



**COMMISSION  
FOURTEENTH REGULAR SESSION**  
Manila, Philippines  
3 – 7 December 2017

---

**SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A TROPICAL TUNA BRIDGING MEASURE**

---

**WCPFC14-2017-09C  
21 November 2017**

This letter was distributed to CCMs and Observers as WCPFC Circular 2017-92 on 21 November 2017



---

**TO ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS, COOPERATING NON-MEMBERS,  
PARTICIPATING TERRITORIES AND OBSERVERS**

**Circular No.: 2017/92  
Date: 21 November 2017  
No. pages: 13**

**Support for Development of a Tropical Tuna Bridging Measure**

Dear Colleagues,

I am checking in one last time before we meet in Manila to seek your continued support for development of a tropical tuna bridging measure that is robust and easy to implement. Nearly all of you have expressed the view that CMM 2016-01 currently lacks these attributes, so there is a clear need for change.

It has now been 16 months since we began developing a Consultative Draft to build a bridge between our current management approach and the application of harvest strategies, which may take several years. You will recall that we wanted to give ourselves as much time as possible to consider a successor measure that would provide a foundation for future harvest strategies and be based on the best available science.

On December 1, we will have our second special session to consider the draft bridging measure.

A number of things have changed in the WCPO fishery in the last 16 months, most notably the change in the status of the bigeye stock from one of “overfished” to “not in an overfished condition”.

Notwithstanding the new stock status, SC13 recommended “...as a precautionary approach that the fishing mortality on bigeye tuna stock should not be increased from current level to maintain current or increased spawning biomass until the Commission can agree on an appropriate target reference point (TRP)”, due primarily to a high amount of uncertainty in the latest assessment.

We anticipate this uncertainty to reduce in the coming months with some further work on bigeye tuna growth, a major influencing factor in the assessment, being requested by the Scientific Committee for consideration at its next annual session.

The Honolulu meeting in August was our first opportunity to consider the management options contained in Rev4 of the draft bridging measure in light of the new bigeye assessment and SC13’s advice. Out of those discussions came a request to SPC to evaluate management options against a set of defined criteria, the results of which are now available and posted to the WCPFC14 meeting website. On your behalf, I would like to thank the SPC for its efforts to complete this very important task ahead of WCPFC14.

We are now at Rev5, supplemented by additional proposals. I expect further proposals in the next several days. We will spend some time on December 1 discussing SPC's evaluation results and what they mean for a successor tropical tuna measure. Our discussions in Manila will also include whether any existing ALTs (or combinations thereof) in Rev5 will achieve our agreed objectives.

The traffic light summary has been updated since Honolulu and is attached for your review. Based on my understanding of intersessional discussions between some members, I have changed some red lights to amber, but the fact is, we still have solid work ahead to reach agreement on some key principles.

As recently requested by FFA members, I have also added *disproportionate burden* to the summary of issues requiring further discussion but have not assigned a traffic light color, as agreement on any new measure will rest on fulfilling this principle.

There is still time for you to continue your intersessional discussions before we meet in Manila in 10 days. I believe that an improved tropical tuna measure is within reach, given your demonstrated commitment in recent months, so I encourage you to keep an open dialogue with other stakeholders between now and 1 December. Every effort counts.

I look forward to seeing you soon in Manila.

Sincerely,



Rhea M Moss-Christian  
CHAIR

cc: Feleti P Teo, OBE, Executive Director, WCPFC  
[feleti.teo@wcpfc.int](mailto:feleti.teo@wcpfc.int)  
Jung-re Riley Kim, Vice-Chair, WCPFC  
[rileykim1126@gmail.com](mailto:rileykim1126@gmail.com)



**The Intersessional Meeting to Progress the Draft Bridging Measure for Tropical Tunas  
Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort & Spa  
Honolulu, Hawaii  
24 August 2017**

**Chair's Summary of Issues for Further Discussion at WCPFC14**

**\*UPDATED ON NOVEMBER 20, 2017 TO REFLECT INTERSESSIONAL DISCUSSIONS**

**Traffic Light Dashboard**


	<b>On track for agreement</b>
	<b>Progress possible</b>
	<b>Significant negotiation required</b>

***NOTE: This document is an attempt by the Chair to capture the key outstanding issues that will form the basis of discussion at WCPFC14. It is not an agreed record of discussion and is not intended to exclude or prevent other issues being raised.***

## GENERAL


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Disproportionate Burden</b>	N/A	FFA members require any further consideration of a new measure to be prefaced by a commitment to addressing disproportionate burden.

## INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPHS 1-11





ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Principles for Application of the Measure</b></li> <li>• <b>Harvest strategies for bigeye, skipjack, and yellowfin tuna</b></li> <li>• <b>Objectives for the Bridging Measure</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Placement and drafting of provisions in the Bridging Measure, relating to SIDS</li> <li>- SWG discussions covered a combination of objectives and possible evaluation criteria for the purpose of scenario modeling</li> </ul> <p><u>Bigeye</u> Pending agreement on a target reference point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the fishing mortality is to be maintained at or below the average fishing mortality level in 2011-2014</li> <li>- the spawning biomass depletion ratio (SB/SBF=0) is to be maintained at or above the average SB/SBF=0 for 2012-2015</li> <li>- [EU/US: and fishing mortality at FMSY]</li> </ul>

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
		<p><u>Yellowfin</u> Pending agreement on a target reference point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the fishing mortality is to be maintained at or below the average fishing mortality level in 2011-2014</li> <li>- the spawning biomass depletion ratio (SB/SBF=0) is to be maintained at or above the average SB/SBF=0 for 2012-2015</li> <li>- [EU/US: and fishing mortality at FMSY]</li> </ul>

**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – FAD Management**


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p><b>Closures vs FAD set limits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CCM-based FAD set limits</b></li> <li>• <b>Zone-based FAD closures</b></li> <li>• <b>High seas FAD closures</b></li> </ul>		<p><u>Small Working Group outputs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Option 1 - CCM 2016-01 (2017 FAD closure limits), 4 month FAD closure/flag state option for 4th month+ high seas FAD closure (Kiribati exemption and footnote3).</li> <li>- Option 2 - 2a - PNA, 3 Month FAD closure + High Seas FAD closure (Kiribati exempt); 2b - 3 Month FAD closure and 5 month high seas FAD closure.</li> </ul>

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Option 3 - 3a - USA, No FAD closure, hard FAD set limits option 3a USA to provide hard limit; 3b - ask SPC to calculate limit necessary to meet objective.</li> <li>– Option 4 - Japan, 4 month closure/flag state option for 4th month + high seas FAD closure (no Kiribati exemption), 5th month FAD closure for non-SIDS fleets averaging &gt;500mt of Bigeye per purse seiner. 350 FAD limit (cannot be assessed by SPC).</li> <li>– Option 5 - Zone-based FAD set limits, with equal SIDS allocation on the high seas.</li> </ul>


<b>Definition of FADs</b>		- Differing views on amending the definition
<b>Exploratory FAD fishing in EEZ</b>		- Niue proposal
<b>Philippines fleet in HSP1</b>		- Continuation of application of existing measure
<b>Ecological impact of FADs</b>		- Need concrete proposal on non-entangling FADs




## PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Effort Control

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p><b>Purse seine effort control:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EEZ vs High Seas</b></li> <li>• <b>Olympic allocation system for high seas limits</b></li> <li>• <b>CCM-based limits/control</b></li> <li>• <b>Exemptions (dependent on limits)</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coastal States to set effort (or catch) limits within their EEZs</li> <li>- No purse seine fishing in the high seas area, south of 20S</li> <li>- Quarterly limits on the high seas effort (and the Olympic system)</li> <li>- CCM-based limits throughout the Convention area; or between 20S and 20N</li> <li>- Quarterly limits on the high seas, based on 2010 level (and the Olympic system)</li> <li>- Non-PNA SIDS proposal</li> </ul>



**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Yellowfin catch limits**

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Setting yellowfin catch limits</b>		– Differing views on need for hard limits


**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Capacity**

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Limit number of vessels</b> <b>Restructure fleet</b> <b>Exemptions</b>		Possible options: – Existing provisions from CMM 2016-01 (some or all paragraphs 49-55) – No provisions on Capacity – Pending outcome of discussions on zone-based vs flag-based FAD and effort limits


**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Transferability of effort limits**

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Global transferability that covers both catch limits and effort limits</b>		– Discussion required on concept
<b>Transferability for non-PNA SIDS</b>		– Transferring of in-zone limits to other CCMs to be used on the high seas


**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Catch Retention**


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Inclusion of longline</b>		<p>Possible options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Development of standalone proposal on longline discard ban</li> <li>– Not having longline catch retention clauses</li> </ul>

**PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Research**


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p><b>Level of obligation to conduct research on yellowfin and bigeye fisheries</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification of obligation and drafting</li> </ul>

**LONGLINE FISHERY – Catch and effort limits**


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p><b>Zone-based / flag-based</b> <b>Area of application</b> <b>Exemptions</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Global limit on the high seas effort (and the Olympic system) with no SIDS exemption</li> <li>- High seas bigeye catch limits with SIDS exemption</li> <li>- CCM-based limits between 20S and 20N, with no SIDS exemption</li> <li>- CCM-based catch limits with most SIDS having a minimum catch limit of 2,000 mt</li> <li>- Zone-based effort (VDS) limits</li> </ul>

<b>Yellowfin catch limits</b>		– Differing views on need for hard limits
-------------------------------	---	---



**LOONGLINE FISHERY – Capacity**

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Limits on vessel numbers and types</b>  <b>Fleet structure</b>		– Differing views on need for capping vessel numbers  – Pending discussions on capacity limits

**OTHER COMMERCIAL FISHERIES**

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<b>Setting a hard limit or taking a stepwise approach</b>		– PNA and US will work together to agree an approach

## MCS PROVISIONS – Longline Fishery

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Transshipment</b></li> <li>• <b>VMS</b></li> <li>• <b>Observer Coverage</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Differing views on additional controls on transshipment at sea</li> <li>– Differing views on manual reporting ban for longline</li> <li>– Differing views on increasing observer coverage on longline vessels; discussion of e-monitoring</li> <li>– Differing views on the area of application of MCS measures</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Charters</b></li> <li>• <b>Monthly BE Reporting</b></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Differing views on removal vs retention of provisions in the bridging measure</li> <li>– SWG on LL measures proposed deletion of monthly BE reporting requirement in the bridging measure; deletion subject further strengthening of other MCS tools</li> </ul>

**PREAMBLE: Not yet discussed; pending finalization of operative provisions.**