TWELFTH REGULAR SESSION
Bali, Indonesia
3 - 8 December 2015

NOTES ON TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND TASKS

WCPFC12-2015-19b
20 November 2015

Paper by Secretariat

Introduction

1. This paper was prepared to support the Commissions consideration of the TCC11 recommendations during WCPFC12 and particularly to provide some guidance on how the recommendations might be considered in the provisional agenda for WCPFC12. The list of TCC11 recommendations are provided in in **Table 1**. The Secretariat has included cross-references to the relevant WCPFC12 provisional agenda item and WCPFC12 papers, as appropriate, as well as notes and supporting details regarding progress since TCC11.

2. Additional supporting details to support the Commissions review and consideration of certain TCC11 recommendations are also provided as Attachments to this paper:
    i) **Attachment 1**: Supporting details on the implementation of a "List of all RFV vessels WCPFC VMS reporting status" (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 211);
    ii) **Attachment 2**: Supporting details for the proposed budget on CMM booklet for ROP observers (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 257); and
    iii) **Attachment 3**: Consideration of the proposed Mass Balance Reconciliation activity for 2016 (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 414 and CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report paragraph 25)
    iv) **Attachment 4**: Notes on additional information submitted by CCMs as a reply to the TCC11 Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 137).

3. **Table 2** provides information on WCPFC 11 decisions regarding Cooperating Non-Members and their Participatory Rights. It also provides thereafter the relevant paragraphs from WCPFC11, relevant to WCPFC/IATTC Overlap Area and CNM general process.

4. **Table 3** provides the recommendations from the 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report and proposed 2015/16 workplan.

5. **Table 4** provides the recommendations from the 2015 Electronic Reporting and Electronic Monitoring Working Group outcomes.

Recommendation

6. The Commission is invited to
    1. note the paper and the updates provided in Table 1; and
    2. consider as appropriate the additional supporting details and clarifications contained in Attachments 1 – 4 and that are related to specific TCC11 recommendations.

Table 1: Notes on Issues arising from TCC11 as at 19 November 2015

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
4.3 APPLICATIONS FOR COOPERATING NON-MEMBER STATUS **4.3.1 PARTICIPATORY RIGHTS OF CNMS**	117. TCC11 provides the following decisions and recommendations to WCPFC12: a. TCC11 has reviewed the following CNM applications and is forwarding them to WCPFC12 for consideration: Ecuador, El Salvador, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Thailand, and Vietnam. b. TCC11 again thanks the Secretariat for the development of the CNM application template which assisted the process greatly and thanks CNM applicants for using the template and submitting their applications in accordance with the prescribed timeframes. c. TCC11 notes with appreciation the attendance and participation of Ecuador, El Salvador, Panama, and Vietnam at this year's meeting and encourages other CNM applicants to attend TCC meetings in the future. d. TCC11 notes the CNM working group process occurred in parallel with the compliance monitoring scheme process and recommends that following TCC11, in consultation with SPC, the Secretariat write a particularised letter to CNMs outlining any identified deficiencies in data provision and requests that CNM applicants provide any information outlined in these letters, and as requested during the CMS process, 30 days in advance of WCPFC12 and that these letters, and any responses be assessed by WCPFC12. e. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 take into consideration the Compliance Status of all CNM applicants in making its decision on the CNM applications and participatory rights.	*Letters from Secretariat advising of TCC11 outcomes were sent to CNM applicants on 22 October. (WCPFC12-2015-08 Attachment 3)* *The latest information on financial contributions by CNM applicants is provided in WCPFC12-2015-08*	**WCPFC12-2015-08** *Documentations relating to the CNM requests and letters sent to CNM applicants post-TCC11 can be accessed by CCMs on the WCPFC secure CCM side of the website* *A copy of the WCPFC11 recommendations on CNM requests is provided in* **Table *2***.

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	f. TCC11 notes that all CNM applicants other than Mexico made a commitment to accept high seas boarding. g. TCC11 notes that all CNM applicants other than Mexico and Vietnam made a financial contribution and notes Vietnam's statement that payment was made over the course of TCC. h. TCC11 notes the position of some CCMs at WCPFC11 regarding provision on non-payment and notes the WCPFC11 summary record which recorded that WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 from Mexico on the understanding that the Secretariat will write a letter to Mexico advising that Mexico's non-payment of any financial contribution generated extensive discussion at WCPFC11. Some CCMs noted their strong concern at the unfairness for SIDS CCMs and other CNMs due to this non-payment and those CCMs did not consider the lack of presence of any Mexico vessels to justify non-payment. Those CCMs also noted that if this concern is not addressed before Mexico's next application for CNM status any such application would not be supported by those CCMs. i. TCC11 recommends that Mexico consider the prospect of a voluntary payment in advance of WCPFC12 given this statement in the WCPFC11 record, and its position regarding its national legislation. j. TCC11 notes that during the SWG four CNM applicants (Ecuador, El Salvador, Panama and Vietnam) have expressed or reiterated interest in becoming full members and that WCPFC12 consider whether to invite them to become members. k. TCC11 notes the following gaps or issues in the applications for individual applicants and encourages applicants to rectify them if possible by WCPFC12:		

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	i. Mexico – TCC11 notes that Mexico has not provided a commitment to make a financial contribution. TCC11 further notes that Mexico has not made an explicit commitment to accept High Seas Boardings and Inspections. ii. Ecuador – TCC11 notes that the provision of the Annual Report Part 1 occurred at TCC and requested that Ecuador provide this important information in a timely manner in the future iii. Panama – TCC11 notes that some Panama flagged vessels were listed on the SEAFO IUU list but Panama noted that these vessels had already been removed from the Panamanian ship register and undertook to provide a written update on this in advance of WCPFC. iv. Vietnam – TCC11 noted that Vietnam's financial contribution had not yet been received during TCC11 but that Vietnam made a statement that payment was pending.		
6. INTRODUCTION OF THE IUU VESSEL LIST RECOMMENDATIONS **14. ADOPTION OF 2016 IUU VESSEL LIST**	51. TCC11 agreed to include FAIMANU V on the Provisional IUU Vessel List. 66. A majority of TCC members supported the inclusion of the RONG DA YANG 28 on the provisional IUU list whilst a minority were against the inclusion of the RONG DA YANG 28 on the Provisional IUU List. TCC11 agreed to place the vessel on the IUU list with a note to WCPFC12 that consensus was not reached on this vessel. 76. TCC11 agreed to include the LADY EVELYN-8, the F/V MASTER RUSTIN-4, the LADY EVELYN 38 and the LADY GELAINE 18 on the Provisional IUU list. 81. With respect to the Provisional IUU Vessel List, all vessels contained in WCPFC-TCC11-2015- 07_rev3 were	*Re: para 98 and 99 letters from the Executive Director regarding the WCPFC IUU list vessels were sent to Chinese Taipei, Georgia and RFMOs in October 2015.* *There were also general recommendations made by TCC11 on the WCPFC IUU list these are expected to be taken up in the*	**WCPFC12-2015-10** *Documentations relating to the provisional IUU list, WCPFC IUU list and letters sent regarding the WCPFC IUU list post-TCC11 can be accessed by CCMs on the WCPFC secure CCM side of the website*

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	reviewed. A Provisional IUU Vessel List was adopted and is attached as TCC11 Summary Report Attachment D. 84. TCC11 agreed to recommend to WCPFC12 that the NEPTUNE should remain on the WCPFC IUU vessel list. 85. TCC11 agreed to recommend to WCPFC12 that the FU LIEN No.1 should remain on the WCPFC IUU vessel list. 89. TCC11 agreed to recommend to WCPFC12 that the YU FONG 168 should remain on the WCPFC IUU vessel list. 97. TCC11 recommends that the Commission Secretariat write to the Flag States of the IUU vessels on the WCPFC IUU list, following TCC11 and WCPFC12 and annually in advance of TCC, to identify their last known operations and track their whereabouts and to advise the Commission of any findings; 98. TCC11 recommends that the Secretariat write a letter to other RFMOs following TCC11, and annually in advance of TCC, for cooperation to locate those vessels listed on the WCPFC IUU list as at the date of TCC11 underlining that they are now listed on a number of IUU lists, and for the Secretariat to provide an update to WCPFC12 on any responses from RFMOs.	*adoption of the TCC11 Summary Report under Agenda 12.3.*	
7. OBSERVER SAFETY	44. WWF made a statement on behalf of WWF and the Association for Professional Observers, expressing appreciation and support for the Secretariat's work and noting that they had been encouraged by the motivation and activity of the Secretariat, including the approach the Commission Chairs have taken. WWF and the Association for Professional Observers emphasised the role of fisheries observers in the role of the Commission and noted that on 10 September 2015 an observer with MRAG Americas, Keith Davis, went missing during a transhipment of the MV Victoria 168, a transhipment vessel flagged to Panama. Both vessels were registered to fish in the WCPFC. It should be noted	*This WCPFC12 agenda item was included at the request of some CCMs and a paper has been prepared by the Secretariat to support these discussions.*	**WCPFC12-2015-11**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	that the event did not occur in the WCPF Convention Area or as a result of WCPFC origin activities. WWF and the Association for Professional Observers noted the need for greater protections for observers when they are doing the job they have been asked to do, adding that the quality and integrity of information they provide is vital for the Commission's work ensuring sustainability of stocks. 45. The Chair commented that the observer community and the Pacific community had been deeply troubled and saddened by this event, and recalled that TCC had discussed the importance of safety of observers often. It was noted that this issue would be further discussed under agenda item 8.2, the ROP. 258. WWF made a statement about the critical issue of observer health and safety, and noted market implications of not taking observer safety issues seriously. This included seeking a requirement that all member states regularly report to the WCPFC Secretariat, in a standard format, any event involving threat, intimidation, harassment, or assault of observers that occurs in any ROP or national programme. Associated with this should be a requirement for immediate reporting (to the Secretariat) in a standard format the disappearance of ANY observer or crewmember; the information should also be incorporated into the ROP Annual Report. WWF suggested the issuance of observers with fully functional two way satellite communicators that they would carry on their person when at sea. 259. The Philippines agreed with WWF that there is no justifiable reason for the death of an observer while doing their duty. This CCM stated that no country or CCM should tolerate such an action and thanked WWF for bringing the issue to the floor. The Philippines delegate noted that this was the first time he had heard about the incident which occurred in 2010 to which WWF had made reference in its statement, as this delegate assumed his position in 2011. This delegate made a commitment		

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	before all TCC participants that before the December Commission meeting he will personally ensure that an investigation is conducted by the government of the Philippines. He further said that the Philippines will not tolerate or sanction offences against an observer doing his or her job. 260. PNG supported the foregoing comments made about observer safety, and noted the passion with which they were delivered. This CCM took issue with the suggestion that PNG does not take allegations seriously and that PNG sanitises information before it gets to the authorities. 261. RMI agreed with the WWF statement. This CCM noted that although it has been agreed that an investigation would start, it is the results of those investigations that are critically important in addressing safety of observers. RMI noted that observers produce these reports for various reasons, including for scientific data and MCS purposes, however, this CCM was disappointed that TCC was not more closely focused on the safety and the health of observers, as a matter of priority concern; these observers were simply carrying out their duties. RMI noted that it would work with those concerned, including WWF, to resolve this matter in Bali. 262. The Chair noted that WWF had proposed a number of action items, and would allow participants time to mull them over and reopen discussions before closing the ROP agenda item if any members wished to take up those recommendations.		
9. REVIEW OF CMM 2014-01 (SKIPJACK, YELLOWFIN, AND BIGEYE)	483. Due to its inability to assess CMM 2013-01, paragraph 28 (yellowfin tuna purse seine catch), TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 agree that until appropriate limits have been formulated and adopted, this obligation should not be included as part of the assessment.	*These TCC11 recommendations are expected to be considered during Agenda item 9 discussions.*	**WCPFC12-2015-12** **WCPFC12-2015-13** **WCPFC12-2015-IP02** **WCPFC12-2015-IP03** **WCPFC12-2015-DP07 (FFA)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	484. Based on its review of CMM 2013-01, paragraphs 49, 51 and 52, TCC11 recommends that the Commission clarify what is meant by the term "current" in each of these paragraphs by stating a specified baseline. 485. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 consider clarifying how to assess CMM 2013-01 paragraph 40 with regards to compliance and that the paragraph be revised to separate the catch limit obligation from the requirement to take remedial action in the following year.		**WCPFC12-2015-DP12 (PNA + Tokelau)** *TRP* **WCPFC12-2015-DP06 (FFA)** **WCPFC12-2015-DP15 (Japan)** *Capacity reduction* **WCPFC12-2015-DP14 (Japan)**
10. REVIEW OF CMM 2010-05 (SOUTH PACIFIC ALBACORE)	425. TCC11 advises WCPFC12 that the compliance and the performance of CMM 2010-05 cannot effectively be assessed, either for implementing management advice for the stock as a whole, or for demonstrably limiting albacore fishing capacity south of 20 degrees south. TCC11 recommended that CMM 2010-05's data requirements need to be revised in order to make it more verifiable.	*These TCC11 recommendations are expected to be considered during Agenda item 10 discussions.*	**WCPFC12-2015-14** **14a** **14b** **WCPFC12-2015-IP06** **WCPFC12-2015-DP04 (FFA)** *TRP* **WCPFC12-2015-DP03 (FFA)**
11. BYCATCH MITIGATION (Sharks, Seabirds, Turtles, Whale Sharks, Cetaceans)	*Guidelines – safe release by-catch spp.* 459. TCC11 recommends WCPFC12 endorse the "Guidelines for Safe Release of Encircled Animals including whale sharks". (SC11 Executive Summary Report Attachment F) (Attachment G) 460. TCC11 supports the ongoing development by SC of more comprehensive guidelines pertaining to the safe release of sharks and rays.	*These TCC11 recommendations are expected to be considered during Agenda item 11 discussions.*	**WCPFC12-2015-16**

	CMM 2010-07 and CMM 2014-05 462. TCC11 taking note of: a. Table 5 and 6 of WCPFC-TCC11-2015-RP02 Annual Report on the Regional Observer Programme indicating that finning still occurs in the WCPFC CA in both LL and PS fisheries; b. SC11 recommendation that the Commission notes that according to the most recent information provided by SPC finning still occurs in the WCPFC CA; c. SC11 was unable to confirm the validity of using a 5% fin to carcass ratio in CMM 2010-07 and that subsequently an evaluation of the 5% ratio is not currently possible due to insufficient information for all but one of the major fleets implementing these ratios. d. Reports from a CCM that, in the course of high seas boardings and inspections, it has been very difficult to verify whether the 5% ratio obligation has been satisfied. recommends that: a. WCPFC12 recognises that it is not possible for TCC to assess compliance with the application of the fins to carcass weight ratio, b. WCPFC12 considers means to strengthen CMM 2010-07 with respect to ensuring compliance with the obligation in paragraph 6. 463. TCC11 noted SC11 difficulties in assessing the sharks management plans submitted by two CCMs in accordance with CMM 2014-05, due to the lack of guidance on what should be incorporated into the shark management plans, what is considered a target fishery, and how the review should be performed.		*Sharks* **WCPFC12-2015-DP16 (EU)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	464. TCC11 endorses SC11 recommendation to consider the development of a list of minimum requirements that such plans should include, guidelines to evaluate such plans, and the definition of a target shark fishery for future review by SC, TCC and the Commission. 465. TCC11 notes that the FAO International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks may be an interesting source of guidance, among others, on what should be incorporated into shark management plans developed in order to refine CMM 2014-05. *Seabirds (CMM 2012-07)* 469. TCC11 notes most CCMs supported that the boundary of the mitigation requirements of CMM 2012-07 as they apply in the South Pacific Ocean, as described in para 1 of the CMM, be moved north to 25°S (excluding the EEZs of those CCMs with less than 15% of their EEZ in the area south of 25°S, which are the EEZs around French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Tonga, Cook Islands and Fiji). Most CCMs agreed that moving the boundary to 25°S would improve the ability of longline fishing vessels to comply with the mitigation requirements of this measure, and improve monitoring, control and surveillance of the Convention Area south of 25°S. 474. In accordance with paragraph 10 of CMM 2012-07, the TCC has evaluated the constraints and opportunities for small vessels to employ seabird mitigation measures in the North Pacific Ocean. Based on reports provided by Chinese Taipei (TCC10-DP11), Japan (TCC10-DP10 and TCC11-DP05), and the USA (TCC9-DP05) in accordance with paragraph 387 of the report of TCC8, the TCC finds that: a. No constraints for small vessels have been identified with respect to the use of side setting, night setting, blue-dyed bait, deep-setting line shooters, or management of offal discharge, but		*Seabirds* **WCPFC12-2015-DP02 (Japan)** **WCPFC12-2015-DP11 (FFA)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	it was noted that some small vessels in some fleets do not normally engage in night-setting. b. Small vessels face constraints with respect to the use of some types of tori lines, which are subject to tangling with the fishing gear due to the size of the vessel. c. There is an opportunity and need to develop alternative minimum specifications for a tori line that is tailored for small vessels. d. There are opportunities to identify areas in which seabirds are rare and in which seabird mitigation methods are not needed or can be relaxed.		
12.3 ADOPTION OF TCC11 REPORT	*General recommendations on IUU list* 95. TCC11 encourages strengthening of cooperation among all CCMs to actively work together to locate the vessels that are on the WCPFC IUU vessel list, so as to stop their illegal activities. 96. TCC11 recommends that such cooperation should include, as appropriate and as applicable to each CCM: a. prompt advice to the Commission Secretariat from any Flag State or other CCM who has information on any vessel on the WCPFC IUU list, including its whereabouts and any known change in name or other circumstance. In addition, Port States are requested to take any appropriate action, including, if possible, denial of port entry and services to those vessels. b. greater scrutiny of the individuals and companies that have been involved in IUU fishing, and the sharing of this information between CCMs and RFMOs. 97. TCC11 recommends that the Commission Secretariat write to the Flag States of the IUU vessels on the WCPFC IUU list, following TCC11 and WCPFC12 and annually in advance of TCC, to identify their last known operations and track their whereabouts and to advise the Commission of any findings;	*The specific recommendations made by TCC11 related to the adoption of the WCPFC IUU list will be presented and considered under Agenda 6/14.*	

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	98. TCC11 recommends that the Secretariat write a letter to other RFMOs following TCC11, and annually in advance of TCC, for cooperation to locate those vessels listed on the WCPFC IUU list as at the date of TCC11 underlining that they are now listed on a number of IUU lists, and for the Secretariat to provide an update to WCPFC12 on any responses from RFMOs. 99. TCC recommends that the Commission clarify that English is to be used in all communications between relevant CCMs regarding alleged IUU activities.		
	List of CMM paragraphs to be reviewed by CMR in 2016 144. TCC11 recommends that an intersessional working group develops a list of obligations to be assessed by CMS in 2016 prior to WCPFC12, noting the need to review bycatch issues and the potential to develop a rolling schedule of obligations to be assessed on a regular basis. TCC11 is grateful to the United States for leading this work.	*United States is leading intersessional work to develop a list of obligations to be assessed by CMS in 2016 and beyond – paper tabled as* ***DP20***	**WCPFC12-2015-DP08 (FFA)** **WCPFC12-2015-DP20 (USA)**
	Possible timeline for 2016 CMR and Annual Reports 152. TCC11 recommends the WCPFC12 consider a revised timeframe for annual reporting for the CMS process for 2016 and beyond.		**WCPFC12-2015-DP08 (FFA)**
	Consideration of an independent audit of the CMS 161. TCC11 noted the paper provided by the Executive Director on the "Concept of an independent audit or independent review of the WCPFC Compliance Monitoring Scheme" and continues to support the concept, but agreed that now was not the right time for such a review. TCC11 noted that such a review might be appropriate after the revised CMS CMM has been in place for at least a couple of years.		
	Recommendations to refine Compliance Monitoring Scheme 164. The Chair noted that before WCPFC12 she will send out a revised CMM based on the discussions at TCC11.	*TCC Chair issued a draft CMM proposal on Compliance Monitoring Scheme on 6 Nov*	**WCPFC12-2015-20** **WCPFC12-2015-DP08 (FFA)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) 211. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC Secretariat publish and maintain through secure CCM WCPFC online systems, that are accessible by authorised CCM users, a list of all RFV vessels WCPFC VMS reporting status. The list will be updated a least once a week, and will be based on the details of vessels as contained in the RFV. The list will confirm those vessels which VTAF details are held by WCPFC and the date of receipt, and submitted to the related communication satellite provider with the date submitted (VTAF activation date), the current VMS reporting channel to the WCPFC VMS (for example WCPFC direct; through FFA; manual reporting or not reporting). The WCPFC Secretariat is tasked to provide to WCPFC12 more information on the proposed implementation of this recommendation, including a sample of how the list will be presented. 212. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC Secretariat is tasked to work with the FFA Secretariat in developing a technical solution to ensure that the WCPFC Secretariat has access to the up to date and accurate information on the VMS reporting status of RFV vessels. 213. TCC11 recommends that flag CCMs that report directly to WCPFC VMS are encouraged to regularly review their respective lists and work with the WCPFC Secretariat to resolve any discrepancies in the list. 233. TCC11 notes with concern the findings of the failure of at least 41 vessels to report to the Commission VMS and the urgency of resolving that problem. 234. TCC11 thanks USA for offering to lead the process up to WCPFC12 to further consider the proposed revisions as set out in WCPFC-TCC11-2015-DP09_rev1.	*The TCC11 recommendation at paragraph 211 can be accommodated within the proposed IMS budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration.* *During TCC11 some CCMs suggested that the Secretariat might consider hiring an additional VMS staff to among assist with supporting WCPFC VMS monitoring and corresponding with CCMs. The Secretariat confirms being interested in further exploring this possibility with interested CCMs prior to and during FAC6 discussions in Bali.* *Supplementary details to support TCC11 recommendation paragraph 211 are provided in* **Attachment *1***.	*ALC Type approval* **WCPFC12-2015-DP13 (USA)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	Regional Observer Programme (ROP) 256. TCC11 recommended the cross endorsement training of observers to be able to carry out duties in IATTC waters and the WCPFC waters on the same trip continues in 2016 and the proposed indicative budget for 2016 be increased from $25,000 to $28,000. 257. TCC11 further recommended that the CMM Booklet relevant to observer roles and duties continues to be printed in 2016 and the proposed indicative budget for 2016 be increased from $8,500 to $14,500. The WCPFC ROP Manager will provide greater detail on the budget implications of this recommendation for WCPFC12. 285. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 adopt the changes as set out in **Attachment E** (WCPFC-TCC11-2015-26_rev1) to the Regional Observer Programme (ROP) Minimum Data Standards and Fields. TCC11 advised WCPFC12 that some fields are new, some represent splits of prior fields and some are existing fields with new text, otherwise all other fields remain the same. *Recommendations to revise CMMs prioritised by CMS process which were ambiguous or problematic* *CMM 2007-01* 482. TCC11 recommends to WCPFC12 that CMM 2007-01 paragraph 8 not be assessed for compliance provided that all the individual associated obligations are assessed.	*The recommendations with budgetary implications (256 and 257) are reflected in the proposed budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration.* *Supplementary details to support TCC11 recommendation 257 are provided in* **Attachment *2***.	**WCPFC12-2015-FAC15**
	Transshipment 303. TCC11 thanks RMI for offering to lead the process up to WCPFC12 to consider paragraph 34 of CMM 2009-06.	*RMI is leading intersessional work on this matter.*	
	High Seas Boarding and Inspection (HSBI)	*The recommendation can be accommodated within the proposed*	**WCPFC12-2015-FAC15**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	319. TCC11 recommended that WCPFC12 task the Secretariat to develop a technical solution to make available to authorized CCM MCS personnel through secure login, a list of vessels that have been previously inspected under the HSBI scheme specifically, the VID, Vessel Name, IRCS, date of boarding and Name of inspecting member. 320. TCC11 encouraged CCMs to check and ensure that their HSBI-relevant contact details are up-to-date, and to use the online capability through their individual CCM portals to update their details as needed. 321. TCC11 requested that CCMs assist in supporting HSBI activities by providing the Secretariat with translated versions of the updated multi-language questionnaire.	*IMS budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration.*	
	Record of Fishing Vessels (RFV) 345. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 agrees that all vessels on the RFV shall complete the minimum required fields by June 30 2016, and instructs the Secretariat to remove any vessels without the minimum required data fields after that date.	*The Secretariat does not envisage any budgetary implications from this proposal.*	
	Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area (EHSP-SMA) 350. The Chair noted that the proposal was not ready for adoption in its entirety but there was interest in continuing to work on it for consideration at WCPFC12.		**WCPFC12-2015-DP05 (FFA)**
	Review of tiered scoring system for evaluating the provision of scientific data to the Commission 376. TCC11 recommends WCPFC Secretariat develop a paper that summarises non-scientific data holdings of WCPFC for information to all CCMs, and to present the paper to TCC12. 386. TCC11 used the tier scoring system adopted by WCPFC11 for performing the compliance evaluation of CCMs		

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	for the provision of Scientific data and concluded that it was very useful and informative tool. 387. TCC11 recommends that the tier scoring system adopted at WCPFC11 is used for assisting in assessing compliance of CCMs for the provision of Scientific data in 2016 and following years. 388. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 tasks SPC to further refine the tier scoring system to provide, among other things, an indicator of compliance of CCMs as a whole with provision of Scientific data. 389. TCC11 also recommends that WCPFC12 consider exploring the usefulness of using the system to assist in the evaluation of other CMMs, including the possible development of an indicator of overall compliance of each CCM in relation to the totality of agreed WCPFC obligations.		
	Proposals to amend "Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission" 393. TCC11 recommends that the proposal (DP01b_rev1) to add additional by-catch species to Annex 1 of the rules on Scientific Data to be provided to the Commission be referred to the SC12, and that SC12 develop and apply a process similar to that used for designating key shark species for data provision and assessment. (Attachment F) *Recommendations to revise CMMs prioritised by CMS process which were ambiguous or problematic* *Scientific data to be Provided to the Commission* 486. TCC11 recommends that Section 01 of the Scientific Data requirements (Estimates of discards should also be provided) be modified to read "shall" instead of "should."		**WCPFC12-2015-DP17 (EU)**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	487. TCC11 notes that the language in Section 04 of the Scientific Data Requirements, paragraph 4, is a "may" and is thus not a mandatory requirement (final sentence of paragraph 4). Therefore, TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 agree that it should not be included as part of the assessment next year, however CCMs are encouraged to provide this data where possible because of their scientific value for the stock assessment for some species (eg south pacific albacore and swordfish). 488. TCC11 agreed that the Section 07 of the Scientific Data Requirements is not a mandatory obligation and recommends that WCPFC12 agree that it should not be included as part of the assessment next year, but recognizes and appreciates that some CCMs nonetheless provide this data to support the scientific work of the Commission. TCC11 further encouraged that other CCMs also provide this data where possible.		
	Charter Notification Scheme 497. TCC11 noted the expiry of CMM 2012-05 Charter Notification Scheme at the end of 2015, and recommends that WCPFC12 considers the extension of this measure for the next three years.		**WCPFC12-2015-IP04**
	TCC Workplan 517. TCC11 agrees to further review and develop the TCC workplan 2016-2018 intersessionally, for presentation to WCPFC12. Australia agreed to lead this task.	*Australia is leading intersessional work to develop a revised TCC workplan 2016-2018 – see **DP21**.*	**WCPFC12-2015-DP21** **Australia**
	Report on Secretariat IMS and website development and online reporting systems (2013-2015) 522. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC12 maintain the commitment to WCPFC Secretariat IMS development and enhancement over the next 2-3 years.	*This recommendation is reflected in the proposed budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration.*	**WCPFC12-2015-FAC15**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
	Next meeting 524. TCC11 recommended that TCC12 be held on Wednesday 21 September – Tuesday 27 September 2016 in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia.		
12.3.1 CDS-IWG (Work Plan)	414. TCC11 adopted the report of the CDS-IWG and forwards it to the Commission for consideration, and recommended that WCPFC12 adopt its recommendations.	*The CDS-IWG 2015 recommendations and the proposed workplan are provided in **Table 3**.* *As per the agreed workplan the FFA Secretariat is expected to table for information an updated paper on CDS-Standards* *The recommendation to hold a 2016 meeting of CDS-IWG is reflected in the proposed budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration. A modest budget has been included based on 2015 costs, for the costs of a CDS expert to assist the CDS-IWG Chair and Secretariat during the 2016 CDS-IWG meeting.* *The Secretariat has* provided in	*CDS-IWG 2015 report* **WCPFC12-2015-19c**

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
		Attachment 3 a further clarification on *the Secretariat 2016 task related to Mass Balance Reconcilation work.*	
12.3.2 ER/EM IWG (Work Plan)	397. TCC11 adopted the following recommendations: a. TCC11 notes that further testing and refinement of the five draft electronic data standards is required by the sub-working group as referenced in Attachment 5 to the ERandEMWG report (WCPFC-TCC11-2015-20); b. TCC11 recommends that a master list of electronic data standards are maintained by the Secretariat with input from the Science Provider and any updates shall be notified to CCMs on an annual basis; c. TCC11 recommends that a decision to report electronically in future be captured by an amendment to the relevant CMM and make reference to the master list; d. TCC11 encourages the development of Electronic Monitoring by CCMs in areas where data gaps exist such as longline observer coverage and high seas transhipment; e. TCC11 recommends WG meet before Scientific Committee in 2016.	*The recommendations to hold a meeting of ERandEMWG in 2015 and to have the sub-technical working group commence its work is reflected in the proposed budget prepared by the Secretariat for FAC6's consideration.* *The ERandEMWG 2015 recommendations are provided in **Table 4**.*	*ERandEMWG report* **WCPFC12-2015-19d**
12.4 IWG-ROP	272. The Chair thanked the IWG-ROP for their hard work and comprehensive recommendations. TCC11 accepted the report of the IWG-ROP4.		**WCPFC12-2015-21** **21a** **21b**
12.5 FAD Management Options IWG	435. TCC11 recommends that the FADMgmtOptions-IWG meet prior to WPCFC12. CCMs and other interested participants are requested to provide comments to the FADMgmtOptions-IWG on WCPFC-TCC11-2015-24 by 1 November 2015.	*Meeting is scheduled for 27 – 28 November 2015 in Bali.*	**WCPFC12-2015-22**
13. Adoption of Final CMR report	137. TCC11 agreed to forward the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report to WCPFC12.	*A special TCC session to review the additional information related to provisional CMRs is scheduled to*	

WCPFC12 AGENDA ITEM	TCC11 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCES	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	WCPFC12 PAPER REF
		be held in Bali, 29 November 2015. *A summary of the additional information submitted as a reply to the provisional CMR is provided in* **Attachment *4***. *Documentations relating to provisional CMR as recommended by TCC11 and additional information submitted by CCMs can be accessed by CCMs on the WCPFC secure CCM side of the intranet and a MS Excel file of the complete provisional CMR with additional information will be posted to the CCM part of the WCPFC website shortly.*	

Table 2. Cooperating Non-Member and Participatory Rights decision from WCPFC11

CNM	WCPFC11 Decision regarding granting of CNM status	WCPFC11 Decision regarding Participatory Rights
Ecuador	33. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 for Ecuador.	126. WCPFC11 agreed that Ecuador's participatory rights for fishing in the WCPO are limited to purse seine fishing, with no participatory rights for fishing on the high seas for highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area. Any introduction of purse seine fishing capacity is to be in accordance with paragraph 12 of CMM 2009-11 and CMM 2013-01 or its replacement measure.
El Salvador	34. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 for El Salvador.	130. WCPFC11 agreed that the participatory rights of El Salvador for fishing in the WCPO are limited to purse seine fishing only. The total level of effort by purse seine vessels of El Salvador on the high seas shall not exceed 29 days in the Convention Area. Any introduction of purse seine fishing capacity is to be in accordance with paragraph 12 of CMM 2009-11 and CMM 2013-01 or its replacement measure.
Liberia	35. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for CNM status in 2015 for Liberia.	132. WCPFC11 agreed that the participatory rights of Liberia are limited to reefer vessels to engage in transshipment activities, and bunker and supply vessels to support fishing vessels in the Convention area.
Panama	47. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 for Panama.	141. WCPFC11 agreed that the participatory rights of Panama in the WCPO are limited to the provision of carrier and bunker vessels.
Thailand	49. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 for Thailand.	148. WCPFC11 noted the need for cooperation between Thailand and the Commission and the commitment from Thailand to provide data from canneries located in Thailand to assist in the work of the Commission. WCPFC11 agreed to grant CNM status to Thailand for 2015 on the understanding that Thailand will cooperate fully with the Commission in the acquisition and exchange of fishery information and data. The Commission notes the provision of data from Thai canneries and encourages Thailand to continue to cooperate with the Commission to improve the acquisition and exchange of fishery information and data. The participatory rights of Thailand in the WCPO are limited to the provision of carrier and bunker vessels only.
DPRK	88. WCPFC11 did not accept the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 from Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK).	123. As the group did not consider DPRK's application should be accepted by the Commission, participatory rights were not considered or recommended.
Mexico	95. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 from Mexico, on the understanding that the Secretariat will write a letter	136. WCPFC11 noted that Mexico has participated in the work of the Northern Committee (NC) at NC 8, 9 and 10 and, noting the need for cooperation with the work of the NC particularly in regard to Pacific bluefin

CNM	WCPFC11 Decision regarding granting of CNM status	WCPFC11 Decision regarding Participatory Rights
	to Mexico advising that Mexico's non-payment of any financial contribution generated extensive discussion at WCPFC11. Some CCMs noted their strong concern at the unfairness for SIDS CCMs and other CNMs due to this non-payment and those CCMs did not consider the lack of presence of any Mexico vessels to justify non-payment. Those CCMs also noted that if this concern is not addressed before Mexico's next application for CNM status any such application would not be supported by those CCMs.	tuna, encouraged Mexico to continue to participate in the NC. Mexico does not intend to have a vessel presence in 2015. Any future introduction of purse seine fishing capacity is to be in accordance with paragraph 12 of CMM 2009-11 and CMM 2013-01 or its replacement measure.
Senegal	111. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 for Senegal, on the condition that it pays its assessed contribution for 2015 by 90 days after 15 January 2015.	144. WCPFC11 agreed that the participatory rights of Senegal be limited to one Senegalese longline vessel to be authorised to fish in the Convention area. Any introduction of fishing capacity is to be in accordance with paragraph 12 of CMM 2009-11 and CMM 2013-01 or its replacement measure.
Vietnam	152. WCPFC11 noted the need for continued cooperation between Vietnam and the Commission to achieve compatibility of fisheries management and conservation, as well as on the acquisition and exchange of fishery information and data, for which Vietnam would require assistance. WCPFC11 agreed to approve the application for renewal of CNM status in 2015 from Vietnam.	152. The Commission notes the significant improvements in the collection and provision of data from Vietnam fisheries through the GEF WPEA project, administered by the WCPFC and encourages Vietnam to continue to cooperate with the Commission to improve the acquisition and exchange of fishery information and data. The participatory rights of Vietnam in the WCPO are limited to the provision of carrier and bunker vessels only.

WCPFC/IATTC Overlap Area

120. In accordance with the decision of WCPFC9 regarding the management of the overlap area south of 4°S and between 130°W and 150°W, vessels flagged to Ecuador, El Salvador and Mexico will be governed by the IATTC when fishing in the overlap area. Accordingly, the participatory rights for, Ecuador, El Salvador and Mexico below apply to the WCPFC Convention Area excluding the overlap area.

121. In accordance with the Data Exchange MOU agreed by both Commissions, fishing vessels flying the flag of a member of either the IATTC or WCPFC shall cooperate with the RFMO to which they are not a member by voluntarily providing operational catch and effort data for its fishing activities for highly migratory species in the overlap area.

122. For the purpose of investigation of possible IUU fishing activities and consistent with international and domestic laws, vessels flying the flag of a CNM that is a Contracting Party to the IATTC will cooperate with those coastal State members of the WCPFC whose EEZs occur in the overlap area by voluntarily providing VMS reports (date, time and position) to those coastal States when operating in the overlap area.

Table 3 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report recommendations and proposed 2015/16 workplan

CDS-IWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
Mass Balance Reconcilation (MBR) **25. The CDS-IWG agreed to** **1. recommend that CCMs are encouraged to include in Annual Report Part 1, in standardized format, the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2. For the purposes of the trial, CCMs are encouraged where available to include these tables (the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2) related to the 2013 calendar year in their 2016 Annual Report Part 1 (so that there is at least one common year that can be the basis of the first trial MBR).** **2. task the Secretariat with the assistance of an appropriately qualified consultant to provide, to the extent practicable, an annual 2013 MBR calculation for the consideration of the CDS-IWG, TCC and the Commission in 2016.**	*Attachment C to the CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report sets out the timelines for Mass Balance Reconciliation work.* *The Secretariat undertook during the CDS-IWG to further investigate the task for the Secretariat proposed for 2016. This analysis is provided in* ***Attachment 3***
Roles and responsibilities in WCPFC CDS 29. The below list is noted to be a non-exhaustive list of stakeholders whose roles and responsibilities would need to be defined in a WCPFC CDS: – vessel operators – Coastal states – Flag States – WCPFC Secretariat – Market states – Other stakeholders eg port states, and processing states, processors and traders 30. **CDS-IWG agrees these roles and responsibilities do need to be defined, but the discussions at this meeting didn't touch on the specifics of all these roles. All the parties listed above are recognized as having a role in CDS.** 31. From the discussions in CDS-IWG the key points were: i. The role of the flag State should be to verify that the vessels are appropriately authorized, and that the vessel operated in accordance with its authorization and all applicable WCPFC CMMs and other obligations, based on available information, including that obtained from coastal States and MCS tools; ii. Agreement that coastal States and port States also should have a critical role to play in the verification process;	

CDS-IWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
iii. The role of the Coastal States should be to verify that vessels have complied with relevant coastal State requirements (laws, regulations, license conditions etc); iv. Agreement that all States that encounter product should have an equal and cooperative role in the certification process, and necessary communication lines need to be established and maintained between respective parties; v. WCPFC Secretariat should have an oversight role, and data repository / data acquisition and data management functions; vi. Recognition that the further development of standards, specification and procedures will influence the definition of roles and responsibilities, and terminology. **32. The CDS-IWG also acknowledged that the roles and responsibilities would continue to evolve as the CDS-IWG's work moves forward.**	
Development of standards, specifications and procedures, including verification **35. The CDS-IWG encouraged the FFA Secretariat to continue to lead the development of CDS draft standards using Attachment A of DP04 as a basis, and taking note of comments and questions provided by CCMs during the discussions at CDS-IWG02 and the Guiding Principles in the CDS-IWG TOR (Attachment 1).** **36. CCMs (which includes Cooperating Non-Members) and other interested parties were requested to provide comments on DP04 to FFA Secretariat, via WCPFC Secretariat, to further improve the paper. Note the deadlines would be determined in the draft CDS-IWG 2015/16 workplan to be develop by the Chair and presented to TCC11.** **37. The CDS-IWG also noted that the Mass Balance Reconciliation trial work that is proposed for 2016 (see next steps below), would usefully inform the development of the CDS draft standards. The CDS-IWG reiterated that while this is very useful, this should not delay progress on the development of the CDS.**	*Attachment C to the CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report sets out the timelines for the development of CDS draft standards.* *1. Comments received from CCMs post-TCC11 were provided to the FFA Secretariat.* *2. A paper providing an update on the CDS draft standards will be provided for information by FFA Secretariat to WCPFC12.* *3. A second round of comments from CCMs are due to Secretariat by 31 March 2016.* *4. A revised set of CDS draft standards is to be circulated by 1 Sept 2016 (in advance of CDS-IWG and TCC meetings in 2016).* *5. WCPFC13 (2016) is proposed as the date for adoption of CDS draft standards*
Objectives of WCPFC CDS **39. The key points from the CDS-IWG discussions was agreement that:**	

CDS-IWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
The primary objective for a WCPFC CDS should be to combat IUU fishing in the WCPFC-CA by providing a means of preventing fish and fish products identified as caught by or originating from IUU activities from moving through the commodity chain and ultimately entering markets.	
Scope of WCPFC CDS The WCPFC CDS should be designed to be as inclusive as possible: ➢ applied to all major gear types (purse seine, longline, pole and line and troll); ➢ initially established to include all main tuna target species (skipjack, yellowfin, bigeye and albacore tuna) during implementation; ➢ include all landed catches, regardless of disposition (domestic or export), with the possible exception of artisanal catches that are not exported; ➢ include all major product forms and processes (whole, headed and gutted, loins, steaks…chilled, frozen, canned, fishmeal) but offal (heads, eyes roes guts and tails) may be exempted; and, ➢ once a CDS is established, it should have the capacity to be expanded to include swordfish, sharks and other priority species. **40. The CDS-IWG continues to support the scope above. The key points from the CDS-IWG discussions was agreement that:** **• the CDS should be designed to be as inclusive (gear, species and products) as possible;** **• it is likely that a phased-approach to implementation or prioritization would be the best way for the Commission to proceed, and perhaps a IUU risk-based process might provide a basis for prioritization;** **• the species to be covered by the CDS should initially be [Pacific Bluefin tuna], Bigeye tuna, Skipjack, Yellowfin and Albacore tuna;** **• the CDS-IWG should commence a process to define the scope of the WCPFC-CDS as a matter of priority, and the way forward and list of species to be covered (point 3 above) should be finalised during TCC11.**	*Attachment C to the CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report sets out the timelines for work on CDS development in 2015/16. This includes an indication that WCPFC12 would "Agree on Priority Species and gear types for initial implementation."*
Next steps **41. The CDS-IWG agreed there was a need for standard definitions for terminology in CDS to be developed eg verification, validation, accreditation, certification.**	*In the margins of TCC11, the Chair subsequently developed a draft workplan for CDS-IWG 2015/16 which was presented to TCC11 as Attachment C (to the CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report).*

CDS-IWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
42. The CDS-IWG agreed the Chair should consult with interested members, and develop a proposed workplan (matrix) for presentation to TCC11. The workplan would consider the agreed tasks for 2015/16 and would seek to address the following questions: **1. What do we want to achieve before the next CDS-IWG meeting?** **2. How will we achieve those objectives?** **3. Where and when will the meeting be held?** **4. What is the timeframe for drafting a related CMM and what other key inputs are needed before this can commence?**	*TCC11 adopted the report of the CDS-IWG and forwards it to the Commission for consideration, and recommended that WCPFC12 adopt its recommendations. (TCC11 Summary Report para 414).*

CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report Attachment C: Proposed workplan for CDS-IWG 2015/16 developed by the Chair and presented to TCC11.

Milestone	Date	Responsibility
1. Scope		
1a. Agree on Priority Species and gear types for initial implementation	Dec 2015 (WCPFC 12)	CCMs & Commission
2. CDS Standards development		
2a. Comments to WCPFC Secretariat on *CDS-IWG2 DP04 Standards*	31 Oct 2015 (Intersessional)	CCMs and Stakeholders
2b. Present update on draft Standards developments (Information paper)	Dec 2015 (WCPFC12)	FFA
2c. Comment to WCPFC Secretariat on updated CDS Standards papers	31 March 2016 (Intersessional)	CCMs
2d. Circulation of revised standards	1 Sept 2016	FFA & WCPFC Secretariat
2e. TCC 12 to recommend to the Commission Revised draft Standards	Oct 2016 (CDS-IWG and TCC 12)	CDS-IWG & TCC
2f. Adoption of Revised draft Standards	Dec 2016 (WCPFC 13)	CCMs and Commission
3. Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR)		
3a. Development of draft ToRs for consultant work and budget	31 Oct 2015	Secretariat
3b. Adoption of ToRs and budget	Dec 2015 (FAC and WCPFC 12)	CCMs and Commission
3c. CCMs prepare MBR data for Part I Report	Jan to July 2016	CCMs
3d. Part I Report Submission	Part I report submission deadline	CCMs
3e.Consultant - MBR expert: Collate Part I MBR submissions and attempt MBR	June to Aug 2016	Secretariat (consultant)
3f. Consider merits and review MBR outcome to CDS development	Sept 2016 (CDS-IWG, TCC) Dec 2016 (WCPFC 13)	CDS-IWG , TCC and Commission
4. CMM development		
4a. Development of draft CMM	Jan-July 2017	TBD
4b. Review draft CMM	Sept 2017 (CDS-IWG, TCC12)	TCC 12
4c. Adoption of CMM	Dec 2017 (WCPFC13)	CMMs and Commission

Table 4. 2015 Electronic Reporting and Electronic Monitoring Summary Report recommendations and proposed 2015/16 workplan

ERandEMWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
2. Review of information / updates on application of ER and EM technologies in WCPO **12. The ERandEMWG acknowledged the substantial work being conducted in the region on ER and EM systems and encourages cooperation and the sharing of related information among CCMs, sub-regional organizations, and NGOs.** **13. The ERandEMWG recognized that electronic reporting can enhance data accuracy, data entry efficiency, reducing reporting burden and avoiding duplication for vessel operators and national fisheries agencies, and therefore encourages CCMs and the Commission to develop policies and systems that allow e-reported information to satisfy data reporting requirements.** **14. The ERandEMWG recognized that some CCMs support the development of ER systems that require a captain to be able to authenticate submitted data which can be used for enforcement purposes. The ERandEMWG encouraged CCMs that have already addressed ER issues for compliance applicability, to share information to support methods to authenticate ER submitted data.** **19. The ERandEMWG recognized that there are clear linkages to the ongoing work being conducted in various WCPFC intersessional working groups related to electronic reporting of information and recommended that the Secretariat facilitate participation and information sharing among working groups.**	
3. Draft E-reporting standards **26. The ERandEMWG encouraged CCMs to consider further evaluation of the draft data field standards for observer data and logsheet data to** **i. (i) review and comment on the draft data standards document for logsheet and observer data, and** **ii. (ii) attempt to produce sample data according to these draft data standards and submit the sample data to SPC with any comments on any issues encountered in the process.**	*The TCC11 recommendation proposes the further evaluation of the drat SSPs continue in 2016.*
4. Strategies for E-Reporting in the WCPO **33. The EMandERWG tasked the sub-working group (referenced in ERandEMWG Terms of Reference workplan item 1) to:** **i. develop and maintain a master list of electronic data standards to support the collection of Commission agreed data fields that includes but is not limited to data validation rules field formats and tags;** **ii. recommend amendments to CMMs and certain decisions covered by these SSPs in relation to data fields that are reported electronically;** **iii. undertake testing as appropriate, of data submission by CCMs working with the Secretariat or SPC using the master list of electronic data standards;**	*The TCC11 recommendation supports the establishment and commencement of the ERandEMWG sub-working groups work in 2016.*

ERandEMWG 2015 Recommendations	Secretariat notes
iv. review results of data submission by CCMs working with the Secretariat or SPC using the master list of electronic data standards; and **v. report to the ERandEM WG as required (including electronically).** **34. The ERandEMWG agreed to recommend the draft SSPs to TCC11 for consideration, with the recognition that the SSPs could be further refined prior to WCPFC12. (Attachment 5)** **35. The ERandEMWG recommended that TCC11 consider how the electronic reporting standards associated with specific CMMs are linked to their respective CMMs.** **36. The ERandEMWG recommended that TCC11 discuss additional SSPs that may be useful (eg transhipment notification).**	*The TCC11 recommendation notes that further testing and refinement of the five draft electronic data standards is required by the sub-working group prior to finalization of the draft SSPs.*
5. Strategies for E-Monitoring in the WCPO **41. The ERandEMWG encouraged the development of EM in areas where data gaps exist such as longline observer coverage and high seas transshipment.** **42. The ERandEMWG recognized that EM systems can support and complement observer programs.**	*TCC11 encourages the development of Electronic Monitoring by CCMs in areas where data gaps exist such as longline observer coverage and high seas transhipment*

Attachment 1. Supporting details on the implementation of a "List of all RFV vessels WCPFC VMS reporting status" (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 211)

1. In recent times there have been a number of instances where, through WCPFC members High Seas Boarding and Inspections, Port Inspections or MCS operations, vessels have been identified as possibly not meeting WCPFC VMS requirements, but further investigations have found that there were some procedural issues which delayed activating the VTAF (Vessel Tracking Activation Form) details. Often the vessel that previously was reporting through the FFA VMS, was not properly activated to report directly to the WCPFC VMS.

2. At TCC11 the Secretariat proposed the establishment of a reporting mechanism to better support enhanced compatibility between the WCPFC and FFA VMS systems. The reporting mechanism was proposed to provide a way that CCMs and the Secretariat can better to monitor VMS reporting by all vessels, and to better support maintaining VMS reporting when a vessel may redirect its reporting between the WCPFC VMS and FFA VMS systems.

3. The subsequent TCC11 recommendations are contained in TCC11 Summary Report paragraphs 211 – 213, and are reproduced below:

> 211. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC Secretariat publish and maintain through secure CCM WCPFC online systems, that are accessible by authorised CCM users, a list of all RFV vessels WCPFC VMS reporting status. The list will be updated a least once a week, and will be based on the details of vessels as contained in the RFV. The list will confirm those vessels which VTAF details are held by WCPFC and the date of receipt, and submitted to the related communication satellite provider with the date submitted (VTAF activation date), the current VMS reporting channel to the WCPFC VMS (for example WCPFC direct; through FFA; manual reporting or not reporting). The WCPFC Secretariat is tasked to provide to WCPFC12 more information on the proposed implementation of this recommendation, including a sample of how the list will be presented.
>
> 212. TCC11 recommends that WCPFC Secretariat is tasked to work with the FFA Secretariat in developing a technical solution to ensure that the WCPFC Secretariat has access to the up to date and accurate information on the VMS reporting status of RFV vessels.
>
> 213. TCC11 recommends that flag CCMs that report directly to WCPFC VMS are encouraged to regularly review their respective lists and work with the WCPFC Secretariat to resolve any discrepancies in the list.

4. Some notes on the specifications for the proposed "List of all RFV vessels WCPFC VMS reporting status" as described in paragraph 211 of the TCC11 Summary Report:

1. The list is not proposed to be public domain information. The list will only accessible by authorized CCM users through the secure online WCPFC systems (the Secretariat is currently working with its IT/IMS contractors to develop the best approach for publishing, it will either the WCPFC website secure section or the WCPFC intranet system);
2. The list will be based on details of vessels as contained in the RFV and records held by WCPFC Secretariat;
3. The list will be readily searchable including but not limited to:
    a. submitted by CCM / flag of the vessel ;
    b. VID;
    c. Vessel name as contained in the RFV.

4. The list will be maintained and updated by the Secretariat a least once a week and the current list will be published;
5. The Secretariat will publish the first version of the list by **30 June 2016**.
6. The data fields proposed to be maintained in the list are described in the table below:

Vessel Name	**RFV VID**	**Call Sign**	**Submitting CCM/Flag**	**Vessel type**	**VTAF details held by WCPFC**	**VTAF activation date**	**VMS reporting channel**
All vessels as contained in the RFV	*As contained in the RFV*	*As contained in the RFV*	*As contained in the RFV*	*As contained in the RFV*	*Date of receipt will be noted where applicable (otherwise will be blank)*	*Date of first report*	*For example a choice of WCPFC direct; through FFA; manual reporting or not reporting*

Attachment 2. Supporting details for the proposed budget for distribution of hard-copy CMM booklet for ROP observers (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 257);

1. As directed by WCPFC10 & WCPFC11 in 2015 the Secretariat compiled a booklet of the current Commission Conservation and Management Measures and Resolutions that are specifically relevant to observer duties. The booklet also highlights some of the issues that will assist observers in understanding the CMMs and the importance of the data they are collecting. Electronic versions were provided on the website for 2014 and 2015 and the Secretariat also understands that the observers using FIMS online reporting systems, are provided access to the electronic version of the booklet through their data-entry tablets.

2. The first hard-copy publication of this booklet (2015) has proven extremely popular and a wider audience other than observers has requested the booklet including vessel captains who have asked some observers to leave the book on board when they disembark. Following requests by programmes on how many they required for 2015; 1500 booklets were printed for 2015. However it is suggested that this may need to be increased by approximately 250 for 2016, as some countries ran out and asked for further copies. The distribution of the booklets in 2015 was a little later than expected, but following the first year of publication the Secretariat has determined the quickest and best methods for distribution after the publications are printed. It is expected that the CMM observer booklet for 2016 will be available a lot earlier than it was in 2015.

3. In 2015, the budget allocated for printing this book and distributing this booklet was insufficient to cover the costs estimated for the budget in 2015: printing and distribution costs are likely to have been overspent by approximately $4000 and the freight costs were under estimated. The total cost of printing and freight in 2015 was $12,562 which represents a delivered cost of $8.37 per booklet. An increased budget will be required for the extra printing for the suggested increase numbers of booklets for 2016 (1750), and extra for the costs of the freight of the 2016 Booklet. In 2016, an increased budget of $14500 for the printing and distribution of the 2016 version is sought. A breakdown of this budget estimate is provided below:

Proposed budget for distribution of hard-copy observer CMM booklets

Printing Costs. Guam	$5496
Shipping Freight from Printers Guam to Pohnpei	$450
Estimated Cost of freight to observer programme destinations	$8554
Total	**$14500**

Observer Programmes	Booklet numbers	Approx Freight Costs based on 2015 figures
American Samoa/FFA UST	60	372
China	30	186
Cook islands,	30	186
FSM.	90	0
French Polynesia	30	186
Fiji	60	372
Hawaii,	30	186
Kiribati	150	930
RMI	60	372
Nauru	30	186
Palau	30	186
Philippines,	270	1674
PNG,	270	1674
Tonga,	30	186
Tuvalu,	60	372
Solomon Islands	90	558
Vanuatu	60	370
Training -Head quarter meeting. Etc.	150	0
Stand by requests for distribution	90	558
Total	**1620**	**8554**

Attachment 3. Further consideration of the proposed Mass Balance Reconciliation exercise covering 2013 activities (CDS-IWG 2015 Summary Report paragraph 25).

1. At the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting, FFA Secretariat presented a paper "Mass Balance Reconciliation" (WCPFC-2015-CDSIWG02-DP03). The paper introduced the concept of Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR), and noted the following key points:

- "MBR is essentially a comparison of declared catch with declared imports, exports and domestic consumption at different points in the commodity chain"
- "A MBR calculation can be used to identify areas where significant anomalies in catch or trade are occurring, acting as a trigger to investigate points where IUU product may be entering or leaving the commodity chain, as well as the sources of that product."
- "A MBR calculation generates a MBR ratio between declared catch and declared exports, imports, and domestic consumption. This ratio is indicative of how well existing catch and trade data collections systems are. It can be used as a Key Performance Indicator to gauge the effectiveness of WCPFCs' CDS development, implementation and management."
- In terms of the WCPFC an MBR may be used as comparison ratio of declared catch to declared trade data for particular species, where one would expect the ratio to be 1:1. Any difference and areas of uncertainty can serve as a trigger to identify and investigate where product disappearance or creation is occurring. MBR for a species would involve:

  Total WCPFC Landing = Total Exports + Total Domestic Consumption

2. The outcomes from the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting on MBR were:

24. In relation to DP03, the CDS-IWG
i. Thanked the FFA for their work on the Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) Concept as outlined in the paper;
ii. Supported in principle the importance of making a start on the collection of the data as set out in Table 1 and Table 2 in DP03;
iii. Noted that MBR is used by other RFMOs e.g. CCSBT, although it is not anticipated that WCPFC will have all possible data fields in this trial;
iv. Recognized that MBR is very complicated, which although desirable in the initial stages is likely to be a challenge for Members to gather and report the data and for the Secretariat to collate and reconcile information based on the member reports;
v. Agreed to implement MBR as a trial on a voluntary basis, which is to be reviewed annually, and noting that the reporting is not yet to be assessed under the Compliance Monitoring Scheme; and
vi. Noted that developing a CDS should be the primary objective of this IWG, and that a trial of the MBR should happen alongside progress continuing to be made on CDS.

25. The CDS-IWG agreed to
1. recommend that CCMs are encouraged to include in Annual Report Part 1, in standardized format, the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2. For the purposes of the trial, CCMs are encouraged where available to include these tables (the information outlined in DP03 Table 1 and Table 2) related to the 2013 calendar year in their 2016 Annual Report Part 1 (so that there is at least one common year that can be the basis of the first trial MBR).
2. task the Secretariat with the assistance of an appropriately qualified consultant to provide, to the extent practicable, an annual 2013 MBR calculation for the consideration of the CDS-IWG, TCC and the Commission in 2016.

3. For recommendation paragraph 25.1, provided below are the proposed templates of the two tables that the CDS-IWG recommendation is encouraging CCMs complete and include in their 2016 Annual Report part 1 for the 2013 calendar year.

Table 1 – Minimum requirements for Disposal of Species (Export and Domestic Market)

Requirement	
Flag CCM	
Catch Location (CCM EEZ or WCPFC HS area)	
Destination (Domestic or Country)	
Gear Code	
Net weight (processed) kg	
Estimated whole weight	

Table 2 - Receipt and Redistribution of Species (re-export and re-imports, transhipment activities to be considered as either export or import)

Requirement	
Export year	
Export CCM or Domestic	
Import CCM	
Harvest year	
Gear code	
Net weight (processed) kg	
Estimated whole weight	

4. In respect of CDS-IWG recommendation paragraph 25.2, during the CDS-IWG discussions some CCMs noted their concerns that they envisaged difficulties in being able to provide complete data for the MBR trial. The proposed CDS-IWG 2015/16 workplan suggests that it is likely that the Secretariat will be expected to undertake the proposed MBR calculation exercise during the same time that the Secretariat is also preparing draft CMRs and undertaking TCC12 preparations. This may in part be the rationale for the proposal for suggesting the engagement of a consultant to assist with the MBR calculation task.

5. Noting these aspects from the CDS-IWG 2015 discussions on the MBR proposal, the Secretariat undertook to further investigate the task being requested of the Secretariat and provide additional detail to WCPFC12. To this end, following TCC11, the Secretariat sought the informal views of a number of experts in Catch Documentation Scheme development and the FFA Secretariat, with a view to better understanding the likely requirements and potential workload for the Secretariat proposed task during 2016. The information that is annually published on the CCSBT website related to the annual summary Catch Documentation Scheme Harvest Report 2010 –2014 and Trade Information Scheme subset Annex 2 report were also reviewed (http://www.ccsbt.org/site/sbt_data.php).

6. From these consultations, the Secretariat feels that the proposed 2013 MBR calculation activity that is recommended for the Secretariat to undertake in 2016, continues to remain quite unclear as a task. It seems fairly certain from the discussions during the CDS-IWG 2015 meeting and as confirmed in the language of the recommendation (paragraph 25.1 of the 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report), that the information which CCMs will provide on 2013 calendar year data in the format of Table 1 and Table 2 (above) will likely be incomplete across fisheries and among CCMs. The experts that were consulted expressed views to the Secretariat, which confirmed that even if all CCMs were able to submit complete data for 2013 calendar year, their expectation is that there would still not be sufficient information to

undertake a reasonable 2013 MBR reconciliation. There will be core business tasks related to CMR, SC and TCC/CDS-IWG that will necessarily be priorities for the Secretariats time and resources during that time.

7. Given these points the Secretariat would like to propose that the task in paragraph 25.2 of the 2015 CDS-IWG Summary Report is clarified to be a tasking for the Secretariat to provide for the 2016 CDS-IWG meeting, two tables that collate the available information as submitted by CCMs in Annual Report Part 1 2016.

Summary Table 1 - minimum requirements for disposal of species in 2013

- Flag State / Fishing Entity
- Harvest Year
- Catch location
- Destination
- Gear
- Net Weight (kg)
- Estimated Whole Weight (kg) -calculated by applying conversion factors to the net weight

Summary Table 2 – receipt and redistribution of species in 2013

- Export year
- Export CCM or Domestic
- Import CCM
- Harvest Year
- Gear
- Net Weight (kg)

Estimated Whole Weight (kg) -calculated by applying conversion factors to the net weight

8. During the CDS-IWG 2016 meeting, it is further proposed that the CDS-IWG meeting could review the Secretariat prepared summary tables, and at that point take an informed decision on the next steps for the MBR trial, including if recommending whether the engagement of an expert consultant to undertake MBR calculation analyses should still occur.

Recommendation

9. The Commission is invited to consider the points highlighted in this Attachment when reviewing and deciding whether to adopt on the TCC11 recommendation "TCC11 adopted the report of the CDS-IWG and forwards it to the Commission for consideration, and recommended that WCPFC12 adopt its recommendations."

Attachment 4. Notes on additional information submitted by CCMs as a reply to the TCC11 Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (TCC11 Summary Report paragraph 137)

1. TCC11 agreed to forward the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (pCMR) to WCPFC12 (TCC 11 Summary Report paragraph 137). In accordance with the Conservation and Management Measure for Compliance Monitoring Scheme (CMM 2014-07), up to 30 days prior to the Commission meeting, CCMs may provide additional advice or information relating to the pCMR, including any steps taken to address identified compliance issues.

2. In an effort to lessen burden and minimize the time spent by WCPFC12 on consideration of the pCMR, TCC Chair proposed that a special session of TCC be convened on 29 November to revise the pCMR to WCPFC12 (Circular No.: 2015/68 & 2015/76). The Commission Chair's letter (Circular No.: 2015/83) set out a suggested working arrangements that will facilitate the special TCC undertaking the proposed review and achieving the desired objective of minimizing the time spent by WCPFC12 on considering the pCMR without unduly undermining the process of the CMM.

3. As at 19 November 2015, additional information had been received from 17 CCMs in response to the provisional Compliance Monitoring Report (pCMR) adopted at TCC11. The additional information is in response to 82 individual potential issues in the pCMR including requesting a change of status for 55 potential issues. The breakdown by section and by obligations of additional information received is as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of additional information received in response to pCMR

# of CCMs who provided additional information	17
# of obligation/issue responded to with additional information	82
# obligation/issue where a change of status/score has been requested	Section i = 7 Section ii = 19 Section iv = 7 Section v = 16 Section vi = 2 Section vii = 4 **Total = 55**

4. At TCC11, many CCMs noted that they will be considering any relevant CCMs actions between TCC11 and WCPFC12 when assessing the final compliance score for CMM 2007-01 14(vii), CMM 2013-01 para 14 and CMM 2013-01 para 16. Thirteen (13) CCMs maybe expected to report back on investigation with respect to 27 of these individual potential issues. Through submission of additional information to the pCMR, 9 CCMs have reported back investigation related to 17 of these obligations. Table 2 provides a count of additional information received by the Secretariat relating to the pCMR by section and by obligation.

Table 2: Count of additional information received in response to pCMR by section and by obligations

Section	CMM	para	# of obligations where a change of Status has been requested	Additional CCMs where update of result/progress of investigation maybe reported
i (total # of obligations where a change of status has been requested = 7) *1 CCM provided additional info for 2 obligations but did not request change of status*	2009-06	34	4	
	2013-01	23	1	
		51	1	
		52	1	
ii (total # of obligations where CCM requested change of status = 19) *1 CCM provided additional info for 4 obligations but did not request change of status*	2009-06	11	6	
		35 (a) (ii)	1	
		35 (a) (iii)	4	
		35 (a) (iv)	5	
	2010-02	02	2	
	2013-01	24	1	
iv (total # of obligations where CCM requested change of status = 6) *2 CCM provided additional info for 3 obligations but did not request change of status*	2013-01	14 [1]	5	6
		16 [2]	2	2 *+3 CCMs who had reporting gaps*
v (total # of obligations where CCM requested change of status = 16) *2 CCM provided additional info for 3 obligations but did not request change of status*	2006-08	30	1	
		40	1	
		41	1	
	2007-01	14 (vii) [3]	4	9
		Att K Ann C 06	1	
	2011-02	9a	1	
		9a VMS SSPs 2.8	1	
		9a VMS SSPs 7.2.2	1	
	2013-03	02	5	
vi	SciData	05	2	

[1] 11 CCMs maybe expected to report back on investigation. Of these, 5 CCMs have provided additional information and requested that they remain Compliant or their score/status be changed to Compliant; 2 CCMs have provided additional information on progress/result of investigation; 4 CCMs did not provide additional information

[2] 3 CCMs maybe expected to report back on investigation. Of these, 1 CCM have provided additional information and requested that they remain Compliant; 2 CCMs did not provide additional information. There were an additional 3 CCMs who had reporting gaps related to this obligation

[3] 13 CCMs maybe expected to report back on investigation. Of these, 4 CCMs have provided additional information and requested that they remain Compliant; 5 CCMs have provided additional information on progress/result of investigation; 4 CCMs did not provide additional information

Section	CMM	para	# of obligations where a change of Status has been requested	Additional CCMs where update of result/progress of investigation maybe reported
(total # of obligations where CCM requested change of status = 1) *2 CCM provided additional info for 5 obligations but did not request change of status*				
vii (total # of obligations where CCM requested change of status = 4) *1 CCM requested a change of status for these 4 missed deadline issues*	2009-06	11	4	
	2013-01	16	1	
	Art 23	2 (b)	1	
	SciData	05	1	