



TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Sixteenth Regular Session

Electronic Meeting

23 – 29 September 2020

ERandEM WG Report

WCPFC-TCC16-2020-18

24 September 2020

Paper prepared by ERandEM WG Chair

INFORMATION PAPER ON ERANDEM WG PROGRESS IN 2020

This paper provides a brief update to TCC16 on the work of the ERandEMWG during 2020 and is an information paper under TCC16 Agenda 7.3. There are no recommendations proposed in this paper as the ERandEMWG4 meeting (virtual) is scheduled for 14 October as noted in Commission Circular 2020/105. A report, including any recommendations, will be prepared post the working group meeting for consideration by WCPFC17.

In 2020, the ERandEMWG has progressed work, via a drafting group and in line with the Working Groups Terms of Reference, on an Electronic Monitoring (EM) Conservation and Management Measure (CMM). There have been two versions circulated to date and I continue to welcome comments and suggestions to progress this important work. I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone that has provided input and comments on the draft CMM thus far.

In considering the comments on the draft CMM, it is clear that there are some areas that require further consideration and discussion by members and it is my intention to include these as particular areas of focus in the ERandEMWG4 agenda. In keeping with the need to have a concise agenda, I propose to focus discussions on the following:

1. The draft CMM sets out the general policy framework and obligations. The Commission agreed to an objective last year. It is proposed that the ERandEMWG4 meeting revisit the sections on principles, scope and roles and responsibilities.
2. Accreditation process and standards
 - a. The minimum standards for WCPFC's Electronic Monitoring Programmes as set out in Annex A generated a lot of productive discussion. The majority of comments sought to clarify what were standards and what were principles relating to an EMP and some paragraphs have been moved in that regard. It is noted that the minimum

standards are applicable to the accreditation of EM programmes and upon reflection, it may not be appropriate for them to form part of a CMM. I note that the standards for the Commission's ROP stand alone as part of the guiding documents for the ROP. I suggest that a similar approach is taken for the EMP with the minimum standards forming part of the documentation that outline the accreditation process.

- b. Consideration is required on what further steps are needed to develop an accreditation process for WCPFC's EMP.
3. Implementation plan
 - a. Discussion on the data to be submitted via EM technologies with reference to the work done by SPC on E-monitoring Process Standards.
 - b. Consideration of the outcomes of Project 93 to inform a phased implementation plan and making particular reference to prioritising EM in areas where independent data collection and verification is low. Previous discussions have noted the suggested phasing by vessel type followed by priority order based on activity (ERandEMWG3 para 61).

A circular will come out in coming weeks that will include an agenda based on the above. In setting out these areas of focus, I do not intend to preclude discussions on other matters.

There is further work that needs to be done and I welcome CCMs input into how we can prioritise and phase the work going forward. One area that requires further consideration is the Commission's data rules and policies and whether they are fit for purpose for data that is collected by EM systems. Some CCMs have sought information on the role of the Commission in providing training and capacity building on EM systems and data analysis. Before a CMM is adopted, there is also the requirement to undertake an assessment under 2013-06 in relation to impacts on SIDS and Territories.

Thank you again for your input into this important work and I look forward to discussions at TCC16 and the ERandEMWG meeting.

Kerry Smith