

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPM04

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT¹ AND IAGO MOSQUEIRA, 4 DECEMBER 2014

PURPOSE

To provide an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous Working Party on Methods (WPM04), which were endorsed by the Scientific Committee (SC), and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants.

BACKGROUND

The Rules of Procedure of the Scientific Committee include the following seven core tasks, which are to be supported by the various Working Parties.

- a) recommend policies and procedures for the collection, processing, dissemination and analysis of fishery data;
- b) facilitate the exchange and critical review among scientists of information on research and operation of fisheries of relevance to the Commission;
- c) develop and coordinate cooperative research programmes involving Members of the Commission in support of fisheries management;
- d) assess and report to the Commission on the status of stocks of relevance to the Commission and the likely effects of further fishing and of different fishing patterns and intensities;
- e) formulate and report to the sub-commission, as appropriate, on recommendations concerning conservation, fisheries management and research, including consensus, majority and minority views;
- f) consider any matter referred to by the Commission;
- g) to carry out other technical activities of relevance to the Commission.

Process:

- 1) **WPM** – At the 4th Session of the WPM, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the IOTC Secretariat on a range of issues;
- 2) **SC** – The recommendations were considered by the SC in December 2012. At the SC15 meeting, the recommendations of the WPM04 were either rejected or revised and then adopted as those of the SC;
- 3) **Commission** – The refined recommendations were then passed to the Commission for its consideration and possible endorsement.

DISCUSSION

Noting the core tasks of the SC, and hence the WPM, participants are reminded that any recommendations developed during a Session, must be carefully constructed so that each contains the following elements:

- 1) a specific action to be undertaken (deliverable);
- 2) clear responsibility for the action to be undertaken (i.e. a specific CPC of the IOTC, the Secretariat, another subsidiary body of the Commission or the Commission itself);
- 3) a desired time from for delivery of the action (i.e. by the next working party meeting, or other date).

The chair and the IOTC Secretariat have undertaken a review of the recommendations arising from the previous WPM meeting and compared them against those endorsed by the SC [Appendix A](#). Any subsequent actions taken by the Commission at the most recent meeting have also been added to the Appendix. In cases where a recommendation is yet to be fulfilled, a proposal for consideration at the WPM meeting has been provided.

¹ Secretariat@iotc.org

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPM **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPM04 and consider the proposed draft revisions to those recommendations yet to be completed.

That the WPM **AGREE** to the revised recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from the WPM05, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

That the WPM:

1) **NOTE** paper IOTC–2014–WPM05–03 which detailed the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPM04, taking into consideration the recommendations from the SC and decisions of the Commission;

2) **AGREE** to consider and revise as necessary, the recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from the WPM05, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

APPENDICES

[Appendix A](#): Progress made on the recommendations of WPM04

APPENDIX A

Progress made on the recommendations of WPM04

WPM04 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15 and SC16	Endorsed at S17	Commission response/suggestions for consideration at WPM05
WPM04.01 (para. 18)	<p>Capacity building</p> <p>The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC consider making a request to the Chair of the Commission, to include an information session during each Commission meeting, which would provide Commissioners with annual updates and explanatory material to ensure they are kept abreast of the methods and processes being undertaken as part of the broader IOTC MSE process.</p>	SC15 (para. 127)	The SC REQUESTED that the Chair of the Commission includes an agenda item for each Commission meeting, which would provide Commissioners with annual updates and explanatory material to ensure they are kept abreast of the methods and processes being undertaken as part of the broader IOTC MSE process.	S17 (para. 21)	<p>The Commission AGREED to initiate a consultative process among managers, stakeholders and scientists to begin discussions about the implementation of an MSE in the IOTC.</p> <p><i>(NB: The first Report IOTC Management Procedure Dialogue was carried out prior to the 2014 Commission meeting (31 May 2014).</i></p> <p><i>Participants were introduced to the main issues related to management objectives and simulation testing of management procedures by members of WPM and other scientists).</i></p>
WPM04.02 (para. 19)	The WPM RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat coordinate the development and delivery of several training workshops focused on providing assistance to developing CPCs to better understand the MSE process, including how reference points and harvest control rules are likely to function in an IOTC context. The implications of IOTC Resolution 12/01 on the implementation of the precautionary approach and IOTC Recommendation 12/14 on interim target and limit reference points should be incorporated into the workshop. The SC should consider requesting that the Commission's budget incorporate appropriate funds for this purpose.	SC15 (para. 128 - 130)	<p>The SC RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat coordinate the development and delivery of several training workshops focused on providing assistance to developing CPCs to better understand the MSE process, including how reference points and harvest control rules are likely to function in an IOTC context. The implications of IOTC Resolution 12/01 on the implementation of the precautionary approach and IOTC Recommendation 12/14 on interim target and limit reference points should be incorporated into the workshop. The SC REQUESTED that the Commission's budget incorporate appropriate funds for this purpose.</p> <p>The SC AGREED that the role of managers and stakeholders is to identify management</p>	Yes S18 (para.30)	<p>The Commission AGREED on the need for the Commission, its Committees and CPCs to develop a better understanding of management strategy concepts, including reference points, harvest control rules and the role of management strategy evaluation. There is also a need to explain and clarify the roles of the Commission, the SC and MSE through the process.</p> <p>Trainings were carried out by the IOTC in conjunction with WWF, and ABNJ (FAO common seas programs). These were targeted to coastal CPC's and others at two separate meetings, one in Colombo in April and another</p>

		SC16 (para. 115)	<p>objectives, acceptable levels of risk of exceeding limit reference points (LRP), and the criteria against which their performance should be evaluated. The role of IOTC scientists is to identify candidate target reference points (TRP) and LRP (e.g. those contained in Recommendation 12/14 on interim target and limit reference points), evaluate candidate TRPs and LRPs, options for harvest control rules (HCR), and the performance of identified candidate HCRs.</p> <p>The SC AGREED that management objectives should explicitly state the goals for the fishery, and that some of these objectives may conflict with one another (e.g. maximising total allowable catch (TAC) versus minimising the risk of low population levels). Where possible, the Commission should be made aware of any conflicting management objectives which they agree upon so that Commissioners set priorities among objectives throughout the MSE process.</p> <p>The SC NOTED the need for the Commission, its Committees and CPCs to develop a better understanding of management strategy concepts, including reference points, harvest control rules and the role of management strategy evaluation. There is also a need to explain and clarify the roles of the Commission, the SC and MSE through the process. To achieve this, the SC RECOMMENDED a process of familiarisation and capacity building at multiples levels as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair of the Commission considers including an agenda item for each Commission meeting, which would provide Commissioner's with annual updates and explanatory material to ensure they are kept abreast of the 		<p>in Colombo in conjunction with the IOTC Commission Meetings.</p> <p>In addition two workshops communicating science with policy were conducted by the IOTC in Phuket, Thailand in June and in Capetown, S. Africa in September. Both workshops dealt with the general understanding of the scientific/stock assessment advice and how to use in management. This was also tied with a general overview of the MSE and te use of these approaches for managing target and limit reference points.</p>
--	--	---------------------	---	--	---

			<p>methods and processes being undertaken as part of the broader IOTC MSE process. This should also cover a dialogue among scientists, managers and stakeholders on issues related to the specific formulation of management objectives that are required for a complete formulation and evaluation of management plans through MSE. In order to accelerate this process the SC REQUESTED that the IOTC Secretariat seek funding for, and coordinate a side event‘ on the topic associated with the 2014 Commission meeting. In addition, to prepare a workplan for the MSE dialogue in consultation with the WPM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IOTC Secretariat coordinate the development and delivery of several training workshops focused on providing assistance to developing CPCs to better understand the MSE process, including how reference points and harvest control rules are likely to function in an IOTC context. The implications of IOTC Resolution 12/01 on the implementation of the precautionary approach and IOTC Resolution 13/10 on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework should be incorporated into the workshops. The SC REQUESTED that the Commission’s budget incorporate appropriate funds for this purpose, as detailed in Table 12. 		
WPM04.03 (para. 37)	<p><i>Dedicated workshop on CPUE standardisation</i></p> <p>The WPM RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat work with relevant interested IOTC scientists and the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the IOTC species working parties, to develop draft terms of reference (TORs) for a dedicated, informal workshop on CPUE standardisation, to</p>				<p><i>A CPUE workshop was conducted in October of 2013. Results of this workshop were discussed in the SC in 2013, and a suggested plan for inter-sessional work was developed for 2014. Both Japan and Taiwan, China along with the help of the secretariat looked at issues pertaining to differing signals from Taiwan, China and Japan, accounting for spatial</i></p>

				S16 (para.29)	<p>formulation and evaluation of management plans through MSE. The Commission AGREED to establish a specific series of workshops as detailed in Resolution 14/03.</p> <p><i>(NB: Progress made to date will be presented to the Commission and the need for dialogue on precise objectives should be restated).</i></p> <p>The Commission ACKNOWLEDGED the work that has been carried out inter-sessionally by the WPM MSE group and thanked its members for the progress achieved so far. The development of tools that would best allow the evaluation of the likely impacts and the relative merits of alternative management options was considered to be a necessary step for the precautionary management of IOTC stocks.</p>
WPM04.05 (para. 44)	The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC consider requesting that the Commission allocate funds in the 2013 and 2014 IOTC budgets, for an external expert on MSE to be hired for 30 days per year, to supplement the skill set available within IOTC CPCs.	<p>SC15 (para. 134 – 135)</p> <p>SC16 (para. 116)</p>	<p>The SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission allocate funds in the 2013 and 2014 IOTC budgets, for an external expert on MSE to be hired for 30 days per year, to supplement the skill set available within IOTC CPCs, and for the establishment of a participation fund to cover the planned WPM workshops.</p> <p>The SC NOTED that the Maldives indicated their full support to this process of development and evaluation of management plans, and their offer to fund an expert in MSE to join the WPM development team.</p> <p>The SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission allocate funds in the 2014 and 2015 IOTC budgets, for an external expert on MSE to be hired for 30 days per year, to supplement the skill set available within IOTC CPCs, and for the establishment of a participation fund to cover the planned WPM</p>	Yes	<p>IOTC Stock Assessment consultant devoted some of his time to MSE work in 2013, but his involvement could not be continued in 2014. While the Government of the Maldives has funded the work of one consultant working on MSE for skipjack, the IOTC has made no specific allocation of funds to MSE technical work.</p>

			workshops, as detailed in Table 12.		
WPM04.06 (para. 45)	<p><i>Date and place of the Fifth Session of the WPM</i></p> <p>The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC note that while the MSE process was still in its early stages of development, there was no pressing need to hold a WPM meeting in 2013, as the work to be undertaken was of a highly technical nature and would require the involvement of a very limited number of experts in the field of development and implementation of population and fishery models for MSE. Thus, as suggested in the MSE workplan (Section 12), one or two workshops composed of experts should be held in 2013 to continue the development of the MSE process. Where possible, these should be held in conjunction with other IOTC meetings to minimise budgetary consequences.</p>	SC15 (para. 136)	<p><i>Date and place of the Fifth Session of the WPM</i></p> <p>The SC NOTED that while the MSE process was still in its early stages of development, there was no pressing need to hold a WPM meeting in 2013, as the work to be undertaken was of a highly technical nature and would require the involvement of a very limited number of experts in the field of development and implementation of population and fishery models for MSE. Thus, as suggested in the MSE workplan, two workshops composed of experts actively involved in the development work should be held in 2013 to continue the development of the MSE process. The WPM has indicated that it would like to hold the first workshop in April, at the EC JRC, Italy, and the second immediately prior to the meeting of the WPTT at the same venue. A document will then be presented to the next session of SC on the progress of the MSE process.</p>	N/A	December 2015?
WPM04.07 (para. 49)	<p><i>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the Fourth Session of the WPM</i></p> <p>The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPM04, provided at Appendix V.</p>		NOTED	Yes	