



TECHNICAL AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

Eighth Regular Session

27 September- 2 October 2012

Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

NOTES ON ISSUES ARISING FROM TCC7, WCPFC8, SC8 AND NC8

WCPFC-TCC8-2012/IP01_rev1

13 September 2012

Table 1 lists those TCC7 recommendations, WCPFC8 recommendations, SC8 recommendations and provides cross-references to the relevant TCC8 agenda item and TCC8 paper.

Where necessary, to provide context to the recommendation as written, some introductory information has been provided, which has been paraphrased from the relevant report, or is provided as a quote in non-italicised font with the paragraph reference in parentheses at the end of the paragraph (eg para xx).

A separate set of supplementary tables commence on page 29:

- Table 2 provides notes from previous WCPFC meetings on Information papers which are proposed to be discussed by exception at TCC8 (to be decided under Agenda 1.5)
- Table 3 Lists three items that SC8 specifically referred to TCC8
- Box 1. Cooperating Non-Member Participatory Rights decision from WCPFC8
- Table 4. Points of interest from the NC8 Report for TCC8 (there were no specific matters which NC8 had referred to TCC8, however there are four matters listed in Table 4 for the information of TCC8)

Proposed process for considering previous Summary Report Outcomes and Recommendations:

It is proposed that TCC8 will consider, as appropriate, specific TCC8-related outcomes from previous meetings listed in Table 1 under the relevant TCC8 agenda item.

TCC8 should decide where in the TCC8 Agenda the three items that SC8 specifically referred to TCC8 should be considered (see table on page 33):

- plan for improvement for availability and use of purse seine species composition data
- SC8 advice on scientific data provision
- Other commercial fisheries for bigeye and yellowfin (para 39 CMM 08-01)

Table 1. Notes on Issues arising from TCC7, WCPFC8 and SC8

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
1.5 Information papers to be discussed by exception	<i>See separate table below (Table 2 on page 29)</i>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012/06
2.1 a) Review of WCPFC IUU list and IUU nominations	<p><u>WCPFC8</u> 193. WCPFC8 agreed to remove Senta (now re-named Sun Fu Fa) from the WCPFC IUU Vessel List.</p> <p>196. WCPFC8 agreed that the Neptune, the Fu Lien No. 1, the Yu Fong 168 and the Jinn Feng Tsair No. 1 would remain on the WCPFC IUU Vessel List. The WCPFC IUU List for 2012 is appended as Attachment M [to WCPFC8 report].</p>	<i>WCPFC Circular 2012-51 was sent to CCMs on 2 August 2012, to provide the draft IUU list for 2012.</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-09
2.1 b) i) IUU listing procedures – update from U.S. on intersessional process on Tongas paper paper	<p><u>TCC8</u> <i>Tonga provided a paper (TCC7-2010-DP/16 Rev1) in response to WCPFC5 and WCPFC7 directives.</i></p> <p>86. TCC7 agreed to establish an inter-sessional process to be led by the United States to produce draft guidelines on application of paragraphs 15 (c) and 25(e) to be further discussed by the Commission.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 407. WCPFC8 agreed that the USA would lead an intersessional working group on this topic with the aim of bringing a proposal to TCC8.</p>	<i>WCPFC Circular 2012-29, was circulated to CCMs on 14 May 2012, seeking comments on Tonga’s Paper (WCPFC8-2011-DP/21) regarding the issue of coastal State satisfaction and the WCPFC IUU listing process by June 8 to United States.</i>	

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
2.1 b) ii) IUU listing procedures of other tuna RFMOs	277. TCC7 agreed to task the Secretariat with compiling IUU listing procedures from other RFMOs, and developing a matrix of similarities and differences in these procedures, as a basis for further discussions on IUU Vessel List harmonization at TCC8.		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-10
2.2 Assessment of Cooperating Non-Member Applications, recommendations and technical advice to the Commission (CMM 2009-11, para 3)	WCPFC8 36. WCPFC8 agreed to grant CNM status for 2012 to Belize, the DPRK, Ecuador, El Salvador, Indonesia, Mexico, Panama, St. Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Thailand and Vietnam.	<i>For details of each CNM's Participatory Rights including in the WCPFC-IATTC Overlap area during 2012, see Box 1. Cooperating Non-Member Participatory Rights decision from WCPFC8 on page 34.</i>	A DRAFT ANALYSIS OF CNM APPLICATIONS WILL BE PROVIDED ON SECURE-CCM SECTION OF WCPFC WEBSITE
2.3 a) Progress report from the co-chairs of the VMS SWG	TCC7 <i>TCC7 received the report of the consultancy study on the Joint WCPFC/FFA Review of VMS. A small working group chaired by the WCPFC Vice-Chair, Mr. Matt Hooper, developed commentary on the recommendations of the review.</i> 138. TCC7 recommends that the table in Attachment F (of TCC7 Report) be forwarded to WCPFC8 to be considered alongside the Joint WCPFC/FFA VMS Report. WCPFC8 Mr Robert Martinolich presented the independent review report (WCPFC-2011/27) explaining that it included visits to ten countries, with input from 21 individuals		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-11

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>representing 13 organizations. The objective of the review was to analyse the cost and structure of the current VMS arrangements in the Pacific to ensure they are delivering an effective service. The following recommendations from the study were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. FFA and WCPFC should continue to work cooperatively and collaboratively; b. The objectives of the respective VMSs should be defined; c. Both organizations should work toward developing a central database; d. Responsibilities should be migrated from commercial service providers to fishery management organizations; e. Data sharing procedures should be expanded to a wider range of users under strict confidentiality guidelines; f. WCPFC should adopt FFA’s approved ALC list; g. Costs should be reduced by reducing packet size, rationalising polling rates and eliminating redundant data transmissions; h. The SLA should be replaced with a legally binding agreement which is reviewed annually; and i. The SLA should be amended to allow the WCPFC to liaise directly with the service provider. <p>The overall findings of the review indicated that while there is room for improvement, the FFA is delivering on all components of the agreement and the VMS is meeting the basic needs of the Commission. (para 236)</p> <p>FFA members noted that the review report confirms that the FFA is meeting all requirements for the VMS and that the joint VMS model is working. These CCMs stated the importance of defining objectives for the VMS and referred WCPFC8 to a paper which outlines their ideas in this regard (WCPFC8-2011-DP/41). FFA members proposed that the Commission task a SWG to work intersessionally by electronic means to:</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>j. Identify the needs, purposes and attributes of the Commission VMS;</p> <p>k. Review the existing VMS Standards, Specification and Procedures (SSPs) and CMM 2007-02 to determine if they meet the needs, purposes and attributes identified in (a) and if not, provide recommended changes to the SSPs and CMM 2007-02.</p> <p>In addition, FFA members requested the Secretariat engage FFA to prepare the functional specifications and costs of the enhanced system envisaged by the TCC7 SWG (WCPFC8-2011/36) with consideration to meeting identified needs, avoiding duplication, protecting confidentiality and providing a “stand alone” system. FFA members proposed Mr Colin Brown of the Cook Islands and Mr Stan Crothers of Tokelau as the Co-Chairs of the VMS SWG.(para 241)</p> <p>245. WCPFC8 agreed to convene an intersessional SWG on VMS, co-chaired by Mr Colin Brown and Mr Stan Crothers to progress the two tasks identified in paragraph <u>241</u> above, related to the priority recommendations from the review report, for the consideration of TCC8.</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>2.3 b) Annual Report of the Commission VMS (see para 7.3.9 and 7.3.10 SSPs) including request information to inform discussions regarding the bracketed text in the SSPs related to manual reporting</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TCC considered the Annual Report on the VMS and discussed a number of matters highlighted by the Secretariat</i> • <i>Some CCMs suggested further information that the Secretariat could include in the VMS Annual Report, which would assist with reviewing and considering aspects of CMM 2007-02 and the SSPs.</i> <p>After some discussion at TCC7, majority and minority views could not be unified and text removing the brackets on the manual reporting requirements in the VMS SSPs could not be agreed. (para 224) FFA members noted that the Secretariat should provide a breakdown of vessels manually reporting by name. ALC/MTU type, fleet, gear type and period and regularity of manual reporting within future Annual Reports, this information may prove helpful to CCMs to resolve the issue of the bracketed text in paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 of the SSPs. (para 225)</p> <p>226. Noting the importance of the issue, TCC7 encouraged CCMs to work intersessionally to bring a proposal to WCPFC8 regarding bracketed text in the SSPs.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> WCPFC8 noted that TCC8 discussed issues related to manual reporting requirements in the VMS SSPs, and the bracketed text in the VMS SSPs, remain unresolved. (para 270)</p> <p>WCPFC8 referred further discussion of the issues associated with bracketed text in the VMS SSPs to TCC8. (para 271)</p>	<p><i>TCC8 Annual Report on Commission VMS includes information to inform discussions regarding the bracketed text in the SSPs related to manual reporting</i></p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP02</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>2.3 c) Consideration of cost optimization of the Commission VMS</p> <p>2.4 d) Consideration of cost optimization of the ROP</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 received a progress report on work by consultants for WCPFC8 on optimization of costs of Commission operations. TCC7 was invited to provide comments in advance of WCPFC8 for early consideration by the consultants. 215. TCC7 noted the report on data entry costs for Noumea and Pohnpei (WCPFC-TCC7-2011/16) and agreed to forward it to the FAC for its consideration.</i></p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> <i>A number of CCMs suggested that the Secretariat be tasked with progressing the issues of cost optimization intersessionally particularly around issues relating to VMS and ROP. It was recommended that these further technical points be revisited under agenda items pertaining to the ROP and VMS (para 95). There was not sufficient time to revisit this item during WCPFC8.</i></p>	<p><i>The Cost Recovery and optimization of costs study is provided as a reference for TCC8.</i></p> <p><i>The TCC8 Annual Report on Commission VMS and ROP Data Management paper include some consideration of cost optimization issues.</i></p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-IP12 (is WCPFC8-2011/13 Rev 1)</p> <p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP02</p> <p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-16</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>2.3 d) Operationalising Article 24(8) of the Convention (Access to in-zone data, Niue application and Flick the Switch)</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 168. TCC7 reviewed the draft VMS Template Agreement prepared by the Secretariat. Members worked throughout the meeting to reach agreement, but were unable to finalize the VMS Template Agreement. TCC7 recommended that the USA continue to work with CCMs intersessionally and requests that CCMs provide it with comments on the current draft of the Template Agreement (WCPFC-TCC7-2011-DP/18) by 5 November 2011. The USA will then prepare a revised version of the VMS Template Agreement, based on comments received, for consideration by the Commission at WCPFC8.</p> <p>Implementation of an EEZ Entry and Exit Notification Scheme <i>France introduced WCPFC7-TCC7-2011-DP/15 Rev 3 which presents a revised version of a proposal presented to WCPFC7 calling for implementation of an EEZ entry and exit notification scheme.</i></p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> France informed WCPFC8 that it appreciated the work that had been done to progress the issues associated with the VMS template agreement as such work may address be able to address the concerns which prompted it to develop the EEZ entry-exit notification scheme proposal. (para 262)</p> <p>263. WCPFC8 agreed that the Commission would provide Niue with VMS data for fishing vessels present in the Niue EEZ which are reporting to the Commission VMS.</p> <p>264. WCPFC8 agreed that the joint US and RMI proposal WCPFC8-2011-DP/30 (Rev 3) be further elaborated at TCC8.</p> <p>265. NOTE: Please note Circular No 2012/41 Concerning the Chairs final decision regarding this issue.</p>	<p><i>WCPFC Circular 2012-41 – is the Chairs decision on the WCPFC8 decision providing coverage of Niue’s EEZ by the WCPFC VMS.</i></p> <p><i>WCPFC Circular 2012-48, was circulated to CCMs on 19 July 2012, seeking comments on Article 24(8) VMS Template Agreement, WCPFC8 proposal (WCPFC8-2011-DP rev 3). Comments were requested on the paper by 10 August 2012.</i></p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP15 (is WCPFC Circular 2012-41)</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
2.3 e) Proposed template for ALC/MTU audits by CCMs (see para 9-13 of SSPs)	<p><u>TCC7</u> 158. TCC7 directed the Secretariat to prepare an ALC/MTU audit template and to include a field for ALC/MTU audits in the Part 2 Annual Report template.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> The WCPFC Chair requested CCMs to provide comments on the template to the Secretariat, and directed the Secretariat to present a revised draft of the template to TCC8. (para 269)</p>	<i>The template was updated to reflect comments received from CCMs. A summary template for Annual Reporting by CCMs is also proposed in the TCC8 paper by the Secretariat.</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-12
2.3 f) Review of integrity of Secretariats VMS data (see para 6.10 SSPs)	<p><u>WCPFC8</u> One CCM asked the reasons for not distributing the VMS security audit of 2010 and about the follow up of the finding identified in the VMS security audit of 2010. It advocated for the VMS Security audit to be carried out in 2012. (para 234) The Executive Director noted that the 2010 audit was not completed by the external consultant. Starting in 2012 an annual VMS audit will be undertaken and it will include an audit of the Commission’s data security rules, which are considered adequate, are being effectively implemented by the Secretariat. (para 235)</p>	<i>Late paper</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-13
2.4 a) ROP –TAG – Update on the ROP-TAG Chair on progress and overview of proposed work plan for 2012-13	<p><u>TCC7</u> 202. TCC7 recommended that WCPFC8 form a Technical Advisory Group (TAG)-ROP to consider further procedures and guidelines for operation of the ROP given the requirements already specified in relevant Commission CMMs. The proposed terms of reference are given in Attachment G (of the TCC7 Report).</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 213. WCPFC8 approved the terms of reference for the TAG-ROP through September 2013 (Attachment O of the WCPFC8 Summary Report). Mr Phillip Lens of Papua New Guinea was appointed TAG-ROP Chair.</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-14

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>2.4 b) Annual Report by Secretariat on the ROP (CMM 2007-01 para 3) including items for consideration raised by the ED</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 210. In noting the report contained in WCPFC-TCC7-2011/15 rev 1, TCC7 considered that vessel master and observer complaints can only be addressed at the national level. TCC7 thus encouraged CCMs to improve their national system for dealing with these complaints and to share information on the assessment and levels of penalties.</p> <p><i>TCC7 received the annual report of the ROP prepared by the Secretariat and discussed a broad range of matters raised in the paper and by Members. Audits of all ROP programmes are expected to be completed by June 2012.</i></p> 221. TCC7 notes that the ROP audits provide an opportunity for review of each CCM’s plan to achieve the required level of observer coverage. <p>The Executive Director explained that discussions have been initiated with IATTC on observer data and training requirements. Identifying which data are required by each programme is considered to be the main area of work at this time, and would report to WCPFC8 and WCPFC9.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 221. Noting the various issues involved, WCPFC8 directed the WPCFC Executive Director to continue to work with the IATTC Executive Director to implement an arrangement for the deployment of cross-endorsed observers as soon as possible.</p> <p><u>SC8 :Recommendations</u> 103. SC8 endorsed the report on “Summary of Regional Observer Programme Audits” (SC8-ST-IP-03). 104. SC8 noted that consistent with previous SC advice, observer coverage should be spatially and temporally representative of each fishery operating in the Convention Area.</p>		<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-08</p> <p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-15</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
2.4 d) Consideration of cost optimization of the ROP	<i>See above at 2.3 c) cost optimization of the VMS</i>		
2.4 e) Proposals for vessel captains/operators to review ROP reports (Operationalising CMM 2007-01 Attachment B para 1(c)).	<u>WCPFC8</u> 229. Noting that it is a requirement of CMM 2007-01, WCPFC8 referred the operational issues of provision of observer reports of observed vessels to the TAG-ROP for further discussion, however WCPFC8 noted that any policy discussions on this issue must be held within TCC and by the Commission.		
3.1 Update on submissions of Annual Report Part 1 and Part 2	<u>TCC7</u> 99. TCC7 recommended that the deadline for submission by CCMs to the Commission for Part 2 Annual Reports be revised from “30 days prior to TCC” to 1 July each year. <u>WCPFC8</u> 197. WCPFC noted the secretariat’s summary of CCMs’ submissions of Annual Reports Parts 1 and 2 (WCPFC8-2011/19), and WCPFC8 agreed to TCC7 recommendation that the deadline for Part 2 Annual Reports be revised from “30 days prior to TCC” to 1 July each year. <u>SC8</u> The Annual Reports-Part 1 of several CCMs were not available by the start of the meeting, and the quality of the reports submitted was highly variable. SC8 therefore noted the need to improve the timeliness and quality of the reports. (para 44)		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP03

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
3.2 Development of Provisional CMR 2011 and Executive Summary	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>Most CCMs had submitted their Part 1 and Part 2 reports in time, and 22 draft CMRs were available for TCC7.</i></p> <p>108. TCC7 agreed that for those CCMs for whom TCC7 has developed a Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report, CCMs may provide additional advice or information relating to the issues identified in the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report to the Secretariat intersessionally, including any steps taken to address identified compliance issues. The Secretariat will update the relevant section of the CCM's Draft Compliance Monitoring Report to include any such additional information, in order to enable the Commission to re-evaluate the CCM's implementation of the requirements identified in the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report and develop a final 2010 Compliance Monitoring Report at WCPFC8.</p> <p>109. TCC7 agreed that for those CCMs who submitted a 2010 Part 2 Report sufficiently after the deadline such that the Secretariat could not prepare a Draft Compliance Monitoring Report, TCC7 requests the Secretariat to prepare a Draft Compliance Monitoring Report for the CCM intersessionally, provide it to the CCM for comment, and make it available to all CCMs for review prior to WCPFC8.</p> <p>110. For those CCMs who have not submitted a 2010 Part 1 and/or Part 2 Annual Report at all, TCC7 requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. These CCMs to provide all outstanding Annual Reports by 4 November 2011; ii. After 4 November 2011, the Secretariat to prepare a Draft Compliance Monitoring Report for the CCM using the Annual Part I and/or Part 2 Reports, if provided. If an Annual Part 1 and/or Part 2 report was not provided by 4 November 2011, TCC7 requests the Secretariat to prepare a Draft Compliance Monitoring Report using all information available. In either case, the Secretariat would provide the draft Compliance Monitoring Report to the CCM for comment, and make it available to all CCMs for review prior to WCPFC8. <p>111. TCC7 recommended that the Provisional Compliance Monitoring Report be forwarded to the Commission for consideration at WCPFC8, per paragraph 16 of</p>	<p>In 2011: 9 draft CMRs were updated based on supplemental information provided after TCC7 by either the CCM or the Science Provider.</p> <p>12 new draft CMRs were developed by the Secretariat after TCC7 in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 110 of the TCC7 report.</p> <p>These documents and the final CMR report are available on the secure side of the WCPFC website</p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-07</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>CMM 2010-03. <i>TCC7 reviewed CMM 2010-03 and discussed extending the measure (due to expire in 2011, but was extended per intersessional decision)) and possible refinements based on its trial operation in 2011.</i></p> <p>128. TCC7 requested that CCMs provide comments on refining CMM 2010-03 to Australia by 5 November 2011 so that Australia can prepare a proposal for consideration by WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> The TCC Vice Chair noted two issues for WCPFC8 concerning the Compliance Monitoring Scheme: completion of the first trial period of the scheme, and amendment and/or extension of CMM 2010-03. At TCC7, 22 CCM's draft Compliance Monitoring Reports (CMRs) were considered. After TCC7, nine of these CCM's draft CMRs were updated based on supplemental information provided by the CCM or the Scientific Services Provider. Twelve new draft CCM CMRs were developed by the Secretariat after TCC7. The status of the CMR's is detailed in WCPFC8-2011/20 and WCPFC8-2011-IP/09. (para 198)</p> <p>Several CCMs spoke in favour of extending the CMS for an additional trial year stating that it was a useful and importance exercise. However, these CCMs emphasized the need for efficiency in terms of timely submission of CCM Annual Reports Parts 1 and 2, focused work by the SWG at TCC8 (particularly as both 2010 and 2011 compliance issues will need to be considered), and sufficient time available for TCC8 to consider the results of the SWG. (para 206)</p> <p>205. WCPFC8 discussed the report of the SWG (WCPFC8-2011/51) and requested amendments to paras 5, 7 and 12. With these amendments WCPFC8 adopted the Compliance Monitoring Report for 2010 (Attachment N of WCPFC8 Summary Report).</p> <p>412. WCPFC8 adopted a revised CMM for the Compliance Monitoring Scheme based on WCPFC8-2011-DP/33 (Rev 1)) as modified by the amendment to para. 11 (iii) (Attachment W, CMM 2011-06).</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
3.3 Refinements to reporting requirements that are relied on for CMR development, including Annual Report Part 2 template design, streamlining and online interface for completing	<p><u>TCC7</u> 104. TCC7 recommended the adoption of a streamlined Part 2 Annual Report template. There was strong support for implementation of a streamlined template in a web-based format subject to provision of funds for its development.</p> <p><i>An updated version of streamlined Part 2 Annual Report template was presented to WCPFC8 for consideration, noting some issues were still being worked through. (WCPFC8-2011/22)</i></p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 209. WCPFC8 noted these issues and deferred further discussions of financial aspects of the work on streamlined Part 2 Annual Reports to the Finance and Administration Committee. The FAC considered the proposed budget to streamlining the Part 2 Annual report and the Commission approved the FAC's recommendation. The work on streamlined Part 2 Annual Report is included within the approved budget under Part 2.3 for "Information Management System including RFV".</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-18
3.4 Anticipated resourcing requirements for the Secretariat from the CMS	<p><u>WCPFC8</u> The Executive Director noted the workload associated with this CMM and asked CCMs to consider providing interns to the Commission during the processing period of CMRs, so that the Secretariat can ensure the draft CMR reports are provided to CCMs within the required timeframes in the CMM.</p>	<i>In 2012, the Secretariat received an intern from Tonga dedicated for CMR work, as well as assistance from interns from Cook Islands and United States.</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-19

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
3.6 Process for responses to non-compliance for the CMS (CMM 2011-06, para 24)	<p><i>Australia presented TCC7-2011-DP/08 proposing a phased response to non-compliance.</i></p> <p>123. TCC7 requested that any further comments on the enhanced CMS be forwarded to Australia to allow for inter-sessional refinement of the proposal to be considered by WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> Australia provided a discussion paper on responses to non-compliance to WCPFC8 (WCPFC8-2011-DP34)</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP10 (is WCPFC8-2011-DP34)
5.1 Record of Fishing Vessels a) Proposed RFV SSPs	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 received a proposal for SSPs for RFV from the USA.</i></p> <p>281. TCC7 endorsed the RFV SSPs contained in WCPFC-TCC7-2011-DP/09 and recommended that they be forwarded for the consideration of WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> Some CCMs, citing the endorsement by TCC7, supported the proposal as presented. (para 275)</p> <p>FFA members supported some components of the proposal but expressed some reservations about the procedures included, in particular whether there should be requirements for minimum fields. FFA members suggested that a decision on this issue be deferred to allow for further discussion. (para 276)</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-24 (is WCPFC8-2011/37)

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>5.2 a) Review of High Seas Transshipment Rules (CMM 2009-06) for fishing vessels, other than purse seine</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 333. TCC7 made no recommendation with regard to a review of CMM 2009-06. The Secretariat, per paragraph 37 of CMM 2009-06, prepared draft Guidelines for High Seas Transshipment from Fishing Vessels other than Purse Seine Vessels.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> The Executive Director noted that from the inception of the CMM 2009-06 (July 1 2010) until October 2011 the Secretariat received 878 notifications of transshipment. The scale of this activity was somewhat surprising and has prompted the Secretariat to consider potential linkages between transshipment and IUU fishing activities. In accordance with paragraph 37 of CMM 2009-06, the Secretariat will prepare a paper for TCC8 on guidelines for high seas transshipment from fishing vessels other than purse seines (WCPFC8-2011-IP/08). (para 282)</p>	<p><i>In 2012, the Secretariat established a database within WCPFC Information Management System, so as to better manage the High Seas Transshipment Notices and Declarations and improve our capability to monitor high seas transshipment activities. At the time of writing the migration of reports received in accordance with CMM 2009-06 was in the final stages of being completed.</i></p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-17</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
5.2 b) Review of any applications received for an exemption from the prohibition of transshipment at sea by purse seine fishing vessels (CMM 2009-06 para 25-32)	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>New Zealand applied for a transshipment exemption under CMM 2009-06. In the past they had applied for a 1 year exemption, but at WCPFC7 it was suggested that the administrative burden could be reduced if an application were made for a 5 year exemption. The application was submitted late on 2 September 2011.</i> 387. TCC7 recommends to WCPFC8 that New Zealand be granted a one-year exemption from prohibition of at-sea transshipment under para. 26 of CMM 2009-06.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 284. WCPFC8 approved New Zealand's application for an exemption from the prohibition on at-sea transshipment from purse seine vessels for a one-year period until the 29th of May 2013.</p>		<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-DP01</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>5.3 Charter Notification Scheme a) proposals to extend 2011-05 or for replacement CMM</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 received a consultancy report by GPA on Catch Attribution in the WCPFC, which described the range of catch attribution practices by Commission members. The report recommended the establishment of WCPFC catch attribution guidelines.</i></p> <p>249. TCC7 noted the catch attribution study (WCPFC-TCC7-2011/23) and recommended that it be referred to WCPFC8 for consideration.</p> <p><i>There was general support for the charter notification scheme, and recognition that some of the catch attribution study recommendations should be considered to enhance the CMM.</i></p> <p>317. Noting the usefulness of the existing charter notification scheme, TCC7 recommends to WCPFC8 that the charter notification scheme (CMM 2009-08) be revised, taking into account the views of CCMs, and extended beyond 2011.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 400. WCPFC8 agreed to extend the CMM on charter notification (CMM 2009-08) to 31 December 2012. (Attachment V, CMM 2011-05)</p> <p>CCMs considered that the study results should be noted for future discussions by the Commission but not referred specifically to TCC for action. (para 402)</p> 403. WCPFC8 noted the results of the catch attribution study.		<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP08</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
5.3 Charter Notification Scheme b) AHTG[data] outstanding task: rules for access by chartering States to data for their vessels	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>The Commission had tasked the AHTG-Data to work intersessionally during 2011 on this matter. RMI submitted a proposal, and comments were received from EU and Chinese Taipei.</i> 252. TCC7 agreed to task the AHTG-Data with revisiting these issues in 2012 pending the outcome of discussions of the catch attribution study and the possible renewal of CMM 2009-08 by WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 427. The Commission had tasked the AHTG-Data to work intersessionally during 2011 on this matter. RMI submitted a proposal, and comments were received from EU and Chinese Taipei. TCC7 agreed to task the AHTG-Data with revisiting these issues in 2012 pending the outcome of discussions of the catch attribution study and the possible renewal of CMM 2009-08 by WCPFC8. WCPFC8 noted the TCC7 recommendation.</p>		<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP09 (is TCC7 papers)</p>
5.4 Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area (CMM 2010-02)	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 received first report on Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area (CMM 10-02), covering first two months since implementation (July 1 2011). TCC7 considered expansion of SMA to high seas within 100nm of EEZ boundaries of coastal States (CMM 2010-02 para 9).</i> 173. TCC7 noted that there is no clear consensus on expansion of the Eastern High Seas Pocket Special Management Area to the high seas within 100 miles from the EEZ boundaries of coastal States.</p>		<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-DP03</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>5.5 South Pacific Albacore CMM (CMM 2010-05)</p>	<p><u>WCPFC8</u> Several CCMs appreciated the information on catch and transhipment by flag and by zone for South Pacific albacore provided by the Secretariat as WCPFC8-2011-IP/04 (Rev 1) and asked that this type of reporting be continued. (para 422) 423. WCPFC8 agreed that South Pacific albacore was a priority issue for WCPFC9.</p> <p><u>SC8: Management Advice and Implications</u> 159. The South Pacific albacore stock is currently not overfished and overfishing is not occurring. Current biomass is sufficient to support current levels of catch. However, for several years the SC has noted that any increases in catch or effort are likely to lead to declines in catch rates in some regions, especially for longline catches of adult albacore, with associated impacts on vessel profitability. SC8 further noted that vessel activity must be managed, as per the requirements of CMM 2010-05. 160. Given the recent expansion of the fishery and recent declines in exploitable biomass available to longline fisheries, and given the importance of maintaining catch rates, the SC recommends that longline fishing mortality be reduced if the Commission wishes to maintain economically viable catch rates.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u> 161. The SC requests that the Scientific Services Provider conduct deterministic projections for south Pacific albacore to be presented to WCPFC9. Projections would be based on scalars of the 2010/2011 [final year] catches as used in the assessment. Specifically, longline scalars of 0.7 to 1.5 in 0.1 increments and scalars of 1, 2, 5 for the surface troll fishery are proposed. Outputs should be similar to those commonly reported for projections, plus information on predicted changes in vulnerable biomass. In making this request it is noted that the management advice was based on the median of the uncertainty grid and some consideration will be required of the technical approaches to be used to undertake these projections. 162. SC8 recognized the potential for analysis of trade data to reduce the uncertainty in reported catch.</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
<p>5.6 Seabirds (Review of CMM 2007-04)</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 308. TCC7 made no recommendation with regard to WCPFC Annual review of seabird mitigation measures contained in CMM 07-04.</p> <p><u>SC8: Recommendations</u> 418. Following the review of the papers presented, the SC determined that currently, there is no single mitigation measure that can reliably prevent the incidental mortality of seabirds in most pelagic longline fisheries. 419. SC8 recognizes the advice from ACAP that the following seabird bycatch mitigation measures are the most effective: weighted branch lines, night setting and bird scaring lines. 420. SC8 recommends that a combination of techniques should be used, especially those including weighted branch lines, bird scaring lines, and night setting that have proven most effective for reducing seabird bycatch of the seabird fauna prevalent in a particular region of concern. Other factors such as safety, practicality and the characteristics of the fishery should also be recognised. 421. SC8 recognizes that different longline fleets have obtained lower interaction rates with different mitigation methods. SC8 also noted that a combination of longline deployment techniques and other gear attributes used in the Hawaii-based longline fisheries effectively reduce incidental seabird capture. 422. SC8 reiterates advice that a spatial management approach be employed for seabird mitigation and recommends that the Commission consider the following advice when it revises the seabird CMM 2007-04: a. Southern hemisphere SC8 recommends that fisheries south of 30 degrees S are required to use at least two of these three measures: weighted branch lines, night setting and bird scaring lines. When using bird scaring lines the descriptions outlined in SC8-EB-WP-06 should be used. b. Northern hemisphere SC8 recommends that the table in CMM 2007-04 be revised to eliminate redundancy by removing weighted branch lines and underwater setting chute in column B. c. Branch Line Weighting</p>	<p><i>Included in TCC8 agenda at request of United States, and annual review</i></p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-OP01 WCPFC-TCC8-2012-OP02</p>

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>With regard to branch line weighting, SC8 recognises that research in Australia (SC8-EB-WP-09 and SC8-EB-WP-10) has demonstrated that the use of at least one weight of 40g within 50cm of the hook, or of 45- 60 g within 1 m of the hook, is more effective to quickly sink baited hooks beyond the depths at which they may be available to seabirds. Other options using weights at greater distance from the hook are not as effective.</p> <p>d. Vessel length SC8 recommends that the potential impacts of the North Pacific vessel size exemption be addressed. Nations conducting longline fishing in the North Pacific to the north of 23 degrees north should provide vessels numbers <24 and =>24m for recent years. Annual Reports-Part 1 have statistics on vessel size by GRT, however statistics on vessel length should be presented to SC9.</p> <p>e. Spatial management SC8 reiterates advice that a spatial management approach should be employed for seabird mitigation. In clearly defined areas south of 30 degrees S and north of 23 degrees N, exemption from the following requirements could be considered if seabird interaction rates can be scientifically demonstrated to be minimal, with observer coverage rates that are sufficient to quantify rare events in these areas. The SC should determine appropriate (minimal) levels of interaction rates when representative observer data are available.</p> <p>f. ROP Data Fields SC8 recommends that the TCC give consideration to the inclusion of data fields on: the mass of added weight attached to branch lines, distance between weight and hook (in meters), and the fate (dead, alive or injured) and number of seabirds for each species in each of these categories and whether the seabirds were released alive or discarded dead.</p>		
5.7 North Pacific Striped Marlin (Review of CMM 2011-01)	<p><u>TCC7</u> 321. TCC7 noted that no new stock assessment results are available but understands that this will be completed in 2012 prior to SC8. Review of the North Pacific Striped Marlin measure (CMM 2010-01) should be undertaken once that stock assessment becomes available.</p>	<p><i>Included in TCC8 agenda at request of United States</i></p>	

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p><u>SC8: Recommendation</u></p> <p>220. Noting the delay in the WCNPSTR assessment, and the associated lack of timely submission of assessment documents, SC8 recommends that the Commission consider tasking the Scientific Services Provider with conducting the next assessment unless the ISC can demonstrate that it will prevent such delays in future and that the ISC Chair cooperates for more timely submission of stock assessment analyses and reports.</p> <p>b. Management Advice and Implications</p> <p>222. SC8 noted ISC’s conservation advice for the Commission’s consideration as follows: Noting that the last year of the model was 2010 and F2012 is likely to be different to Fcurrent, current fishing mortality (average 2007-2009) is estimated to be 24% above FMSY. Fishing at FMSY would lead to an estimated spawning biomass increase of roughly 45% to 72% by 2017. Seven additional harvest scenarios were also modelled using either resampled recruitment estimates from 1994-2008 or randomly generated deviations around the assumed spawner-recruit relationship. Included in the alternative harvest scenarios were: constant catch at 2,500 mt, that represents 80% of average catches during 2007-2009; constant catch at 3,600t that represents catch levels prescribed in CMM 2010-01; fishing at the current F (average 2007-2009); and fishing at the average F (2001-2003):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishing at a constant catch of 2,500 mt was estimated to increase spawning biomass by 133% to 223% by 2017. • Fishing at a constant catch of 3,600 mt was estimated to increase spawning biomass by 48% to 120% by 2017. • In comparison, fishing at the current (2007-2009) fishing mortality rate was estimated to increase spawning biomass by 14% to 29% by 2017, and fishing at the average 2001-2003 fishing mortality rate would lead to a spawning biomass decrease of 2% under recent recruitment to an increase of 6% under the stock-recruitment curve assumption by 2017. <p>223. The SC8 recommends that the ISC conduct an additional set of projections of the WCNPO striped marlin based on the 2012 stock assessment results. The</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>projections should be based on resampling only recruitment from the most recent 5 year period (2004-2008). Recruitment during that period is below the average of the 1994-2008 and may represent a different and more pessimistic recruitment regime than assumed in the current projections. The 8 harvest scenarios examined in the 2012 stock assessment should be evaluated with this more pessimistic assumption, and an additional run using this recruitment scenario and constant catch at the 2011 level should also be included. Probabilities of stock recovery as well as trajectories of spawning biomass and catch should be documented and presented to WCPFC9. 224. Given the current pessimistic status of the stock, SC8 recommends that the Commission strengthen the existing CMM to ensure the recovery of NPSR based on information provided by ISC.</p>		
<p>6.1 Proposed Whale Shark CMM</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Australia updated progress on developing proposed CMMs for WCPFC8</i> • <i>Best Practice guidelines for safe release of encircled animals are currently being progressed by the SC – EBM Theme Convenor, Mr Jone Amoe.</i> <p>306. TCC7 noted Australia’s proposal on whale sharks and cetaceans and encouraged CCMs to participate in the electronic discussion group being led by Mr Jone Amoe of Fiji with a view to presenting a fully considered proposal to WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u></p> <p>363. WCPFC8 adopted a Conservation and Management Measure to address the impact of purse seine fishing activity on cetaceans (WCPFC8-2011-DP/15b (Rev 2)). (Attachment S, CMM 2011-03)</p> <p>367. In considering the draft measure on protecting whale sharks from purse seine fishing operations, WCPFC8 noted ongoing work, through the Scientific Committee, on the development of best practice guidelines for release of encircled whale sharks. Based on the current draft measure, the Commission agreed to finalise the measure at WCPFC9.</p> <p><u>SC8: Recommendations</u></p> <p>391. SC8 noted the progress made in support of the Shark Research Plan while</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>also noting that meaningful progress in some areas remains hindered by data availability and quality.</p> <p>392. SC8 recommended that the Commission assist in providing or identifying funds to distribute existing shark identification guides and promote the development of species identification guides harmonized where appropriate with other RFMOs to improve data reporting.</p> <p>393. SC8 through the Commission encourages CCMs to adopt and promote the recording of data by their longline fleets on harmonized and sufficiently detailed longline logsheets that include the key shark species.</p> <p>394. SC8 recommends that the Scientific Services Provider conduct a study on the spatial and temporal distribution of whale shark in the WCPO based on observer data and other data sources as appropriate.</p> <p>395. SC8 supports the finding of the Scientific Services Provider that whale shark meets the basic criteria for consideration as a key shark species and recommends that the whale shark (<i>Rhincodon typus</i>) be defined as a key shark species of the WCPFC.</p>		
6.2 Port State Measures	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 discussed the EU proposal for a CMM for Port State Measures. Some CCMs proposed that a gap analysis would ensure PSM are harmonised with existing CMMs, and are designed to enhance, and not duplicate, existing CMMs.</i></p> <p>244. TCC7 reiterated that PSM is a priority issue for the Commission and expressed a strong desire to continue working toward development of a CMM on this topic. CCMs were encouraged to provide any further comments to the EU by 7 November 2011 with a view to further consideration of the issue at WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 345. WCPFC8 agreed to continue to work intersessionally toward developing a proposal on port state measures for the consideration of TCC8.</p>		

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
6.3 Catch Documentation Scheme WG TOR	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>TCC7 received two proposals:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TORs for the CDS working group, provided by PNG as coordinator of the intersessional CDS WG,</i> • <i>An EU proposal for a WCPFC CDS</i> <p>235. TCC7 noted the ongoing efforts of CCMs to agree a TOR for a working group on CDS but acknowledged that further inter-sessional consultation will be required to forward an agreed TOR to WCPFC8 for endorsement.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 380. WCPFC8 agreed that the TOR for the CDS working group (WCPFC-2011-DP/20) be referred back to TCC8.</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-25 (is WCPFC8-2011-DP20)
6.4 Response to reported fishing gear damages		<i>Included in Agenda at request of Japan</i>	
7.1 Performance Review	<p>82. WCPFC8 noted the report of the Performance Review Panel. WCPFC8 agreed that CCMs could provide comments to the Secretariat by June 1 2012 on the priorities and process to move the recommendations forward. WCPFC8 tasked the Executive Director with preparing a matrix categorising the recommendations, and noting any comments from CCMs, for the consideration of the Commission's subsidiary bodies as appropriate. The matrix and recommendations from subsidiary bodies will be considered at WCPFC9.</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-20 (is WCPFC Circular 2012-54)

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
8.1 a) Report of the Review related to the integrity of the Secretariats Information Management System and Record of Fishing Vessels	<p><u>TCC7</u> The Executive Director advised that the Secretariat will conduct a review of its data integrity and security standards and procedures and post the results of this review prior to WCPFC8 (para 163).</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> The Executive Director noted that the 2010 audit was not completed by the external consultant. Starting in 2012 an annual VMS audit will be undertaken and it will include an audit of the Commission’s data security rules, which are considered adequate, are being effectively implemented by the Secretariat. (para 235)</p>	<i>Late paper</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-22
8.2 Future approaches to TCC, including TCC agenda	<p><u>WCPFC8</u> 449. WCPFC8 agreed that the Secretariat, in conjunction with the Chair, develop a discussion paper on this topic [Rationalisation of WCPFC-related meetings], drawing on WCPFC8-2011-DP/48 as well as experiences in other tuna RFMOs, for consideration by WCPFC9.</p>	<i>The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair has prepared a paper for TCC8.</i>	WCPFC-TCC8-2012-23 WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP11(is WCPFC8-2011-DP/48)
8.3 Proposed TCC Work Plan and budget for 2013-15	<p><u>TCC7</u> <i>The draft work plan for TCC developed by WCPFC Secretariat was discussed by TCC7. There were a range of suggested changes to the work plan, and discussion on whether the work plan should be “recommended to WCPFC8” or “adopted by TCC7”.</i></p> <p>378. TCC7 agreed to work intersessionally to finalise the TCC Work Plan for 2012-2014 for consideration by the Commission at WCPFC8.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> The Executive Director drew WCPFC8’s attention to the draft TCC work programme for 2012-2014 (WCPFC-2011/30), noting that it had been revised based on FFA comments received subsequent to TCC7 (WCPFC8-2011-DP/08) and was under discussion in the FAC with regard to the financial implications of the streamlined Annual Report template. (para 288)</p>		WCPFC-TCC8-2012-21

TCC8 AGENDA ITEM	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS	TCC8 PAPER
	<p>Japan considered that it is premature to assume that the outcome of direct entry of observer data would result in a cost savings, and questioned the need to expend \$35,000 on this item. Japan also stated that it strongly supported calls for streamlining and prioritisation of the work of the TCC. (para 289)</p> <p>The Executive Director agreed that this item should be removed from the 2012 budget pending a full evaluation of the observer data direct entry trials. (para 290)</p> <p>The USA stated its view that the TCC work plan was a helpful exercise but advocated that the Commission should identify the priority tasks for the TCC and these should be the basis of the TCC work plans. The USA supported the priorities identified by the FFA in WCPFC8-2011-DP/08 but also considered that port state measures, the catch documentation scheme and the continuation of the CMS were also priorities. (para 291)</p> <p>The Chair directed the Secretariat to take account of these comments [para 288-291] when revising the TCC Work Plan for presentation to TCC8. (para 292)</p> <p>The USA noted that the funding which offsets the full costs to WCPFC for data entry through 2014 (WCPFC8-2011-FAC5/12, para. 20) is provided through a generous contribution from New Caledonia and New Zealand for year 2012. Subject to the availability of funds the current level of contribution from New Caledonia will continue through 2014. (para 443)</p> <p>The Executive Director clarified that the SLA fees were reduced by \$300,000 through a detailed negotiation process. Quarterly meetings continue to be held between the Secretariat and FFA to discuss VMS issues. (para 233)</p> <p>444. WCPFC8 accepted the summary report and recommendations of FAC5, WCPFC8-2011-50 Rev3). (Attachment Y)</p>		

Table 2. Notes from TCC7/WCPFC8/SC8 related to Information papers which are proposed to be discussed by exception at TCC8 (to be decided under Agenda 1.5)

TCC8 INFO PAPER	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
<p>Secretariat Report summarizing best available information, including reports by CCMs, on the applicable limits in CMMs and summarizing best available information on recent verified catch and effort levels (WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP04) (WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP04)</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 118. TCC7 acknowledged the usefulness of compliance reporting under the format presented in WCPFC-TCC7-WP/17a and recommended that preparation of reports in this format by the Secretariat continue. CCMs were encouraged to carefully review the information contained in the report and provide any corrections to the Secretariat.</p>	<p>A revision of this paper was issued following WCPFC8, to accommodate some corrections that were received to this document (WCPFC8-2011/21 (Rev 3, 8 May 2012)</p>

TCC8 INFO PAPER	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
Joint Management Scheme for the Overlap Area with IATTC (WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP14)	<p><u>TCC7</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Executive Director provided an update on the MOU for cross-endorsement of observers</i> • <i>TCC reviewed the report from the WCPFC/IATTC meeting in the margins of Kobe3 (WCPFC-TCC7-2011/28 Annex 2)</i> • <i>CCMs agreed that there was a critical need to resolve management issues relating to the overlap area, and discussed alternative ways for resolving management issues in the overlap area.</i> <p>268. TCC7 recommends that the WCPFC Chair send a letter inviting the IATTC Executive Director, Chair and Vice-Chair to meet with their WCPFC counterparts, possibly at WCPFC8, to progress this issue. The agenda of the meeting should include the drafting Terms of Reference for developing a cooperative management scheme for the WCPFC-IATTC overlap area.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u></p> <p>440. WCPFC8 agreed that this issue of the overlap area needed to be resolved as a matter of priority and asked the Chairs and Executive Directors of the two RFMOs to progress the issue, and report back to CCMs.</p>	<p>The paper by the secretariat (WCPFC8-2011/41 Rev 1) concentrated on options for managing the overlap area, for guidance from the Commission.</p>
Secretariat paper on High Seas Boarding and Inspection Scheme (WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP16)	<p><u>TCC7</u></p> <p><i>CMM 2008-08 on High Seas Boarding and Inspection requires members to report annually to the Commission on their activities and any possible violations observed. TCC7 received reports from: Members whose inspectors and/or inspection vessels had conducted boardings and inspections during 2010, and Members whose vessels had been boarded and inspected.</i></p> <p>332. TCC7 noted the reports by CCMs on HSB&I activities carried out under CMM 2006-08.</p>	
Secretariat report on Record of Fishing Vessels WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP06)	<p><u>WCPFC8</u></p> <p>The EU questioned whether the RFV can be used to provide the Commission with information on the number of vessels actively fishing in the Convention Area. If so, the EU requested that this information is provided to TCC8 and WCPFC9 and on a yearly basis in all future WCPFC meetings. (para 277)</p> <p>WCPFC Compliance Manager confirmed that the RFV can be used for this purpose and this information can be provided to both TCC8 and the WCPFC9 based on the CCM reports under CMM 2009-01 paragraph 9 (“fished” or “did not fish” reports). (para 278)</p>	<p><i>This is accommodated in the Record of Fishing Vessels paper</i></p>

TCC8 INFO PAPER	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
<p>SW striped marlin (CMM 06-04, para 6)</p>	<p><u>SC8 - SW striped marlin</u></p> <p>207. The southwest Pacific striped marlin assessment results indicate that the stock is fully exploited, is not experiencing overfishing but may be overfished. The SC noted that recent catches are close to MSY, and that recent fishing mortality is slightly below FMSY, and that recent spawning biomass is slightly below SBMSY. The recent catch increase is driven in part by increases in catch in the northern area of the stock area that is not subject to the current CMM for this stock.</p> <p>208. SC8 recommends measures to reduce overall catch of this stock, through the expansion of the geographical scope of CMM 2006-04 to cover the distribution range of the stock.</p> <p>209. In designing such a measure to implement this recommendation from SC8, the Commission may need to consider the historic trends in the fishery, including the catch declines in the traditional central and southern areas and the recent catch increases in the northern areas.</p> <p>210. SC8 recognizes that striped marlin is often caught as a non-target species. SC8 therefore recommends data analysis be conducted to identify areas of high catch concentration that could be subject to targeted management.</p>	

TCC8 INFO PAPER	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
<p>Swordfish CMM (CMM 09-03, para 10)</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 313. Noting that there are no new stock assessment results for swordfish, TCC7 made no recommendation with regard to review of the conservation and management measure for swordfish CMM 09-03.</p> <p><u>WCPFC8</u> 394. WCPFC8 agreed that the Scientific Services Provider should begin work on the swordfish stock assessment and present available results to SC8.</p> <p><u>SC8 – South west swordfish Recommendations</u> 180. SC8 recommended that, if possible, the sex specific growth and other biological parameters should be incorporated prior to undertaking the next stock assessment. SC8 recommended that SPC conduct the south Pacific swordfish stock research under the proposed work plan as follows: a. finalise the development of the method of sex specific stock assessment; b. stock assessment conducted through collaboration from the EU and results will be presented at SC9; c. the Scientific Services Provider will present an update on their analysis of SWO as a component of their stock status report to WCPFC9.</p> <p>b. Management Advice and Implications 182. SC8 noted that no stock assessment was conducted for South Pacific swordfish in 2012. Therefore, the management recommendations from SC5 are still current. 183. Since there was no stock assessment conducted in 2012, SC8 recommended provision of management advice to the Commission be deferred to SC9.</p>	
<p>Sea Turtle Mitigation Measures (CMM 08-03, para 9)</p>	<p><u>TCC7</u> 309. TCC7 made no recommendation with regard to annual review of CMM 08-03 sea turtle mitigation measures.</p>	

Table 3. Three items that SC8 specifically recommended be referred to TCC8

TOPIC	ADVICE FROM SC8	TCC8 PAPER
<p>Plan for improvement for availability and use of purse seine species composition data</p>	<p>88. SC8 recommended that: a. SC8-WCPFC8-08 “Plan for the improvement of the availability and use of Purse seine catch composition data” be referred to TCC8 for consideration, and to consider the broader application of spill sampling across the ROP. c. CCMs identified in Table 1 of SC8-WCPFC8-08 should collaborate with SPC and the WCPFC Secretariat to further increase the number of paired sampling trips. d. Project 60 be continued through 2013. The study has a target of 50 trips to be sampled, of which 35 trips will be completed by the end of 2012. The Data and Statistics Theme forwarded a 2013 budget request of US\$75,000 based on US\$5,000 per trip for the remaining 15 trips.</p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP17 (is SC8-WCPFC8-08)</p>
<p>SC8 advice on scientific data provision</p>	<p>SC8: Management recommendations 67. The SC noted the request by the Commission’s Scientific Services Provider for CCMs to review their data provision status on the WCPFC website (http://www.wcpfc.int/statprov), to ensure the provisions of scientific data reflects what they have provided to the Commission, and to acknowledge and plan to resolve any of the gaps highlighted. 68. The SC recognised the importance of the provision of operational-level catch and effort data for the work of the Commission, with an important example highlighted as a recommendation in an earlier SC8 presentation summarising the outcomes of the WCPO bigeye tuna assessment peer review (refer to SC8-SA-WP-01). 69. The SC noted that several CCMs have not provided operational catch/effort data and none of these CCMs have submitted a Data Improvement Plan, as recommended by WCPFC7. 70. SC8 recommended that: a. CCMs who have yet to provide operational level catch and effort data provide Data Improvement Plans to TCC8. It was also recommended that until operational catch/effort data are provided, these CCMs should provide annual catch estimates by gear and species for waters of national jurisdiction and high seas areas separately, as per the scientific data provision rules of the Commission. b. The paper SC8-ST-WP-01 Rev.1 be forwarded to TCC8 to highlight data gaps that need addressing and for use in the CCMM process. c. The Data Gaps Report should include references to relevant WCPFC CMMs to clarify the data obligations of CCMs particularly in regards to chartered vessels.</p>	<p>WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP18 (is SC8-ST-WP-01 Rev.1)</p>
<p>Other commercial fisheries for bigeye and yellowfin (para 39 CMM 08-01)</p>	<p>SC8 recommended that: 95. Noting that no reports for “Other Commercial Tuna Fisheries Fishing for Bigeye and Yellowfin Tuna” were received, in accordance with paragraph 39 of CMM 2008-01, this issue is forwarded to TCC8 for consideration</p>	

Box 1. Cooperating Non-Member Participatory Rights decision from WCPFC8

37. WCPFC8 also agreed that the WCPFC Chair will write to Mexico to reinforce the importance of their participation in the work of the Northern Committee.

39. WCPFC8 agreed that in accordance with provisions of the WCPF Convention and its conservation and management measures and resolutions, the following limits apply to the participatory rights of Cooperating non-members (CNMs) for fisheries in the high seas within the WCPFC Convention Area.

40. WCPFC8 also agreed that, unless otherwise specified below, CNMs may fish in waters under their national jurisdiction or other CCM's national jurisdiction, in accordance with appropriate bilateral arrangements. Such CNMs shall ensure vessels flying their flags comply with all provisions of the WCPF Convention and WCPFC conservation and management measures. In addition, such CNM vessels will be placed on the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels (WCPFC RFV). CCMs shall ensure that CNM fishing activities that are conducted in waters under their national jurisdiction in accordance with bilateral arrangements are consistent with all relevant conservation and management measures and provisions of the WCPF Convention. Renewal of CNM status by the Commission will be conditional on full compliance with the national laws and regulations of any licensing CCM, all conservation and management measures and provisions of the WCPF Convention. CCMs shall identify any violations by vessels flagged to a CNM and report on any investigations of such violations to the TCC.

41. WCPFC8 noted that the CNMs identified below (paragraphs 43-53) provide assurances that they will comply with all requests from Commission Members for information and documentation to investigate cases of possible illegal fishing.

42. WCPFC8 encouraged CNMs to implement export controls that ensure that their shipbuilding activities do not undermine any conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission to control fishing capacity in the WCPO tuna fisheries, in accordance with Article 10, or undermine Article 30 of the Convention.

Belize

43. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Belize with the following participatory rights:

Catches of bigeye tuna from Belize are limited to 803.25 mt and 2,000 mt of yellowfin tuna. Belize fishing activities are limited to the following (except within the overlap area in accordance with the provisions described in paragraph 54-58 below):

- a. Under CMM 2005-02 in accordance with paragraph 1, Belize is limited to historical catch level for 2004 of two unique longliners in the Convention Area south of 20 degrees south latitude;
- b. Under CMM 2005-03 Belize is limited to the 2005 level of five unique longliners in the Convention Area north of the equator; and
- c. Under CMM 2006-04, Belize is limited to two unique longliners in the Convention Area south of 15 degrees south latitude.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

44. WCPFC8 approved the application of CNM status by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with the following participatory rights:

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has no participatory rights for fishing on the high seas for highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area.

Ecuador

45. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Ecuador with the following participatory rights:

The participatory rights of Ecuador for fishing in the WCPO are limited to purse seine fishing only. Ecuador has no

participatory rights for fishing on the high seas for highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area (except within the overlap area in accordance with the provisions described in paragraph 54-58 below).

El Salvador

46. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by El Salvador with the following participatory rights:

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 vessels on the high seas shall not exceed 29 days in the Convention Area (except within the overlap area in accordance with the provisions described in paragraph 54-58 below).

Indonesia

47. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Indonesia with the following participatory rights:

Indonesia's fishing activities in the Convention Area are limited to a longline bigeye catch limit of 5,889 mt (8,413 mt minus 30%) and purse-seine fishing on the high seas in the Convention Area is limited to 500 days.

WCPFC8 encouraged Indonesia to apply compatible measures within its archipelagic waters given the significance of these waters for juvenile yellowfin and bigeye catch. Indonesia noted that it is participating in the new Global Environment Facility (GEF) West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management (WPEA OFM) and cooperating with the Commission, particularly in areas of data collection improvement.

Indonesia expressed its appreciation to the Commission for the decision to renew its CNM status and reiterated its intention to become a full member of the Commission, Indonesia stated that, consistent with its position throughout the Multilateral High Level Conference (MHLC) and Preparatory Conference, it considers that WCPFC CMMs do not apply to archipelagic waters.

Mexico

48. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Mexico with the following participatory rights:

Noting the need for cooperation with the work of the Northern Committee (NC), particularly in regard to Pacific bluefin tuna, Mexico is encouraged to participate in the NC and is advised that future renewals of Mexico's CNM status could be hampered by a continuing lack of participation in the work of the NC.

Mexican participation in the WCPO tuna fisheries may not begin until all requested information and commitments have been provided to the WPCFC Secretariat in accordance with Commission requirements. The participatory rights of Mexico for fishing in the WCPFC Convention Area are limited to purse seine fishing only. Mexico has no participatory rights for fishing on the high seas for highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area (except within the overlap area in accordance with the provisions described in paragraph 54-58 below).

Panama

49. WCPFC8 approved the application of CNM status by Panama with the following participatory rights: The participatory rights of Panama in the WCPO are limited to the provision of carrier and bunker vessels only.

Senegal

50. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Senegal with the following participatory rights:

The participatory rights of Senegal for fishing in the WCPO are limited to one unique longline vessel (the Robaliera). This vessel may only target swordfish and may only catch 154 mt of swordfish (as determined in accordance with CMM 2009-03).

St Kitts and Nevis

51. WCPFC8 approved the application for CNM status by St Kitts and Nevis with the following participatory rights:

The participatory rights of St Kitts and Nevis in the WCPO are limited to the provision of carrier and bunker vessels only.

Thailand

52. WCPFC8 approved the application for CNM status by Thailand with the following participatory rights: Noting 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, WCPFC8 agreed to grant CNM status to Thailand for 2012 on the understanding that Thailand will cooperate fully with the Commission in 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.

Vietnam

53. WCPFC8 approved the application for renewal of CNM status by Vietnam with the following participatory rights: Noting 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, WCPFC8 agreed to grant CNM status to Vietnam for 2012. Vietnam has no participatory rights for fishing for highly migratory fish stocks in the high seas of the Convention Area.

WCPFC/IATTC Overlap Area

54. The Commission agreed that the WCPFC and the IATTC should urgently resolve the management uncertainties and inconsistencies that apply to fisheries within the overlap area south of 4° S and between 130° W and 150° W. The following provisions are intended as an interim measure and do not establish any precedent for the discussions between the WCPFC and the IATTC over the management of the overlap area.

55. For 2012, pending agreement between WCPFC and IATTC on management of the overlap in the Convention Areas of these two RFMOs, the limits prescribed above shall not apply to fishing vessels flying the flag of a CNM that is a Contracting Party of IATTC and operating in the IATTC/WCPFC overlap area south of 4° S and between 130° W and 150° W.

56. These CNMs agree that in the IATTC/WCPFC overlap area fishing vessels flying their flag shall:

- comply with all applicable IATTC Resolutions and requirements including effort, capacity and catch controls and limits;
- carry, on all purse seine vessels, an observer accredited with either the IATTC observer program or WCPFC ROP; and
- operate a vessel monitoring system (VMS) in accordance with IATTC Resolution C-04-06.

57. In accordance with the Data Exchange MOU agreed by both Commissions, flag states of 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.

58. For investigation of possible IUU fishing activities consistent to international and domestic laws, flag states of fishing 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.

Box 2. SC8 Management Advice related to TCC8 Agenda item 4 Discussion of a replacement CMM for CMM 2008-01 and CMM 2011-01

Bigeye, yellowfin, skipjack stock status

130. SC8 noted that no stock assessment was conducted and there is no new information to inform stock status for WCPO bigeye in 2012; therefore, the a) Stock status and trends and b) Management advice and implications from SC7 are still current.

136. SC8 noted that no stock assessment was conducted and there is no new information to inform stock status for WCPO yellowfin in 2012; therefore, the a) Stock status and trends and b) Management advice and implications from SC7 are still current.

138. SC8 noted that no stock assessment was conducted and there is no new information to inform stock status for WCPO skipjack in 2012; therefore, the a) Stock status and trends and b) Management advice and implications from SC7 are still current.

Review of CMM 08-01 - Recommendations

350. The SC8 recommends that the TCC and the Commission note the following conclusions based on the analyses presented in working papers SC8-MI-WP-04 and SC8-MI-WP-06 when reviewing the effectiveness of CMM 2008-01 (and its extension under CMM 2011-01) and in the development of a revised CMM for bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack tuna stocks:

- i) the limits placed on purse seine operations have not adequately constrained total purse seine effort, with total effort in 2011 estimated to be 31% higher compared to effort in 2004 and 46% higher than the 2001-2004 level;
- ii) that the number of days reported with any activity related to a drifting FAD was 16.1% in 2009, 6.8 % in 2010 and 8.2% in 2011 during the FAD closure periods. The observed incidence of vessels drifting at night with fish aggregation lights on increased from 2.3% in 2009 to 6.8% in 2010 and was 3.4% in 2011;
- iii) despite the FAD closure the total estimated number of FAD sets made in 2011 was a record high, largely due to high a FAD set ratio outside of the FAD closure period and increased purse seine effort overall. Nevertheless, several fleets (notably Japan, Philippines, New Zealand) have substantially changed their fishing operations, focusing more on unassociated set fishing in 2010 and 2011 than they had in the past but others remain highly dependent on FADs;
- iv) the catch of bigeye tuna, small yellowfin and small skipjack can be significantly reduced by purse seines switching from FAD sets to unassociated sets;
- v) the total purse seine catch of bigeye during 2011 was the highest on record (77,095 mt) and only the second time that the purse seine catch had exceeded the longline catch;
- vi) available data indicates that the high-seas pocket closure since 1 January 2010 has largely been respected. Since January 2010, effort has been concentrated mainly in the EEZs, with no apparent re-distribution of effort to the eastern high seas, though effort in this area could increase with the predicted return of ENSO-neutral or El Niño conditions;
- vii) closing areas/time entirely to purse seine fishing without consideration of the fate of displaced fishing effort will not be effective for bigeye conservation and less profitable to purse seine operations as a whole;
- viii) the provisional longline catch of bigeye tuna in 2011 is 24% lower than the 2001-2004 level. However, in the core area of the tropical longline fishery, the reduced catches have been paralleled by a decline in nominal CPUE and no apparent reduction in fishing effort, which indicate that the recent catch declines could be more the result of further declines in adult bigeye tuna abundance than reduced fishing mortality or a shift in target species;
- ix) the provisional longline catch of yellowfin tuna in 2011 is close to the 2001-2004 average level;
- x) stock projections undertaken using the reference case models for the 2011 assessments for bigeye tuna indicate that maintenance of bigeye tuna catch and effort levels observed in the

fishery in 2009 results in F/FMSY remaining high, with a projected level of 1.40 in 2021. However, for the scenario best approximating the reported catch and effort in the fishery in 2010, F/FMSY declines and is at a projected level of 0.96 in 2021. This is driven by several factors: the lower than usual FAD use in 2010, the lower longline catches, and a large (30%) reduction in reported catches from the domestic fisheries of Indonesia and the Philippines. For the scenario approximating 2011 fishery conditions, F/FMSY stabilises at a projected level of 1.29. The difference between 2010 and 2011 fishery outcomes is mainly due to the return to higher levels of FAD-based purse seine effort in 2011;

xi) for scenarios that mimic a total purse seine closure (i.e., where FAD effort is not transferred to unassociated fishing), there is a small incremental reduction in F/FMSY compared to that achieved by a FAD closure. However, this comes at a cost of substantial reductions in total catch, particularly of skipjack in the purse seine fishery. This conclusion is robust to the use of base years from 2001-2009 to characterize the differences;

xii) it is estimated that if the CMM was implemented without exemptions, approximately an additional half of the overfishing that is estimated could occur under the CMM as written could be removed (reduction of bigeye tuna F/FMSY from 1.35 to 1.17);

xiii) estimation of the individual impacts on bigeye tuna F/FMSY of observed levels of catch or effort for the longline, purse seine and domestic Philippines and Indonesia fishery groups in 2009 and 2010 against a base of 2004 indicates that the reduction in purse seine FAD effort in 2010 has the greatest effect in terms of removing overfishing (67.4% of overfishing removed) followed by the reduction in longline catch in 2010 (34.7% of the overfishing removed).

351. Based on the above observations and analyses, and noting that the fishing mortality for bigeye has not been reduced to the level intended under CMM-2008-01, SC8 supports the need for additional or alternative targeted measures to reduce the fishing mortality on bigeye. In the development of a revised CMM for bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack tuna stocks SC8 recommends the Commission consider:

i) a strengthening of the control of FAD activities;

ii) building on the apparent success of some fleets in reducing their dependence on FADs to achieve greater control of FAD activity outside the closures, including control of the number of FADs set throughout a year instead of FAD time-closures;

iii) a reduction of the total number of FAD sets to the levels no greater than those in the fishery in 2010;

iv) clear definition of the limits on purse seine effort that are applicable in different areas;

v) reductions in fishing mortality on bigeye tuna from the longline fishery; and

vi) the adoption of management measures that apply to all sectors of the fishery.

352. SC8 recommends that the Commission take account of the information in working paper SC8-MI-WP-05 "Mapping the distribution of the conservation burden" in its consideration of new management measures for the WCPFC.

Box 3. SC8 Management Advice and Recommendations for other WCPFC stocks which were not specifically mentioned on the TCC8 provisional agenda

<p><u>NP Albacore</u></p> <p>231. SC8 noted that no stock assessment and management advice was provided since SC7. Therefore the advice from SC7 should be maintained pending a new assessment or other new information.</p>
<p><u>Pacific Bluefin</u></p> <p>237. SC8 noted that no stock assessment and management advice was provided since SC7.</p> <p>238. SC8 noted the following conservation advice from the ISC: "Until a new stock assessment result becomes available, ISC12 agreed to carry over the previous conservation advice, albeit with the precautionary note that the uncertainty in the stock status has increased through the passage of time and stock biomass may have declined since the last stock assessment. The advice on Pacific bluefin stock status from ISC11 is: 'Given the conclusions of the July 2010 PBFWG workshop (ISC/10/ANNEX/07), the current (2004 -2006) level of F relative to potential biological reference points, and the increasing trend of F, it is important that the level of F is decreased below the 2002- 2004 levels, particularly on juvenile age classes'."</p>
<p><u>NP Swordfish</u></p> <p>241. SC8 noted that no stock assessment and management advice was provided since SC6. Therefore the advice from SC6 should be maintained, pending a new assessment or other new information.</p>
<p><u>Oceanic Whitetip Shark</u></p> <p>259. Despite the data limitations going into the assessment, and the wide range of uncertainties considered, all of the accepted model runs indicate that the WCPO oceanic whitetip shark stock is currently overfished and overfishing is occurring relative to commonly used MSY-based reference points and depletion-based reference points. Management measures to reduce fishing mortality and to rebuild spawning biomass have been agreed to under CMM 2011-04, but mitigation to avoid capture is recommended.</p> <p>260. Given the bycatch nature of most of the fishery impacts, mitigation measures provide the best opportunity to improve the status of the WCPO oceanic whitetip shark stock.</p> <p>261. Reference points for non-target species, including oceanic whitetip sharks, should be developed as envisaged under Articles 5 and 10 of the WCPF Convention.</p>
<p><u>Silky shark</u></p> <p>280. Noting SC8s concerns over the data conflict and potential biases in the silky shark assessment, it is not possible to provide management advice based on the assessment at this time. However, noting that some basic fishery indicators (e.g. mean lengths and some CPUE series) are showing declines in recent years, the SC recommends no increase in fishing mortality on silky sharks.</p> <p>281. Further, recognizing that the major fishery impacts relate to non-target fisheries, the SC recommends that the Commission consider mitigation measures to reduce the impact of these non-target fisheries as a precautionary measure. SC8 recommends that the silky shark assessment be updated to incorporate all potentially important data series.</p> <p>282. Reference points for non-targets species, including silky sharks, should be developed as envisaged under Articles 5 and 10 of the WCPF Convention.</p>

Table 4. Points of interest for TCC8 from NC8 Report

TOPIC	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
Updated North Pacific Albacore Catch and Effort Tables	<p><u>NC8</u> 26. The United States presented NC8-DP-02, which was intended to help provide direction to NC8 in following up to Tables 1 and 2 of Attachment C, Annex A of the report from NC7. The United States provided updates to the table for U.S. fisheries and also made suggestions intended to help Committee members complete the table in a consistent and informative way so as to further the work of the Committee. Some members found the U.S. suggestions helpful, but others indicated that they still had difficulty in determining under what circumstances a vessel of fishery is determined to be targeting albacore tuna, and that they had drawn somewhat arbitrary lines in an effort to describe marginal situations in order to categorize their fisheries accordingly, which the U.S. proposal did not allow for. A small working group convened produced revised tables (Attachment D). The Committee tentatively adopted those tables with the understanding that they are subject to future review by the Committee.</p>	<p>This attachment will be included in the TCC8 paper: WCPFC-TCC8-2012-IP04</p>
Implementation of the ROP (CMM 07-01 by vessels fishing for fresh fish in the Northern Area.	<p><u>NC8</u> 41. After reviewing the NC 7 proposal on ROP by fishing vessels for fresh fish in the northern area, the Committee agreed to submit a revised proposal (Attachment G) to the Commission for its approval. 42. The Committee also discussed the application of ROP to small vessels, which continues to be deferred under the CMM. Chinese Taipei introduced its experience on the observer deployments on small longliners in the recent two years, and highlighted the difficulties for addressing the concerns of observer safety, insufficient working spaces and the heavy burden for more than one thousand longliners in three Oceans. Chinese Taipei, therefore, requested the Committee to consider this special case while discussing its small longliners smaller than 70 GT, around 110 vessels, used to fish for fresh fish in the high sea north of 20 degree north. For its part, Chinese Taipei expressed its intent to achieve 5% observer coverage for its small longliners by the end of 2016.</p>	
Implementation of WCPFC VMS in the Northern Area	<p><u>NC8</u> 43. Korea noted that they consider VMS to be one of the most effective tools in combating IUU and that VMS should be applied throughout the entire Convention Area. 44. The Committee noted that all the Committee members are prepared to make the VMS implemented in area north of 20N and west of 175E by December 31, 2013 and seeks the endorsement of this plan by the Commission.</p>	

TOPIC	RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT PARAGRAPH REFERENCE <i>(With italicised paraphrased introductory text)</i>	SECRETARIAT COMMENTS
Other matters IUU Fishing in the area	<p><u>NC8</u></p> <p>59. The United States highlighted a recent instance of IUU fishing by a stateless vessel utilizing large scale drift nets on the high seas. The vessel has on board approximately 20mt of NP albacore tuna at the time it was intercepted. China reported that the vessel is currently in their possession and that it will be confiscated.</p> <p>60. The Committee reiterated its condemnation of IUU fishing and encouraged members to continue to make efforts to address IUU fishing.</p>	