycatch measures of ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC when fishing in those Convention Areas. Most CCSBT mitigation measures are highly recommended (as opposed to mandatory) due to a lack of lack of consensus as to whether CCSBT has a mandate to make binding resolutions on bycatch matters.
[xxi] CCSBT has implemented a mandatory exchange of aggregated ERS data collected by scientific observers.
[xxii] Many of these principles are used, but they have not been formally adopted and are mainly non-binding (although strongly recommended).
[xxiii] The SBT stock is at low levels, but the CCSBT has undergone a management strategy evaluation process and has subsequently implemented a management procedure designed to have a 70% probability of rebuilding the SBT stock to its interim rebuilding target of 20% SSB_0 by 2035.
[xxiv] The Chair and Vice Chair of the CCSBT rotate on an annual basis and sometimes the Chair may not have been appointed when Kobe related issues arise and sometimes the nominated Chair might not have previous experience of the CCSBT. Consequently, CCSBT has agreed that the Chairing and Vice Chairing Members may nominate alternatives with CCSBT experience to represent the Chair and Vice Chair at Kobe Steering Committee (KSC) meetings and for the Chair's representative to report the KSC meetings outcomes back to the CCSBT.
[xxv] CCSBT does not have a Convention Area and the SBT fishery distribution overlaps with the Convention Areas of ICCAT, IOTC and WCPFC. Therefore, there will be movement of SBT vessels between RFMO Areas.
[xxvi] The majority of CCSBT Members have either completed a self-assessment of capacity in relation to their allocation or have undertaken to complete a self-assessment by October 2014.
[xxvii] The SBT fishery is managed by a global TAC and national allocations of the TAC. Most Members also have IQ or ITQ systems for SBT. Capacity or effort control is therefore not the primary management measure for CCSBT as it is in some other RFMOs, and is currently of lower priority.
[xxviii] The CCSBT management approach contains elements of a rights-based management regime, with national allocations of a global quota and 5 of the 6 Members managing their allocation with an IQ or ITQ system. Further elements are required for full rights-based management, but these are considered as and when required.
[xxix] Capacity related information is now regularly exchanged for the Consolidated List of Authorised Vessels. CCSBT manages capacity indirectly through national allocations of a global TAC.
[xxx] The CCSBT does not have a closed authorized vessel register, so an annual assessment of capacity by the Secretariat would be difficult. In addition, because of the TAC management regime and the use of IQs or ITQs by most Members, capacity has not been considered a priority for CCSBT and there are no plans for an annual measurement.
[xxxi] The CCSBT has an active vessel list (http://www.ccsbt.org/site/active_vessels.php) in place. However, a joint active vessel list has yet to be established amongst the tRFMOs.
[xxxii] Purse seining for SBT is currently only conducted by a few vessels for farming purposes and is under ITQ controls.
[xxxiii] Certain CCSBT Members have been and continue to provide support and training for CCSBT's single developing country Member. CCSBT has also recently provided both scientific and compliance workshops in that country and for the last two years has included a provision for ad-hoc support to developing States in the CCSBT's budget. Finally, CCSBT is currently running an independent Quality Assurance Review on certain compliance systems of its one developing Member, the results of which are expected to enable CCSBT to better target its future assistance.

[xxxiv] At the time of Kobe 3, the CCSBT did not maintain an IUU vessel list. The CCSBT adopted an IUU vessel list Resolution during October 2013 and this Resolution contains a provision that will enable cross-listing with other tRFMOs on a case by case basis. The CCSBT's IUU vessel list Resolution is based on those of the other tRFMOs, so it is harmonised to the extent possible.
[xxxv] The CCSBT has developed and adopted a Corrective Actions Policy.
[xxxvi] IOTC is the lead tRFMO for this work. Further work is being supported by the GEF funded ABNJ project and all tRFMOs are being included in this work.
[xxxvii] Harmonised reporting formats (including data submission) could have considerable benefits, but it would also involve major work from all involved to implement new formats – e.g. significant changes to data submission/loading code, possible changes to the meaning of certain data items and possible re-submission of historic data etc. CCSBT considered that this is a low priority on the basis of the significant effort and disruption involved rather than the usefulness of the concept. However, if all tRFMOs showed a strong commitment to this recommendation, then this priority would be reconsidered.
[xxxviii] CCSBT has an active vessel register, but it is not aware of any work underway to develop a global register of active vessels.
[xxxix] CCSBT's VMS resolution adopts the VMS systems of IOTC, WCPFC, ICCAT and CCAMLR and modifications to those systems that are adopted by these RFMOs from time to time. Any standards set in those systems will thus become standards for CCSBT's VMS.
[xl] The CCSBT has Scientific Observer Program standards with a target coverage of 10%. Most Members are now achieving this target.
[xli] During and after the development of the CCSBT observer program standards, this type of information was exchanged between Member programs and with some other RFMOs. It may be an appropriate time to repeat this exchange process, both between Members/CNMs and RFMOs. However, without a specific goal for the exchange it is unlikely that the exchange will achieve a concrete result and much of the information will be ignored. It was therefore suggested that exchange of information be encouraged and supported, but only in response to a request for such information from a Member/CNM or another RFMO.
[xlii] CCSBT's has a 10% target observer coverage and most Members are now achieving this target. However, this coverage may not be sufficient for rare bycatch events. CCSBT Members have recently commenced reporting aggregated ERS data from scientific observers as part of a mandatory data exchange process.
[xliii] However, 3 of the 6 Members have already signed the agreement.
[xliv] CCSBT is currently in the process of discussing a Port State Measures Resolution for the CCSBT. In the interim, other measures such as the CDS and authorised vessel/farm resolutions impose significant obligations on port States.
[xlv] The CCSBT has implemented a CDS for SBT. It would not be able to implement an effective CDS for tuna-like species or sharks because its mandate does not extend to tuna like species or sharks except as an Ecologically Related Species when fishing for SBT.
[xlvi] The CCSBT is unlikely to implement new or expanded CDS schemes (to other species), therefore this is not currently relevant.
[xlvii] The CCSBT CDS already utilises tags and allows Members/CNMs to submit information electronically. CCSBT's current focus is to improve its own system. Development of a harmonised form is more of a longer term objective.
[xlviii] This was raised in the context of an expanded CDS, which is unlikely in the case of CCSBT because CCSBT's system is already comprehensive.

Footnotes for IATTC

1 The Stock Synthesis assessment files are available on request. The stock assessment reports are published online in draft form for the meetings of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) and in final form in the Stock Assessment Report series.
2 The Kobe Strategy Matrix has been evaluated for bigeye and yellowfin tuna
3 A Memorandum of Cooperation on the exchange and release of data between the IATTC and the WCPFC has been in force since December 2009.
4 A report (Document SAC-04-09a) on the application of K2SM and the related decision analysis was presented at the 4th meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in May 2013

5IATTC staff members participate in the joint MSE working group. Also, the staff prepared a report (Document SAC-05-10b) for the 5th meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in May 2014; a preliminary MSE has been applied to north Pacific bluefin tuna, and is planned for other species
6 At the 5th meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in May 2014, staff made recommendations regarding harvest control rules (Document SAC-05-16)
7 Within IATTC, issues related to capacity are addressed first by the Permanent Working Group on Capacity that was established for this purpose and has already met on fourteen occasions. Reports are commonly presented on the capacity of the tuna fleet, including calculations and recommendations on optimal target capacity. Special workshops are also organized, the latest one in April 2014.
8 See previous footnote, also more information on vessel database at https://www.iattc.org/VesselListsENG.htm. The IATTC Regional Vessel Register, which is precise, detailed, comprehensive and constantly updated, was established in 2000. Vessels are classified by flag and gear.
9 Resolution C-02-03 establishes vessel capacity limit rules in the IATTC area of competence. The modifications that have been made to the resolution are described this presentation, which also shows that most of the capacity in the EPO belongs to developing flag States, and more particularly to developing coastal States of the region, and not to developed fishing States. The purpose of the workshops referred to in the previous footnote is to provide inputs to the IATTC for a scheme for reducing overcapacity which would update and strengthen the *Plan for Regional Management of Fishing Capacity* that it adopted in June 2005.
10 Capacity building is an active area of effort by staff, see the capacity building section in Document SAC-05-15
11 IATTC has created a fund to assist developing countries. This fund was recently used to support the participation of scientists in the meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in May 2014.
12 See previous footnote
13 See previous footnote
14 See previous footnote
15 Presently IATTC prepares and adopts its own IUU vessel list in accordance with the provisions of its Resolution C-05-07 (June 2005). Collaboration among the tuna RFMOs in this matter is still limited to an exchange of such lists.

Footnotes for ICCAT

[1I] In 2009 the Commission requested the SCRS to conduct a pilot application of the Kobe strategy matrix (Res. 09-12).
[2I] Since 2009 strategy matrix are included as part of the assessment outputs.
[3I] Exchange of data and information is already happening in relevant areas: a) The transhipment monitoring program, in which information is shared between CCSBT, and IOTC; b) eBCD, ICCAT is working to establish an electronic system for the bluefin catch document, this system is expected to be extend to other species as well as to the IOTC, c) Rules and procedures for the protection, access to, and dissemination of data compiled by ICCAT contain provisions for the confidentiality of data shared with other RFMOs. d) ICCAT participate in the CLAV (consolidated list of authorized fishing vessels) project since 2005.
[4I] ICCAT adopted in 2010 the Rules and procedures for the protection, access to, and dissemination of data compiled by ICCAT "Data Confidentiality Policy" that will provide access to the SCRS of more detailed fishery and biology related information.
[5I] A 5% of observer coverage for longliners over 24 m has been adopted by ICCAT (Rec. 04-01).
[6I] ICCAT participated in the International working group on tuna purse seine and baitboat catch species composition derived from observer and port sampler data, joint WG held in 2009 as well as in the joint 2011 ISSF meeting.
[7I] Some of the ICCAT stock assessments (SKJ, ALB, BET) have been peer reviewed.
[8I] ICCAT has conducted a full assessment on the impact of tuna fisheries on sea birds and is preparing similar work for sea turtles. ICCAT has also conducted Risk Assessment evaluations for less common catch of sharks species.
[9I] ICCAT has adopted several recommendations regarding the data collection of by catch species (including turtles, sea birds…) and minimum scientific observer coverage.
[10I] ICCAT Contracting Parties, non-Contracting Parties, Entities and Fishing Entities have been encouraged to conduct research programs on technological improvements in the various fishing gears, which promote the maximum reduction in mortality of by catch species. Mitigation measures such as the mandatory use of tori-line for

longliners in specific areas (Rec. 07-07) have been already adopted by ICCAT. Also, measures for the release of live non-target species such billfish from main longline fleets.

[11I] NGOs regularly attend the ICCAT meetings as observers. In addition the assessment of the impact of the tuna fisheries on the sea birds populations was conducted jointly with ACAP. NGOs do actively participate in the scientific meetings of the SCRS ICCAT.

[12I] The Conservation and Management Measures Compliance Committee (COC) and the Permanent Working Group for the Improvement of ICCAT Statistics and Conservation measures (PWG) examine annually compliance with ICCAT conservation and management measures by Contracting Parties (COC) and non Contracting Parties (PWG). Since 2009, further to the review by the Commission of full and effective compliance of ICCAT obligations by the respective Contracting Parties, the Commission Chair and the COC Chair send a letter of concern or a letter of identification to CPCs pointing out lack of data reporting and non-compliance issues. Contracting Parties have then to review data deficiencies and rectify lapses in compliance before the next annual meeting of the Commission in which improvement shall be assessed.

[13I] In 2010, the PWG considered the development of guidance on the implementation of provisions of ICCAT Recommendation 09-10 that allow ICCAT to incorporate other tuna RFMOs IUU vessel lists into the ICCAT IUU list.

[14I] Established by ICCAT Recommendations 09-04 (SWO) and 10-04 (BFT).

[15I] The ICCAT Secretariat has participated in November 2010 in the "FAO Technical Consultation to Identify a Structure and Strategy for the Development and Implementation of the Global Record of Fishing Vessels, Refrigerated Transport Vessels and Supply Vessels".

[16I] ICCAT has adopted capacity measures for E-BFT by which Contracting Parties have established management plan for 2010-2013 (refer to Recommendation 10-04).

[17I] The ICCAT Working Group on integrated monitoring measures met in February 2010 to consider, among other issues, Port State measures and inspection scheme.

[18I]. ICCAT Recommendation 07-08 stipulates the format for the communication of VMS messages by fishing vessels.

[19I] Fishing vessels involved in E-BFT fisheries have to transmit VMS messages (refer to ICCAT Recommendation 10-04).

[20I] In 2006 ICCAT adopted a Programme for Transhipment (by ICCAT Recommendation 06-11) that requires that all transhipments of ICCAT species take place in port, unless they are properly monitored under the ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (ROP). The ROP is currently limited to large-scale longline vessels of Parties/Entities that participate in it.

In addition, since April 2010, ICCAT has implemented the ICCAT Regional Observer Programme (BFT-ROP) for bluefin tuna in the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean to ensure 100% coverage of purse seine vessels over 24 meters during all the annual fishing season, of all purse seiners involved in joint fishing operations, irrespective of the length of the vessels, during all transfer of bluefin tuna to the cages and all harvest of fish from the cage. The BFT-ROP establishes obligations for the observer (among others: monitor purse seine vessels' compliance with ICCAT conservation and management measures and collect Task II data based on the directives from the SCRS – refer to ICCAT Recommendation 10-04).

[21I] Since 2009, through ICCAT Recommendation 08-12 (amended by ICCAT Recommendation 09-11), ICCAT has implemented a Bluefin tuna catch documentation scheme to identify the origin of any bluefin tuna in order to support the implementation of ICCAT conservation and management measures. ICCAT Recommendation 10-11 stipulates that an electronic Blue Fin Tuna Catch Documentation System (eBCD) shall be developed to cover all bluefin tuna caught, farmed, harvested and traded. Since January 2011 a Working Group on e-BCD is examining the technical specifications of an eBCD system.

Footnotes for IOTC

1. SC continues to look for improved ways of conveying advice for decision making.
2. All data are routinely available through the IOTC website with datasets published at regular intervals and prior to the assessments.
3. The Secretariat keeps a repository of the programs as well as the input and output data files utilized in the assessments by the Working Parties. The Secretariat also publishes data summaries which include an assessment of the quality of the data in the IOTC databases.
4. The Executive Summaries used by the IOTC continue to undergo annual revision and improvement. .
5. A K2SM has accompanied the advice for all stock assessments where possible, since 2010.
6. There are three basic ways to distribute information, depending on the intended audience: for the scientific community, through the Report of the Scientific Committee; for decision makers, through the Executive Summaries; for the general Public; through the Summary Table published in the Scientific Committee Report and on the IOTC Website stock status dashboard.
7. In progress
8. Information is routinely exchanged with other RFMOs and the FAO concerning fisheries statistics, the List of IUU vessels, the information on authorized vessels (through the CLAV), and in coordination of the transhipment monitoring programme activities between oceans, with confidentiality provisions where applicable. The IOTC has recently extended is data confidentiality policy and procedures to incorporate provisions for all types of data in the IOTC databases and some of this provisions are in line with those existing in other t-RFMOs.
9. The Compliance Committee was strengthened in 2011 and country-based assessments of compliance are conducted. The Scientific Committee and the Working Parties also identify the major fleets not complying with the data reporting requirements. The IOTC Secretariat has implemented several capacity building activities to assist IOTC CPCs with their data requirements.
10. All data submissions by IOTC members are done electronically. Basic data formats requirements have been similar to those of other RFMOs. Data forms and reporting guidelines are published in the IOTC website.
11. This has been only partially done. While operational level data is available for national scientists of the flag states, there is limited collaboration with scientists from other member states that would involve access to operational (logbook) data.
12. IOTC Members have adopted binding resolutions concerning the types of data, and submission timelines to be respected by the Members. The quality, completeness and timeliness of the submissions are reviewed by the Scientific and the Compliance Committees, and non-compliant fleets are identified. Data reports are regularly cross-checked against data from alternative data sources (e.g. processing plants, third-party reports, etc.).
13. A Regional Observers Scheme was adopted in 2010 aimed at placing observers vessels, targeting 5% coverage. In the Indian Ocean, the importance of the artisanal fisheries (~50% of catches), means that port sampling schemes are also required for small-scale fisheries that cannot carry on-board observers. However, sampling levels, in particular for catch-and-effort and length, remain low for most IOTC fisheries/fleets.
14. For the past ten years, IOTC has been cooperating with the Overseas Fishery Cooperation Foundation of Japan to improve statistical systems in developing CPCs in the Indian Ocean. Sampling programmes are being implemented for artisanal fisheries (see above). An established sampling design has been implemented in industrial tuna purse seine vessels since several years ago, covering the majority of the industrial purse seine catch.
15. Processors associated with the International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) have reported commercial data that has allowed comparisons with official statistics from IOTC Members. Since many years ago, information from port sampling projects conducted by the Secretariat have been routinely used in estimating catches of non-reporting fleets.
16. The IOTC, in collaboration with the Commission de l'Ocean Indien and several IOTC Members completed in 2008 the Indian Ocean Tuna Tagging Programme that tagged almost 200,000 fish of the main three species. This data are an essential contribution to the assessments of the main species.
17. There are several projects in the Indian Ocean, especially in the western IO, involving the release of archival tags in the main species. The total number to date is in excess of 250 archival tags.
18. Stock assessment methods (MULTIFAN-CL; SS3) applied in the main tuna species (yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna) incorporate spatial structure. One spatial management measure (time-area closure) has been adopted although there is little evidence to suggest it is effective.
19. Scientists are working in the application of ecosystem-based models (e.g. APECOS; SEAPODYM)
20. The SC has discussed this several times, though no commitment has yet been made to undertake formal review. Invited Experts are brought to each Working Party meeting where an assessment is undertaken, to act as an informal peer reviewer.

[21.] Regularly, several models, with different data requirements and assumptions are applied in the IOTC assessments, as well as analyses of other status indicators in the formulation of the scientific advice.
[22.] Minimum standards have been adopted and reviewed by the Scientific Committee. These are communicated to all those undertaking assessments each year as guidelines and minimum standards
[23.] For the past ten years, the Secretariat has collaborated with OFCF in improvement human capacity in coastal states and improving data collection in almost 20 countries of the region.
[24.] Data from observer programmes has been analysed to obtain estimates of bycatch for some purse seine and longline fleets. However, the amount of data available is still very low for most fleets and therefore of limited use.
[25.] IOTC has adopted minimum data standards for the collection of data under its Regional Observer Scheme. Observer schemes are mandated to collect information on bycatch species.
[26.] IOTC Secretariat normally invites or encourages recognized scientists to attend its meetings to increase available expertise at the Working Parties.
[27.] IOTC Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch routinely reviews information on the effectiveness on existing measures from research. Several initiatives are being conducted in the region to explore mitigation measures.
[28.] Member scientists, NGO's, Industry and the IOTC Secretariat have collaborated on several projects to test and identify suitable mitigation measures for seabirds, marine turtles and sharks. The Commission has adopted some of these in binding Resolutions and others will continue to be tested. An Indian Ocean Shark research program is also being developed which will include the testing of possible catch mitigation measures.
[29.] There are several initiatives currently in place to address these issues, such as the bycatch work by ISSF, WWF. See the above point for additional information. Progress on these initiatives is followed by the WPEB.
[30.]

Ban of retention of thresher sharks and oceanic whitetip sharks adopted in 2010 and 2013, respectively. The Commission annually considered additional measures. Secretariat's work in support of data collection includes collection of data about sharks at the species level.

[31.] Non-IOTC species of concern have received protection in various forms by the Commission. See point above. Measures for mitigation of incidental mortality of seabirds have been adopted and revised. However, in 2013 the Commission agreed to recruit a Fisheries Officer to support the IOTC observer schemes.
[32.] Mitigation measures have been adopted to protect seabirds, cetaceans marine turtles. IOTC Members collect information on bycatch species, especially pelagic sharks. This data is required to be collected and reported using the same standards as those of IOTC species.
[33.] Although requests for a bycatch officer post to be created at the Secretariat was not agreed upon, several of the regular activities concerning data collection and observer schemes are consistent with this requirement.
[34.] The effectiveness of limits on fishing capacity adopted in 2006 and 2007 will be affected by the extent that the implementation of Fleet Development Plans increase current capacity.
[35.] The effectiveness of the time-area closure adopted by the Commission in 2010, was evaluated as being 'ineffective' by the Scientific Committee at its 2011, 2012 and 2013 Sessions. Unless the closure area is modified, it is highly unlikely to be of use for stock sustainability purposes.
[36.] All major stocks are assessed and their status is available on the IOTC websites, Stock Status Dashboard.
[37.] Limits on fishing capacity were established in 2006 and 2007, with clauses that contemplate, in principle, the rights of developing coastal States. The IOTC Members commenced in 2011 work on a mechanism for the allocation of fishing opportunities, though this process has encountered many difficulties and delays.
[38.] Only vessels that have been in the Record of Vessels of other RFMOs (and not in any IUU list) can be transferred to the IOTC area.
[39.] The measures adopted in control of fishing capacity are based and monitored on the basis of active vessels only.
[40.] These principles were implemented in the resolutions on control of fishing capacity.
[41.] The implicit definition utilized is the overall tonnage (measured in GRT or GT) of the vessel or fleet involved.
[42.] A management regime based on allocation of fishing rights among IOTC Members is under consideration by Members.
[43.] See reference 42
[44.] The consolidation of the lists of authorized vessels by all T-RFMOs is a step in developing information exchange mechanisms. The list of active vessels of IOTC is available from its website.
[45.] The Secretariat provides training and support in cooperation with various initiatives in the region. A Meeting Participation Fund was adopted in 2010 that is being used to support participation of developing states in the activities of the Commission. The IOTC has also devoted additional funds to assist developing CPCs with the implementation of their observer schemes in 2014 an 2015 (pending budget approval in June 2014).

[46.] The final reports of the cooperation projects undertaken by the Secretariat with the support of Japan (IOTC-OFCF Project), includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of the assistance provided. Similar evaluations are conducted in other cooperative projects (IOC-SmartFish, BOBLME, etc.).
[47.] There are multiple initiatives to support capacity building, directly through the IOTC Secretariat in cooperation with regional initiatives funded by developed Member countries, and through bilateral arrangements (e.g. access agreements) between countries of the region and distant-water fishing nations.
[48.] See above for the various cooperative projects currently in place
[49.] See above for the various cooperative projects currently in place
[50.] IOTC has not adopted a Catch Documentation Scheme
[51.] The Compliance Committee has been reinforced in 2011, expanding its work to include country-by-country review of the compliance situation, including identification of the areas for improvement.
[52.] The IOTC Secretariat has coordinated joint-t-RFMO work on the Global Consolidated List.of Authorized Vessels (CLAV), and allocation of Unique Vessel Identifiers to all vessels authorized by t-RFMOs. At present the IOTC Secretariat is coordinating this work with the support of the ABNJ Project and the plan is to make updates of the CLAV possible in near real-time by the end of 2014.
[53.] IOTC has a Record of Active Vessels that is published in the IOTC website.
[54.] Completed. The lists include small-scale vessels that operate outside the EEZ of the Members
[55.] See above
[56.] The controls on fishing capacity in IOTC are done on the basis of active vessels.
[57.] IOTC is the only RFMO that has adopted a Port State measure similar to the FAO binding PSM Agreement. The strengthening of the Compliance Committee also creates an incentive to improve the implementation of the measures by the Members
[58.] The structure (format) of the message is not provided.
[59.] Size limit for the application of the IOTC VMS is 15 m LOA. Although no regional VMS exists currently, implementation at national level should provide coverage of the whole region, including the high seas
[60.] All concerned RFMOs are using more or less the same transhipment declaration forms and reporting timeline.
[61.] Advance notification is provided to the flag state
[62.] IOTC adopted a scientific Regional Observer Scheme, based on national implementation, to improve on the catch statistics of target and bycatch species. The Scheme also includes a port sampling component for the case of artisanal fisheries.
[63.] The data collection standards proposed were partly based on a comparison with those existing in other RFMOs.
[64.] The Resolution establishing the Scheme came into force on July 1st 2010. To date, no evaluation of observer coverage levels has been conducted.
[65.] IOTC has its own implementation through Res 10/11, consistent with the FAO Agreement.
[66.] Proposals have been tabled by Members but no agreement was reached at the last two sessions of the Commission.
[67.] Some IOTC CPCs and non-members report data that falls short of the IOTC requirements. In recent years, the IOTC Secretariat has assisted some CPCs to improve reporting and work is ongoing in other countries.
[68.] In 2013 the IOTC estimated levels of input capacity in the Indian Ocean in recent years and future levels using the information provided by IOTC CPCs in their fleet development plans. However, the information available is not sufficient to estimate optimum levels and provide the Commission with advice on those levels.
[69.] Ditto 68. Assessment is carried out on an annual basis and presented to the Compliance Committee/Commission.
[70.] Ditto 53
[71.] Ditto 52
[72.] Ditto 45

[73.] Various measures have been adopted aimed at reducing bycatch of threatened and endangered species (marine turtle, sea birds, sharks and cetaceans).
[74.] A freeze in capacity for tropical tuna (based on capacity at 2006 level) invariably targets the purse seine fishery. There is no restriction in transfer of capacity from developed to developing States, provided that the vessels to be transferred are not in any IUU list.
[75.] Capacity building activities have been undertaken in various member States for the implementation of port State Measures. The Republic of Korea, a member State of the IOTC has organized a workshop on port State measures. The Secretariat has planned Regional workshops for the future.
[76.] Delisting procedures from the IUU vessels list, which are similar to some of the other RFMOs, have been incorporated in the concerned IOTC resolution.
[77.] Ditto 65

Footnotes for WCPFC

1 WCPFC presently has MOUs with a number of RFMOs, which includes provisions for data exchanges
2 Compliance with scientific data provision rules, including with reporting deadlines, are reviewed and assessed through the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme.
3 Additional work is expected to commence in 2014/15 to cross-check data with market, landings and processing
4 WCPFC currently has a record of authorized fishing vessels (CMM 2013-10), which includes both active and inactive fishing vessels. This is an area of work that is expected to commence once the Commission has taken decisions on how to manage fishing capacity.
5 CMM 2013-01 included provisions to limit the number of purse seine vessels larger than 24m with freezing capacity operating between 20N and 20S at current levels (CMM 2013-01 para 49). Paragraph 54 of CMM 2013-01 says that "CCMs other than SIDS, shall jointly develop a scheme to jointly reduce the capacity of LSPSVs to the level of 31 December 2012 and submit to WCPFC11. " and paragraph 55 says "Nothing in this measure shall restrict the ability of SIDS to construct or purchase vessels from other CCMs for their domestic fleets."
6 Partial – WCPFC has held regular workshops on data collection and has well-established mechanisms to facilitate the participation of developing country scientists in Scientific Committee meetings. WCPFC has not yet agreed on mechanisms of assistance to implement CDS and Port State Measures, which in part is because conservation and management measures have not yet been agreed.
7 In December 2013, the WCPFC Commission agreed to include the IMO Number in the Record of Fishing Vessels (CMM 2013-04) – the footnote to paragraph 6(s) of CMM 2013-10 says "Effective 1 January 2016, flag CCMs shall ensure that all their fishing vessels that are authorized to be used for fishing in the Convention Area beyond the flag CCM's area of national jurisdiction and that are at least 100 GT or 100 GRT in size have IMO or LR numbers issued to them.". In addition WCPFC agreed to continue to explore how to ensure that all vessels of the RFV have UVIs.
8 In 2012, the WCPFC Secretariat provided the paper WCPFC-TCC8-2012-10 *Compilation and Analysis of IUU listing procedures from other RFMOs*. The WCPFC has not yet decided to adopt any changes to its WCPFC IUU listing procedures, nor agreed to a process to further progress this matter.
9 CMM 2009-06 specifies the minimum fields to be included in transshipment declarations that are submitted to WCPFC, for high seas transshipment activities. In accordance with CMM 2009-06 transshipments that occur in port and within areas under national jurisdiction are to occur in accordance with national laws of the coastal State.
10 A WCPFC Catch Documentation Scheme intersessional working group was established in December 2012, to work on the development of a WCPFC Catch Documentation Scheme that is expected to take these recommendations into account in its work.