



3rd MEETING OF CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP

FSM-China Gymnasium, Palikir,
Pohnpei, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

16-17 September 2016

CHAIRS REPORT

WCPFC-TCC12-2016-24_final_rev1¹
27 October 2016

Contents

Agenda Item 1 Welcome and Opening	2
Agenda Item 2 Review of Information and Updates from CCMs	3
Agenda Item 3 Key elements of future CDS.....	4
Agenda Item 4 Mass Balance Reconciliation Trial	12
Agenda Item 5 CMM Development	13
Agenda Item 6 General Discussion and Next Steps	13
Agenda Item 7 Other Matters.....	13
Agenda Item 8 Close	13
Attachment A: List of CDS-IWG3 Participants.....	14
Attachment B: Agenda.....	21

¹ Update to incorporate participants comments on the draft version of the report that was presented to TCC12 dated 24 September 2016. Rev 1 includes a correction to paragraph 15.

Agenda Item 1 Welcome and Opening

1. The Chair, Mr Alois Kinol, called the meeting to order at 9am. After welcoming participants to the workshop, the Chair requested the delegate from Federated States of Micronesia to offer a prayer.
2. The Executive Director, Mr Feleti Teo OBE, in his opening remarks welcomed the participants to this workshop and to Pohnpei, the home of the Commission Secretariat. This is the fourth meeting of the CDS-IWG, but is considered to be the third official meeting as the 2014 meeting was held as a workshop. It was noted that this is a busy two weeks ahead, and after this meeting, there will be a Strategic Planning Workshop, TCC and a FAD IWG. The CDS-IWG TORs guide the work of the group despite divergent views, there is a commitment to agree and develop a CDS for the Commission. There has been good progress under the guidance of the Chair, Mr Alois Kinol, whose sterling work was recognized by the ED. There was generally good progress in developing standards, though it is noted that further work is required to progress Bluefin Tuna. The focus of this workshop will be on refining and agreeing the 9 draft standards provided in the FFA Secretariat working paper CDSIWG03-03.
3. The Chair introduced the Provisional Agenda (WCPFC-2016-CDSIWG03-01_rev1), noting that no additional items have been submitted for inclusion in the agenda. The WCPFC Compliance Manager, Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott noted that a revised agenda on September 14th was posted. The revision essentially moved the report of the Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) under the Secretariat reporting and an emphasis is now placed on the review nine (9) draft standards alluded to above. The presented agenda was adopted and is inserted as **Attachment A**.
4. The following members, cooperating non-members and participating territories (CCMs) attended CDS-IWG03: Australia, European Union, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Japan, Republic of Korea, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Solomon Islands, Chinese Taipei, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and United States of America (USA), Vanuatu.
5. Intergovernmental organisations representing the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) Office, and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) attended CDS-IWG03.
6. Observers representing International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) also attended CDS-IWG03.
7. A list of CDS-IWG03 meeting participants is provided as **Attachment B**.
8. The Secretariat introduced the staff supporting the meeting, and it was noted that the Secretariat would be rapporteur for the meeting. The meeting arrangements were announced.

Agenda Item 2 Review of Information and Updates from CCMs

9. The WCPFC Compliance Manager, Dr Lara Manarangi-Trott, presented two papers. The first presentation provided background information and progress on CDS-IWG intercessional activities in 2016 (CDS-IWG03-02); the second presentation detailed the report (CDS-IWG03-04) on Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) trial, including review and collation of Part 1 Report Summaries.

10. In the last two years work has accelerated resulting in agreements on objectives and much of the scope for a WCPFC CDS. Two streams of work were identified for 2015/2016: The first was on Draft standards, which are the focus of this workshop and are presented in a revision of last year's FFA paper (CDS-IWG03-03).

11. Secondly, members agreed to submit information on MBR in AR Part 1's – Secretariat reviewed the relatively small amount of information provided, and a simple compilation of the information has been prepared (see attachment in CDS-IWG03-04). MBR submissions to AR Part 1 were received, and the compiled and analysis are detailed in CDS-IWG03-04: of those eight (8) CCMs included some information related to MBR in their AR Part 1, but 3 were statements from CCMs confirming that they were unable to provide any useful information at this stage.

12. Japan provided an update on the discussions amongst NC Members on development of CDS for Pacific Bluefin tuna and referred participants to the relevant paragraph in the NC12 Summary Report. Paragraph 47 (vi) of the NC12 Summary Report says:

“The [IATTC/WCPFC-NC working group] WG noted that NC12 endorsed the following conclusions on of the joint working group meeting between NC and IATTC on Pacific bluefin tuna conservation management;

-Participants supported to advance the work on CDS of Pacific bluefin tuna in the next joint meeting, in line with the development of overarching CDS framework by WCPFC and taking into account of the existing CDS by other RFMOs.

-In order to do so, participants welcomed the offer by Japan to submit a draft document describing objectives, the basic elements and work plan of CDS to the next joint meeting.”

Reports from CCMs, Observers, Chairs of other WCPFC IWGs and updates on relevant international developments

13. The Chair opened the floor for update reports, first providing the opportunity for CCMs to provide updates on their national CDS-related developments.

14. The European Union drew the attention of the WG to their wider CDS efforts including European Union and FAO developments. While the legal basis legislation setting up EU catch certification remains unchanged, that legislation is currently being used to move towards the establishment of an IT database [based on the one used in the sanitary area] to manage catch certification information in support of an effective implementation of the catch certification scheme..

15. The representative from ISSF introduced their observer paper (CDSI-WG03-OP01). The paper compares CDS in other RFMOs including from CCAMLR and CCSBT and was prepared as a reference for members.

16. The Chair presented CDS-IWG03-05 a report on the FAO progress to develop International guidelines for CDS. The Chair had attended FAO CDS-related meetings in 2015, and appraised the participants on progress to date in the development of the international guidelines. Concerns about IUU fishing were raised by the UN Assembly as early as 2013 and as a consequence COFI was directed to develop guidelines for CDS. FAO developed CDS based on a number of key principles that are set out in CDS-IWG03-05.

17. European Union added that a consultation group would resume its meeting to agree on voluntary guidelines in advance of the next FAO Conference.

18. Japan pointed out that although CDS under discussion at FAO is useful and contributes to WCPFC deliberations. However, FAO guidelines are generic, whereas WCPFC fisheries are specific and this should be recognized when developing CDS regulations in the WCPO.

19. The CDS-IWG noted the updates on the FAO Technical Consultation to develop Voluntary Guidelines for Catch Documentation Schemes.

Agenda Item 3 Key elements of future CDS

20. The Chair opened Agenda 3 focusing on the five topics that were agreed at the previous CDS-IWG-02. Secretariat paper (CDS-IWG03-02) was referenced and the FFA delegation paper (CDSIWG03-03) presented. The Chair noted that the CDS-IWG has already agreed objectives, most of the scope, the list of entities that have roles and responsibilities in a WCPFC CDS, accepting that the roles will need to be refined as the CDS develops. There remains the need to develop standards.

21. The Chair noted that comments from CCMs expressed during CDS-IWG02 and subsequent submissions to FFA in late 2015 were considered in this second version of this draft standards document. Edits to terms and definitions are indicated in track change; where changes have been applied to the draft standards these are presented as 'clean'.

Presentation of FFA Secretariat paper (CDSIWG03-03)

22. FFA Secretariat (P. Maru) introduced as an overview, the working paper (CDSIWG03-03) Development of WCPFC CDS Standards (Version 2). The presentation acknowledged input from members and provided some background to the development of the document especially in relation to the standards. It was anticipated that a phased implementation of the CDS would be required to allow for operational trials as part of overall fisheries planning. The CDS-IWG02 agreed objectives and the scope were followed in this paper, and the initial selection of species for consideration is YFT, SKJ, BET and SP ALB, with some uncertainty on how Pacific Bluefin Tuna would be treated. The roles of WCPFC Secretariat and CDS IMS requirements were described, noting potential overlap in future work with the ER/EM WG technical working group. Automatic processes would need to be developed to enhance transparency and traceability. Electronic-CDS would need agreement on data exchange protocols, and it is noted that related work in international organisations could be directly useful in this area. Under a phased implementation Certification of Product, IUU risk classification for species and transition from manual reporting to electronic would require consideration of how these are implemented during a transitional period, so not to hinder trade flows. It was noted that manual reporting needs to be catered for in the grace period – IT capability and human resource capacity would be developed and phased in to meet automated data reporting standards.

23. FFA Secretariat referenced the need to give effect to Article 25, by developing in built mechanisms using criteria for demonstrating IUU, and develop regulations to prohibit commercial profiteering from IUU activities that undermines CCM's national laws or WCPFC CMMs. An outline was provided of the roles of key players in the CDS process, i.e. the WCPFC Secretariat, WCPFC, TCC, SC and CCMs. MCS tools that may be applied in support of the CDS process were listed. In response to an enquiry from the floor, it was clarified that the reference to manual reporting referred to the processing of data recorded on paper forms into an electronic database, not a paper pushing process.

24. European Union – Standards appear to be conditions to access the CDS. A phased development could result in dual trade flows, uncertified and certified, which could create trade distortion. The products from WCPFC may or may not be certified. But the standards should be the standards for the development of a CDS, not the CDS itself. E.g. whether manual or automatic data it doesn't matter – the data is entered into the CDS and is the basis for the certification of the product. The role of the Secretariat in terms of the standards is unclear – the CDS is an obligation on the CCMs. The phased in period isn't appropriate in terms of achieving the main objective (no IUU fish products in the supply chain). Once an IUU product is identified at any moment of the supply chain, there has to be someone responsible to deal with the issue as required by Article 25. Need to know the precise role of stakeholders and authorities, because any triggering event different actors with different responsibilities. What are the roles of the different authorities/stakeholders in the supply chain, for example which ones validate and which ones certify? Definitions as well as clarification of respective roles are needed.

25. FFA Secretariat indicated that the work as presented is work in progress, i.e. the presentation is not a final product. The phased approach was a means to enable participation by all players to cater for various stages of CDS development, at the same time encouraging continued systems development. This approach would only apply during the 'grace period' to cater for the developmental phase of CDS. IUU classification of species is an ongoing discussion, noting that previous meetings had debated whether trade of IUU product should be prohibited or if there was room for mitigating circumstances, such as the offender addressing the IUU issue, enabling the product to then enter the commodity trade. Stakeholder roles will be developed over time, noting the need to include consideration of non-CCMs etc. The agreed role of other stakeholders would depend largely upon how CCMs develop their national CDS processes.

26. Japan reminded the WG that non-fishery sector such as trade-sector are also involved in the CDS processes and therefore a complex internal process is needed for policy decision; it would take a long time to agree and operationalize a complex system and so an initial system should be as simple as possible. It is preferable to start with one or two species caught by major fisheries under a paper based system. Given that the objective of the CDS is to combat IUU fishing, items to be validated should be regulated under CMMs. Similarly, in combatting IUU fishing a simple system without a grace period is better than a complex system with a grace system. Noting the FFA proposal would be a final CDS standards, Japan stated an initial standard covering one or two species caught by major fisheries should be developed at first.

27. The Chair asked the workshop to note that we are not at the implementation phase and input from the floor will be taken into consideration at a later stage. He further noted that whilst our aim is to agree the draft standards, there may be different views on how we apply those standards.

Review of (nine) draft standards as presented in Attachment A of CDSIWG03-03

28. FFA Secretariat introduced the standards document. At this time the focus has been on the identifying the data required in support of CDS rather than the specific providers of that data. She introduced Attachment A of CDSIWG03-03, and described the FFA Secretariats' approach to refining the standards.

29. Chair indicated that the workshop would work on each standard one by one. If necessary small working groups may be appointed to discuss issues in detail.

30. Japan inquired as to how the standards envisaged would apply to Cannery States, for example, P/S catches go to Thailand and Philippines.

31. Presenter FFA Secretariat, referencing discussions last year at CDSIWG2, agreed that there is a clear need to engage with non-CCMs, though this is not explicitly considered in these standards. An area that requires further consideration and development.

32. For the sake of clarity of respective roles and responsibilities, European Union suggested dealing in future with standards by separating the catch area (to landing/transshipment event) from the subsequent trade/processing part.

33. Japan reminded the WG that Thailand is a CNM and Philippines is a CCM of the WCPFC.

Glossary

34. FFA Secretariat (P Maru) – presented and explained changes to the glossary of terms from that tabled to CDS-IWG2.

35. The European Union raised numerous queries in relation to the Glossary of Definition, including, why isn't catch data included. European Union recalled that Japan mentioned a variety of processing states under the supply chain. There is reference to importing, exporting, transshipment etc., all these events include countries where further processing could take place, which are not the final destination market state. What is the purpose of domestic trade definition? There is a definition for export but not for import. The export definition is vague and could have repercussions on other areas, e.g. customs. While there is not clarity what certification/validation means, different authorities will have to have different roles. They have to be clarified. As an example, an import state authority appears to have the right to certify the product as non-IUU and that should not be their role. In agreement with Japan a comprehensive process with no phasing is better than phase in with a complex system; if there are parallel tracks of product in the chain then we will not have an effective CDS.

36. USA expressed they were in agreement with some the European Union comments regarding the glossary of terms and thinks that it needs a closer review, particularly where the definitions are not consistent with the generally accepted usage of those terms, but was assuming that the chair is not looking for revision on the floor.

37. Chair clarified that there would be no re-drafting at this time – general comments will be noted by FFA for future consideration

38. Japan concurred with European Union and USA and was unclear about the proposed validation and certification process, and considered that the WG needed a common understanding. It also noted the definition of basic terms such as “validation”, “certification” and “verification” should be stipulated in the standard for the purpose of preventing operational confusion.

39. Chair agreed with Japan on the importance of all players understanding the process and terminology.

40. Chinese Taipei agreed with the USA, and feels that there needs to more internal discussion on CDS nationally. Chinese Taipei did not have a clear understanding of how IUU high risk is defined.

41. FFA Secretariat explained that the initial IUU classification was based on a review of the species and their associated fisheries; but agreed on the need to define the determination of IUU [see para 26]. The comments on the glossary will be fully considered in the next iteration. The term Authorised Certifiers clearly needs a refined definition.

42. The Chair noted that the glossary of definitions was not final and is still work in progress. Indeed when working through the draft standards, it is likely that the group discussions would have a bearing on the draft definitions.

43. FFA Secretariat presented the 9 following standards and the chair led subsequent discussion on each standard in turn.

i. Unique Identification of Traceable Products

44. Japan questioned if it was possible to estimate the number of individual fish in a purse seine fishery. In addition it commented for a proposed rule that fishing boats may not hold catch from different jurisdictions that further discussion is needed on the treatment of coastal states' regulation under WCPFC CDS.

45. Chinese Taipei asked for a definition of product in this standard, and suggested that there should be the same standard for all species. The last 3 bullets in this standard appear more stringent than in standard 5 and would cause difficulties for Chinese Taipei.

46. FFA Secretariat responded, recognizing that for the purse seine fishery a more appropriate approach would be volume based. There are a variety of approaches to managing IUU risk, such as applying the risk classification (low/high) approach to species, or the application of risk management strategies across a specific fishery.

47. USA expressed discomfort with this standard 1 and noted a linkage to standard 5.

48. Chair noted the comments and agreed to revisit the issues when the WG discussed Standard 5

ii. Data Capture

49. Japan commented on the first para including reference to CMM 2013-05 – noting that the CMM refers to fishing on the high seas only. It is important that the standards developed here are consistent with existing requirements.

50. European Union notes that reference to certified product here in standard 2 links with standard 5. The questions are: Who certifies the product (validation)? How can an authority identify IUU with

limited data? Who has the role of providing/endorsing data and to which extent? What is the interaction between authorities if there are data discrepancies? The process as detailed in the standard is not logical. It would be useful to clarify the supply chain, from point of capture to point of landing – and a second procedure where product is exported processed re-exported etc. A sequence of events across the whole supply chain would help to provide clarity to roles and authorities across the supply chain.

51. USA commenting on both this standard and for standard 5 stated that there are concerns about ensuring the feasibility of a timely certification process, i.e. a process that won't be a barrier to trade, nor tempt certifying agencies to take shortcuts.

52. FFA Secretariat explained that the proposed CDS process is very inclusive and takes in to account the multi-jurisdictional nature of WCPO fisheries, and the suite of measures adopted by the Commission. It is acknowledged that further work is needed to define roles and responsibilities, and that CCM feedback will help with this ongoing work.

iii. Data Communication

53. European Union noted that from this standard it appears that the scheme would be managed by individual CCMs rather than by means of a CDS tool itself. CDS as an IT tool should require the entry or validation of data by a CMM at each level of the supply chain (roles), but it should also be a tool to share data (interaction for verification) and build the data flow under the CDS to confirm the legality a given product (catch certificate). In relation to this European Union asked for clarification on what are manual and digital catch certificates.

54. FFA Secretariat explained that some CCMs felt that digital forms facilitate timeliness; and that a manual (paper) document could accompany the product. Some CCMs still preferred the use of paper documentation, rather than using electronic solutions.

55. Japan asked if these standards be finalised step by step or all together at one time. For example in the case of this standard 3, it is difficult for the CCM to comment on this standard without a holistic view of the CDS. It reiterated that it is preferable to start with one or two species caught by major fisheries and a paper based system.

56. NZ digital means e-reporting, noting that there is a parallel process in the WCPFC to develop ER, and members should be encouraged to develop digital capacity. It is also noted that paper forms already form a large burden for the work of the secretariat.

57. FFA Secretariat explained that regardless of the form that the documentation takes [paper or digital], the key message is that some basic data items need to be captured and exchanged among parties, to determine the legality of product, and identify potential IUU products.

58. In relation to how to proceed, USA recommended that we continue discussing each standard in turn, Japan concurred.

iv. CDS [Certifier/Validator]

59. European Union stated firstly that in reference to para 3 the CDS should provide tools and define conditions under which information is shared or passed between CCMs. Secondly certifier/validator lists different stakeholders and is somewhat confusing since some of those stakeholders provide data they do not certify the product (certifier/validator to be defined in any case).

60. Japan requested a definition and who is responsible for of certification and validation noting those information would be necessary for considering the proposal.

61. FFA Secretariat explained that this standard is about CCMs having the capacity to access required traceability and verification data, linking that data across the commodity chain, and requirements for accreditation with WCPFC. There are differing views on which parties can validate/certify products, so alternative language was used to try to progress this work, rather than stalling on specific text.

62. USA suggested that the process was similar to that of the ROP in the sense that either the US government or an entity authorised by the USA would be the competent authority.

63. With regard to the capacity of CCMs to meet the requirements of the CDS standards, the European Union noted that if CCMs have to ensure their capacity to exchange digital data across the supply chain, this suggests that there is no common (CDS) IT platform for this action. Such a CDS IT Platform should be foreseen. It is not clarified what the expected obligations of the data sharing are. Is the data provided to identify mismatches, or is it to eventually validate the specific product by means of a catch certificate. Is the CDS to be based on standards to be driven by CCMs or will it be an IT CDS Platform.

64. FFA Secretariat explained that the intent is to develop the framework for members to develop their own systems which will be interoperable, i.e. they will be able to share data. The intention is not to create an overarching CDS system.

65. Chinese Taipei asked if just one CCM fails to provide relevant traceability data in a chain, how can we have an efficient CDS that doesn't create barriers for trade ?

66. FFA Secretariat agreed on this important point, noting that the Commission is at an early stage of CDS development, and further noted that much of the required data is already being collected by members.

v. Certified Product

67. USA reiterated its concerns with the certification process and the feasibility of doing so in a timely manner, and discussed the traceability scheme under development in the USA. It is important that we ensure that any scheme we develop include mechanisms to address unlawful product that is identified later in the chain of custody that will allow it to still be taken out of the supply chain.

68. Japan in support of USA commented that approaches in the standards need to be practical and operationable.

69. European Union concurred with the previous 2 speakers. The flow of an IUU product should be interruptible at any point in the supply chain. In addition a certified product can only be certified when given checks have been made. Lack of certification of the product should stop its entry into the supply chain. The standards agreed here need to be understood by all the stakeholders. Again the European Union wants clarification on key definitions.

70. NZ commented that participants were raising issues in relation to the current proposal, but it should be recognized that many existing MCS tools are in place which support the CDS process.

71. FFA Secretariat agreed that there is a need to clarify the language in the standard to avoid ambiguity.

vi. Data Management

72. In reference to the proposed standard, Chinese Taipei asked for clarification, on the meaning of “data assets” and “any curation and preservation activities performed.” In addition, the term “non-contracting Parties” used in the proposed standard should be all revised as “non CCM.”?

73. FFA Secretariat said that there were no definitions to hand but these will be developed.

74. In response to a query regarding the final paragraph, and it was acknowledged that this would be reviewed.

vii. Training

75. Japan thought that training is best addressed once the entire CDS is established since it is difficult at this early stage to fully comprehend training needs.

viii. Inclusivity

76. Chinese Taipei enquired who, and based on what standards, will decide whether the non CCM have the mechanism in place to meet the WCPFC data standards.

ix. Dispute Settlement

77. Chinese Taipei indicated that there was probably a need for a procedures, including for non-CCM and CCM interactions.

78. WWF complemented the FFA on the paper produced. He noted that much of the data is already collected and the CDS document will largely help to organize how this data is used. Markets expect validation and certification throughout the supply chain hence those countries that adopt these measures will have an advantage in the market.

Outcomes – key elements of a future CDS

79. **Recommendation: The CDS-IWG agreed to recommend that CCMs should provide comments on CDS-IWG03-03 paper to FFA Secretariat by 31 October 2016. Interested CDS-IWG participants were also invited to an informal discussions with the FFA Secretariat on 17th September 2016. The FFA Secretariat undertook to provide an update on progress of developing Version 3 of the draft CDS data standards to WCPFC13.**

Agenda Item 4 Mass Balance Reconciliation Trial

80. Australia noted that data is held across several agencies. The exercise was useful in identifying gaps in the data collected, and there are discussions underway to determine how important those gaps are. The exercise would be easier if it had to be repeated.

81. NZ provided some data in the Part 1 report. They had a similar experience to Australia.

82. Compliance Manager noted that the current methodology in AR Part 1 creates problems for the Secretariat since the data has to be entered manually often from a pdf copy of the data. It remains unclear what is expected of the Secretariat once MBR data has been submitted.

83. Chinese Taipei – most members had problems submitting data for MBR in the AR Part 1. The Secretariat should focus on more pressing work. Japan supported this view.

84. Recommendation: The MBR data provision to AR PT 1 should be suspended.

Agenda Item 5 CMM Development

85. It was thought that the group was not yet ready to work on the development of a CMM, however a placeholder would be retained.

Agenda Item 6 General Discussion and Next Steps

86. The Chair suggests that this CDSIWG03 may be concluded and reported on to TCC. The output of the small working group would be reflected in the next iteration of the FFA CDS Standards Paper.

87. The WG agreed that individual members and the Secretariat should provide updates on WCPFC progress and approach to the FAO process on developing voluntary guidelines for CDS.

88. It was agreed that the Chair would prepare a draft report to share with participants of the working group which he would then present to TCC.

Agenda Item 7 Other Matters

89. There were no other matters.

Agenda Item 8 Close

90. The Chair expressed his thanks to the Executive Director, Secretariat and the CDS-IWG members for their support to the CDS-IWG. Special mention was made to FFA Secretariat for their continued work on the draft CDS data standards.

91. ED added to the words of the Chair, and on behalf of the participants thanked the Chair for his leadership of the CDS-IWG.

92. The chair officially declared the plenary meeting of the 3rd CDSIWG CLOSED at 5pm on 16th September.

Attachment A: List of CDS-IWG3 Participants

CHAIRMAN

Alois Kinol
CDS Chair
alois.kinol@gmail.com

Naiten Bradley Phillip Jr.
Chief of Research Division
FSM National Oceanic Resource Management
Authority

bradley.phillip@norma.fm

AUSTRALIA

Kelly Buchanan
Director - Multilateral and Migratory Stocks
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
18 Marcus Clarke St Canberra ACT 2601
+61 2 6272 4719
kelly.buchanan@agriculture.gov.au

Derek Pelep
Assistant Fisheries Biologist
NORMA
PO BOX PS 122, Palikir FM 96941
691-320-2700
derek.pelep@norma.fm

Mat Kertesz
Policy Officer - Multilateral and Migratory
Stocks
Department of Agriculture and Water and
Resources

+61 2 6271 6334
mat.kertesz@agriculture.gov.au

OKean Ehmes
Project Coordinator
FSM NORMA
Box PS-122, Pohnpei, FSM, 96941
320-2700
okean.ehmes@norma.fm

EUROPEAN UNION

Pawel Swiderek
Deputy Head of Unit
European Commission
Rue Joseph II 99 Brussels 1049
Pawel.SWIDEREK@ec.europa.eu

Truman Jano
Port Sampler
NORMA
P.O. Box 122, Palikir, Pohnpei FSM 96941

truman.jano@norma.fm

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Justino Helgen
VMS/Compliance Manager
NORMA (FSM)
P.O BOX PS 122
320-2700
justino.helgen@norma.fm

JAPAN

Yujiro Akatsuka
Assistant Director, International Affairs Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo,
JAPAN
+81-3-3502-8459
yujiro_akatsuka530@maff.go.jp

Suzanne Gallen
Chief of Statistics, Compliance and Technical
Projects
NORMA (FSM)
P.O BOX PS 122
320-2700
suzanne.gallen@norma.fm

Shingi Koto
Assistant Director, Agriculture and Marine
Products Offices
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo,
JAPAN
+81-3-3501-0532
koto-shingi@meti.go.jp

Takahiro Fujiwara

Section Chief, International Affairs Division
Fisheries Agency of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo,
JAPAN
+81-3-3502-8459
takahiro_fujiwara550@maff.go.jp

REPUBLIC OF KOREA**Kim Yun Jyeng**

Inspector
National Fishery Products Quality &
Management Service
10-4, 6 Ga-Jungong-dong, Jung-Gu Busan
Korea
8210-2881-2078
yun301@korea.kr

Sujin-Lee

Inspection
NFQS
47, 424-Bungil, Gong Hang-Ro, Incheon, Korea
+82 10-6437-1250
tnwls339@hanmail.net

ILkang Na

Assistant Manager
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association

ikna@kosfa.org

REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS**Samuel K. Lanwi, Jr.**

Deputy Director, MIMRA
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
(MIMRA)
P.O. Box 860
(692) 625-8262/5632
skljr@mimra.com

Laurence Edwards

Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
Legal Advisor
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
P.O. Box 860
(692) 625-8262/5632
ledwards@mimra.com

Melvin Silk

Asst. MCS Officer - Boarding and Inspection
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
P.O. Box 860 Majuro, MH 96960
(692) 625-8262
msilk@mimra.com

Marcella Tarkwon

Compliance Officer
Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
P.O. Box 860 Majuro, MH 96960
(692) 625-8262
mtarkwon@mimra.com

NAURU**Monte Depaune**

Coastal Fisheries & NROB Manager
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority
Buada District
5573136
monstartuna@gmail.com

NEW ZEALAND**Shannon Tau**

Legal Adviser
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

shannon.tau@mfat.govt.nz

Andrew Wright

Advisor
Ministry for Primary Industries
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace, Wellington, NZ
0064 4 8194757
andrew.wright@mpi.govt.nz

Megan Linwood

Senior Policy Analyst, International Fisheries
Management
Ministry for Primary Industries
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526,
Wellington 6011, New Zealand
6448301532
megan.linwood@mpi.govt.nz

PALAU

Kathleen Sisor

Fisheries Licensing/Revenue Officer II
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment &
Tourism, PALAU
P.O. Box 117, No.1 Malakal Road, Koror,
Republic of Palau 96940
4884934
utau.sisor@gmail.com

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Nancy Taka

Legal Officer
PNG National Fisheries Authority
P.O. Box 2016 Port Moresby
675 309 0485
ntaka@fisheries.gov.pg

Yaniba Koimilla Alfred

Snr. Audit & Certification Officer
PNG National Fisheries Authority
P.O. Box 2016 Port Moresby

ybarowci@fisheries.pg

Adrian J Nanguromo

Acting Observer Manager
The National Fisheries Authority
NFA, Box 2016, Port Moresby
675 3090400
ajnanguromo@gmail.com

Deborah R. Telek

Manager, Port Moresby
South Seas Tuna Corporation
PO Box 376, Port Moresby 121, National
Capital District, Papua New Guinea
+6753213200
deborah.telek@gmail.com

Harry Chen

Operation Officer
South Seas Tuna Corporation
PO Box 376, Port Moresby 121, National
Capital District, Papua New Guinea

sstcharry@gmail.com

SAMOA

Ueta Junior Faasili

Principal Fisheries Officer
MAF
Apia, Samoa
+685 20369
ueta.faasili@maf.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Francis Tofuakalo

Deputy Director Offshore Fisheries
Solomon Islands Ministry of Fisheries and
Marine Resources
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
(677) 39143
ftofuakalo@fisheries.gov.sb

Charles Tobasala

CHINESE TAIPEI

Chi-Chao Liu

Senior Specialist
Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture
8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd.,
Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City

chichao@msl.fa.gov.tw

Joseph Chia-Chi Fu

Deputy Director
Oversea Fisheries Development Council
3F, No.14, Wenzhou St., Da'an Dist., Taipei

Joseph@ofdc.org.tw

Joy Hsiang-Yi Yu

Officer
Fisheries Agency, Council of Agriculture
8F., No.100, Sec. 2, Heping W. Rd.,
Zhongzheng Dist., Taipei City

hsiangyi@msl.fa.gov.tw

Shan-Wen Yang

Secretary
Oversea Fisheries Development Council
3F, No.14, Wenzhou St., Da'an Dist., Taipei

shenwen@ofdc.org.tw

TONGA**Losaline Lotoahea**

Fisheries Officer (Acting Director for Fisheries
Compliance)
Fisheries Department
P.O. Box 871, Nuku'alofa, TONGA
676 21399
losilini@gmail.com

Salote Koloamatangi

Legal Officer
Ministry of Fisheries, Kingdom of Tonga
Nuku'alofa, Tonga
877-9317
skoloamatangi@tongafish.gov.to

TUVALU**Samasoni Finikaso**

Director of Fisheries
Tuvalu Fisheries Department
Funafuti, Tuvalu
+68820814
samfinikaso70@gmail.com

Solomua Ionatana

PFO Oceanic
Tuvalu Fisheries Department
Funafuti, Tuvalu
+68820814
tualen@gmail.com

Penihuro Simeti

Senior Fisheries Officer-Oceanic

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**Alexa Cole**

Deputy Chief, Enforcement Section
NOAA Office of General Counsel
1315 East West Highway, SSMC 3, Silver
Spring, MD 20910
301-427-8286
alexa.cole@noaa.gov

VANUATU**Tony Taleo**

Principal Data Officer
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
PMB 9045 Port Vila
678-23119
ttaleo@vanuatu.gov.vu

Felix Toa Ngwango

Principal Compliance Officer
Vanuatu Fisheries Department
PMB 9045, Port Vila, Vanuatu
+6785447335
ftngwango@vanuatu.gov.vu

PARTICIPATING TERRITORIES**TOKELAU****Feleti Tulafono**

Offshore Fisheries Officer
EDNRE
Fakaofu, Tokelau
(Work:+690 23113 / 23134), (Home: +690
23248)
ftulafono@gmail.com

OBSERVERS**FFA****Pamela Maru**

Fisheries Management Adviser
Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
pamela.maru@ffa.int

Noan Pakop

Director Fisheries Operation
Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
noan.pakop@ffa.int

Manu Tupou-Roosen

Legal Counsel
Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int

Lisa Williams-Lahari

Media Officer
Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
lisa.williams-lahari@ffa.int

Hugh Walton

Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
hugh.walton@ffa.int

Viv Fernandes

Compliance Policy Adviser
Forum Fisheries Agency
1 FFA Road, Honiara, Solomon Islands
21124
vivian.fernandes@ffa.int

ISSF**Claire van der Geest**

Policy Advisor
International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
cvandergeest@iss-foundation.org

PNA**Ludwig Kumoru**

Chief Executive Office
PNA
P.O. Box 3992 Majuro, Marshall Islands
ludwigpnatuna.com

Les Clark

Advisor
PNA
85 Innes Road, Christchurch, 8052, New
Zealand
64 3 3562892
les@rayfishresearch.com

Sangaalofa Clark

Policy Advisor
PNA
85 Innes Road, Christchurch, 8052, New
Zealand
64 3 3562892
sangaa@pnatuna.com

SPC**Peter Williams**

Principal Fisheries Scientist
SPC
B.P. D5 Noumea, New Caledonia
peterw@spc.int

WWF**Bubba Cook**

WWF WCP Tuna Programme Manager
World Wide Fund for Nature
PO Box 6237, Marion Square
+64278330537
acook@wwf.panda.org

WCPFC SECRETARIAT

Feleti P. Teo, OBE

Executive Director
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
feleti.teo@wcpfc.int

SungKwon Soh

Science Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
sungkwon.soh@wcpfc.int

Aaron Nighswander

Finance & Administration Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
aaron.nighswander@wcpfc.int

Lara Manarangi-Trott

Compliance Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
lara.manarangi-trott@wcpfc.int

Samuelu Taufao

IT Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
sam.taufao@wcpfc.int

Karl Staisch

Observer Programme Coordinator
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
karl.staisch@wcpfc.int

Albert Carlot

VMS Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
albert.carlot@wcpfc.int

'Ana Taholo

Assistant Compliance Manager
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
ana.taholo@wcpfc.int

Anthony Beeching

Assistant Manager Science
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
692-320-1993
anthony.beeching@wcpfc.int

Lucille Martinez

Administrative Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
lucille.martinez@wcpfc.int

Arlene Takesy

Executive Assistant
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
arlene.takesy@wcpfc.int

Donald David

Data Quality Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
donald.david@wcpfc.int

Milo Abello

VMS Operations Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
milo.abello@wcpfc.int

Samuel Rikin

IT Officer
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
samuel.rikin@wcpfc.int

Emma Nelson Mori

Project Management Assistant
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
emma.mori@wcpfc.int

Rose George

Support
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
rose.george@wcpfc.int

Virgilio San Jose

Support
WCPFC
Kaselehlie Street, PO Box 2356
Pohnpei, FM 96941
691-320-1993
virgilio.jose@wcpfc.int

Attachment B: Agenda



3rd MEETING OF CATCH DOCUMENTATION SCHEME INTERSESSIONAL WORKING GROUP

FSM-China Gymnasium, Palikir,
Pohnpei, FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

16-17 September 2016

AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 1. WELCOME AND OPENING		
1.1	Opening	
1.2	Adoption of agenda	CDSIWG03-01_rev1
1.3	Meeting arrangements	
AGENDA ITEM 2. REVIEW OF INFORMATION AND UPDATES FROM CCMs		
2.1	Report from Secretariat, including review of 2015/16 WCPFC activities against workplan and review of CDS-IWG TOR	CDS-IWG03-02 WCPFC12 Att T
	a Report on Mass Balance Reconciliation (MBR) trial, including review collation of Part 1 Report Submissions	CDS-IWG03-04
2.2	Reports from CCMs	
2.3	Reports from subregional agencies and Non-Governmental Organisations	
2.4	Reports from Chairs of other WCPFC IWGs	
2.5	Updates on relevant international developments	CDS-IWG03-05
AGENDA ITEM 3. KEY ELEMENTS OF FUTURE CDS		
3.1	Review progress to date regarding key elements of future CDS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and Responsibilities • Objectives • Scope: priority species and gear types for initial implementation • Development of standards 	CDS-IWG03-02 Att 1
3.2	CDS standards development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Development of WCPFC CDS Standards Paper –Version 2 (revised CDS-IWG DP04 paper) • Review and discuss Draft CDS Standards and Definitions (CDS-IWG03-03 Attachment A) 	CDS-IWG03-03
3.3	Outcomes – key elements of future CDS	

AGENDA ITEM 4. MASS BALANCE RECONCILIATION (MBR)	CDS-IWG03-04
4.1 Consider merits and review MBR outcome to CDS development	
AGENDA ITEM 5. CMM DEVELOPMENT	
5.1 Process and timeframes for draft CMM development	
AGENDA ITEM 6. GENERAL DISCUSSION AND NEXT STEPS	
6.1 Next steps and report to WCPFC13	
6.2 Notes on linkages to other IWGs and work of other subsidiary bodies	
AGENDA ITEM 7. OTHER MATTERS	
AGENDA ITEM 8. CLOSE	