

Report of the Eighteenth Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Colombo, Sri Lanka, 1–5 June 2014

DISTRIBUTION:

Participants in the Session
Members of the Commission
Other interested Nations and International Organizations
FAO Fisheries Department
FAO Regional Fishery Officers

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ENTRY

IOTC 2014. Report of the Eighteenth Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission. Colombo, Sri Lanka, 1–5 June 2014. *IOTC-2014-S18-R[E]*: 151 pp.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission or the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This work is copyright. Fair dealing for study, research, news reporting, criticism or review is permitted. Selected passages, tables or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgment of the source is included. Major extracts or the entire document may not be reproduced by any process without the written permission of the Executive Secretary, IOTC.



The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission has exercised due care and skill in the preparation and compilation of the information and data set out in this publication. Notwithstanding, the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, employees and advisers disclaim all liability, including liability for negligence, for any loss, damage, injury, expense or cost incurred by any person as a result of accessing, using or relying upon any of the information or data set out in this publication to the maximum extent permitted by law.

Contact details:

Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Le Chantier Mall
PO Box 1011
Victoria, Mahé, Seychelles
Ph: +248 4225 494
Fax: +248 4224 364
Email: secretariat@iotc.org
Website: <http://www.iotc.org>

ACRONYMS

AFAD	Anchored fish aggregating device
SB _{MSY}	Spawning or ‘adult’ equilibrium biomass at MSY
B _{MSY}	Biomass which produces MSY
CMM	Conservation and Management Measure (of the IOTC; Resolutions and Recommendations)
CNCP	Cooperation Non-Contracting Party, of the IOTC
CoC	Compliance Committee of the IOTC
CPCs	Contracting Parties and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties
DFAD	Drifting fish aggregating device
DWFN	Distant Water fishing Nation
EAF	Ecosystem approach to fisheries
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FAD	Fish aggregating device
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
F _{MSY}	Fishing mortality at MSY
ICRU	Improved Cost Recovery Uplift
IO	Indian Ocean
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IOSEA	Indian Ocean - South-East Asian Marine Turtle Memorandum
IO-ShYP	Indian Ocean Shark multi-Year Program
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IUU	Illegal, unreported and unregulated
LSTLV	Large-scale tuna longline vessel
MPF	Meeting participation fund, of the IOTC
MSC	Marine stewardship council
MSE	Management Strategy Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPOA	National Plan of Action
OPRT	Organisation for the Promotion of Responsible Tuna Fisheries
OT	Overseas Territories
PEW	PEW Charitable Trust
RFMO	Regional Fisheries Management Organisation
SC	Scientific Committee of the IOTC
SCAF	Standing Committee on Administration and Finance, of the IOTC
SIOFA	Southern Indian Ocean Fisheries Agreement
SWIOFC	Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission
TCAC	Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria, of the IOTC
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System
WPEB	Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch, of the IOTC
WPM	Working Party on Methods, of the IOTC
WPTmT	Working Party on Temperate tunas, of the IOTC
WPTT	Working Party on Tropical Tunas, of the IOTC
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature (a.k.a World Wildlife Fund)

MEMBERS OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION**THIRTY-TWO (32) AS OF 5TH JUNE 2014**

AUSTRALIA
BELIZE
CHINA
COMOROS
ERITREA
EUROPEAN UNION
FRANCE(OT)
GUINEA
INDIA
INDONESIA
IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF
JAPAN
KENYA
KOREA, REPUBLIC OF
MADAGASCAR
MALAYSIA
MALDIVES
MAURITIUS
MOZAMBIQUE
OMAN
PAKISTAN
PHILIPPINES
SEYCHELLES
SIERRA LEONE
SOMALIA
SRI LANKA
SUDAN
TANZANIA, UNITED REPUBLIC OF
THAILAND
UNITED KINGDOM(OT)
VANUATU
YEMEN

COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION**THREE (3) AS OF 5TH JUNE 2014**

DJIBOUTI
SENEGAL
SOUTH AFRICA

Table of contents

Executive summary	7
1. Opening of the session	8
2. Adoption of the Agenda and arrangements for the session	8
3. Admission of Observers	8
4. Update on actions from the 17th Session	9
5. Report of the 16th Session of the Scientific Committee.....	9
5.1 Status of the stocks	9
5.2 Commission requests to the Scientific Committee.....	10
5.3 General comments and consideration of other recommendations made by the Scientific Committee in 2013.....	12
6. Report of the 11th Session of the Compliance Committee.....	14
6.1 Summary report on the level of compliance	14
6.2 Reports of implementation	14
6.3 Review of individual CPC Compliance Status against IOTC Conservation and Management Measures.....	14
6.4 Deliberations in relation to Resolution 11/03 On establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the IOTC area.....	15
6.5 Applications for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status.....	16
7. Report of the 11th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance.....	17
7.1 Member contributions	17
7.2 Capacity building	18
7.3 Meeting participation fund (MPF).....	18
7.4 Improved Cost Recovery Uplift (ICRU).....	18
7.5 Programme of work and budget estimates.....	19
8. Proposal to revise the IOTC Rules of Procedure.....	19
9. Performance Review of the IOTC.....	19
9.1 Progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Performance Review Panel (Resolution 09/01 on the performance review follow-up)	19
9.2 Terms of reference for the second performance review of the IOTC.....	19
10. Reform of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission	20
11. Conservation and Management Measures	20
11.1 Current Conservation and Management Measures that require action by the Commission in 2014.....	20
11.2 Review of objections received under Article IX.5 of the IOTC Agreement.....	21
11.3 Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission	21
11.4 Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures not endorsed by the Commission.....	22
12. Other Business	27
12.1 Proposal for a statement on piracy	27
13. Date and Place of the Commission in 2015 and of its subsidiary bodies for 2014	27
14. Review of the Draft and Adoption of the report of the 18th Session of the Commission.....	28
Appendix I List of Participants	29
Appendix II Opening Addresses.....	34
Appendix III Agenda of the 18th Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission	39
Appendix IV List of Documents	41
Appendix V Recommendations of the 16th Session of the Scientific Committee (2–6 December, 2013) to the Commission	43

Appendix VI Stock Status Summary for the IOTC Species	55
Appendix VII Statements of Mauritius and the United Kingdom (OT).....	59
Appendix VIII List of Chairs, Vice-Chairs and their respective terms for the Commission and Subsidiary Bodies.....	60
Appendix IX Recommendations of the 11th Session of the Compliance Committee (26–28 May 2014) To The Commission.....	61
Appendix Xa IOTC IUU Vessels List (June 2014).....	65
Appendix Xb Provisional IOTC IUU Vessels List (June 2014)	67
Appendix XI Recommendations of the 11th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (29 and 31 May, 2014) to the Commission.....	68
Appendix XII Budget for 2014/15 and Indicative Budget for 2016 (in USD).....	70
Appendix XIII Scheme of Contributions for 2014.....	71
Appendix XIV Indian Ocean Tuna Commission: Rules of Procedure (2014)	73
Appendix XV Update on Progress Regarding Resolution 09/01 – On the Performance Review Follow-up	98
Appendix XVI Terms of Reference and criteria to conduct the Second Performance Review of the IOTC	119
Appendix XVII Resolution 14/01 On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures.....	124
Appendix XVIII Resolution 14/02 For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence.....	126
Appendix XIX Resolution 14/03 On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers.....	127
Appendix XX Resolution 14/04 Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence	129
Appendix XXI Resolution 14/05 Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information	133
Appendix XXII Resolution 14/06 On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels	136
Appendix XXIII Recommendation 14/07 To standardise the presentation of scientific information in the annual Scientific Committee report and in Working Party reports	145
Appendix XXIV Statement of the IOTC Plenary on Piracy in the Western Part of the IOTC Area of Competence.....	148
Appendix XXV Schedule of subsidiary body meetings for 2014, and tentatively for 2015.....	151

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Eighteenth Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, from 1 to 5 June 2014, Chaired by Mr Daroomalingum Mauree (Mauritius). A total of 172 delegates attended the Session, composed of 134 delegates from 25 Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission, 3 delegates from 2 Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties and 35 delegates from 14 Observers to the Commission (including 1 from FAO and 12 invited experts))

The Commission adopted the IOTC IUU Vessels List as provided in [Appendix X](#). ([para. 66](#))

The Commission granted the status of Cooperating non-Contracting Party until the close of the 19th Session in 2015 to Djibouti, Senegal and South Africa. ([paras. 69, 75, 77](#))

The Commission adopted the budget for, and the scheme of contributions for 2014 and 2015 as outlined in [Appendix XII](#) and [Appendix XIII](#) respectively, with the understanding that areas of potential savings continue to be explored. ([para. 96](#))

The Commission adopted 7 Conservation and Management Measures in 2014, consisting of 6 Resolutions and 1 Recommendation, as follows:

- Resolution 14/01 *On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures*
- Resolution 14/02 *For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence*
- Resolution 14/03 *On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers*
- Resolution 14/04 *Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence*
- Resolution 14/05 *Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information*
- Resolution 14/06 *On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels*
- Recommendation 14/07 *To standardise the presentation of scientific information in the annual Scientific Committee report and in Working Party reports*

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The Eighteenth Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, from 1 to 5 June 2014, Chaired by Mr Daroomalingum Mauree (Mauritius). A total of 172 delegates attended the Session, composed of 134 delegates from 25 Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission, 3 delegates from 2 Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties and 35 delegates from 14 Observers to the Commission (including 1 from FAO and 12 invited experts). The list of participants is provided at [Appendix I](#).
2. On behalf of the Government of Sri Lanka, the Honorable Dr. Rajitha Senaratne, Minister of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development, Sri Lanka, gave the inaugural address ([Appendix II](#)), welcomed participants to Colombo and declared the Eighteenth Session of the IOTC open. The Chairperson, Mr Daroomalingum Mauree, and the Executive Secretary Mr Rondolph Payet joined in welcoming participants to the meeting ([Appendix II](#)).
3. The Commission **WELCOMED** the Federal Republic of Somalia as the newest member of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission and looks forward to a fruitful collaboration.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

4. The Commission **ADOPTED** the agenda provided at [Appendix III](#), that included two additional items added under 'Other business': i) Outcomes of the adhoc meeting on the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme and ii) Outcomes of the seabird bycatch mitigation trials. The documents presented to the Commission are listed in [Appendix IV](#).

3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

5. The Commission **RECALLED** its agreement made in 2012 that meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should be open to participation by observers from all those who have attended the current and/or previous sessions of the Commission. Applications by new Observers should continue to follow the procedure as outlined in Rule XII of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (note: new Rules were adopted at S18).
6. Pursuant to Article VII of the Agreement establishing the IOTC, the Commission admitted the following observers, as now defined in Rule XIV of the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014):
 - Rule XIV.1. *The Director-General or a representative designated by him, shall have the right to participate without vote in all meetings of the Commission, of the Scientific Committee and of any other subsidiary body of the Commission.*
 - i. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
The Commission **NOTED** the opening remarks made by Mr Matthew Calemeri on behalf of Mr Arni Mathiesen, the Assistant Director General of the Department of Fisheries, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) [Appendix II](#).
 - Rule XIV.2. *Members and Associate Members of the Organization that are not Members of the Commission are, upon their request, invited to be represented by an observer at sessions of the Commission.*
 - i. Russian Federation
 - ii. Saudi Arabia
 - iii. United States of America
 - Rule XIV.4. *The Commission may, on their request, invite intergovernmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission, to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify.*
 - i. Indian Ocean Commission (IOC)
 - ii. Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC)
 - Rule XIV.5. *The Commission may invite, upon request, non-governmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify. The list of the NGOs wishing to be invited will be submitted beforehand by the Secretary to the Members of the Commission. If one of the Members of the Commission objects giving in writing its reasons within 30 days, the matter will then be subject to decision of the Commission out of session by written procedure.*
 - i. Greenpeace International (GI)
 - ii. International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF)
 - iii. Organisation for the Promotion of Responsible Tuna Fisheries (OPRT)
 - iv. Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)

- v. PEW Charitable Trusts (PEW)
- vi. World Wide Fund for Nature (a.k.a World Wildlife Fund, WWF)

Invited experts

- Rule XIV.9. *The Commission may invite consultants or experts, in their individual capacity, to attend the meetings or participate in the work of the Commission as well as the Scientific Committee and the other subsidiary bodies of the Commission.*
 - i. Taiwan, Province of China

4. UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM THE 17TH SESSION

7. The Commission **NOTED** the paper IOTC–2014–S18–05 which provided updates to each of the previous requests from the Commission to CPCs or the Secretariat. Members provided further updates and clarifications during the Session, although these are not summarised here for brevity.
8. The Commission **RECALLED** that at its previous Session, it had requested that appropriate legal support be present during CoC Sessions to aid Members deliberations of alleged IUU cases. Unfortunately no support was provided by FAO during the CoC, despite the Secretariat requesting support from the FAO legal office. The FAO Legal Officer was present during a portion of the Commission meeting, held after the CoC11.

5. REPORT OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

9. The Commission **NOTED** the report of the 16th Session of the Scientific Committee (SC) (IOTC–2013–SC16–R) which was presented by the Chair of the SC, Dr Tsutomu Nishida (Japan). A total of 75 individuals (54 in 2012) attended the Session, comprised of 60 delegates (46 in 2012) from 21 Member countries (21 in 2012), 2 delegates from 1 Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (0 in 2012), and 12 observers, including 3 invited experts (9 observers in 2012).
10. The Commission addressed the list of recommendations made by the SC16 ([Appendix V](#)) from its 2013 report (IOTC–2013–SC16–R) that related specifically to the Commission. The Commission **ENDORSED** the list of recommendations, taking into account the range of issues outlined in this Report (S18) and incorporated within adopted Conservation and Management Measures.

5.1 Status of the stocks

11. The Commission **NOTED** the latest stock status and management advice for each of the 16 species under the IOTC mandate, as well as seven shark species/groups directly impacted by vessels fishing for tuna and tuna-like species, contained in the stock status table provided at [Appendix VI](#).

5.1.1 Albacore

12. The Commission **NOTED** that there remains considerable uncertainty about the relationship between abundance and the standardised CPUE series for albacore in the IOTC area of competence, and about the total catches over the past decade. The most recent assessment was carried out in 2012 and the next assessment is scheduled for 2014. Revisions to the catch history in 2013 indicated that reported landings in 2012 (33,960 t), and those from 2011 (33,605 t) are only slightly above the MSY estimates from the 2012 stock assessment. Maintaining or increasing effort in the core albacore fishing grounds is likely to result in further declines in albacore biomass, productivity and CPUE.
13. The Commission **AGREED** that pending the results of the 2014 albacore stock assessment, it should take a precautionary approach to the management of albacore and consider, at its 19th Session, proposals for Conservation and Management Measure to reduce fishing pressure for albacore; including the consideration of zone-based management of fishing effort.

5.1.2 Skipjack tuna

14. **NOTING** that the SC expressed concerns on the ability of both the pole and line CPUE and the purse seine CPUE to reflect the dynamics of the stock, and given their major role in driving the current stock assessment results, the Commission **REQUESTED** that further investigation is carried out for both CPUE series.

5.1.3 Striped marlin

15. The Commission **NOTED** the advice from the SC that indicates the striped marlin stock is currently subject to overfishing and that biomass is below the level which would produce MSY. The stock has been subject to

overfishing for some years, and that as a result, the stock biomass is well below the B_{MSY} level and shows little signs of rebuilding despite the recent declining effort trend.

16. The Commission **AGREED** that it should take a precautionary approach to the management of striped marlin and consider, at its 19th Session, proposals for Conservation and Management Measures to reduce fishing pressure for striped marlin; including the consideration of zone-based management of fishing effort.
17. The Commission **AGREED** that all CPCs should take a precautionary approach and immediately reduce their impact on striped marlin in the IOTC area of competence.

5.1.4 Sharks

18. The Commission **NOTED** that the stock status of all shark species is uncertain, and in December 2013 the IOTC Scientific Committee recommended that a detailed multiyear shark research program be prepared by a small group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat, to further advance, detail and propose an Indian Ocean Shark multi-Year Program (IO-ShYP) for finalisation at the next WPEB meeting (see SC recommendation SC16.33). The main objective of the IO-ShYP will be to “*promote cooperation and coordination among IOTC researchers, to improve the quality of the scientific advice on sharks provided to the Commission, namely by conducting quantitative stock assessments for selected species by 2016, and to better assess the impact on shark stocks of the current IOTC Conservation and Management Measures.*”
19. The Commission **NOTED** that the IO-ShYP01 was held in Olhão, Portugal from 14 to 16 May 2014, and that a detailed workplan will be submitted to the WPEB later this year.

5.2 Commission requests to the Scientific Committee

20. The Commission **RECALLED** that in 2013, it had made several specific requests to the SC, as outlined below. The summary which follows highlights the initial request, the response from the SC, and any subsequent clarification or request by the Commission during the current Session.

5.2.1 Outlook on time-area closures

21. The Commission, at its 16th Session, adopted Resolution 12/13 *for the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence*, which superseded Resolution 10/01. Contained within Resolution 12/13 is a requirement that the SC will develop at its 2012 and 2013 sessions, the following:
 - a) *an evaluation of the closure area, specifying in its advice if a modification is necessary, its basic scientific rationale with an assessment of the impact of such a closure on the tropical tuna stocks, notably yellowfin and bigeye tuna;*
 - b) *an evaluation of the closure time periods, specifying in its advice if a modification is necessary, its basic scientific rationale with an assessment of the impact of such a closure on the tropical tuna stocks, notably yellowfin and bigeye tuna.*
22. The Commission **NOTED** the SC conclusion that the current closure is likely to be ineffective, as fishing effort will be redirected to other fishing grounds in the Indian Ocean. The positive impacts of the moratorium within the closed area would likely be offset by effort reallocation, as they will result in similar catch rates and total annual catches.
23. **NOTING** that the objective of Resolution 12/13 was to decrease the overall pressure on the main targeted stocks in the Indian Ocean, in particular yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna, and also to evaluate the impact of the current time/area closure and any alternative scenarios on tropical tuna populations, the Commission **REQUESTED** that the SC (via the WPTT in 2014) undertake an analysis of the combined impacts of the two closed areas in the Indian Ocean (contained in Resolution 12/13 and the UK(OT) MPA), with the objective of determining the utility of closed areas in managing highly migratory species.
24. The Commission **NOTED** the statements from Mauritius and the United Kingdom (OT) provided at [Appendix VII](#).

5.2.2 Impacts of catching bigeye tuna and yellowfin tuna juveniles and spawners

25. The Commission **RECALLED** that at its 16th Session, it adopted Resolution 12/13 *for the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence*, which superseded Resolution 10/01. Contained within Resolution 12/13 is a requirement that the SC will develop at its 2012 and 2013 sessions, the following:

- c) *an evaluation of the impact on yellowfin and bigeye tuna stocks by catching juveniles and spawners taken by all fisheries. The Scientific Committee shall also recommend measures to mitigate the impacts on juvenile and spawners.*

26. The Commission **NOTED** the indication from the SC that the most direct way to measure the impact of fishing fleets on juveniles could be obtained by looking at the catches of juvenile yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna by gear.
27. The Commission **NOTED** however, that the fishery statistics available for many fleets, in particular for coastal fisheries, are not accurate enough for a comprehensive analysis as has been repeatedly noted in previous WPTT and SC reports. The Commission **REQUESTED** that the countries engaged in those fisheries take immediate actions to improve fishery statistics reporting to the IOTC Secretariat.

5.2.3 Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE)

28. The Commission **RECALLED** that at its 15th Session, Members ‘*endorsed the development of a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) in the framework of IOTC and requests that this process be continued in 2011*’ (para. 43 of the S15 report). MSE is a procedure whereby the performance of alternative management strategies are evaluated using simulations of stock and fishery dynamics (para. 18 of the S17 report).
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. The Commission **NOTED** the informal working group meeting which took place immediately prior to the S18, aimed at promoting 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. The Commission **AGREED** to establish a specific series of workshops as detailed in Resolution 14/03.

5.2.4 Requests to the SC contained in IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

32. The Commission **NOTED** the following in regards to the requests to the SC and WPEB outlined in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12/04:
- a) *Develop recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures for gillnet, longline and purse seine fisheries in the IOTC area*
- Gillnet:** The absence of data for marine turtles, fishing effort, spatial deployment and bycatch in the IOTC area of competence makes it difficult to provide management advice for gillnets. However, possible mitigation measures to avoid marine turtle mortality in gillnets would be possible and, thus, the group suggested that research in gillnet mitigation measures (e.g. using lights on gillnets) will be considered as a research priority. Moreover, improvements in data collection and reporting of marine turtle interactions with gillnets, and research on the effect of gear types (i.e. net construction and colour, mesh size, soak times, light deterrents) are necessary.
- Longline:** Current information suggests inconsistent spatial catches (i.e. high catches in few sets) and by gear/fishery. The most important mitigation measures relevant for longline fisheries are to:
1. Encourage the use of circle hooks, whilst developing further research into their effectiveness using a multiple species approach.
 2. Release live animals after careful dehooking/disentangling/line cutting (See handling guidelines in the *Marine turtle identification cards for Indian Ocean fisheries*).
- Purse seine:** see c) below
- b) *Develop regional standards covering data collection, data exchange and training*
1. The development of standards using the IOTC guidelines for the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme should be undertaken, as it is considered the best way to collect reliable data related to marine turtle bycatch in the IOTC area of competence.
 2. The Chair of the WPDCS to work with the IOSEA MoU Secretariat, which has already developed regional standards for data collection, and revise the observer data collection forms and observer reporting template as appropriate, as well as current recording and reporting

requirements through IOTC Resolutions, to ensure that the IOTC has the means to collect quantitative and qualitative data on marine turtle bycatch.

3. Encourage CPCs to use IOSEA expertise and facilities to train observers and crew to increase post-release survival rates of marine turtles.
- c) *Develop improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of marine turtles, including the use of biodegradable materials*
 1. All FAD-directed purse seine fisheries should rapidly change to only use ecological FADs¹ based on the principles outlined in Annex III of Resolution 13/08 *Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species.*

5.3 General comments and consideration of other recommendations made by the Scientific Committee in 2013

5.3.1 National Reports

33. **NOTING** that the Commission, at its 15th Session, expressed concern regarding the limited submission of National Reports to the SC, and stressed the importance of providing the reports by all CPCs, the Commission **ACKNOWLEDGED** that in 2013, 28 reports were provided by CPCs, up from 26 in 2012, 25 in 2011, 15 in 2010 and 14 in 2009.
34. The Commission **REMINDED** CPCs that the purpose of the National Reports is to provide relevant information to the SC on fishing activities of Contracting Parties (Members) and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties operating in the IOTC area of competence. The report should include all fishing activities for species under the IOTC mandate as well as sharks and other byproduct / bycatch species as required by the IOTC Agreement and decisions by the Commission. The submission of a National Report is mandatory, irrespective if a CPC intends on attending the annual meeting of the SC and shall be made no later than 15 days prior to the SC meeting. The National Report does not replace the need for submission of data according to the IOTC Mandatory Data Requirements listed in the relevant IOTC Resolution [currently 10/02].

5.3.2 Status of development and implementation of National Plans of Action for seabirds and sharks, and implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations

35. The Commission **NOTED** the updated status of development and implementation of National Plans of Action for seabirds and sharks, and the implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations, by each CPC, as provided in the Scientific Committee report.
36. The Commission **AGREED** with the request from the Scientific Committee that all CPCs without an NPOA-Sharks and/or NPOA-Seabirds expedite the development and implementation of a NPOA, and to report progress to the WPEB and SC in 2014, recalling that NPOA-Sharks are a framework that should facilitate estimation of shark catches, and development and implementation of appropriate management measures, which should also enhance the collection of bycatch data and compliance with IOTC Resolutions.

5.3.3 On data, including bycatch and discards

37. The Commission **AGREED** that data quality was integral to the accuracy of stock assessments. IOTC is one of the most transparent tuna RFMO's about describing the quality of the information used in its assessments. The data issues are common in other RFMO's but rarely acknowledged and described in such detail in the assessment reports.
38. The Commission **NOTED** the paucity of catch statistics for the main species of sharks, by major fisheries (gears), for the period 1950–2012. Although some CPCs have reported more detailed data on sharks in recent years, including time-area catches and effort, and length frequency data for the main commercial shark species, the Commission expressed strong **CONCERN** as the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks.

¹ This term means improved FAD designs to reduce any incidental entanglement of bycatch species, using biodegradable material as much as possible.

39. **NOTING** that the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks, the Commission **REQUESTED** that all CPCs collect and report catches of sharks (including historical data), catch-and-effort and length frequency data on sharks, as per IOTC Resolutions, so that more detailed analysis can be undertaken for the next WPEB meeting.
40. The Commission **NOTED** some minor improvements in the quantity of fisheries statistics available to the SC and its Working Parties in 2013 but reiterated its concerns about the lack of fisheries data from some gears and fleets for target and bycatch species. Specifically, many fisheries statistics are missing or incomplete for some industrial and artisanal fisheries. As such, the Commission **REQUESTED** that all CPCs improve their data collection and reporting to the IOTC, especially taking into account that the Commission has initiated the consultation process on developing criteria for a quota allocation system.
41. The Commission **NOTED** the request from the SC to increase the IOTC Capacity Building budget line so that capacity building workshops/training can be carried out in 2014 and 2015 on the collection, reporting and analyses of catch and effort data for neritic tuna and tuna-like species. Where appropriate these training sessions shall include information that explains the entire IOTC process from data collection to analysis and how the information collected is used by the Commission to develop Conservation and Management Measures.

5.3.4 Resolution 11/04 *On a regional observer scheme*

42. The Commission **NOTED** the recommendation from the SC that the total number of days-at-sea covered by observers versus the total number of days-at-sea for each fleet over a year is used instead of the number of sets/operations. However, this was not endorsed as it was felt that observer coverage rates were better calculated on the actual effort observed (i.e. number of hooks, number of sets).

5.3.5 Fin to body weight ratio

43. The Commission **RECALLED** the advice from the SC15 that:
 SC15.24, para. 111 “...the best way to encourage full utilisation of sharks, to ensure accurate catch statistics, and to facilitate the collection of biological information, is to revise the IOTC Resolution 05/05 concerning the conservation of sharks caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC such that all sharks must be landed with fins attached (naturally or by other means) to their respective carcass. However, the SC **NOTED** that such an action would have practical implementation and safety issues for some fleets and may degrade the quality of the product in some cases. The SC **RECOMMENDED** all CPCs to obtain and maintain the best possible data for IOTC fisheries impacting upon sharks, including improved species identification.”

5.3.6 Wire leaders/traces

44. The Commission **RECALLED** the advice from the SC15 that:
 SC15.25, para 113...“On the basis of information presented to the SC in 2011 and in previous years, the SC **RECOGNISED** that the use of wire leaders/traces in longline fisheries may imply targeting of sharks. The SC therefore **RECOMMENDED** to the Commission that if it wishes to reduce catch rates of sharks by longliners it should prohibit the use of wire leaders/traces.”
45. The Commission **NOTED** that the studies presented to the SC to date, indicate that catch rates of target tuna species are either not negatively impacted, or increase, if monofilament leaders are used instead of wire leaders. Monofilament leaders promote bite-offs which can lead to lower mortality rates. In contrast, wire and braided nylon traces produces higher shark catch rates and mortality, although it appears to vary by species.

5.3.7 Employment of a Fisheries Officer (Bycatch)

46. The Commission **NOTED** the request from the SC that the Commission approve the hiring of a Fishery Officer (Bycatch) to work on bycatch matters in support of the scientific process given the rapidly increasing scientific workload at the IOTC Secretariat, including a wide range of additional duties on ecosystems and bycatch assigned to it by the SC and the Commission. However, at this point in time, it was not considered a financial priority.

5.3.8 Chairs and Vice-Chairs

47. The Commission **NOTED** and welcomed the re-elected and new Chairs and Vice-Chairs for each of the IOTC Working Parties and the SC, as listed in [Appendix VIII](#).

6. REPORT OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

48. The Commission **NOTED** the report of the Eleventh Session of the Compliance Committee (CoC) (IOTC–2014–CoC11–R) which was presented by the Chair of the CoC, Mr. Herminio Tembe (Mozambique). A total of 122 delegates attended the Session, composed of 96 delegates from 25 Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission, 1 delegate from 1 of the 2 Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties and 16 delegates from 7 Observers (including 9 invited experts).
49. The Commission addressed the list of recommendations made by the CoC11 ([Appendix IX](#)) from its 2014 report (IOTC–2014–CoC11–R) that related specifically to the Commission. The Commission **ENDORSED** the list of recommendations, taking into account the range of issues outlined in this Report (S18) and incorporated within adopted Conservation and Management Measures.

6.1 Summary report on the level of compliance

50. The Commission **NOTED** that although there has been a continued improvement in the levels of compliance by some CPCs in 2013, there are still many CPCs not meeting their obligations to provide information under the various CMMs covered in the paper. Some of the required information is not only important to ensure the completeness of datasets, but also to allow the CoC and Commission to fully assess the level of compliance of CPCs with the CMMs to monitor the catch and capacity of fleets actively fishing for tuna and tuna-like species under the mandate of IOTC.
51. The Commission **REMINDED** all CPCs of the need to respect the deadlines of the process established in Resolution 10/09 *Concerning the functions of the Compliance Committee*, para. 4.

6.2 Reports of implementation

52. The Commission **NOTED** that in 2014, a total of 25 national ‘Reports of Implementation’ were provided by CPCs (25 Members and zero Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties), down from 27 in 2013 and 28 in 2012. The Commission stressed the importance of the timely submission of national ‘Reports of Implementation’ by all CPCs and urged those CPCs who did not meet their reporting obligations in this regard (Eritrea, Guinea, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Yemen, Senegal and South Africa), to provide a national Report of Implementation to the Secretariat as soon as possible.
53. The Commission **REMINDED** CPCs of their obligation under Article X.2 of the IOTC Agreement to transmit to the Commission a national ‘Reports of Implementation’ on the actions it has taken to make effective the provisions of the IOTC Agreement and to implement CMMs adopted by the Commission. Such ‘Reports of Implementation’ shall be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Commission not later than 60 days before the date of the following regular session of the Commission.

6.3 Review of individual CPC Compliance Status against IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

54. The Commission **WELCOMED** the progress made by each CPC on compliance with IOTC CMMs in 2013/2014 and encouraged each CPC to continue their efforts to improve compliance during the intersessional period.
55. The Commission **NOTED** that eight CPCs (Members: Eritrea, Guinea, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Vanuatu and Yemen; CNCs: South Africa) were not present at CoC11 and **AGREED** that attendance by all CPCs at each CoC meeting is essential to the effective operation of the Commission.
56. The Commission **AGREED** that the Chair of the CoC would provide questions in writing to each of the CPCs who were not in attendance at the CoC meeting. For those CPCs who attend S18, this would be done during the last day of the meeting. For those CPCs who do not attend S18, the ‘letter of feedback on compliance issues’ would be sent by the IOTC Chair following the Commission meeting and would include an expression of concern given the CPCs absence from the IOTC meetings.

6.3.1 Follow-up actions on the decisions of the 17th Session of the Commission

57. The Commission **RECALLED** that the UK(OT) and Sri Lankan Authorities had established a bilateral mechanism for exchanging information on IUU vessels from 2011, and which was further reinforced following the discussions held in Fremantle, Australia in 2012 and Grand Baie, Mauritius in 2013. This mechanism has been working well and closer collaboration with the Sri Lankan authorities is welcomed in order to combat IUU.

58. The Commission **ENCOURAGED** Sri Lanka to continue their work in improving compliance with IOTC CMMs by their fleets and to work closely with other CPCs and the Secretariat, as they have done in 2012 and 2013.

6.4 Deliberations in relation to Resolution 11/03 On establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the IOTC area.

6.4.1 IOTC IUU Vessels List - 2013 review

59. The Commission **AGREED** that the following vessels shall remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations:

- OCEAN LION (Flag unknown)
- YU MAAN WON (Flag unknown)
- GUNUAR MELYAN 21 (Flag unknown)
- HOOM XIANG II (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA No. 21 (Flag unknown)
- FULL RICH (Flag unknown)

6.4.2 IUU Vessels List - Consideration of other vessels

60. The Commission **AGREED** that the following vessels shall be added to the IOTC IUU Vessels List, as permitted under Resolution 11/03 para. 13.

- SHUEN SIANG (Flag unknown)
- HOOM XIANG 101 (Flag unknown)
- HOOM XIANG 103 (Flag unknown)
- HOOM XIANG 105 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 01 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 02 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 06 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 08 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 09 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 11 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 13 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 17 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 21 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 23 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 26 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 30 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 18 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 67 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 168 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 188 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 189 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 286 (Flag unknown)
- SRI FU FA 888 (Flag unknown)
- FU HSIANG FA NO. 20 (Flag unknown)

QIAN YUAN (Flagged to Cambodia)

61. The Commission **CONSIDERED** whether the Cambodian flagged cargo vessel *QIAN YUAN* should be kept on the IOTC Provisional IUU List.
62. The Commission **NOTED** that the concerned parties have reached an agreement and would like to withdraw the request for keeping the vessel on the IOTC Provisional IUU Vessels List. On the basis of the agreement, China agreed to provide a report on its investigation, within 30 days after the 18th Session of the Commission, on the activities of the cargo vessel *QIAN YUAN* in the IOTC area of competence, including the provision of the names and VMS tracks of the Chinese flagged fishing vessels, which received supplies from this cargo vessel.

MAAN YIH FENG (Flagged to Taiwan, Province of China)

63. The Commission **AGREED** to retain the *MAAN YIH FENG* on the Provisional IUU Vessels List, as provided under Resolution 11/03 para. 14, until sanctions of adequate severity have been applied and until an investigation is conducted and the report received. In the absence of these requirements the vessel should be moved onto the IUU list.

6.4.3 General discussion

64. The Commission **RECOMMENDED** that the use of flags of convenience for vessels operating in the IOTC area of competence should be discouraged to the full extent possible.
65. **NOTING** the confusion among many CPCs regarding the lack of a clear definition of fishing vessels, the Commission **AGREED** that the Compliance Committee develop a recommendation for a clear definition for fishing vessels, fishing and fisheries related activities.
66. The Commission **ADOPTED** the IOTC IUU Vessels List as provided in [Appendix Xa](#) and the Provisional IOTC IUU Vessels list as provided in [Appendix Xb](#). All CPCs shall be required to take the necessary measures regarding the IUU Vessels List in accordance with para. 16 of Resolution 11/03.

6.5 Applications for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status**6.5.1 Senegal**

67. The Commission **NOTED** Senegal's application for the renewal of its status as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (paper IOTC-2014-CoC11-CNCP01).
68. The Commission **NOTED** the confirmation from Senegal that it will commence fishing operations in the Indian Ocean in 2015, when Senegal would become a Contracting Party of the Commission, via the accession process detailed in the IOTC Agreement.
69. The Commission **GRANTED** the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party until the close of the 19th Session in 2015 to Senegal, based on the understanding that Senegal will attend the CoC or Commission meetings in 2015.

6.5.2 Bangladesh

70. The Commission **NOTED** the application for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status by Bangladesh (IOTC-2014-CoC11-CNCP02). As Bangladesh was not present at the Compliance Committee or the Commission meeting, the Commission **AGREED** that the application could not be considered. The Bangladesh application for CNCP status should be resubmitted to and presented at the next Compliance Committee meeting to be held in 2015, by Bangladesh.

6.5.3 Democratic People's Republic of Korea

71. The Commission **NOTED** the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's (DPRK) application for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (paper IOTC-2014-CoC11-CNCP03). The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, via its submission, informed the Commission that it intended on complying fully to the terms of the IOTC Agreement and all IOTC CMMs adopted by it.
72. **NOTING** that the DPRK was not present at the Compliance Committee or the Commission meeting, the Commission **AGREED** that the application could not be considered. The DPRK application for CNCP status should be resubmitted to and presented at the next Compliance Committee meeting to be held in 2015, by the DPRK.

6.5.4 Djibouti

73. The Commission **NOTED** Djibouti's application for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (paper IOTC–2014–CoC11–CNCP04). Djibouti, via its submission to the CoC, informed the Commission that it intended on complying fully to the terms of the IOTC Agreement and all IOTC CMMs adopted by it.
74. Although Djibouti was not present at the Commission meeting, the Commission **NOTED** that Djibouti was present at the 11th Session of the Compliance Committee, where the request for CNCP status was presented by Djibouti.
75. The Commission **GRANTED** the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party until the close of the 19th Session in 2015 to Djibouti based on the understanding that Djibouti will attend the CoC or Commission meetings in 2015.

6.5.5 South Africa, Republic of

76. The Commission **NOTED** South Africa's application for the renewal of its status as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (paper IOTC–2014–CoC11–CNCP05). South Africa informed the Commission that unfortunately, it had not been able to complete its process of accession to the IOTC, but that it expected to do so before the next meeting of the CoC. South Africa renewed its commitment to sustainability noting that it had fully complied with all IOTC CMMs.
77. The Commission **GRANTED** the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party until the close of the 19th Session in 2015 to South Africa, based on the understanding that South Africa will attend the CoC or Commission meetings in 2015.

6.5.6 General comments on CNCP applications

78. The Commission **RECALLED** its previous decision that applications for CNCP status shall not be considered unless the concerned parties are present at the Compliance Committee or Commission meetings to present their application and respond to questions from Members.

7. REPORT OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

79. The Commission **NOTED** the report of the 11th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF) (IOTC–2014–SCAF11–R) which was presented by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Benjamin Tabios (Philippines). A total of 78 individuals attended the Session, comprised of 64 delegates from 25 Member countries, 1 delegate from 1 Cooperating Non-Contracting Party, and 14 observers, including 7 invited experts.
80. The Commission addressed the list of recommendations made by the SCAF11 ([Appendix XI](#)) in its 2014 report that related specifically to the Commission. The Commission **ENDORSED** the list of recommendations, taking into account the range of issues outlined in this Report (S18) and incorporated within adopted Conservation and Management Measures.

7.1 Member contributions

81. The Commission **NOTED** that the cumulative total of outstanding contribution payments has increased from US\$1,069,802 as of December 31st 2012, to US\$1,425,893 as of December 31st 2013, an increase of US\$356,091 (33.3%) with 11 Members having payments in arrears (excluding minor outstanding payments resulting from bank charges and differences in currency exchange rates).
82. The Commission **NOTED** that as of 23 April 2014, seven IOTC Members (Eritrea, Guinea, I.R. Iran, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Vanuatu), have contributions that are in arrears by two years or more. The I.R. of Iran has encountered difficulties to submit funds through regular banking channels to the accounts provided by FAO.
83. The Commission **REQUESTED** that all Members with overdue IOTC contributions finalise payment of those contributions as soon as possible so as not to hinder the operation of the IOTC. To facilitate this process, the Chair of the Commission, with the assistance of the Secretariat and the FAO Legal Department, shall conduct bilateral discussion with each of the CPCs with contributions in arrears totalling more than the previous two years, with a view to recover the outstanding contributions and further assess their interest of continued involvement in the IOTC. Responses from those CPCs should be circulated by the Secretariat to all CPCs for consideration at the 12th Session of the SCAF.

7.1.1 Membership of Sierra Leone and Guinea in the IOTC

84. The Commission **NOTED** the recommendation from the SCAF11 following its discussion of the membership of Sierra Leone and Guinea in the IOTC (contained within paper IOTC-2014-SCAF11-10). The paper outlined two Members deemed to have withdrawn from the Membership of IOTC in accordance with the IOTC Agreement. Guinea and Sierra Leone have previously been contacted by the Chair of the Commission, with assistance of the IOTC Executive Secretary, to assess their confirmation of continued involvement in the IOTC and to seek payment for overdue contributions. Despite no response having been received to several communication attempts, the Commission was unable to agree on a course of action and deferred further discussion until the next Session of the Commission.

7.2 Capacity building

85. The Commission **AGREED** that capacity building activities, including workshops on science (stock assessment), compliance with IOTC CMMs, data collection and reporting, and bridging the gap between IOTC science and management advice, be continued in 2014 and financially supported through the IOTC budget and through voluntary contributions from Members and other interested parties.

7.3 Meeting participation fund (MPF)

86. The Commission **RECALLED** that the intention of the MPF (previously Resolution 10/05; now Rule XVI in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)) is to utilise the funds, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing Contracting Parties in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties. In 2013, the Secretariat facilitated the participation of 58 (46 in 2012 and 33 in 2011) individuals from 16 developing Contracting Parties of IOTC to the five Working Party meetings held. There was a continued increase in attendance by national scientists from developing Contracting Parties to IOTC Working Parties and the SC in 2013 (58 in 2013; 42 in 2012; 33 in 2011; 19 in 2010), which was largely due to the IOTC MPF. In 2013, 2012 and 2011 all MPF recipients developed and presented at least one working paper or National Report, relevant to the meeting in which the Commission funded their attendance. The papers presented to IOTC meetings by MPF recipients have continued to improve in quality as a direct result of improved attendance and participation by scientists from developing coastal states.
87. The Commission **RECALLED** that as a secondary priority the MPF (previously Resolution 10/05; now Rule XVI in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)) the MPF should be used to fund the participation of one representative per developing Contracting Party to a non-scientific meeting of the Commission, including regular Sessions, if the Contracting Party intends to present reports relevant to the meeting in question.
88. **NOTING** that the Commission had directed the Secretariat to ensure that the MPF be utilised, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing Contracting Parties in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties, rather than non-science meetings, the Commission **REQUESTED** that the Secretariat strictly adhere to the directives of the Commission contained in Rule XVI in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)), including paragraph 5 which states that *'The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditures of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.'* Thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing Contracting Parties scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.
89. The Commission **REQUESTED** that the Secretariat seek voluntary contributions from Contracting Parties and other interested groups to supplement the MPF.
90. The Commission **AGREED** that any cost savings made on the annual IOTC budget, shall also be used to further supplement the \$60,000 currently budgeted for the MPF. The priorities for the funds use shall be consistent with the 75:25 split between the science meetings (SC and its Working Parties) and non-scientific meetings of the Commission, in accordance with the Rules adopted by the Commission.
91. The Commission **AGREED** that the IOTC MPF exclude funding for Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, as they currently do not contribute to the IOTC budget.

7.4 Improved Cost Recovery Uplift (ICRU)

92. The Commission **AGREED** that the Improved Cost Recovery Uplift (ICRU) does not seem to be justifiable to the specific framework of the IOTC. Moreover, security-related charges were excessive, considering the relative safety and security within the host country and the security provisions made by Seychelles, as per the Headquarters Agreement between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and Seychelles.

93. The Commission **AGREED** that the ICRU related charges, applied by the FAO, be eliminated from the IOTC current and future expenditure accounts, and that the Chair of the Commission communicate this decision to FAO.
94. The Commission **REQUESTED** the Chair through the Secretariat, write to the FAO Director General indicating its concerns regarding ICRU charges on the IOTC budget.

7.5 Programme of work and budget estimates

95. The Commission thanked the Secretariat for the work conducted during 2013, and **ENDORSED** the IOTC Secretariat's programme of work for the financial period 01 January 2014 to 31 December 2015, as outlined in paper IOTC–2014–SCAF11–05.
96. The Commission **ADOPTED** the budget for, and the scheme of contributions for 2014 and 2015 as outlined in [Appendix XII](#) and [Appendix XIII](#) respectively, with the understanding that areas of potential savings continue to be explored.

8. PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE

97. The Commission **NOTED** paper IOTC–2014–S18–06 which proposed revised IOTC Rules of Procedure, incorporating administrative Resolutions, as well as a degree of modernisation and thanked those involved in its development.
98. The Commission **ADOPTED** the revised '*INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION: RULES OF PROCEDURE*' as provided at [Appendix XIV](#) by consensus.

9. PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE IOTC

9.1 Progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Performance Review Panel (Resolution 09/01 on the performance review follow-up)

99. The Commission **NOTED** paper IOTC–2014–S18–07 which outlined the current status of implementation for each of the recommendations arising from the report of the Performance Review Panel.
100. The Commission **AGREED** to the updated version of the document on progress made regarding the recommendations arising from the report of the Performance Review Panel, provided at [Appendix XV](#). The Commission tasked the Secretariat with ensuring that the revised table is provided to the respective Committees in advance of their next Sessions in accordance with the IOTC Rules of Procedure for further updating.
101. The Commission **NOTED** two avenues available to the Commission when considering how best to deal with recommendations from the Performance Review Panel to amend the existing IOTC Agreement and to replace the Agreement with a completely renegotiated one. However, the most logical path would be to undertake both paths, in series, i.e. to amend the Agreement as permitted under Article XX of the IOTC Agreement to satisfy some of the recommendations from the Panel, while also undertaking a process to renegotiate the entire Agreement, which is likely to take several years.
102. The Commission **NOTED** that the IOTC Agreement, and the institutional links with the FAO, inhibits the full involvement of all fleets in the Commission. This results in an element contributing for non-compliance by some vessels in certain important fleets, with little action available to the Commission to deal with them.

9.2 Terms of reference for the second performance review of the IOTC

103. The Commission **NOTED** paper IOTC–2014–S18–08 which aimed to inform the Commission of the process undertaken since the last Session, by the small discussion group of interested CPCs to develop the draft Terms of reference and criteria to conduct the Performance Review of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.
104. The Commission **NOTED** the recent recommendations that came out of the CoC regarding the extent to which the CMMs on capacity have been implemented and a need to highlight its level of compliance. In addition, a recommendation came out of SCAF that an analysis of the cost and the benefits of IOTC's existence within and outside of FAO's structure be undertaken to ascertain the viability of IOTC breaking from the UN administrative structure and mandate.

105. The Commission **ENDORSED** the amended Terms of Reference and criteria ([Appendix XVI](#)) to conduct the Second Performance Review of the IOTC and agreed on a process to start undertaking the review in 2014. The composition of the Panel will be as follows, with the IOTC Secretariat acting as facilitator of the process:

- Chair with appropriate background
- Contracting Parties from coastal States: Maldives, Mauritius, Oman and Seychelles
- Contracting Parties from DWFN: European Union and Japan
- Science expert (To be decided by the Panel Members)
- NGOs: PEW and ISSF
- Members from other RFMO's: WCPFC and ICCAT

106. The Commission **NOTED** the statement from the European Union on the composition of the Panel, as follows:

“With regard to the composition of the Performance Review Panel, the European Union notes that it is both a coastal CPC and a Distant Water Fishing CPC.”

107. The Commission **AGREED** that Panel meetings shall be held at the Secretariat in the Seychelles, with funding from the MPF to be used (if available) to cover the travel expenses of those Panel members from developing coastal Contracting Parties.

108. The Commission **RECALLED** the importance for all CPCs, RMFOs NGOs and Invited Experts to follow the process closely, and to participate whenever requested by the Panel via information provision.

10. REFORM OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION

109. The Commission **DEFERRED** discussion of the IOTC reform until the finalisation of the analysis of the costs and the benefits of IOTC's existence within and outside of the FAO structure, after the Second Performance Review, and an update will be provided at each Session of the Commission.

11. CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

110. The Commission **NOTED** with appreciation that all proposals for new or revised Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs) were provided to the Secretariat prior to the 30 day pre-meeting deadline. The submission of proposals at least 30 days prior to the Session gives all CPCs an opportunity to thoroughly review the proposals. In doing so, CPCs are able to carry out internal consultations with institutions that would be responsible for implementing the proposed measures. Submission 30 days before the Session also allows CPCs time to discuss contentious issues before the commencement of the Session, thereby improving efficiency during Plenary.

111. The Commission **RECALLED** its previous decision that the 30 day rule shall continue to be strictly applied for all future Sessions unless otherwise agreed. Specifically, no proposals for new or revised Conservation or Management Measures shall be accepted by the Secretariat for the Commission's consideration, if received after the 30 day deadline.

112. The Commission **NOTED** the statements from Mauritius and the United Kingdom (OT) provided at [Appendix VII](#).

113. The Commission **RECOGNISED** the need to utilise the time resources during Sessions of the Commission so that Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures are fully considered, including discussions on budgetary consequences.

114. The Commission **REQUESTED** that all proposals from Members should include, as part of their Explanatory Statements, any budgetary consequences, as well as consideration of the feasibility of implementation by CPCs.

11.1 Current Conservation and Management Measures that require action by the Commission in 2014

115. The Commission **NOTED** paper IOTC–2014–S18–09 outlined previous decisions contained in IOTC Conservation and Management Measures, on which the Commission agreed to action at the 18th Session in 2014, and thanked the Secretariat for its preparation. Where possible, any outstanding issues shall be dealt with during the current Session and in the new or revised Conservation and Management Measures adopted.

11.2 Review of objections received under Article IX.5 of the IOTC Agreement

116. The Commission **NOTED** paper IOTC–2014–S18–09 which aimed to provide the Commission with an opportunity to review the ‘Objections’ received following the last Session of the Commission and how this review process should be carried out.

117. The Commission **RECALLED** that at the 17th Session, pursuant to Article IX.5 of the IOTC Agreement, the IOTC Secretariat received the first formal objection from a Contracting Party of the Commission, for the following Conservation and Management Measures:

- Resolution 13/02 *Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence*
- Resolution 13/03 *On the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence*
- Resolution 13/06 *On a scientific and management framework on the Conservation of sharks species caught in association with IOTC managed fisheries*
- Resolution 13/07 *Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information*

118. The Commission **NOTED** that INDIA will provide feedback to the IOTC Secretariat in due course.

11.3 Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission

119. The Commission **CONSIDERED** and **ADOPTED** 7 proposals (6 Resolutions and 1 Recommendation) as Conservation and Management Measures as detailed below:

11.3.1 On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures

120. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/01 *On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures* ([Appendix XVII](#)). This Resolution supersedes a range of CMMs that have been fulfilled or are obsolete (22 in total), as they have been replaced without being superseded or are no longer relevant to the conservation and management of tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean. Resolution 03/01 proposed for revoking was not superseded as several CPCs felt it should be retained until some of its elements were included into Resolution 12/11 (or any subsequent revision). This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/01.

11.3.2 For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence

121. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/02 *For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence* ([Appendix XVIII](#)). This Resolution removes obsolete and ineffective elements from the previous Resolution 12/13, in particular the month long closed area following advice from the Scientific Committee that the current closure is likely to be ineffective, as fishing effort will be redirected to other fishing grounds in the Indian Ocean. The positive impacts of the moratorium within the closed area would likely be offset by effort reallocation, as they will result in similar catch rates and total annual catches. In addition, the area closure includes not only the high seas but also part of the EEZ of Somalia, which may be detrimental to the aspirations of Somalia with respect to granting of fishing rights within its EEZ. The revised Resolution retains only those elements related to the already established process for an allocation system or any other relevant measures to be developed to manage tropical tuna stocks. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 12/13.

11.3.3 On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers

122. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/03 *On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers* ([Appendix XIX](#)). The Resolution creates a Science and Management Dialogue process dedicated to enhance the decision making response of managers to existing Conservation and Management Measures as well as to the recommendations made by the Scientific Committee. The objective is to enhance communication and to foster mutual understanding between fisheries managers, stakeholders and scientists; and to promote the efficient use of scientific resources and information.

123. The Commission **NOTED** that financial support for any new meetings should be sourced as much as possible, from voluntary contributions by CPCs, NGOs and other bodies.

11.3.4 Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence

124. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/04 *Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence* ([Appendix XX](#)). This Resolution introduces amendments to Resolution 13/02 by requiring fishing vessels operating in the IOTC area of competence 24 meters or above, or less than 24 meters if fishing outside their EEZ, hold an IMO numbers by 1 January 2016 (if eligible). This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/02.

11.3.5 Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information

125. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/05 *Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information* ([Appendix XXI](#)). This Resolution introduces amendments to Resolution 13/07, similar to those introduced to Resolution 13/02, by requiring licenced foreign fishing vessels operating in the IOTC area of competence 24 meters or above, or less than 24 meters if fishing outside their EEZ, to hold an IMO numbers by 1 January 2016 (if eligible). This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/07.

11.3.6 On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels

126. The Commission **ADOPTED** Resolution 14/06 *On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels* ([Appendix XXII](#)). This Resolution introduces amendments to Resolution 12/05, to make use of IMO numbers when notifying an intended at-sea transshipment and seeking authorisation from the flag State authority. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 12/05.
127. **NOTING** the comments from Australia that the current Resolution contained anomalies concerning references to sharks, the Commission **AGREED** that Australia could bring forth a proposal to amend the newly adopted Resolution 14/06 for consideration at the next Session.

11.3.7 To standardise the presentation of scientific information in the annual Scientific Committee report and in Working Party reports

128. The Commission **ADOPTED** Recommendation 14/07 *To standardise the presentation of scientific information in the annual Scientific Committee report and in Working Party reports* ([Appendix XXIII](#)). The Recommendation builds upon the excellent work to date by the Scientific Committee, its working parties and the IOTC Secretariat to standardise the presentation of scientific information in their annual reports, including via the 'Executive Summaries' for each stock. In this context and in order to support scientific advice made available by the IOTC Scientific Committee, the executive summaries of the annual IOTC Scientific Committee report which present the stock assessment results may include, when possible as defined in this proposal, clearly: Stock status; Model outlooks; Data quality and limitations of the assessment models; Alternative approach (data poor stocks).

11.4 Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures not endorsed by the Commission

129. The Commission considered the following proposals as Conservation and Management Measures, but consensus could not be reached.

11.4.1 Data confidentiality policy and procedures

130. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal to address the data confidentiality and security requirements (IOTC–2014–S18–PropK) associated with a companion proposal (IOTC–2014–S18–PropJ) on the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) programme, but the proposal was withdrawn and some elements moved into the VMS proposal, detailed below. The proposal included elements to update Resolution 12/02 *Data confidentiality policy and procedures* to include VMS data.

11.4.2 On a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species and on the protection of silky sharks (*Carcharhinus falciformis*) caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC

131. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal on the conservation of silky sharks (*Carcharhinus falciformis*) caught in association with fisheries in the IOTC area of competence (IOTC–2014–S18–PropB), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next Session of the Commission. According to the proposal, it aimed to prohibit the retention onboard, transshipment, landing or storing any part or whole carcass of silky sharks by all vessels on the IOTC record of authorised vessels or authorised to fish for tuna or tuna-like

species, with the exception of observers. Silky sharks in the Indian Ocean have been classified as "near threatened" by the international scientific community, and the continuation of the current fishing pressure on this species could lead to the depletion of silky sharks and have a negative impact on the ecosystem. In addition, according to the proposal, silky sharks have been identified among the most vulnerable species by the IOTC Scientific Committee, based on the results of Ecological Risk Assessment conducted on this species. Several CPCs indicated that there is little data available on this species and requested that proposal is deferred until such a time where data are sufficiently available and the status of these stocks can be properly assessed. It was also suggested that the proposal was not consistent with the provisions of IOTC Resolution 13/06, in particular paragraphs 1 and 2 which call for the Commission to consider the implementation of management measures on the basis of advice from the Scientific Committee. It was further suggested by some CPCs that the proposal adversely affects data collection on silky sharks and dead silky sharks should be fully utilised.

132. The Commission **NOTED** that Scientific Committee has indicated that (IOTC–2013–SC16–R, Appendix XXVII):

*“**Stock status.** There remains considerable uncertainty about the relationship between abundance and the nominal CPUE series from the main longline fleets, and about the total catches over the past decade (Table 1). The ecological risk assessment (ERA) conducted for the Indian Ocean by the WPEB and SC in 2012 (IOTC–2012–SC15–INF10 Rev_1) consisted of a semi-quantitative risk assessment analysis to evaluate the resilience of shark species to the impact of a given fishery, by combining the biological productivity of the species and its susceptibility to each fishing gear type. Silky shark received a high vulnerability ranking (No. 4) in the ERA rank for longline gear because it was estimated as one of the least productive shark species, and with a high susceptibility to longline gear. Silky shark was estimated as the second most vulnerable shark species in the ERA ranking for purse seine gear, due to its low productivity and high susceptibility for purse seine gear. The current IUCN threat status of ‘Near Threatened’ applies to silky sharks in the western and eastern Indian Ocean and globally (Table 2). There is a paucity of information available on this species and this situation is not expected to improve in the short to medium term. There is no quantitative stock assessment or basic fishery indicators currently available for silky shark in the Indian Ocean therefore the stock status is highly uncertain. Silky sharks are commonly taken by a range of fisheries in the Indian Ocean. Because of their life history characteristics – they are relatively long lived (over 20 years), mature relatively late (at 6–12 years), and have relatively few offspring (<20 pups every two years), the silky shark is vulnerable to overfishing. Despite the lack of data, it is clear from the information that is available that silky shark abundance has declined significantly over recent decades. Therefore stock status remains **uncertain** (Table 1).”*

11.4.3 On a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species and on the protection of hammerhead sharks (Family Sphyrnidae) caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC

133. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal on the conservation of hammerhead sharks (Family Sphyrnidae) caught in association with fisheries in the IOTC area of competence (IOTC–2014–S18–PropC), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. According to the proposal, it aimed to prohibit the retention onboard, transshipment, landing or storing any part or whole carcass of hammerhead sharks by all vessels on the IOTC record of authorised vessels or authorised to fish for tuna or tuna-like species, with the exception of observers. Hammerhead sharks in the Indian Ocean have been classified as "near threatened" by the international scientific community, and, according to the proposal, the continuation of the current fishing pressure on this species could lead to the depletion of hammerhead sharks and have a negative impact on the ecosystem. In addition, according to the proposal, the hammerhead sharks have been identified among the most vulnerable species by the IOTC Scientific Committee, based on the results of Ecological Risk Assessment conducted on these species. The reasons for not adopting this proposal are the same as those for silky sharks, detailed above.

134. The Commission **NOTED** that Scientific Committee has indicated that (IOTC–2013–SC16–R, Appendix XXV):

*“**Stock status.** The current IUCN threat status of ‘Endangered’ applies to scalloped hammerhead sharks globally and specifically for the western Indian Ocean (Table 1). The ecological risk assessment (ERA) conducted for the Indian Ocean by the WPEB and SC in 2012 (IOTC–2012–SC15–INF10 Rev_1) consisted of a semi-quantitative risk assessment analysis to evaluate the resilience of shark species to the impact of a given fishery, by combining the biological productivity of the species and its susceptibility to each fishing gear type. Scalloped hammerhead shark received a low vulnerability ranking (No. 14) in the ERA rank for longline gear because it was estimated as one of the least productive shark species, but was also characterised by a lower susceptibility to longline*

*gear. Scalloped hammerhead shark was estimated as the sixth most vulnerable shark species in the ERA ranking for purse seine gear, but with lower levels of vulnerability compared to longline gear, because the susceptibility was lower for purse seine gear. There is a paucity of information available on this species and this situation is not expected to improve in the short to medium term. There is no quantitative stock assessment or basic fishery indicators currently available for scalloped hammerhead shark in the Indian Ocean therefore the stock status is highly uncertain. Scalloped hammerhead sharks are commonly taken by a range of fisheries in the Indian Ocean. They are extremely vulnerable to gillnet fisheries. Furthermore, pups occupy shallow coastal nursery grounds, often heavily exploited by inshore fisheries. Because of their life history characteristics – they are relatively long lived (over 30 years), and have relatively few offspring (<31 pups each year), the scalloped hammerhead shark is vulnerable to overfishing. Therefore stock status remains **uncertain** (Table 1).”*

11.4.4 On the conservation of sharks

135. The Commission **CONSIDERED** two proposals on the conservation of sharks (IOTC–2014–S18–PropD and IOTC–2014–S18–PropE), but agreement could not be reached and the proposals was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. This proposals were to introduce amendments to Resolution 05/05 *On the conservation of sharks*, that require sharks to be landed with their fins attached to their respective carcass, to promote full utilisation of shark protein for food, and to facilitate the collection of critical data by species i.e. nominal catch, required to undertake rigorous assessments of the impact of fishing on these populations. The proposals also encouraged research into the effectiveness of prohibiting the use of wire trace on longline fishing vessels as a proven mitigation measure that will ameliorate the impact of fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species on shark populations throughout the IOTC area of competence.
136. The Commission **NOTED** that the proposed amendments to Resolution 05/05 aim to promote full utilisation of shark protein for food, to deter shark finning and to facilitate the collection of critical data required to undertake rigorous assessments of the impact of fishing on these populations. Moreover, the Scientific Committee also noted that landing sharks with fins attached would be an important step forward for the identification of shark species and for the gathering of shark statistics. According to the proposals, they specifically require that sharks be landed with their fins attached to their respective carcass when caught in association with fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species throughout the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission area of competence.
137. The Commission **NOTED** some CPCs comments which indicated that 1) Resolution 05/05 is implemented in the framework of other RFMOs; 2) prohibiting the removal of fins onboard vessels has nothing to do with management measures; 3) it adversely affects fishers economics as it prohibits their value adding practice; and 4) it provides no incentive to retain sharks onboard, which may adversely affect data collection on sharks.
138. **NOTING** the comments of CPCs concerning Proposals B, C and D (IOTC–2014–S18–PropB, PropC and PropD), Australia requested the Commission consider Proposal E, seeking a ban on shark finning, for adoption as a Recommendation instead of as a Resolution. Many Members indicated willingness to adopt Proposal E as a Recommendation; however, some Members indicated their unwillingness. In view of the strong support of many CPCs, Australia respectfully requested those Members reconsider their position with a view to adopting the Recommendation in support of sustainable fisheries management in the region and to provide a clear signal that the IOTC was serious about stopping the practice of shark finning and associated illegal activities. However, a small number of the Members confirmed they could not support Proposal E as a Recommendation.
139. The Commission **NOTED** the advice sought by Australia concerning the Commission's procedure as there appeared to Australia to be a clear majority in favour of adopting Proposal E as a non-binding Recommendation. The following are the relevant paragraphs in the IOTC Agreement and IOTC Rules of Procedure:

IOTC Agreement:

Article IX. PROCEDURES CONCERNING CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Para. 8. *The Commission may, by a simple majority of its Members present and voting, adopt recommendations concerning conservation and management of the stocks for furthering the objectives of this Agreement.*

IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014) (Note: Previously RULE IX, para. 8).

RULE X: VOTING ARRANGEMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS

Para. 1. *Except as provided for in paragraph 4 of this Rule, votes at meetings of the Commission shall be by show of hands unless a member requests that the vote be taken by a roll call or secret ballot, and that this request is seconded.*

Para. 8. *Voting arrangements and other related matters not specifically provided for in the Agreement or in these Rules shall be governed mutatis mutandis by the provisions of the General Rules of the Organization.*

140. The Commission **NOTED** that Australia was generally not in favour of pushing matters to a vote, instead it encouraged respect and cooperation among Commission Members with the aim of achieving consensus on decisions. Consistent with that statement, Australia deferred Proposal E on shark finning until the 19th Session on the understanding that all CPCs would return to the Commission next year to work constructively on agreeing to a legally binding Resolution banning shark finning.

11.4.5 On a ban on discards of bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna, yellowfin tuna and non-targeted species caught by purse seine vessels in the IOTC area of competence

141. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal to revise IOTC Resolution 13/11 *On a ban on discards of bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna, yellowfin tuna and non-targeted species caught by purse seine vessels in the IOTC area of competence* (IOTC–2014–S18–PropF), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. This proposal was to modify the voluntary component of Resolution 13/11 to make it a mandatory, specifically, to ban the discard by purse seiners of non-targeted species catches, other than living sharks, marine turtles and cetaceans protected under IOTC Resolutions 05/05, 09/06, 12/09, 12/04, 13/04 and 13/05, with the aim of improving the supply of seafood to the countries where the catches are landed or transhipped, and to provide more reliable statistics through shore-sampling programmes. The proposal was later revised to include a recommendation for all the other fleets to avoid discards at sea.
142. The Commission **NOTED** that several CPCs, while agreeing in principle with the spirit of the proposal, indicated that full retention may not be practical for longline fleets, in which the fishing operation is very different for the purse seine fleets. Longline fleets target high quality product, have reduced storage space onboard, and often tranship the majority of the catch on the high seas, which makes unloading of bycatch in coastal countries unfeasible. These CPCs noted that the purpose of this proposal would be better achieved on longliners through release of bycatch, rather than full retention. In addition, other CPCs indicated that they would only be in a position to adopt this proposal if it is only applicable on the high seas, and excluded the EEZs of coastal States.
143. **NOTING** the comment from the authors of the proposal that the lack of data shall not prevent adoption of precautionary management measures, and that the measure is in line with UN Millennium Development Goals and provisions in the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) and may contribute to food security in some of the coastal countries of the IOTC, the Commission **REQUESTED** that the Scientific Committee review proposal IOTC–2014–S18–PropL Rev_1, and to make recommendations on the benefits of retaining non-targeted species catches, other than those prohibited via IOTC Resolutions, for consideration at the 19th Session of the Commission.

11.4.6 On the implementation of a harmonized and coordinated scheme of IOTC observers

144. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal on the implementation of a harmonized and coordinated scheme of IOTC observers (IOTC–2014–S18–PropM), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. According to the proposal, it aimed to promote the creation of an IOTC pool of scientific observers by facilitating CPCs monitoring of catches and other scientific related activities by fishing vessels ensuring the respect of Conservation and Management Measures and to improve the scientific assessment of those stocks. The proposal also aimed to seek synergies, given the limited space on board fishing vessels, as it is necessary to seek synergies for cooperation, accreditation and mutual recognition of observers. The proposal claimed that for CPCs that have difficulty in sourcing observers locally, the creation of a regional pool of IOTC scientific observers to be used by CPCs in the implementation of the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme, would facilitate the implementation of this scheme.
145. The Commission **NOTED** the concerns raised by several CPCs that the measure was proposed independently from the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme, and that a financial mechanism to support its provisions is not clearly specified. Some CPCs national laws do not allow the use of foreigners as observers onboard their vessels. The EU expressed its disappointment that its proposal for a pool of scientific observers to be established by the IOTC was not adopted and reminded CPCs that adoption of this proposal will only be beneficial for IOTC CPCs and

ship owners, as it allows sharing of observers by CPCs, and would not require a significant increase of the IOTC budget.

11.4.7 On the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) programme

146. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal to revise IOTC Resolution 06/03 *On establishing a vessel monitoring systems (VMS) programme* (IOTC–2014–S18–PropJ), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was withdrawn.
147. The Commission **NOTED** the concerns raised by some CPCs that establishing a Centralised VMS at the IOTC Secretariat will likely lead to a large increase in the IOTC budget. Some CPCs in this regard expressed strong concern on the sovereign rights, legality, data security and confidentiality. Furthermore, other CPCs have pointed out that their national legislation strictly prohibit the disclosure of confidential information covered by the VMS. Some CPCs agreed that a cost and benefit feasibility study could be carried out to evaluate these issues. In addition, concerns were raised about releasing VMS data, noting that some CPCs have strict rules that apply to the use of VMS data.
148. The Commission **NOTED** the comment from the Maldives, who recalled the spirit of this proposal, which is to help on the fight against IUU activities. In addition, the Maldives believes that implementing a Centralised VMS will benefit developing coastal CPCs, in particular those with large EEZs. The UNFSA contains provisions for assistance to developing countries in the implementation of their VMS and invited those CPCs that have not implemented VMS to date to consider requesting assistance from the UN. Notwithstanding the above the Commission urged CPCs that have not fully implemented their VMS as yet to do so as a matter of priority.
149. The Commission **NOTED** the revised proposal which outlined a request to commission a study for a centralised VMS in the IOTC area of competence, which was of fundamental importance to combating IUU fishing in the Indian Ocean. The Kobe process calls for harmonisation of measures amongst the tuna RFMOs and centralised VMS already exist in ICCAT and WCPFC, and that under UNCLOS and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement CPCs have a duty to cooperate to manage shared resources and to combat IUU. The proposal was explicit that the results of the study shall not prejudice the rights of any CPC to provide further information, comments or decisions to the Commission. In the light of this, the co-sponsors of the proposal (UK(OT), Maldives, Mozambique and Seychelles) expressed their deep concern that this Commission was unable to adopt this important study.
150. The Commission **NOTED** that the UK(OT) will initiate a process of consultation with all those CPCs not in support of the proposal at the current Session to assess if presenting a revised proposal at the next meeting of the Commission would be beneficial.

11.4.8 Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species

151. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal to revise IOTC Resolution 13/08 *Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species* (IOTC–2014–S18–PropL) but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. The proposal included more detailed specifications of catch reporting from FAD sets, and calling for IOTC CPCs having fisheries on FADs to develop improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species. In addition, the proposal set the maximum number of DFADs or DFADs' beacon to be deployed by each individual purse seine vessel to the average of DFADs or DFADs' beacon deployed by the purse seiner and its supply vessel(s) (if any) during the years 2013 and 2014 as declared to the Commission according to the Resolutions 12/08 and 13/08.
152. **NOTING** the indication from the Chair of the Scientific Committee that it would be premature to adopt a measure of this nature due to a lack of information, and taking into consideration that the revised version proposed to put a freeze on the number of existing FADs being deployed, the Commission **AGREED** that in order to facilitate future consideration of this measure, all CPCs that have not implemented FAD Management Plans to do so as a matter of priority and report data on FADs to the Commission, as specified in IOTC Resolution 13/08. Advice from the Scientific Committee shall include all those fleets/fisheries that use them (i.e. for DFADs and AFADs).

11.4.9 Terms of Reference of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission Working Party on Compliance (WPC)

153. The Commission **CONSIDERED** a proposal to form an IOTC Working Party on Compliance (WPC) (IOTC-2014-S18-PropQ), but agreement could not be reached and the proposal was deferred until the next meeting of the Commission. The proposal included a set of Terms of Reference with the aim of supporting the Compliance Committee in its annual review of CPC compliance and capacity building activities.
154. **NOTING** the comments from several developing coastal CPCs that their Compliance has improved thanks to the assistance that the IOTC Secretariat has provided through Compliance Missions, and that country-based actions are more effective than meetings, the Commission **ENCOURAGED** the IOTC Secretariat to continue with this work.

12. OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 Proposal for a statement on piracy

155. The Commission **RECOGNISED** the severe impact of piracy acts on humanitarian, commercial and fishing vessels off the coast of Somalia and noted that the range of the attacks extended towards almost all of the western Indian Ocean, notably toward Kenya and Seychelles, with attacks being reported in their respective EEZ.
156. The Commission **ISSUED** a new Statement on the issue of piracy ([Appendix XXIV](#)), calling once again on the international community to give all its support to ensure the safety of all fishing vessels and their crew in the region from acts of piracy.

12.2 Outcomes of the adhoc meeting on the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme

157. The Commission **NOTED** the outcomes of the informal adhoc meeting and actions proposed relating to (i) CPCs to develop bound logbooks as required by Resolution 13/03 paragraph 3 and Resolution 13/02 paragraph 16 and Consortium to add phrase to inspection report for translation specifying to captain that observer must see a bound logbook; (ii) that updated language cards are used in all future interactions with the captains of LSTLVs and language requirement by observers as required by Resolution 12/05; (iii) Develop a system for reducing the delay in reporting possible infractions to the relevant fleet; and (iv) The Secretariat to develop a standard reporting form, which is to be agreed by participating fleets, for them to respond to the possible infractions reported by observers; (v) consortium to update the standard operating procedures for observers in the manual if, necessary, and submit to the Secretariat to be placed on the website.
158. The Commission **AGREED** that some of the technical aspects of the Implementation of the Transshipment at-sea programme should be reviewed at the next Compliance Committee meeting. Some participating CPCs expressed concerns on many issues related to the implementation of the ROP and **REQUESTED** the Commission to establish clearer definitions, guidelines and sets of procedures, especially on minimum safety requirements of fishing vessels and carrier fishing vessels to ensure consistency and transparency.

12.3 Seabird bycatch mitigation trials

159. The Commission **NOTED** Japan's presentation on new plan of experimental research on seabird bycatch mitigation measures, which is now under consideration.
160. The Commission **RECALLED** that IOTC Resolution 12/06 *On reducing incidental bycatch of seabirds in longline fisheries* will enter into force on 1 July 2014.
161. The Commission **NOTED** that Japan and the Rep. of Korea, in association with Birdlife International have been undertaking additional testing and trialling of seabird bycatch mitigation measures and these will be presented to the SC, via the Working Party on Ecosystems and bycatch in future years.
162. The Commission **COMMENDED** Japan, Rep. of Korea and Birdlife international for their continued commitment to undertake scientifically based trials of current and new mitigation measures.

13. DATE AND PLACE OF THE COMMISSION IN 2015 AND OF ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES FOR 2014

163. The Commission was unanimous in its thanks to Sri Lanka for hosting the 18th Session of the Commission and commended Sri Lanka on the warm welcome, the excellent facilities and assistance provided to the Secretariat in the organisation and running of the Session.

164. The Commission **THANKED** the Republic of Korea for its generous offer to host the 19th Session of the Commission (S19), the 12th Session of the Compliance Committee (CoC12) and the 12th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF12), in the last two weeks of April 2015. The exact dates and meeting venue will be confirmed and communicated by the Secretariat at a later date.
165. The Commission **AGREED** to the schedule of meetings for its subsidiary bodies for 2014, and tentatively for 2015 as detailed in [Appendix XXV](#).

14. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE COMMISSION

166. The report of the 18th Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission was **ADOPTED** on the 5 June 2014.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIRPERSON

Mr. Daroomalingum **Mauree**
Ministry of Fisheries
E-mail: dmauree@mail.gov.mu

IOTC MEMBERS

AUSTRALIA

Head of Delegation
Mr. Simon **Veitch**
Department of Agriculture
Email: simon.veitch@agriculture.gov.au

Alternate

Mr. Steve **Auld**
Fisheries Management Authority
Email: steve.auld@afma.gov.au

BELIZE

Head of Delegation
Mr. Robert **Robinson**
Belize High Seas Fisheries Unit
Email: deputydirector.bhsfu@gmail.com

Alternate

Ms. Breanna **Mossiah**
Belize High Seas Fisheries Unit
Email: fisheriesofficer.bhsfu@gmail.com

CHINA

Head of Delegation
Mr. Wan **Chen**
Ministry of Agriculture
Email: bofdwf@agri.gov.cn

Alternate

Ms. Wuhong **Shi**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Email: shi_wuhong@mfa.gov.cn

Advisor(s)

Pr. Liuxiong **Xu**
Shanghai Ocean University
Email: lxu@shou.edu.cn

Mr. Dewen **Ruan**
Foreign Ministry of PRC
Email: ruan_dewen@mfa.gov.cn

Ms. Jinjin **Liu**
China Overseas Fisheries Association
Email: admin1@tuna.org.cn

COMOROS

Head of Delegation
Mr. Ahmed Said **Soilihi**
Direction Générale des Ressources
Halieutiques
Email: ahmed_ndevou@yahoo.fr

Alternate

Mr. Said **Boina**
Centre National de Contrôle et des
Surveillances des Pêches
Email: dalaili@live.fr

ERITREA

Absent

EUROPEAN UNION (MEMBER ORGANIZATION)

Head of Delegation
Mr. Seppo **Nurmi**
Email: Seppo.nurmi@ec.europa.eu

Alternate

Mr. Orlando **Fachada**
Email: Orlando.fachada@ec.europa.eu

Advisor(s)

Mr. Nicolas **Dross**
European Union
Email: Nicolas.DROSS@ec.europa.eu

Mr. Patrick **Daniel**
European Commission
Email: patrick.daniel@ec.europa.eu

Mr. Jonathan **Lansley**
European Union
Email: jon.lansley@ec.europa.eu

Mr. Iago **Mosqueira**
European Union
Email: iago.mosqueira-sanchez@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Mr. Thomas **Roche**
European Union
Email: thomas.roche@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Mr. Eric **Mostert**
European Union
Email: eric.mostert@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Mr. Serge **Chiarovano**
European Union
Email: serge.chiarovano@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Mr. Yvon **Riva**
European Union
Email: yriwa@aupiquet.com

Mr. Dr. Michel **Goujon**
European Union
Email: mgoujon@orthongel.fr

Mr. Laurent **Pinault**
European Union
Email: lpinault@iosms.com

Mr. Carlos **Moreno Blanco**
European Union
Email: cmorenob@magrama.esn

Mr. Antonio **Lizcano Palomares**
European Union
Email: alizcano@magrama.es

Dr. Hilario **Murua**
European Union
Email: hmurua@azti.es

Mr. Julio **Moron Ayala**
European Union
Email: julio.moron@opagac.org

Mr. Peter **Funegard**
European Union
Email: peter.funegard@havochvatten.se

Mr. Anertz **Muniategi**
European Union
Email: anabac@anabac.org

FRANCE

Mr. Pascal **Bolot**
France
Email: pascal.bolot@taaf.fr

Mr. Vincent **Lelionnais**
France
Email: vincent.lelionnais@developpement-durable.gouv.fr

Mr. Thierry **Clot**
France
Email: thierry.clot@taaf.fr

GUINEA

Absent

INDIA

Head of Delegation
Mr. Vishnu **Bhat**
Ministry of Agriculture
Email: bhatbvishnu@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr. T. **Valsaraj**
All India Association of Deep Sea Fisheries
Email: deepcfisheries@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr. Naraharasetti **Sreenivas**
All India Association of Deep Sea Fisheries
Email: deepcfisheries@gmail.com

INDONESIA

Head of Delegation
Dr. Gellwynn **Jusuf**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email:

Alternate

Dr. Toni **Ruchimat**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: truchimat@yahoo.com

Advisor(s)

Mr Saut **Tampubolon**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: s.tampubolon@yahoo.com

Mr Sri Dyah **Retnowati**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: retnowati@yahoo.com

Ms. Eva **Suryaman**
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

Mr. Dwi Agusagus Sisiwa **Putra**
Indonesia Tuna Longline Association
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

Mr. Hendrik **Kosasih**
Indonesia Tuna Longline Association
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

Mrs Hariyani **Sudarmo**
Indonesia Tuna Longline Association
Email: sdi.djpt@yahoo.com

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)**Head of Delegation-**

Mr. Ali Asgar **Mojahedi**
Iran Fisheries Organization
Email: a_mojahedi@hotmail.com

JAPAN**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Hisashi **Endo**
Fisheries Agency
Email: hisashi_endo@nm.maff.go.jp

Alternate

Mr. Tsunehiko **Motooka**
Fisheries Agency
Email: tsunehiko_motooka@nm.maff.go.jp

Advisor(s)

Mr. Yuki **Morita**
Fisheries Agency
Email: morita_yuki@nm.maff.go.jp

Ms. Nabi **Tanaka**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
Email: nabi.tanaka@mofa.go.jp

Dr. Tsutomo **Nishida**
National Research Institute of Far Sea Fisheries
Email: aco20320@par.odn.ne.jp

Dr. Takayuki **Matsumoto**
National Research Institute of Far Sea Fisheries
Email: matumot@affrc.go.jp

Mr. Shunji **Fujiwara**
Overseas Fisheries Cooperation Foundation
Email: shunji.fujiwara@ffa.int

Mr. Nozomu **Miura**
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Email: gvojyo@japantuna.or.jp

Mr. Hiroyuki **Yoshida**
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Email: gvojyo@japantuna.or.jp

Mr. Kojiro **Gemba**
Japan Tuna Fisheries Co-operative Association
Email: gvojyo@japantuna.or.jp

Mr. Michio **Shimizu**
National Ocean Tuna Fisheries Association
Email:

Mr. Sakae **Terao**
Japan Far Seas Purse Seine Fishing Association
Email: japan@kaimaki.or.jp

KENYA**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Okumu **Makogola**
State Department
Email: okumumak@yahoo.co.uk

Alternate

Ms. Lucy **Obungu**
Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries
Email: lucyobungu@yahoo.com

Advisor(s)

Mr. Nicholas **Ntheketha**
State Department of Fisheries
Email: mwanzanick@yahoo.com

Mr. Benedict **Kiilu**
State Department of Fisheries
Email: kiilub@yahoo.com

Mr. Peter Nyongesa **Wekesa**
State Department of Fisheries
Email: penyongesa@yahoo.co.uk

MADAGASCAR**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Mr. Jean Jacques **Rasamoel**
Ministère des Ressources Halieutiques et de la Pêche
Email: rasamoelj@moov.mg

MALAYSIA**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Mat Zain **Nazari**
Ministry of Agriculture & Agro Based Industry

Alternate

Mr. Mohd Noor bin **Noordin**
Department of Fisheries
Email: mn@dof.gov.my

Mr. Samsudin **Basir**
Department of Fisheries Malaysia
Email: s_basir@yahoo.com

Mr. Adrian Lee **Szion**
Blue Oceans Holdings Sdn Bhd
Email: blueoceanholdings1@gmail.com

Mr. Lee **Wey Pung**
LuHaiFeng Holding Malaysia Sdn Bhd
Email: smimyben@yahoo.com.hk

Mr. Liu **Jisheng**
LuHaiFeng Holding Malaysia Sdn Bhd
Email: smimyben@yahoo.com.hk

MALDIVES**Head of Delegation**

Dr. Mohamed **Shainee**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: minister@fishagri.gov.mv

Alternate

Ms. Zaha **Waheed**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: zaha.waheed@fishagri.gov.mv

Advisor(s)

Dr. Mohammed Shiham **Adam**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: ms.adam@mrc.gov.mv

Mr. Adam **Ziyad**
Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture
Email: adam.ziyad@fishagri.gov.mv

Mr. Adhley **Ismail**
Email: Kooddoo Fisheries Maldives

Mr. Abdulla **Mohamed**
Kooddoo Fisheries Maldives
E-mail:

Mr. Mohamed Waseem **Ismail**
Seafood Processors and Exporters Association
E-mail:

Mr. Abdul Waheed **Thoufeeg**
Ensis Fisheries
Email:

MAURITIUS**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Bojrazsingh **Boyramboli**
Ministry of Fisheries
Email: bboyramboli@mail.gov.mu

Alternate

Mr. Sreenivasan **Soondron**
Temporary Principal Fisheries officer
Email: soondron@mail.gov.mu

Advisor(s)

Mrs. Veronique **Garrioch**
Mexa Seafood Council
Email:

MOZAMBIQUE**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Herminio **Tembe**
Ministry of Fisheries
Email: herminio.tembe948@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr. Simeao **Lopes**
Ministry of Fisheries
Email: slopes41@hotmail.com

Ms. Maria **Pinto**
Ministry of Fisheries of Mozambique
Email: apinto347@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Ms. Maria **Pinto**
Ministry of Fisheries of Mozambique
Email: apinto347@gmail.com

Dr. Atanásio **Brito**
Ministry of Fisheries of Mozambique
Email: mikamba@hotmail.com

Mr. Avelino **Munwane**
National Directorate of Fisheries
Administration
Email: avelinoalfiado@hotmail.com

Mr. Peter **Flewelling**
Ministry of Fisheries
Email: peteflewelling@yahoo.ca

OMAN**Head of Delegation**

Dr. Ahmed Mohammed **Al-Mazroui**
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Email: ahmed.almazrui20@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr. Salman Khalaf **Al-Subhi**
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Email: skomani@hotmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr. Tarik Marhoon **Al Mamari**
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Email: tariq_almamari@yahoo.com

Mr. Rashid **Al-Barwani**
Century Star Company
Email: ahmed-dxn@hotmail.com

Mr. Mohammed Said **Al Muslimani**
Sea Tawariq
Email: mohamed.aba@hotmail.com

PAKISTAN

Absent

PHILIPPINES**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Benjamin **Tabios Jr**
Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: benjotabios@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr. Richard **Sy**
OPRT Philippine
Email: syrichard139@gmail.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA –**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Yongseok **Kang**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Email: yskang66@gmail.com

Alternate

Mr. Jeongseok **Park**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Email: jeongseok.korea@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Dr. Zang Geun **Kim**
National Fisheries Research and
Development Institute
Email: zgkim@korea.kr

Ms. Jiwon **Yoon**
Korea Overseas Fisheries Cooperation
Institute
Email: jiwon.yoon@kofci.org

Mr. Ducklim **Kim**
SAJO Industries Co., Ltd
Email: 14031006@sajo.co.kr

Mr. Youngwoo(Bruce) **LEE**
Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd
Email: bruce2891@dongwon.com

Mr. Soung Ho **Shin**
Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd
Email:

Mr. Ilkang **NA**
Korea Overseas Fisheries Association
Email: ikna@kosfa.org

Ms. Anna **Jo**
Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries
Email: anna88112@naver.com

SEYCHELLES**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Philippe **Michaud**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: pmichaud@mfa.gov.sc

Alternate

Mr. Roy **Clarisse**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: royc@sfa.sc

Advisor(s)

Mr. Vincent **Lucas**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: vlucas@sfa.sc

Mr. Tan Kay **Hwee**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: deepsea-fishery@umail.hinet.net

Mr. Howard **Tan**
Seychelles Fishing Authority
Email: deepsea-fishery@umail.hinet.net

SIERRA LEONE

Absent

SOMALIA**Head of Delegation**

H.E Mohamudolow **Barrow**
Ministry of Fisheries and marine Resources
Email:

ALTERNATE

Said Jama **Mohamed**
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Email: saidjghalib@gmail.com

Advisor(s)

Abdirahin Ibrahim **SheikHeile**
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Email: aibrahim@somalia.gov.so

Mr. Julien **Million**
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
Email: julienmillion2@gmail.com

SRI LANKA**Head of Delegation**

Mr. Nimal **Hettiarachchi**
Dept. Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: nimalhetti@gmail.com

Alternate

Dr. S. **Subasinghe**
Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: drsuba@hotmail.com

Advisor(s)

Mr. H.M.B.C **Herath**
Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: herathhmbc@yahoo.com

Dr S.G. **Samarasundaram**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email:

Dr. Rekha. **Maldeniya**
NARA
Email: rekhamaldeniya@gmail.com

Ms. W.S **Wickramasinghe**
Dept. Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: dydirqc@fisheries.gov.lk

Ms. Kalyani **Hewapathirana**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email: hewakal2012@gmail.com

Mr M. **Marcus**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email:

Ms. H.L.N.S **Herath**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email: hlsherath@gmail.com

Mr. Anuradha **Seneviratne**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email:

Mr. Fernando **Roshan**
Tropic Frozen Co. Pvt Ltd
Email: roshan-f@sltnet.lk

Ms. D **Ranmadugalla**
NARA
Email: dinalir@yahoo.com

Ms.J.P.I **Swanalatha**
Department of Fisheries & Aquatic
Resources
Email:

Mr. K.S **Chandrakumara**
Dept. Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
Email: ksckmidi@gmail.com

SUDAN
Absent

THAILAND
Head of Delegation
Ms Pattira **Lirdwitayaprasit**
Department of Fisheries
Email: pattiral@hotmail.com

Alternate
Dr. Smith **Thummachua**
Department of Fisheries
Email: thuma98105@yahoo.com

UNITED KINGDOM
Head of Delegation
Dr. Christopher **Mees**
MRAG LTD
Email: c.mees@mrags.co.uk

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
Head of Delegation
Dr. Kassim Gharib **Juma**
Fisheries Department
Email: drjumabar@hotmail.com

Alternate
Dr. Charles **Nyamrunda**
Fisheries Department
Email:

Advisor(s)
Mr. Zahor Mohamed **El-Kharousy**
Tanzania Deep Sea Fishing Authority
Email: zahor1m@hotmail.com

Mr. Hosea Gonza **Mbilinyi**
Fisheries Development Division
Email: hoseagonza@yahoo.com

Mr. Rashid Bakari **Hoza**
Deep Sea Fishing Authority Tanzania
Email: rbhoza@yahoo.com

VANUATU
Absent

COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES

SENEGAL
Head of Delegation
Mr Sidi Ndaw
Direction des Pêches Maritime
Email: sidindaw@hotmail.com

SOUTH AFRICA
Head of Delegation
Mr. Saasa **Pheeha**
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Email: saasaP@daff.gov.za

Alternate
Ms. Marisa **Kashorte**
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Email: MarisaK@daff.gov.za

OBSERVERS

FAO
Mr. Matthew **Camilleri**
Email: matthew.camilleri@fao.org

Ms. Annick **VanHoutte**
FAO Legal Support
Email: Annick.VanHoutte@fao.org

RUSSIAN FEDERATION
Dr. Sergey **Leontiev**
Russian Research Institute of
Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO)
Email: leon@vniro.ru

SAUDI ARABIA
Mr Mazen **Abushokoor**
Ministry of Agriculture
Email: maz1363maz@hotmail.com

Mr Abdullah **Alatas**
Ministry of Agriculture
Email: alatas1733@hotmail.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Ms. Deirdre **Warner-Kramer**
Email: warner-kramerd@state.gov

GREENPEACE
Mr. François **Chartier**
Email: francois.chartier@greenpeace.org

Mr. Sebastian **Losada**
Email: slodsada@greenpeace.org

INDIAN OCEAN COMMISSION
Mr. Jude **Talma**
Commission Océan Indien
Email: jude.talma@coi-ioc.org

Mr. Leon Martial **Razaka**
Chargé de mission
Email: harihons.razaka@coi-ioc.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEAFOOD
SUSTAINABILITY FOUNDATION**
Ms. Claire **Van der Geest**
Email: cvandergeest@iss-foundation.org

Mr. Gerald **Scott**
Email: gpscott_fish@hotmail.com

MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL
Mr. Martin **Purves**
Email: martin.purves@msc.org

**ORGANISATION FOR THE
PROMOTION OF RESPONSIBLE TUNA
FISHERIES**
Mr. Daishiro **Nagahata**
Email: nagahata@opr.or.jp

PEW ENVIRONMENT GROUP
Mr. Henry **Debey**
Email: hdebey@pewtrusts.org

Mr. Maximillio **Bello**
Email: Mbello-consultant@pewtrusts.org

Ms. Adrian **Fabra**
Email: afabra@yahoo.es

Mr. Luke **Warwick**
Email: lwarwick@pewtrusts.org

**SOUTH WEST INDIAN OCEAN
FISHERIES COMMISSION**

Mr. Aubrey **Harris**
Email: aubrey.harris@fao.org

WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE

Dr. Wetjens **DIMMLICH**
Email: wdimmlich@wwf.panda.org

Mr. Mr. Umair **Shahid**
Email: ushahid@wwf.org.pk

Mr. Domingos **Gove**
Email: DGove@wwfafrica.org

US-JAPAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Prof. Isao **Sakaguchi**
Researcher
Email: 20050137@gakushuin.ac.jp

CSIRO

Dr. Campbell **Davies**
Email: campbelldavies@csiro.au

INVITED EXPERTS

Mr. Ming-Fen **Wu**
Fisheries Agency
Email: hangyen@msl.f.gov.tw

Dr. Shih-Ming **Kao**
Fisheries Agency
Email: kaosm@udel.edu

Mr. Wei-Yang **Liu**
Fisheries Agency
Email: weiyang@ofdc.org.tw

Mr. Hsin-Chiang **Hsu**
Fisheries Agency

Email: lukaslaw866@gmail.com

Mr. Kuan-Ting **Lee**
Email: simon@tuna.org.tw

Mr. Hong-Yen **Huang**
Email: hangyen@msl.f.gov.tw

Ms. Ling-Fei **Chou**
Email: lingfei@msl.f.gov.tw

Mr. Wen-Jung **Hsieh**
Email: simon@tuna.org.tw

Mr. Yin-Ho **Liu**
Email: simon@tuna.org.tw

Mr. Shih-Chieh **Ho**
Email: sefe121@hotmail.com

Mr. Chien-Yi **Yang**
Email: kenichifish@gmail.com

IOTC SECRETARIAT

Mr. Rondolph **Payet**
Executive Secretary
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: aa@iotc.org

Dr. David **Wilson**
Deputy Secretary/Science Manager
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: dw@iotc.org

Mr. Steven **Ciocca**
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: steven.ciocca@iotc.org

Mr. Gerard **Domingue**
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: gd@iotc.org

Mr. Miguel **Herrera**
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: mh@iotc.org

Mr. Olivier **Roux**
Translator
Email: Olivier@otolithe.com

Ms. Claudia **Marie**
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: cm@iotc.org

Ms. Mirose **Govinden**
Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
Email: mirose.govinden@iotc.org

INTERPRETERS

Mr Jean_Luc **Genion**
Email: jl.genion@aiic.net

Ms. Jennifer Suzanne **Kobine-Roy**
Email: suzanne@in-other-words.cc

Mr. Olivier Beauchemin **Bonifacio**
Email: Olivier.bonifacio@gmail.com

Ms. Annie **Trottier**
Email: a.trottier@aiic.net

Ms. Vandana **Kawlra**
Email: vandana.kawlra@gmail.com

Tyronne **Carbone**
Email: t.carbone@aiic.net

APPENDIX II

OPENING ADDRESSES

Opening Address by the Honorable Dr. Rajitha Senaratne Minister of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development

Honourable (Prof) G L Peiris, Honorable Minister of External Affairs
Honourable Basil Rajapakse, Minister of Economic Development
Honourable Sarath Kumara Gunaratne, Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development
Dr D M R B Dissanayake, Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development
Mr Rondolph Payet, Secretary General IOTC
Excellencies
Invited Guests
Ladies and Gentlemen

It gives me great pleasure to associate myself with this 18th Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission. I am very happy to note the presence of over 250 delegates, observers and invited guests from over 35 countries with us this morning. This shows the importance the countries bordering the Indian Ocean and beyond attach to this meeting, and the tuna resources in the Indian Ocean, in particular.

From time immemorial, countries in the Indian Ocean region have treated their oceanic resources with respect, taking what we need and not more, from vast oceanic areas we are endowed with. However, things changed with population growth, industrialization, technological developments and the growth of market economies. Technological developments in fishing in the 60s and 70s, gave rise to virtual “Killing Machines”, which could hunt fish with much speed and efficiency in any ocean, taking thousands of tons of fish in one run. Even at this very moment, hundreds of much improved mega fishing vessels are being designed and built in many parts of the world, to hunt the already depleted fish stocks in our oceans. When we consider the fact that more than 75% of the marine stocks are over fished and another 12% are fully utilized as per FAO, it is difficult to justify such action. This has been highlighted in the address by Renato Curto, president and CEO of Tri Marine International, who as Chairman of TUNA 2014 Bangkok concluded last week, has quoted “... in a few years, the number of vessels will have increased beyond the level that is sustainable and the scientists will tell us so, after the fact”.

In contrast, even today, fleets belonging to most Indian Ocean Coastal states are of more humble in nature. For example, Sri Lanka’s fleet largely consists of artisanal ‘Multi day’ vessels, totaling around 2800. Fish provides over 70% of the animal protein intake of our people. Even though our per capita intake of seafood has gone up over the years, and now stands at 45gm/ day, it is still far below our target of 60gms/ day, based on WHO recommendations. Therefore, there is a need to increase production from both capture and culture fisheries to feed our population. To achieve this we have to increase our fish production to 686,000 metric tons by 2016, from the present level of little over 500,000 tons, while being mindful of the sustainability of our resources.

Sri Lanka has lost years of development and billions of dollars as a result of decades of terrorism. However, since the conclusion of civil disturbances, our nation is making steady progress in all fields, under the leadership of our President, guided by his vision document “Mahinda Chintana”. The North and the East accounted for about half of the country’s fish production in the 70s. We witnessed a drastic drop in production from these areas as a result of the unsettled conditions which prevailed. Our government is now doing all what it can, to redevelop these areas through improved infrastructure, and re-establishing the agricultural and fisheries sectors to former glory, or even to a higher pedestal.

We are living in an era of uncertainties. In spite of technological developments in food production, gone are the days of unchallenged food security. I read somewhere that a Canadian scientist has predicted that there will be no room for commercial marine fisheries by 2050!

Looking at the rapid rate of degradation and destruction in the environment around us, and the apparent depletion of marine fish resources, the urgency of some solid plan of action cannot be overestimated. In this context this meeting is much relevance to us in the Indian Ocean, which holds a much cherished tuna resource, only second to the Western and Central Pacific by volume, but qualitatively I believe, even richer. In this context, it is interesting to note some of the latest recommendations of the high level panel of experts appointed by the FAO Committee on World Food Security, which recommends:

a) Strengthening the capacity of developing countries to negotiate better terms in fishing agreements to protect the food security and nutrition of their populations.

b) Recognizing the contribution of small-scale fisheries to food security and nutrition, take note of their unique characteristics in the design and implementation of all national and international policies and programs related to fisheries

c) Where small-scale fisheries are in competition with larger-scale operations, governments should promote developing national policy regulations that protect small-scale fisheries.

I think the recommendations of the FAO Expert Panel is food for thought for all policy makers. I have no doubt five days of meeting sessions will address all the current issues related to tuna resource management in the Indian Ocean in an efficient, fair manner primarily with the a view to enriching the food security, or rather “fish security” of our populations, and safeguarding our tuna resources for posterity. I wish the meeting all the success and our friends from overseas a pleasant, enjoyable stay in Sri Lanka and in this historic capital city of the country.

Thank you.

Mr Daroomalingum Mauree, Chair of the Commission

Hon. Minister for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development

Dr. Rajitha Senaratne

Hon. Minister of Economic Development

Dr. Basil Rajapaksa

Hon. Minister of External Affairs, (Prof) G L Peiris

Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development

Dr. D.M.R.B. Dissanayake

Chairman of IOTC, Mr. D. Mauree

Members of Diplomatic Corp

Distinguished Delegates

Ladies and gentlemen

All Protocols observed

I am particularly honoured to be associated with the official opening ceremony of the Eighteenth Commission meeting of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) in collaboration with the Government of Sri Lanka. I wish to extend a very warm welcome to all Member States and the foreign delegates who have travelled a long way to Sri Lanka to attend this Commission meeting.

First of all on your behalf, I would like to express our gratitude to the Government of Sri Lanka for caringly hosting the 18th Commission meeting. The Government of Sri Lanka has provided us with all the logistics and facilities in this wonderful environment to work and move ahead in our endeavor.

This meeting bears testimony to the commitment which we Member States place for the development of our fisheries sector including our fisheries-based industrial segment. It would for sure focus on strategies to deliver questions and explore avenues for closer collaboration among the States.

Our fish stocks have vital roles to play as they are important for the ecosystem of our oceans and also the basis for the economic activity of our fishing industry. But we cannot keep using marine and aquatic resources as if they were endless. Today, nearly one third of global fish stocks are over exploited and the livelihood of almost 12 percent of the world's population depends on the fisheries and aquaculture sector. Our aim is to achieve the highest productivity levels that tuna and tuna like fish stocks can give us over the long term. We are thus bound to design an intelligent stock management of the tuna resources fit for the next generation.

Ladies and Gentlemen

As you know, we have an international obligation to make sure that we use the best available scientific advice for policy-making, taking into account the eco-system and precautionary approach. Scientific advice needs to be easy to understand and provide all the elements required so as to take sound decisions.

It's a sense of pride to note that the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission has actively played a determinant role on every single diverse meetings and sessions to brainstorm on fisheries issues of mutual interest besides discussing proposals and Resolutions and their eventual adoption at the IOTC Commission session. Members have collaborated efficiently, took difficult decisions and implemented effectively these decisions.

To give substance to our commitment, we need to continue to work towards improvements in the state of fisheries. In particular, with and through our Members, we work towards improved fisheries governance, and seek to bring about

better tools against IUU fishing, National Plan of Actions (NPOA's), Endorsement of Fisheries Guidelines, ratifications of international fisheries instrument and so on in order that in particular the tuna fish stocks are better conserved and managed.

We at the IOTC have amply demonstrated to the international community our willingness to combat IUU fishing, and capacities to implement a sectoral policy. However, IUU fishing is still a threat to sustainability and must be fought collectively on all fronts including market access measures besides addressing excess fleet capacity.

On the issue of Excess Capacity and Quota allocation, I recognize that Members are not equally affected by the different issues. Here we need of course to calibrate our efforts and consultations accordingly. We must work together to fix and strengthen the system, and to ensure that it is responsive to the needs of the entire membership. Here, I ensure to be transparent, open and inclusive. This will be a key part of how we move forward. I will be doing everything I can to ensure that all Members are involved and that all voices are heard. I will want to hear from you. My door will always be open to you and so will the doors of my entire team.

If we are to achieve effective long-term sustainable management of our regional fisheries, the key challenge remains that we have to cooperate. Here, I very firmly believe that as an RFMO the IOTC is the effective forum for cooperation in order to enable us to agree on conservation and management measures of the tuna resources. Some issues will probably in principle be very difficult to resolve; like excess capacity of fishing fleets, quota allocation on an equitable and sustainable basis and the precautionary approach.

Nevertheless, practical steps that could be taken without changing any existing paradigm is to consolidate and share information, for example, filling of data gaps and addressing scientific uncertainty. When the times come, we will be in a better position to give clear guidance on the priorities and goals that we would like to pursue on applying Resolutions without attempting to steer away from being prescriptive on management measures of the tuna stocks under our jurisdiction.

Ladies and Gentlemen

When it comes to sustainable fisheries management and conservation, it is really challenging to manage and implement sets of rules and procedures. Hence, to have efficient measures in place it is very important that we mutually assist each other to enforce regulations, built capacity and monitor and control fishing activities in an effective and timely manner.

Sustainability of the tuna resources are high on the agenda of many international platforms for discussions amongst others; the FAO, the UN, the EU Common Fisheries Policy, ISSF, WWF, PEW and Green Peace which requires an integrated response towards a sustainable, inclusive and resource efficient path. However, we need to ensure that the Economic, Social and Environmental considerations form part of the entire policy process which are bearable, equitable, viable and that spins around sustainability.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the Executive Secretary has informed you about our family status being enlarged with the addition of Somalia. Somalia deposited its instrument of ratification to FAO. The legal office of FAO confirmed the Acceptance of Somalia as a Member of the IOTC. I am sure all Members will extend a warm welcome to Somalia.

The strength of the IOTC is you. It is you that hold the wheel of the ship. I can only propose the direction, but our path would need to be chosen by one and all. We have to deliver and we will by working hand in hand.

Thank you.

Mr. Rondolph Payet, Executive Secretary, IOTC

Hon. Minister for Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development

Dr. Rajitha Senaratne

Hon. Minister of Economic Development

Dr. Basil Rajapaksa

Hon. Minister of External Affairs, (Prof) G L Peiris

Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Development

Dr. D.M.R.B. Dissanayake

Chairman of IOTC, Mr. D. Mauree

Members of Diplomatic Corp

Distinguished Delegates

Ladies and gentlemen

It is good to be back in enchanting Sri Lanka and the Wonder of Asia after three years, and I still remember standing here before you, and obviously it was in a different capacity. And from that moment, at least from my perspective, we have seen a tremendous impetus by Sri Lanka to improve its tuna fisheries and at the same time taking bold steps to meet its obligations under the IOTC. The progress made, Honourable Minister Senaratne, is indeed remarkable, and I wish you and your team every success.

This is also a special occasion for all us, as the IOTC this year, celebrates its 18th year since coming into force and just last week the IOTC registered a new member - the Federal Republic of Somalia. I wish to take this opportunity to welcome Somalia onboard.

I can say that the journey has not been easy but this Commission has always been hopeful that it can do better with an expectation of a progressive growth amongst its members every year. Compliance to the IOTC Conservation and Management Measures is improving and members are more aware of what needs to be done to improve the effectiveness of this organisation. And to build on these achievements the Commission last year agreed to conduct a second performance review.

Nevertheless, we have a few challenges ahead of us and these can be described as follows: reporting of minimum fishery statistics, implementation of observer programme, bycatch reporting and implementation port state control measures. All of these are fundamental to the management of the Indian Ocean tuna fisheries. It goes without saying, that these should form a large part of the Commission's work. In addition, it has been noted that for us to address these issues, we need to identify the root causes and seek tangible and workable solutions especially with the wide diversity of aspirations and economic situation of countries benefiting from the tuna fisheries in the Indian Ocean.

From the point of view of the Secretariat, this has been yet another year of intense work, in its customary role of facilitator of the work of the IOTC Members. More so than ever, we are reaching out and working with you on the ground where we feel the most benefit can be achieved. The work of the Secretariat as you may know has extended beyond the traditional scientific support, as we continue to work with Member states and other regional initiatives to promote better compliance and the understanding of our science so as to better inform management and vice-versa, of the tuna fisheries. This translates into the need of working to a level deeper than before, that is, working and empowering, for example, the person engaged in the port inspection, collecting the daily fish statistics or capturing the data into a database. This is no easy task due to our limited resources and growing demand on our services.

In closing, I would like first to express my gratitude to Government of Sri Lanka for providing these excellent facilities for our work. Second, my gratitude goes to my staff, the local organizing committee who has worked long hours to ensure the success of this meeting. This has been already a long week, and their efforts have been much appreciated. I look forward to enjoying with you other week of constructive work and also take some time to enjoy what Sri Lanka has to offer.

Thank you very much.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) – ADG, Mr Arni Mathiesen

Matthew Camilleri
(on behalf of ADG-FI)

Mr Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen.

On behalf of the Assistant Director General of the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Mr Arni Mathiesen, it is my great pleasure to welcome you to the 18th Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC). The presence of all of you here is a clear indication of your commitment to overseeing the sustainable exploitation of living marine resources in this vast Ocean, the protection of livelihoods of stakeholders involved in the fisheries sector, and the safeguarding of food security through the provision of fish and fishery-products for current and future generations.

The performance of IOTC over the years is commendable and the decisions taken by this model Regional Fisheries Management Organization to conserve and manage fish stocks, on the basis of the best scientific information, have translated into several positive results. The challenges in managing fisheries globally are increasing exponentially, particularly with the growing demand for food and quality fish products, the impact of climate change on the oceans, and the threats posed by illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. The sound scientific monitoring and

research programme coordinated by IOTC and the robust monitoring, control and surveillance scheme established and implemented in the region, has enabled this RFMO to face such challenges and to support its continued development and effective functioning into the forthcoming decades. The devotion by IOTC to combat IUU fishing in the region is particularly praiseworthy, especially through the development, promotion and implementation of effective port State measures at regional level.

FAO also notes with satisfaction the progress made by the Commission in line with several recommendations which emanated from the Performance Review concluded five years ago. In addition, FAO welcomes the initiative to undertake a second performance review to further address the effectiveness of the Commission in, *inter alia*, conserving and managing fish stocks, monitoring compliance by flag states and port States, implementing enforcement schemes, and fostering international cooperation.

The role of RFMOs in the sustainable management of fisheries is central to the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries and is clearly spelt out in other binding and voluntary international instruments related to fisheries. FAO is committed to supporting and strengthening the functioning of RFMOs and other regional bodies worldwide. The Organization is also at the disposal of developing States to assist them in developing their fisheries and to be better placed when engaging in regional decision-making processes. In recent years, the FAO Committee on Fisheries has been particularly emphatic about the need to reinforce RFMOs and this call has been echoed in various other international meetings under the auspices of the United Nations and other organizations. In this context, I would like to reconfirm FAO's unceasing dedicated support to IOTC through the Secretariat of the Commission along with the assistance, as required, of the FAO fisheries and aquaculture technical branches.

In conclusion, I would like to wish you a successful meeting and I look forward to following your deliberations which will undoubtedly bear fruitful outcomes for the mutual benefit of all Parties concerned and with due consideration for the conservation and long-term sustainability of fisheries resources.

APPENDIX III**AGENDA OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION****Date:** 1–5 June, 2014**Location:** Bandaranaike Memorial International Conference Hall (BMICH)
Colombo, Sri Lanka**Time:** 09:00 – 17:00 daily**Chair:** Mr. Mauree Daroomalingum (Mauritius); **Vice-Chairs:** Dr Ahmed Mohammed Al-Mazroui (Oman) and Mr Jeongseok Park (Rep. of Korea)**1. OPENING OF THE SESSION** (Host & Chair)**2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION** (Chair)**3. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS** (Chair)

In accordance with Article VII: ‘Observers’ of the IOTC Agreement, and Rule XIII: ‘Participation by observers’ of the IOTC Rules of Procedure, the list of Observers present from FAO Members and Associate Members of FAO, intergovernmental organisations, non-governmental organisations, consultants and experts, will be presented by the Chair.

4. UPDATE ON ACTIONS FROM THE 17th SESSION (Chair & Secretariat)**5. REPORT OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE** (SC Chair)**6. REPORT OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE** (CoC Chair)**7. REPORT OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE** (SCAF Chair)**8. PROPOSAL TO REVISE THE IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE** (Australia)**9. PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF IOTC**

9.1 *Progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Performance Review Panel (Resolution 09/01 on the performance review follow-up)* (Chair & Secretariat)

9.2 *Terms of reference for the second performance review of the IOTC* (Chair & Secretariat)

10. REFORM OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION (Chair & Members)**11. CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES** (Chair & Members)

Noting that in 2012, the Commission reiterated its previous AGREEMENT that the 30 day rule shall be strictly applied for all future Sessions unless otherwise agreed. Specifically, no proposals for new or revised Conservation or Management Measures shall be accepted by the Secretariat for the Commission’s consideration, if received after the 30 day deadline. (para 88, S16 report).

11.1 *Current Conservation and Management Measures that require action by the Commission in 2014 and 2015* (Chair)

11.2 *Review of objections received under Article IX.5 of the IOTC Agreement* (Chair)

11.3 *Proposals for Conservation and Management Measures* (Members)

12. OTHER BUSINESS (Chair)

12.1 *Proposal for a statement on piracy* (European Union)

12.2 *Outcomes of the adhoc meeting on the IOTC Regional Observer Scheme* (Secretariat)

12.3 *Outcomes of the seabird bycatch mitigation trials* (Japan)

13. DATE AND PLACE OF THE COMMISSION IN 2015 AND OF ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES FOR 2014 AND TENTATIVELY FOR 2015 (Chair)

14. REVIEW OF THE DRAFT AND ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 18th SESSION OF THE COMMISSION (Chair)

APPENDIX IV

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC-2014-S18-01a	Provisional agenda for the 18 th Session of the Commission	3 March 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-01b	Provisional annotated agenda for the 18 th Session of the Commission	2 May 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-02	Draft list of documents for the 18 th Session of the Commission	28 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-03	Draft indicative schedule for the 18 th Session of the Commission	8 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-04	Draft list of participants for the 18 th Session of the Commission	1 June 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-05	Actions arising from the previous Session of the Commission (S17)	29 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-06	Proposal to revise the IOTC Rules of Procedure, based on the recommendation from the compendium working group (Australia)	1 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-07 Rev_1	Update on progress regarding Resolution 09/01 – <i>on the performance review follow-up (Chair and Secretariat)</i>	29 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-08	Terms of reference for the second performance review of the IOTC (Chair)	24 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-09	Conservation and management measures requiring action by the Commission in 2014 (Secretariat)	4 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-10	Review of objections received under Article IX.5 of the IOTC Agreement	28 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-11	Proposal: Statement of the IOTC plenary on piracy in the western part of the IOTC area of competence – 2014 (European Union)	30 April 2014
<i>Committee Reports</i>		
IOTC-2013-SC16-R	Report of the 16 th Session of the IOTC Scientific Committee	18 December 2013
IOTC-2014-CoC11-R	Report of the 11 th Session of the IOTC Compliance Committee	31 May 2014
IOTC-2014-SCAF11-R	Report of the 11 th Session of the IOTC Standing Committee on Administration and Finance	31 May 2014
<i>Conservation and Management Measures – Proposals</i>		
IOTC-2014-S18-PropA	On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures (Australia – to replace a range of CMMs)	7 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-PropB	On a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species and on the protection of silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC (European Union – New proposal)	30 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-PropC	On a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species and on the protection of hammerhead sharks (Family Sphyrnidae) caught in association with fisheries managed by IOTC (European Union – New proposal)	30 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-PropD	On the conservation of sharks (European Union – Revision to Resolution 05/05)	30 April 2014
IOTC-2014-S18-PropE	On the conservation of sharks (Australia – Revision to Resolution 05/05)	1 May 2014

Document	Title	Availability
IOTC–2014–S18–PropF	On a ban on discards of bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna, yellowfin tuna, and non-targeted species caught by purse seine vessels in the IOTC area of competence (Mauritius – Revision to Res. 13/11)	2 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropG	For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence (Mauritius – Revision to Resolution 12/13)	2 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropH	To standardise the presentation of scientific information in the annual Scientific Committee report and in Working Party reports (European Union – New proposal)	30 April 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropI	On enhancing the dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers (Maldives and Mozambique – New Proposal)	1 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropJ	On the Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) programme (UK(OT), Maldives, Mozambique, Seychelles – Revision to Resolution 06/03)	1 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropK	Data confidentiality policy and procedures (UK(OT), Maldives, Mozambique, Seychelles – Revision to Resolution 12/02)	1 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropL	On limiting the number of instrumented buoys per vessel to limit the number of tracked drifting fish aggregating devices (DFADs) and the deployment of artificial drifting fish aggregating devices (DFADs) (Mauritius – New proposal)	2 May 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropM	On the implementation of a harmonized and coordinated scheme of IOTC observers (European Union – New proposal)	30 April 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropN	IMO number: Concerning the IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence (European Union – Revision to Res. 13/02)	30 April 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropO	IMO number: Concerning a record of licensed foreign vessels fishing for IOTC species in the IOTC area of competence and access agreement information (European Union – Revision to Res. 13/07)	30 April 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropP	IMO number: On establishing a programme for transshipment by large-scale fishing vessels (European Union – Revision to Res. 12/05)	30 April 2014
IOTC–2014–S18–PropQ	Terms of Reference of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission Working Party on Compliance (WPC) (Mozambique, UK-(OT), Maldives – New proposal)	1 May 2014
Information papers		
IOTC–2014–S18–INF01	Nil	–
NGO Statements		
ISSF	ISSF Position Statement	22 April 2014
PEW	PEW Position Statement	14 May 2014
IGFA	IGFA Position Statement	14 May 2014
WWF	WWF Position Statement	31 May 2014

APPENDIX V
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 16TH SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
(2–6 DECEMBER, 2013) TO THE COMMISSION

Note: paragraphs allusions refer to paragraphs in the Report of the 16th Session of the Scientific Committee (IOTC–2013–SC16–R)

STATUS OF TUNA AND TUNA-LIKE RESOURCES IN THE INDIAN OCEAN

Tuna – Highly migratory species

- SC16.01 ([para. 161](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for each tropical and temperate tuna species as provided in the Executive Summary for each species.
- Albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*) – [Appendix VIII](#)
 - Bigeye tuna (*Thunnus obesus*) – [Appendix IX](#)
 - Skipjack tuna (*Katsuwonus pelamis*) – [Appendix X](#)
 - Yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*) – [Appendix XI](#)

Billfish

- SC16.02 ([para. 164](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for each billfish species as provided in the Executive Summary for each species:
- Swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*) – [Appendix XII](#)
 - Black marlin (*Makaira indica*) – [Appendix XIII](#)
 - Blue marlin (*Makaira nigricans*) – [Appendix XIV](#)
 - Striped marlin (*Tetrapturus audax*) – [Appendix XV](#)
 - Indo-Pacific sailfish (*Istiophorus platypterus*) – [Appendix XVI](#)

Tuna and seerfish – Neritic species

- SC16.03 ([para. 165](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for each neritic tuna species as provided in the Executive Summary for each species:
- Bullet tuna (*Auxis rochei*) – [Appendix XVII](#)
 - Frigate tuna (*Auxis thazard*) – [Appendix XVIII](#)
 - Kawakawa (*Euthynnus affinis*) – [Appendix XIX](#)
 - Longtail tuna (*Thunnus tonggol*) – [Appendix XX](#)
 - Indo-Pacific king mackerel (*Scomberomorus guttatus*) – [Appendix XXI](#)
 - Narrow-barred Spanish mackerel (*Scomberomorus commerson*) – [Appendix XXII](#)

Status of Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Sharks in the Indian Ocean

Sharks

- SC16.04 ([para. 166](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for a subset of shark species commonly caught in IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species:
- Blue shark (*Prionace glauca*) – [Appendix XXIII](#)
 - Oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*) – [Appendix XXIV](#)
 - Scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*) – [Appendix XXV](#)
 - Shortfin mako shark (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) – [Appendix XXVI](#)
 - Silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*) – [Appendix XXVII](#)
 - Bigeye thresher shark (*Alopias superciliosus*) – [Appendix XXVIII](#)
 - Pelagic thresher shark (*Alopias pelagicus*) – [Appendix XXIX](#)

Marine turtles

- SC16.05 ([para. 167](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for marine turtles, as provided in the Executive Summary encompassing all six species found in the Indian Ocean:
- Marine turtles – [Appendix XXX](#)

Seabirds

- SC16.06 ([para. 168](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the management advice developed for seabirds, as provided in the Executive Summary encompassing all species commonly interacting with

IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species:

- Seabirds – [Appendix XXXI](#)

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSION, TO SPECIFIC CPCs AND/OR OTHER BODIES

Standardisation of IOTC Working Party and Scientific Committee report terminology

- SC16.07 ([para. 23](#)) The SC **ADOPTED** the reporting terminology contained in [Appendix IV](#) and **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers adopting the standardised IOTC Report terminology, to further improve the clarity of information sharing from, and among its subsidiary bodies.

National Reports from CPCs

- SC16.08 ([para. 26](#)) **NOTING** that the Commission, at its 15th Session, expressed concern regarding the limited submission of National Reports to the SC, and stressed the importance of providing the reports by all CPCs, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note that in 2013, 28 reports were provided by CPCs, up from 26 in 2012, 25 in 2011, 15 in 2010 and 14 in 2009 ([Table 2](#)).
- SC16.09 ([para. 27](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Compliance Committee note the lack of compliance by several CPCs that did not submit a National Report in 2013, noting that the Commission agreed that the submission of the reports to the SC is mandatory ([Table 2](#)).

Report of the Third Session of the Working Party on Neritic Tunas (WPNT03)

- SC16.10 ([para. 32](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission increase the IOTC Capacity Building budget line so that capacity building workshops/training can be carried out in 2014 and 2015 on the collection, reporting and analyses of catch and effort data for neritic tuna and tuna-like species. Where appropriate this training session shall include information that explains the entire IOTC process from data collection to analysis and how the information collected is used by the Commission to develop Conservation and Management Measures.
- SC16.11 ([para. 33](#)) **NOTING** that some CPCs, in particular from India, Indonesia and Thailand, have collected large data sets on neritic tuna species over long time periods, the SC reiterated its previous **RECOMMENDATION** that this data, as well as data from other CPCs, be submitted to the IOTC Secretariat as per the requirements adopted by IOTC Members in Resolution 10/02. This would allow the WPNT to develop stock status indicators or comprehensive stock assessments of neritic tuna species in the future.
- SC16.12 ([para. 34](#)) **NOTING** that monofilament gillnets are recognised to have highly detrimental impacts on pelagic ecosystems, as they are non-selective, and that the use of monofilament gillnets have already been banned in a large number of IOTC CPCs, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that each CPC using monofilament gillnets to estimate total catch and bycatch, etc., taken by monofilament gillnets in comparison to other net material, and to report the findings at the next WPNT meeting.

Stock structure research

- SC16.13 ([para. 36](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat act in a project coordination role, as well as to seek funding for stock structure projects in the Indian Ocean. Initially, this would require the establishment of an intersessional discussion group with participants from the WPNT, and experts in the field of stock structure differentiation. CPCs with current or planned stock structure studies are encouraged to circulate project proposals to the wider group for comment that may be considered for submitting to prospective funding partners with support from the IOTC Secretariat.

Report of the Ninth Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB09)

Regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean

- SC16.14 ([para. 38](#)) The SC reiterated its previous **RECOMMENDATION** that the Commission considers allocating funds to support a regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean. As an essential contribution to this review, scientists from all CPCs having gillnet fleets in the Indian Ocean, in particular those from I.R. Iran, Oman, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, should collate the known information on bycatch in their gillnet fisheries, including sharks, marine turtles and marine mammals, with estimates of the likely order of magnitude where more detailed data are not

available. A consultant should be hired for 30 days to assist CPCs with this task (budget estimate: [Table 3](#)).

Training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on species identification, bycatch mitigation and data collection methods and also to identify other potential sources of assistance – Development of plans of action

SC16.15 ([para. 39](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocate funds in its 2014 and 2015 budgets for the IOTC Secretariat to facilitate training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on bycatch mitigation methods, species identification, and data collection methods (budget estimate: [Table 4](#)).

Review of new information on the status of sharks and rays

SC16.16 ([para. 40](#)) **NOTING** that the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that all CPCs collect and report catches of sharks (including historical data), catch-and-effort and length frequency data on sharks, as per IOTC Resolutions, so that more detailed analysis can be undertaken for the next WPEB meeting.

SC16.17 ([para. 41](#)) **NOTING** that there is extensive literature available on pelagic shark fisheries and interactions with fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species, in countries having fisheries for sharks, and in the databases of governmental or non-governmental organisations, the SC **AGREED** on the need for a major data mining exercise in order to compile data from as many sources as possible and attempt to rebuild historical catch series of the most commonly caught shark species, in particular blue shark and oceanic whitetip shark. In this regard, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocates funds for this activity, in the 2014 and 2015 IOTC budgets (budget estimate: [Table 5](#)).

SC16.18 ([para. 42](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat facilitate a process to develop standardised sampling protocols for bycatch species which are thought to be heavily impacted by IOTC fisheries. The protocols established by the WCPFC may be a useful starting point. Given the lack of staffing resources at the Secretariat to undertake the work directly, the Commission may wish to allocate sufficient funds in its 2014 budget to hire a consultant to undertake this work, under the guidance of the Secretariat. The primary aim would be to assist CPCs to gather information in a consistent way that would lead to improved assessments of fisheries impacts on species, species groups and ecosystems. An approximate budget is provided in [Table 6](#).

Ecological Risk Assessment: review of current knowledge and potential management implications

SC16.19 ([para. 43](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the list of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to longline gear ([Table 7](#)) and purse seine gear ([Table 8](#)) in the Indian Ocean, as determined by a productivity susceptibility analysis, compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded for each gear, contained in Resolution 13/03 *on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence*. At the next revision to Resolution 13/03, the Commission may wish to add the missing species/groups of sharks and rays.

SC16.20 ([para. 46](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that, in line with Recommendation 12/15 on the best available science, the list of shark species (or groups of species) for longline gear under Resolution 13/03 ([Table 7](#)) should be supplemented with the silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*), which was estimated to be at risk in longline fisheries by the ERA conducted in 2012 (ranked as the 4th most vulnerable species to longline gear). The SC **REQUESTED** the Commission to define the most appropriate means of collecting this additional information.

TABLE 7. List of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to longline gear compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded in logbooks, as listed in Resolution 13/03 *on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence*.

PSA vulnerability ranking	Most susceptible shark species to longline gear	FAO Code	Shark species currently listed in IOTC Resolution 13/03 for longline gear: mandatory recording	FAO Code
1	Shortfin mako (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>)	SMA	Blue shark (<i>Prionace glauca</i>)	BSH
2	Bigeye thresher (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>)	BTH	Mako sharks (<i>Isurus</i> spp.)	MAK
3	Pelagic thresher (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>)	PTH	Porbeagle shark (<i>Lamna nasus</i>)	POR
4	Silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>)	FAL	Hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna</i>	SPN

			spp.)	
5	Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>)	OCS	Other sharks	SKH
6	Smooth hammerhead (<i>Sphyrna zygaena</i>)	SPZ	Thresher sharks (<i>Alopias</i> spp.)	THR
7	Porbeagle (<i>Lamna nasus</i>)	POR	Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>)	OCS
8	Longfin mako (<i>Isurus paucus</i>)	LMA		
9	Great hammerhead (<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>)	SPM		
10	Blue shark (<i>Prionace glauca</i>)	BSH		

SC16.21 (para. 47) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that, in line with Recommendation 12/15 on the best available science, the list of shark species (or groups of species) for purse seine gear under Resolution 13/03 (Table 8) should be supplemented with the silky shark (*Carcharhinus falciformis*), mako sharks (*Isurus* spp.), hammerhead sharks (*Sphyrna* spp.), pelagic stingray (*Pteroplatytrygon violacea*), dusky shark (*Carcharhinus obscurus*), tiger shark (*Galeocerdo cuvier*), which were estimated to be at risk in purse seine fisheries by the ERA conducted in 2012. The SC **ADVISED** the Commission to define the most appropriate means of collecting this additional information.

TABLE 8. List of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to purse seine gear compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded in logbooks, as listed in Resolution 13/03 on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence.

PSA vulnerability ranking	Most susceptible shark species to purse seine gear	FAO Code	Shark species listed in IOTC Resolution 13/03 for purse seine gear: Mandatory recording	FAO Code
1	Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>)	OCS	Whale sharks (<i>Rhincodon typus</i>)	RHN
2	Silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>)	FAL	Thresher sharks (<i>Alopias</i> spp.)	THR
3	Shortfin mako (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>)	SMA	Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>)	OCS
4	Great hammerhead (<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>)	SPM		
5	Pelagic stingray (<i>Pteroplatytrygon violacea</i>)	PLS		
6	Scalloped hammerhead (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>)	SPL		
7	Smooth hammerhead (<i>Sphyrna zygaena</i>)	SPZ		
8	Longfin mako (<i>Isurus paucus</i>)	LMA		
9	Dusky shark (<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>)	DUS		
10	Tiger shark (<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>)	TIG		

Review of Resolution 12/04 on the conservation of marine turtles

SC16.22 (para. 51) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that at the next revision of IOTC Resolution 12/04 on the conservation of marine turtles, the measure is strengthened to ensure that where possible, CPCs report annually on the total estimated level of incidental catches of marine turtles, by species, as provided at Table 9.

TABLE 9. Marine turtle species reported as caught in fisheries within the IOTC area of competence.

Common name	Scientific name
Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>
Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>
Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>
Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>
Olive ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>

Resolution 10/02 Mandatory statistical [reporting] requirements for IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs)

- SC16.23 (para. 52) **NOTING** that Resolution 10/02 does not make provisions for data to be reported to the IOTC on marine turtles, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that Resolution 10/02 is revised in order to make the reporting requirements coherent with those stated in Resolution 12/04 *on the conservation of marine turtles* and Resolution 13/03 *on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence*.

Requests contained in IOTC Conservation and Management Measures

- SC16.24 (para. 53) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the following in regards to the requests to the SC and WPEB outlined in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12/04:

- a) *Develop recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures for gillnet, longline and purse seine fisheries in the IOTC area*

Gillnet: The absence of data for marine turtles, fishing effort, spatial deployment and bycatch in the IOTC area of competence makes it difficult to provide management advice for gillnets. However, possible mitigation measures to avoid marine turtle mortality in gillnets would be possible and, thus, the group suggested that research in gillnet mitigation measures (e.g. using lights on gillnets) will be considered as a research priority. Moreover, improvements in data collection and reporting of marine turtle interactions with gillnets, and research on the effect of gear types (i.e. net construction and colour, mesh size, soak times, light deterrents) are necessary.

Longline: Current information suggests inconsistent spatial catches (i.e. high catches in few sets) and by gear/fishery. The most important mitigation measures relevant for longline fisheries are to:

3. Encourage the use of circle hooks, whilst developing further research into their effectiveness using a multiple species approach.
4. Release live animals after careful dehooking/disentangling/line cutting (See handling guidelines in the *Marine turtle identification cards for Indian Ocean fisheries*).

Purse seine: see c) below

- b) *Develop regional standards covering data collection, data exchange and training*

4. The development of standards using the IOTC guidelines for the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme should be undertaken, as it is considered the best way to collect reliable data related to marine turtle bycatch in the IOTC area of competence.
5. The Chair of the WPDCS to work with the IOSEA MoU Secretariat, which has already developed regional standards for data collection, and revise the observer data collection forms and observer reporting template as appropriate, as well as current recording and reporting requirements through IOTC Resolutions, to ensure that the IOTC has the means to collect quantitative and qualitative data on marine turtle bycatch.
6. Encourage CPCs to use IOSEA expertise and facilities to train observers and crew to increase post-release survival rates of marine turtles.

- c) *Develop improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of marine turtles, including the use of biodegradable materials*

All FAD-directed purse seine fisheries should rapidly change to only use ecological FADs² based on the principles outlined in Annex III of Resolution 13/08 *Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species*.

Review of Resolution 00/02 On a survey of predation of longline caught fish

- SC16.25 (para. 54) **NOTING** that the requirements contained in Resolution 00/02 *on a survey of predation of longline caught fish* was completed by the WPEB and SC in past year's, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that Resolution 00/02 be revoked by the Commission.

Development of technical advice for marine mammals

- SC16.26 (para. 55) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that depredation events be incorporated into Resolution 13/03 at its next revision, so that interactions may be quantified at a range of spatial scales. Depredation events should also be quantified by the regional observer scheme.

² This term means improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of bycatch species, using biodegradable material as much as possible.

Employment of a Fisheries Officer (Bycatch)

- SC16.27 ([para. 56](#)) **NOTING** the rapidly increasing scientific workload at the IOTC Secretariat, including a wide range of additional duties on ecosystems and bycatch assigned to it by the SC and the Commission, and that the new Fishery Officer (Science) supporting the IOTC scientific activities has not been given a mandate by the Commission to work on ecosystems and bycatch matters, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission approve the hiring of a Fishery Officer (Bycatch) to work on bycatch matters in support of the scientific process.

Invited Expert/s at the next Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch meeting

- SC16.28 ([para. 60](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that two Invited Experts be brought to the WPEB in 2014 so as to further increase the capacity of the WPEB to undertake work on sharks at the next meeting, and for this to be included in the IOTC budget for 2014.

Status of development and implementation of National Plans of Action for seabirds and sharks, and implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations

- SC16.29 ([para. 63](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the updated status of development and implementation of National Plans of Action for seabirds and sharks, and the implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations, by each CPC as provided at [Appendix VI](#).

Best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled cetaceans

- SC16.30 ([para. 65](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocates funds in its 2014 and 2015 budgets, to produce and print the IOTC best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled cetaceans. The guidelines could be incorporated into a set of IOTC cetacean identification cards: “*Cetacean identification for Indian Ocean fisheries*”.

Best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks

- SC16.31 ([para. 67](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** the following *Guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks*, that should be added as an additional page in the IOTC shark identification guides:

The methods listed below depend on the condition of the particular purse seine set, e.g. the size and orientation of the encircled animal, size of fish in the purse seine set and operation style.

- Cutting the net when the whale shark is at the surface and separated from the tuna and when the operation presents no danger for the crew;
- Standing the animal on the net and rolling it outside the bunt. A rope placed under the animal and attached to the float line could help rolling the whale shark out of the net;
- Brailing sharks (only for small individual less than 2–3 meters).

The crew should never:

- Pull up the shark by its tail;
- Tow the shark by its tail.

- SC16.32 ([para. 68](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocates funds in its 2014 budget, to produce and print the IOTC best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks, and for these to be incorporated into the existing IOTC “*Shark and ray identification in Indian Ocean pelagic fisheries*”, identification cards.

Shark Year (multi-year research) Program

- SC16.33 ([para. 74](#)) The SC **ENDORSED** the Indian Ocean Shark Year Program (multi-year research initiative) provided at Appendix I of paper IOTC-2013-SC16-18 and **RECOMMENDED** that a detailed multi-year shark research program be prepared (by a small group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat) covering the various aspects raised in paper IOTC-2013-SC16-18. The IOTC budget for 2014 should include funding support to allow the small group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat to attend a short ad-hoc meeting ([Table 10](#)).

Report of the Eleventh Session of the Working Party on Billfish (WPB11)**Length-age keys**

- SC16.34 ([para. 77](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that as a matter of priority, CPCs that have important fisheries catching billfish (EU, Taiwan, China, Japan, Indonesia and Sri Lanka) to collect and provide basic or

analysed data that would be used to establish length-age keys and non-standard measurements to standard measurements keys for billfish species, by sex and area.

Data support

- SC16.35 (para. 79) **NOTING** that the work carried out during the meeting requires an IOTC data expert to be in attendance at each meeting to answer the many and varied questions from participants, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat support team attending the WPB meeting each year, also contain a staff member from the IOTC Data Section, in addition to the Science Manager and Fishery Officer (Stock Assessment), and for the attendance of the third team member to be incorporated into the IOTC budget for 2014 and for all future years.

Mozambique Channel billfish fishery

- SC16.36 (para. 81) **NOTING** that at present few scientific observers are being placed on board vessels fishing in the Mozambique Channel (between parallels 10°–30° South). Further **NOTING** the importance of that area for billfish fishery statistics, the SC recalled its **RECOMMENDATION** that CPCs whose vessels fish in that area take the necessary measures to take on board scientific observers as adopted in Resolution 11/04 and to report the data collected as per IOTC requirements.

Recreational and sports fisheries for billfish

- SC16.37 (para. 82) **NOTING** that in 2011, the Chair of the WPB, in collaboration with the IOTC Secretariat, participating billfish foundations and other interested parties, commenced a process to facilitate the acquisition of catch-and-effort and size data from sport fisheries, by developing and disseminating reporting forms to Sport Fishing Centres in the region, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Chair and Vice-Chair work in collaboration with the IOTC Secretariat and the African Billfish Foundation to find a suitable funding source and lead investigator (university or consultant) to undertake the project outlined in Appendix VI of the WPB11 report (IOTC–2013–WPB11–R). The aim of the project will be to enhance data recovery from sports and other recreational fisheries in the western Indian Ocean region. The WPB Chair should circulate the concept note to potential funding bodies on behalf of the WPB. A similar concept note could be developed for other regions in the IOTC area of competence at a later date.

Parameters for future analyses: stock assessments

- SC16.38 (para. 83) **NOTING** that the current time frames for data exchange do not allow enough time to conduct thorough stock assessment analyses, and this could have a detrimental effect on the quality of advice provided by the WPB, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that exchanges of data (CPUE indices and coefficient of variation) should be made as early as possible, but no later than 30 days prior to a working party meeting, so that stock assessment analysis can be provided to the IOTC Secretariat no later than 15 days before a working party meeting, as per the recommendations of the SC, which states: “*The SC also ENCOURAGED data to be used in stock assessments, including CPUE standardisations, be made available not less than three months before each meeting by CPCs and where possible, data summaries no later than two months prior to each meeting, from the IOTC Secretariat; and RECOMMENDED that data to be used in stock assessments, including CPUE standardisations be made available not less than 30 days before each meeting by CPCs.*” (IOTC–2011–SC14–R; p68)

Swordfish Nominal and standardised CPUE indices

- SC16.39 (para. 84) **NOTING** the request from the Commission in 2013 that the southwest region continue to be analysed as a special resource, in addition to the full Indian Ocean assessment, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that CPCs with longline fleets with important swordfish catches in the southwest Indian Ocean (EU, Taiwan, China and Japan) undertake revised CPUE analysis for their longline fleets in the southwest Indian Ocean, in addition to CPUE analysis for the entire Indian Ocean.

Report of the Fifteenth Session of the Working Party on Tropical Tunas (WPTT15)

Data collection and processing systems

- SC16.40 (para. 87) The SC **THANKED** Japan and Taiwan, China for addressing some of the concerns raised by the WPTT in 2012 about data collection and length frequency processing, and **RECOMMENDED** that both Japan and Taiwan, China, as well as the IOTC Secretariat continue joint work, in cooperation with countries having longline fisheries, to address other issues identified by the WPTT, such as conflicting trends in the longline CPUE among the main longline fleets, the lack of specimens of small size from the samples for Taiwan, China longline fleet, and discrepancies in the average weights estimated using the available catch-and-effort and length frequency data for the Japanese longline fleet.

Length Frequency inter-sessional meeting guidelines

- SC16.41 ([para. 88](#)) **NOTING** the size data issues (discrepancies in size data (low sampling rate, uneven distribution of sampling in regard to the spatial extent of the fishery) in the Japan and Taiwan, China tropical tuna data sets) identified by the WPTT in 2012 and 2013 and the Scientific Committee in 2012, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the course of action outlined in [para. 105](#) of this report is undertaken.

India fisheries

- SC16.42 ([para. 91](#)) **NOTING** the potential utility of the longline CPUEs derived from the research surveys conducted by the “Fishery Survey of India”, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that as a high priority, India undertake a standardisation of the CPUE series, with the support of the IOTC Secretariat, and for this to be presented at the next WPTT meeting.

Consultants

- SC16.43 ([para. 92](#)) The SC **NOTED** the excellent work done by IOTC consultants in 2013 on a range of projects from Management Strategy Evaluation to the bigeye tuna SS3 stock assessment, and **RECOMMENDED** that their engagement be renewed for the coming year to supplement the skill set available within IOTC CPCs. An indicative budget is provided at [Table 11](#).

Report of the Ninth Session of the Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS09)**Resolution 10/02 Mandatory statistical requirements for IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPC's).**

- SC16.44 ([para. 98](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission amends IOTC Resolution 10/02 as follows:
- Adding the following definitions in order to clarify the type of fisheries, area and species covered by Resolution 10/02:
 - Longline fisheries: Fisheries undertaken by vessels in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels that use longline gear.
 - Surface fisheries: All fisheries undertaken by vessels in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels other than longline fisheries; in particular purse seine, pole-and-line, and gillnet fisheries.
 - Coastal fisheries: Fisheries other than longline or surface, as defined above, also called artisanal fisheries.
 - IOTC Area of Competence: as described in Annex A of the IOTC Agreement.
 - Species: refers to all species under the IOTC mandate as described in Annex B of the IOTC Agreement, and the most commonly caught elasmobranch species, as defined by the Commission in IOTC Resolution 13/03 or any subsequent revisions of this Resolution.
 - Support vessels: Any types of vessels that operate in support of the fishing activities of purse seine vessels.
 - Specify the requirements for Nominal Catch data, including:
 - Changing the term Nominal by Total;
 - Change the time-period resolution of Total catch data from Year to Quarter, in order to be able to assess the seasonality of fisheries that do not report catch-and-effort data;
 - Request separate reports for retained catches (in live weight) and discards (in live weight or number), as per the above resolution.
 - Specify the requirements for Catch and effort data, including:
 - Surface fisheries: Extend the requirements to report catch and effort data by type of fishing mode to other fisheries that use FADs, drifting or anchored; and ensure that the effort units reported are consistent with those requested in Resolution 13/03 or any subsequent revisions to such Resolution;
 - Coastal fisheries: Specify the time-period to be used to report this information, preferably Month.
 - Specify that Size Frequency data shall be reported according to the procedures described in the IOTC Guidelines for the Reporting of Fisheries Statistics (instead of those set out by the IOTC Scientific Committee).
 - Specify the requirements for data on supply vessels, including:
 - Change the term Supply to Support (Support Vessels);
 - Indicate that data on the activities of support vessels shall be reported by the flag country of the vessels that receive the assistance of the support vessel (and not by the flag country or other parties);
 - Request the name of the purse seiners that receive assistance from each support vessel;
 - Recall Resolution 13/08 which contains provisions for CPCs to collect more detailed information on

Fish Aggregating Devices

Resolution 11/04 On a regional observer scheme

SC16.45 ([para. 99](#)) The SC **NOTED** that the number of trips covered by observers over the total number of trips estimated for longliners have been used to estimate levels of coverage on longline fleets, further noting the difficulties that some countries have to use the number of sets/operations covered by observers over the total number of sets/operations by their fleets, as requested by the Commission. Using the number of trips as unit of effort to measure coverage by observers may not be appropriate as longline fishing trips can extend for more than one year and are usually not fully covered by scientific observers. For this reason, and acknowledging the difficulties that some countries have to estimate the total number of sets/operations for their fleets, the use of alternative units of effort may be appropriate to assess coverage, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the total number of days-at-sea covered by observers versus the total number of days-at-sea for each fleet over a year is used instead of the number of sets/operations.

General discussion on data issues

SC16.46 ([para. 101](#)) The SC **NOTED** that India had reported very incomplete catches and effort, and no size data, for its commercial longline fleet. Over 60 longliners from India had operated in the Indian Ocean during 2006–07. The SC **RECALLED** the recommendation from the WPTT that scientists from Taiwan, China assist India in the estimation of catches of IOTC species and sharks for this fleet, with the majority of those vessels used the flag of Taiwan, China in the past. The SC thanked the scientists from Taiwan, China for offering assistance and **RECOMMENDED** that India reports a revised time-series of catch and effort for its longline fleet, where required, as soon as the review is finalised.

SC16.47 ([para. 102](#)) **NOTING** that to date, I.R. Iran has not reported catch and effort data to the IOTC Secretariat as per the IOTC Requirements; that the WPEB had previously recommended that I.R. Iran strengthen its monitoring of catches of sharks from both the logbook and observer programmes; and that I.R. Iran is setting procedures in its databases that will make it possible to report catch and effort data for its fisheries as per the IOTC standards in the future; the SC **RECOMMENDED** that I.R. Iran finalises this work and reports the available series of catch and effort data for its fisheries as a matter of priority.

IOTC Data Summary

SC16.48 ([para. 110](#)) The SC **NOTED** the plans from the IOTC Secretariat to resume publication of the IOTC Data Summary in electronic form, including work on the set-up of an online querying facility in the IOTC Web Site, which will allow site users to filter nominal catch and catch-and-effort data using a range of criteria and visualise the output in table or graphic format, including different types of charts, figures and maps. The work will facilitate the use of information in the IOTC Databases by the general public. The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat carries out this work during 2014 and presents the new system to the next meeting of the WPDCS for suggested improvements.

Update on the inter-sessional work of the WPM small working group on Management Strategy Evaluation

SC16.49 ([para. 115](#)) The SC **NOTED** the need for the Commission, its Committee's 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:

- 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 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.
- 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](#).

- SC16.50 ([para. 116](#)) 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 workshops, as detailed in [Table 12](#).

Outcomes of the informal workshop on CPUE standardisation

- SC16.51 ([para. 127](#)) The SC **ENDORSED** all of the recommendations from the workshop, contained in paper IOTC-2013-SC16-12. In particular, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that in areas where CPUE's diverged the CPC's were encouraged to meet inter-sessionally to resolve the differences. In addition, the major CPC's were encouraged to develop a combined CPUE from multiple fleets so it may capture the true abundance better. Approaches to possibly pursue are the following: i) Assess filtering approaches on data and whether they have an effect, ii) examine spatial resolution on fleets operating and whether this is the primary reason for differences, and iii) examine fleet efficiencies by area, iv) use operational data for the standardization, and v) have a meeting amongst all operational level data across all fleets to assess an approach where we may look at catch rates across the broad areas.
- SC16.52 ([para. 128](#)) **NOTING** the CPUE issues identified by the WPTT in 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 and the Scientific Committee in 2012, as well as the informal CPUE workshop in 2013, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that further inter-sessional work be carried out in conjunction with the IOTC Secretariat on the major longline CPC's in the Indian Ocean in early 2014 using operational data to address issues identified in the CPUE Workshop Report.

Estimation of fishing capacity by tuna fishing fleet in the Indian Ocean

- SC16.53 ([para. 130](#)) The SC **NOTED** paper IOTC-2013-SC16-19 which outlines the main outcomes and findings from the report on estimation of fishing capacity by tuna fishing fleets in the Indian Ocean. The results presented in the study show that the contribution of vessels between 15–24 m LOA in the Indian Ocean has increased substantially in recent years. Vessels of this size that operate within the EEZ of coastal countries are not required to provide catch-and-effort and size data as per the same resolution as vessels in the IOTC Record of Authorized vessels. Thus, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers extending requirements for these vessels in IOTC Resolution 10/02 to equally apply to all of the Authorized vessels.

Summary discussion of matters common to Working Parties

Meeting participation fund

- SC16.54 ([para. 133](#)) **NOTING** that the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund (MPF), adopted by the Commission in 2010 (Resolution 10/05 *On the establishment of a Meeting Participation Fund for developing IOTC Members and non-Contracting Cooperating Parties*), was used to fund the participation of 58 national scientists to the Working Party meetings and SC in 2013 (42 in 2012), all of which were required to submit and present a working paper at the meeting, the SC strongly **RECOMMENDED** that this fund be maintained into the future. The MPF is currently funded through accumulated IOTC budgetary funds and voluntary contributions by CPCs. The Commission may need to develop and implement a procedure for supplying funds to the MPF in the future, as specified in Resolution 10/05.
- SC16.55 ([para. 134](#)) **NOTING** that the Commission had directed the Secretariat (via Resolution 10/05) to ensure that the MPF be utilised, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing CPCs in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties, rather than non-science meetings, the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat strictly adhere to the directives of the Commission contained in Resolution 10/05, including paragraph 8 which states that '*The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditures of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.*' Thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing CPC scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.

Capacity building activities

- SC16.56 ([para. 136](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission increase the IOTC Capacity Building budget line so that capacity building workshops/training can be carried out in 2014 and 2015 on the collection, reporting and analyses of catch and effort data for neritic tuna and tuna-like species. Where appropriate this training session shall include information that explains the entire IOTC process from data collection to analysis and how the information collected is used by the Commission to develop

Conservation and Management Measures.

IOTC species identification cards**Billfish**

- SC16.57 ([para. 141](#)) The SC **EXPRESSED** its thanks to the IOTC Secretariat and other experts involved in the development of the identification cards for billfish and **RECOMMENDED** that the cards be translated into the following languages, in priority order: Farsi, Arabic, Indonesian, Swahili, Spanish, Portuguese, Thai and Sri Lankan, and that the Commission allocate funds for this purpose. The Secretariat should utilise any remaining funds in the IOTC Capacity Building budget line for 2013 to translate the cards.
- SC16.58 ([para. 142](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocate additional funds in 2014-15 to further translate and print sets of the billfish identification cards (budget estimate: [Table 13](#)).

Seabirds, shark and marine turtles

- SC16.59 ([para. 143](#)) The SC **EXPRESSED** its thanks to the IOTC Secretariat and other experts involved in the development of the identification cards for marine turtles, seabirds and sharks and **RECOMMENDED** that the cards be translated into the following languages, in priority order: Farsi, Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese and Indonesian, and that the Commission allocate funds for this purpose.
- SC16.60 ([para. 144](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocate additional funds in 2014-15 to translate and print further sets of the shark, seabird and marine turtle identification cards (budget estimate: [Table 14](#)).

Tunas and mackerels

- SC16.61 ([para. 146](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocate additional funds in the 2014-15 budget to translate and print sets of identification cards for the three tropical tuna, two temperate tuna, and six neritic tuna and seerfish species under the IOTC mandate, noting that the total estimated production and printing costs for 1000 sets of the identification cards is around a maximum of US\$16,200 ([Table 15](#)). The IOTC Secretariat shall seek funds from potential donors to print additional sets of the identification cards at US\$5,500 per 1000 sets of cards.

Fishing hook identification cards

- SC16.62 ([para. 147](#)) **NOTING** the continued confusion in the terminology of various hook types being used in IOTC fisheries, (e.g. tuna hook vs. J-hook; definition of a circle hook), the SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission allocate funds in the 2014-15 IOTC Budget to develop an identification guide for fishing hooks and pelagic fishing gears used in IOTC fisheries. The total estimated production and printing costs for the first 1000 sets of the identification cards is around a maximum of US\$16,500 ([Table 16](#)). The IOTC Secretariat shall seek funds from potential donors to print additional sets of the identification cards at US\$5,500 per 1000 sets of cards.

Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Working Parties

- SC16.63 ([para. 149](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note and endorse the Chairs and Vice-Chairs for each of the IOTC Working Parties, as provided in [Appendix VII](#).

Implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme

- SC16.64 ([para. 176](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Compliance Committee and the Commission consider how to address the continued lack of compliance with the implementation of regional observer schemes by CPCs for their fleets and lack of reporting to the IOTC Secretariat as per the provision of Resolution 11/04 *on a Regional Observer Scheme*, noting the update provided in [Appendix XXXII](#).
- SC16.65 ([para. 177](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that as a priority, the IOTC Secretariat should immediately commence work with CPCs that are yet to develop and implement a Regional Observer Scheme that would meet the requirements contained in Resolution 11/04, and provide an update at the next session of the WPEB.

Observer programme training

- SC16.66 ([para. 178](#)) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers funding of future activities under the Regional Observer Scheme, by allocating specific funds to the implementation of capacity building activities in developing coastal countries of the IOTC Region, as detailed in [Table 17](#).

Outlook on Time-Area Closures

- SC16.67 (para. 185) The SC reiterated its previous **RECOMMENDATION** that the Commission note that the current closure is likely to be ineffective, as fishing effort will be redirected to other fishing grounds in the Indian Ocean. The positive impacts of the moratorium within the closed area would likely be offset by effort reallocation, as they will result in similar catch rates and total annual catches.
- SC16.68 (para. 186) **NOTING** that the objective of Resolution 12/13 is to decrease the overall pressure on the main targeted stocks in the Indian Ocean, in particular yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna, and also to evaluate the impact of the current time/area closure and any alternative scenarios on tropical tuna populations, the SC reiterated its previous **RECOMMENDATION** that the Commission specify the level of reduction or the long term management objectives to be achieved with the current or alternative time area closures and/or alternative measures, as these are not contained within the Resolution 12/13. This will, in turn, guide and facilitate the analysis of the SC, via the WPTT in 2013 and future years.
- SC16.69 (para. 187) **NOTING** the slow progress made in addressing the Commission request, the SC reiterated its **RECOMMENDATION** that the SC Chair begins a consultative process with the Commission in order to obtain clear guidance from the Commission about the management objectives intended with the current or any alternative closure. This will allow the SC to address the Commission request more thoroughly.

Progress on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Performance Review Panel

- SC16.70 (para. 191) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the updates on progress regarding Resolution 09/01 *on the performance review follow-up*, as provided at [Appendix XXXIII](#).

Schedule and Priorities of Working Party and Scientific Committee Meetings for 2014 and 2015

- SC16.71 (para. 200) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission endorse the schedule of Working Party and Scientific Committee meetings for 2014, and tentatively for 2015, noting that the SC agreed that flexibility in the dates proposed should be retained ([Appendix XXXVI](#)).

Discussion of the ASFA database

- SC16.72 (para. 206) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider allocating the necessary funds in order to renew data entry under the ASFA Partnership Agreement, which would be in addition to the current information sharing of IOTC documents, via the IOTC website where all papers are publicly available.

Election of a Chair and a Vice-Chair for the next biennium

- SC16.73 (para. 210) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the re-election of Dr Tom Nishida (Japan) as Chairperson, and Mr Jan Robinson (Seychelles) as Vice-Chairperson of the SC for the next biennium, as well as the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each of the Working Parties as provided in [Appendix VII](#).

Review of the Draft, and Adoption of the Report of the Sixteenth Session of the Scientific Committee

- SC16.74 (para. 211) The SC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the proposed science budget for 2014–15 ([Appendix XXXVII](#)) and the consolidated set of recommendations arising from SC16, provided at [Appendix XXXVIII](#).

APPENDIX VI

STOCK STATUS SUMMARY FOR THE IOTC SPECIES

Status summary for species of tuna and tuna-like species under the IOTC mandate, as well as other species impacted by IOTC fisheries

Stock	Indicators	Prev ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	Advice to the Commission
Temperate and tropical tuna stocks: These are the main stocks being exploitation by industrial, and to a lesser extent, artisanal fisheries throughout the Indian Ocean, both on the high seas and in the EEZ of coastal states.							
Albacore <i>Thunnus alalunga</i>	Catch 2012: 33,960 t Average catch 2008–2012: 37,082 t MSY (80% CI): 33,300 t (31,100–35,600 t) F_{2010}/F_{MSY} (80% CI): 1.33 (0.9–1.76) SB_{2010}/SB_{MSY} (80% CI): 1.05 (0.54–1.56) SB_{2010}/SB_{1950} (80% CI): 0.29 (n.a.)	2007					There remains considerable uncertainty about the relationship between abundance and the standardised CPUE series, and about the total catches over the past decade. No new stock assessment was carried out in 2013. Revisions to the catch history in 2013 indicated that reported landings in 2012 (33,960 t), and those from 2011 (33,605 t) are only slightly above the MSY estimates from the previous assessment. Maintaining or increasing effort in the core albacore fishing grounds is likely to result in further declines in albacore biomass, productivity and CPUE. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix VIII
Bigeye tuna <i>Thunnus obesus</i>	Catch in 2012: 115,793 t Average catch 2008–2012: 107,603 t MSY (1000 t): 132 t (98.5–207 t) ² F_{2012}/F_{MSY} : 0.42 (0.21–0.80) ² SB_{2012}/SB_{MSY} : 1.44 (0.87–2.22) ² SB_{2012}/SB_0 : 0.40 (0.27–0.54) ²	2008					The 2013 stock assessment model results did not differ substantively from the previous (2010 and 2011) assessments; however, the final overall estimates of stock status differ somewhat due to the revision of the catch history and updated standardised CPUE indices. All the runs (except 2 extremes) carried out in 2013 indicate the stock is above a biomass level that would produce MSY in the long term (i.e. $SB_{2012}/SB_{MSY} > 1$) and in all runs that current fishing mortality is below the MSY-based reference level (i.e. $F_{2012}/F_{MSY} < 1$). Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix IX
Skipjack tuna <i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>	Catch 2012: 314,537 t Average catch 2008–2012: 400,980 t MSY (1000 t): 478 t (359–598 t) F_{2011}/F_{MSY} : 0.80 (0.68–0.92) SB_{2011}/SB_{MSY} : 1.20 (1.01–1.40) SB_{2011}/SB_0 : 0.45 (0.25–0.65)						No new stock assessment was carried out for skipjack tuna in 2013. Spawning stock biomass was estimated to have declined by approximately 45 % in 2011 from unfished levels. Total catch has continued to decline with 314,537 t landed in 2012, in comparison to 384,537 t in 2011. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix X
Yellowfin tuna <i>Thunnus albacares</i>	Catch 2012: 368,663 t Average catch 2008–2012: 317,505 t Multifan ³ MSY (1000 t): 344 t (290–453 t) F_{curr}/F_{MSY} : 0.69 (0.59–0.90) SB_{curr}/SB_{MSY} : 1.24 (0.91–1.40) SB_{curr}/SB_0 : 0.38 (0.28–0.38)	2008					No new stock assessment was carried out for yellowfin tuna in 2013. Total catch has continued to increase with 368,663 t landed in 2012, a value over previous MSY estimates (344,000 t), in comparison to 327,490 t in 2011 and 300,000 t in 2010. However, catch rates have improved in the purse seine fishery while remaining stable for the Japanese longline fleet. Therefore it is difficult to know whether the stock is moving towards a state of being subject to overfishing. If the provisional catch estimate for 2013 confirms the increasing trend, it may be necessary to carry out a new stock assessment in 2014. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XI

Stock	Indicators	Prev ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	Advice to the Commission
Billfish: These are the billfish stocks being exploitation by industrial and artisanal fisheries throughout the Indian Ocean, both on the high seas and in the EEZ of coastal states. The marlins and sailfish are not usually targeted by most fleets, but are caught and retained as byproduct by the main industrial fisheries. They are important for localised small-scale and artisanal fisheries or as targets in recreational fisheries.							
Swordfish (whole IO) <i>Xiphias gladius</i>	Catch 2012: 26,184 t Average catch 2008–2012: 24,545 t MSY (4 models): 29,900–34,200 t F_{2009}/F_{MSY} (4 models): 0.50–0.63 SB_{2009}/SB_{MSY} (4 models): 1.07–1.59 SB_{2009}/SB_0 (4 models): 0.30–0.53	2007					No new assessment was carried out in 2013. The most recent catch estimate of 26,184 t in 2012 indicate that the stock status is unlikely to have changed. Thus, the stock remains not overfished and not subject to overfishing. However, recent revisions to the catch history for swordfish make it timely for a new stock assessment to be undertaken in 2014. The decrease in longline catch and effort in recent years has lowered the pressure on the Indian Ocean stock as a whole, indicating that current fishing mortality would not reduce the population to an overfished state. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XII
Swordfish (southwest IO) <i>Xiphias gladius</i>	Catch 2012: 6,662 t Average catch 2008–2012: 6,808 t MSY (3 models): 7,100 t–9,400 t F_{2009}/F_{MSY} (3 models): 0.64–1.19 SB_{2009}/SB_{MSY} (3 models): 0.73–1.44 SB_{2009}/SB_0 (3 models): 0.16–0.58						Most of the evidence provided to the WPB indicated that the resource in the southwest Indian Ocean is not a separate genetic stock. However this region has been subject to localised depletion over the past decade and biomass remains below the level that would produce MSY (B_{MSY}). Recent declines in catch and effort have brought fishing mortality rates to levels below F_{MSY} . The catches of swordfish in the southwest Indian Ocean increased in 2010 to 8,099 t, which equals 121.3% of the recommended maximum catch of 6,678 t agreed to by the SC in 2011. If catches are maintained at 2010 levels, the probabilities of violating target reference points in 2013 are less than 34% for F_{MSY} and less than 32% for B_{MSY} . Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XII
Black marlin <i>Makaira indica</i>	Catch 2012: 8,315 t Average catch 2008–2012: 9,417 t MSY (range): 8,605 (6,278–11,793) F_{2011}/F_{MSY} (range): 1.03 (0.15–2.19) B_{2011}/B_{MSY} (range): 1.17 (0.75–1.55) B_{2011}/B_{1950} (range): 0.58 (0.38–0.78)						Data poor methods for stock assessment using Stock reduction analysis (SRA) techniques indicate that the stock is not overfished and close to optimum fishing levels. However, as this is the first time that the WPB used such a method on marlin species, further testing of how sensitive this technique is to model assumptions and available time series of catches needs to be undertaken before the WPB uses it to determine stock status. Thus, the stock status remains uncertain. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XIII
Blue marlin <i>Makaira nigricans</i>	Catch 2012: 13,885 t Average catch 2008–2012: 10,640 t MSY (range): 11,690 (8,023–12,400) F_{2011}/F_{MSY} (range): 0.85 (0.63–1.45) B_{2011}/B_{MSY} (range): 0.98 (0.57–1.18) B_{2011}/B_{1950} (range): 0.48 (na)						In 2013, an ASPIC stock assessment confirmed the preliminary assessment results from 2012 that indicates the stock is currently being exploited at sustainable levels and that the stock is at the optimal biomass level. Two other approaches examined in 2013 came to similar conclusions, namely a Bayesian State Space model, and a data poor stock assessment method, Stock reduction Analysis using only catch data. However, the uncertainty in the data available for assessment purposes and the CPUE series suggests that the advice should be interpreted with caution as the stock may still be in an overfished state (biomass less than B_{MSY}). Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XIV
Striped marlin <i>Tetrapturus audax</i>	Catch 2012: 4,833 t Average catch 2008–2012: 3,011 t MSY (range): 4,408 (3,539–4,578) F_{2011}/F_{MSY} (range): 1.28 (0.95–1.92) B_{2011}/B_{MSY} (range): 0.416 (0.2–0.42) B_{2011}/B_0 (range): 0.18						In 2013, an ASPIC stock assessment confirmed the preliminary assessment results from 2012 that indicates the stock is currently subject to overfishing and that biomass is below the level which would produce MSY. Two other approaches examined in 2013 came to similar conclusions, namely a Bayesian State Space model, and a data poor stock assessment method, Stock Reduction Analysis using only catch data. The Kobe plot from the ASPIC model indicates that the stock has been subject to overfishing for some years, and that as a result, the stock biomass is well below the B_{MSY} level and shows little signs of rebuilding despite the declining effort trend. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XV

Stock	Indicators	Prev ¹	2010	2011	2012	2013	Advice to the Commission
Indo-Pacific Sailfish <i>Istiophorus platypterus</i>	Catch 2012: 28,449 t Average catch 2008–2012: 26,283 t MSY (range): unknown F_{2012}/F_{MSY} (range): unknown SB_{2012}/SB_{MSY} (range): unknown SB_{2012}/SB_0 (range): unknown						No quantitative stock assessment is currently available for Indo-Pacific sailfish in the Indian Ocean; due to a lack of fishery data and poor quality of available data for several gears, only preliminary stock indicators can be used. A data poor approach was pursued by the WPB in 2013, though results were considered preliminary and require further sensitivity analysis. Therefore stock status remains. Click here for full stock status summary: Appendix XVI
Neritic tunas and mackerel: These six species have become as important or more important as the three tropical tuna species (bigeye tuna, skipjack tuna and yellowfin tuna) to most IOTC coastal states with a total estimated catch of 589,774 t being landed in 2012. They are caught primarily by coastal fisheries, including small-scale industrial and artisanal fisheries. They are almost always caught within the EEZs of IO coastal states. Historically, catches were often reported as aggregates of various species, making it difficult to obtain appropriate data for stock assessment analyses.							
Bullet tuna <i>Auxis rochei</i>	Catch 2012: 8,862 t Average catch 2008–2012: 8,468 t MSY (range): unknown						No quantitative stock assessment is currently available for these species in the Indian Ocean, and due to a lack of fishery data for several gears, only preliminary stock indicators can be used. Therefore stock status remains uncertain . However, aspects of the fisheries for these species combined with the lack of data on which to base a more formal assessment are a cause for considerable concern. Click on each species for a full stock status summary: Bullet tuna: Appendix XVII Frigate tuna: Appendix XVIII
Frigate tuna <i>Auxis thazard</i>	Catch 2012: 83,029 t Average catch 2008–2012: 90,221 t MSY (range): unknown						
Kawakawa <i>Euthynnus affinis</i>	Catch 2012: 152,391 t Average catch 2008–2012: 147,951 t MSY (range): unknown						Preliminary analysis using a stock-reduction analysis (SRA) approach indicates that the stock is near optimal levels of F_{MSY} , or exceeding these targets, although stock biomass remains above the level that would produce MSY (B_{MSY}). Due to the quality of the data being used, the simplistic approach used here, and the rapid increase in kawakawa catch in recent years, some measures need to be taken to slow the increase in catches in the IO Region, despite the stock status remaining classified as uncertain . Click for a full stock status summary: Appendix XIX
Longtail tuna <i>Thunnus tonggol</i>	Catch 2011: 155,603 t Average catch 2007–2011: 133,890 t MSY (range): unknown						Stock Reduction Analysis techniques indicate that the stock is being exploited at rates that exceed F_{MSY} in recent years. Whether a four quadrant stock structure of catches in the Indian Ocean or a one stock assumption is used in the analysis, the conclusions remain the same. Given estimated values of current biomass are above the estimated abundance to produce B_{MSY} in 2011, and that fishing mortality has exceeded F_{MSY} values in recent years, the stock is considered to be not overfished , but subject to overfishing . Click for a full stock status summary: Appendix XX
Indo-Pacific king mackerel <i>Scomberomorus guttatus</i>	Catch 2012: 46,234 t Average catch 2008–2012: 47,245 t MSY (range): unknown						No quantitative stock assessment is currently available for this species in the Indian Ocean, and due to a lack of fishery data for several gears, only preliminary stock indicators can be used. Therefore stock status remains uncertain . However, aspects of the fisheries for this species combined with the lack of data on which to base a more formal assessment are a cause for considerable concern. Click for a full stock status summary: Appendix XXI
Narrow-barred Spanish mackerel <i>Scomberomorus commerson</i>	Catch 2012: 136,301 t Average catch 2008–2012: 133,692 t MSY (range): unknown						No quantitative stock assessment is currently available for this species in the Indian Ocean, and due to a lack of fishery data for several gears, only preliminary stock indicators can be used. Therefore stock status remains uncertain . However, aspects of the fisheries for this species combined with the lack of data on which to base a more formal assessment are a cause for considerable concern. Click for a full stock status summary: Appendix XXII

Sharks: Although sharks are not part of the 16 species directly under the IOTC mandate, sharks are frequently caught in association with fisheries targeting IOTC species. Some fleets are known to actively target both sharks and IOTC species simultaneously. As such, IOTC Members and Cooperating non-Contracting Parties are required to report information at the same level of detail as for the 16 IOTC species. The following are the main species caught in IOTC fisheries, although the list is not exhaustive.

Blue shark <i>Prionace glauca</i>	Reported catch 2012: 21,901 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 24,204 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Oceanic whitetip shark <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	Reported catch 2012: 412 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 292 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Scalloped hammerhead shark <i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	Reported catch 2012: 80 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 74 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Shortfin mako <i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>	Reported catch 2012: 1,426 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 1,300 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Silky shark <i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	Reported catch 2012: 4,177 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 3,443 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Bigeye thresher shark <i>Alopias superciliosus</i>	Reported catch 2012: 465 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 98 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						
Pelagic thresher shark <i>Alopias pelagicus</i>	Reported catch 2012: 328 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 42,793 t Average reported catch 2008–2012: 76 t Not elsewhere included (nei) sharks: 48,708 t MSY (range): unknown						

There is a paucity of information available for these species and this situation is not expected to improve in the short to medium term. There is no quantitative stock assessment and limited basic fishery indicators currently available. Therefore the stock status is highly uncertain. The available evidence indicates considerable risk to the stock status at current effort levels. The primary source of data that drive the assessment (total catches) is highly uncertain and should be investigated further as a priority. Click below for a full stock status summary:

- Blue sharks – [Appendix XXIII](#)
- Oceanic whitetip sharks – [Appendix XXIV](#)
- Scalloped hammerhead sharks – [Appendix XXV](#)
- Shortfin mako sharks – [Appendix XXVI](#)
- Silky sharks – [Appendix XXVII](#)
- Bigeye thresher sharks – [Appendix XXVIII](#)
- Pelagic thresher sharks – [Appendix XXIX](#)

¹ This indicates the last year taken into account for assessments carried out before 2010

² The point estimate is the median of the plausible models investigated in the 2013 SS3 assessment

³ most recent years data 2010; ⁴ most recent years data 2011

Colour key	Stock overfished ($SB_{year}/SB_{MSY} < 1$)	Stock not overfished ($SB_{year}/SB_{MSY} \geq 1$)
Stock subject to overfishing ($F_{year}/F_{MSY} > 1$)		
Stock not subject to overfishing ($F_{year}/F_{MSY} \leq 1$)		
Not assessed/Uncertain		

APPENDIX VII**STATEMENTS OF MAURITIUS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM (OT)**

“The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reaffirms that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” (“BIOT”) which the United Kingdom purported to create by illegally excising the Chagos Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius prior to its accession to independence. This excision was carried out in violation of international law and United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, 2066 (XX) of 16 December 1965, 2232 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 and 2357 (XXII) of 19 December 1967.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius reiterates that the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius under both Mauritian law and international law. The Republic of Mauritius is, however, being prevented from exercising its rights over the Chagos Archipelago because of the de facto and unlawful control of the United Kingdom over the Archipelago.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius does not recognize the existence of the ‘marine protected area’ which the United Kingdom has purported to establish around the Chagos Archipelago in breach of international law, including the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). On 20 December 2010, Mauritius initiated proceedings against the United Kingdom under Article 287 of, and Annex VII to, UNCLOS to challenge the legality of the ‘marine protected area’. The dispute is currently before the Arbitral Tribunal constituted under Annex VII to UNCLOS.

In the light of the above, consideration of any documents which the United Kingdom has purported to submit to this Committee in respect of the Chagos Archipelago or which purport to refer to the Chagos Archipelago as the so-called “BIOT”, as well as any action or decision that may be taken on the basis of such documents, cannot and should not be construed as implying that the United Kingdom has sovereignty or analogous rights over the Chagos Archipelago.”

“The UK has no doubt about its sovereignty over the British Indian Ocean Territory which was ceded to Britain in 1814 and has been a British dependency ever since. As the UK Government has reiterated on many occasions, we have undertaken to cede the Territory to Mauritius when it is no longer needed for defence purposes.”

APPENDIX VIII

LIST OF CHAIRS, VICE-CHAIRS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE TERMS FOR THE COMMISSION AND SUBSIDIARY BODIES

Group	Chair/Vice-Chair	Chair	CPC/Affiliation	1 st Term commencement date	Term expiration date (End date is until replacement is elected)	Comments
Commission	Chair	Mr. Daroomalingum Mauree	Mauritius	21-Apr-11	End of Com. in 2015	2nd term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Ahmed Mohammed Al-Mazroui	Oman	10-May-13	End of Com. in 2015	1st term
	Vice-Chair	Mr Jeongseok Park	Rep. of Korea	10-May-13	End of Com. in 2015	1st term
CoC	Chair	Mr. Herminio Tembe	Mozambique	4-May-13	End of CoC in 2015	1 st term
	Vice-Chair	Mr. Hosea Gonza Mbilinyi	Tanzania	4-May-13	End of CoC in 2015	1 st term
SCAF	Chair	Dr. Benjamin Tabios	Philippines	31-May-14	End of SCAF in 2016	1 st term
	Vice-Chair	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant
TCAC	Chair	Mr. Daroomalingum Mauree	Mauritius	21-Apr-11	End of Com. in 2014	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant	Vacant
SC	Chair	Dr Tsutomu Nishida	Japan	17-Dec-11	End of SC in 2015	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Mr Jan Robinson	Seychelles	17-Dec-11	End of SC in 2015	2 nd term
WPB	Chair	Dr Jerome Bourjea	EU,France	08-Jul-11	End of WPB in 2015	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Miguel Santos	EU,Portugal	08-Jul-11	End of WPB in 2015	2 nd term
WPTmT	Chair	Dr Zang Geun Kim	Korea, Rep. of	22-Sep-11	End of WPTmT in 2014	1 st term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Takayuki Matsumoto	Japan	06-Sep-12	End of WPTmT in 2014	1 st term
WPTT	Chair	Dr Hilario Murua	EU,Spain	25-Oct-10	End of WPTT in 2014	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Shiham Adam	Maldives, Rep. of	23-Oct-11	End of WPTT in 2015	2 nd term
WPEB	Chair	Dr Rui Coelho	EU,Portugal	16-Sept-13	End of WPEB in 2015	1 st term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Evgeny Romanov	EU,France	27-Oct-11	End of WPEB in 2015	2 nd term
WPNT	Chair	Dr Prathibha Rohit	India	27-Nov-11	End of WPNT in 2015	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Farhad Kaymaram	I.R. Iran	27-Nov-11	End of WPNT in 2015	2 nd term
WPDCS	Chair	Dr Emmanuel Chassot	EU,France	30-Nov-13	End of WPDCS in 2015	1st term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Pierre Chavance	EU,France	10-Dec-11	End of WPDCS in 2015	2 nd term
WPM	Chair	Dr Iago Mosqueira	EU,Spain	18-Dec-11	End of WPM in 2015	2 nd term
	Vice-Chair	Dr Toshihide Kitakado	Japan	18-Dec-11	End of WPM in 2015	2 nd term
WPFC	Chair	Not active	Not active	Not active	Not active	Not active
	Vice-Chair	Not active	Not active	Not active	Not active	Not active

APPENDIX IX

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE (26–28 MAY 2014) TO THE COMMISSION

Note: Appendix reference refer to the Report of the 11th Session of the Compliance Committee (IOTC-2014-CoC11-R)

National Reports on the Progress of Implementation of Conservation and Management Measures

- CoC11.01 ([para. 21](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs who have not submitted their national ‘Reports of Implementation’ for 2014 should do so as soon as possible. The Chair of the CoC, with the assistance of the IOTC Secretariat shall follow-up with each such CPC to ensure a national ‘Reports of Implementation’ is submitted for publication on the IOTC website and to inform CPCs via an IOTC Circular once each is received.
- CoC11.02 ([para. 36](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission agree to the development and distribution of letters of feedback by the IOTC Chair, highlighting areas of non-compliance to relevant CPCs, together with the difficulties and challenges being faced.
- CoC11.03 ([para. 37](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider developing follow-up actions on the issues contained in the letters of feedback, including potential capacity building activities to address these matters, particularly for developing coastal States.
- CoC11.04 ([para. 38](#)) **NOTING** that there are practical limitations of time prior to the CoC meeting for the Secretariat to prepare, and CPCs to review the country compliance reports, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider as a basis for discussion, the text contained in [Appendix V](#).
- CoC11.05 ([para. 39](#)) **NOTING** that there are 10 carrier vessels operating under the ROP that are flagged to a non-CPC of the IOTC (Panama), the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that vessels involved in at-sea transshipment operations flagged to non-CPCs shall not be allowed to operate in the IOTC area of competence.

Review of Additional Information Related to IUU Fishing Activities in the IOTC Area of Competence

SHUEN SIANG

- CoC11.06 ([para. 45](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider adding the *SHUEN SIANG* on the IOTC IUU Vessels List, as permitted under Resolution 11/03 para. 12.

HOOM XIANG 101, HOOM XIANG 103 and HOOM XIANG 105

- CoC11.07 ([para. 48](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider adding the *HOOM XIANG 101*; *HOOM XIANG 103* and *HOOM XIANG 105* on the IOTC IUU Vessels List.

Follow-up actions on the decisions of the 17th Session of the Commission

- CoC11.08 ([para. 57](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that Sri Lanka continues to provide monthly reports for vessels found guilty of IUU activities in UK(OT) waters over the past 3 years (i.e. since 2011).
- CoC11.09 ([para. 58](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that in November 2014, Sri Lanka provides to the IOTC Secretariat for circulation to the Commission, a further six monthly update on the implementation of their Roadmap of activities for combating IUU fishing. Details, such as copies of the amended High Seas Fishing Act, should be made available immediately.

Identification of possible infringements under the Regional observer programme

- CoC11.10 ([para. 69](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that those CPCs identified in paper IOTC-2014-CoC11-08c Rev_1 and Add_1, a summary of possible infractions of IOTC regulations by large-scale fishing vessels (LSTLVs/carrier vessels), which have not submitted any response to the Committee investigate and report back to the IOTC via the Secretariat, the findings of their investigations, within three months of the end of the 18th Session of the Commission, by submitting reports on the follow-up on the irregularities identified. In order to assist with the comprehensive evaluation of any alleged infringement, copies of the logbooks, VMS plots, licenses and any other relevant documents should be provided by the flag States, as necessary.
- CoC11.11 ([para. 71](#)) **NOTING** the confusion among many CPCs regarding what certain terms mean, the CoC **RECOMMENDED** that there should be a requirement for all Conservation and Management

Measures to use a set of clear definitions. The Compendium Working Group should develop the definitions for them to be added to the IOTC website and the Compendium of CMMs.

Review of the Provisional IUU Vessels List and of the Information Submitted by CPCs Relating to Illegal Fishing Activities in the IOTC Area of Competence – Res. 11/03

OCEAN LION (Flag unknown)

CoC11.12 ([para. 74](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *Ocean Lion* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

YU MAAN WON (Flag unknown)

CoC11.13 ([para. 76](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *Yu Maan Won* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

GUNUAR MELYAN 21 (Flag unknown)

CoC11.14 ([para. 78](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *Gunuar Melyan 21* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

HOOM XIANG II (Flag unknown)

CoC11.15 ([para. 80](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *Hoom Xiang II* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

FU HSIANG FA No. 21 (Flag unknown)

CoC11.16 ([para. 82](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *FU HSIANG FA No. 21* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

FULL RICH (Flag unknown)

CoC11.17 ([para. 84](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the *FULL RICH* remain on the IOTC IUU Vessels List as no further information was provided to the CoC11 during its deliberations.

Vessels with flag unknown

CoC11.18 ([para. 87](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider adding the vessels detailed in [para. 86](#) on the IOTC IUU Vessels List, as permitted under Resolution 11/03 para. 12.

[from [para. 86](#)]

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| a) FU HSIANG FA NO. 01 | (Flag unknown) |
| b) FU HSIANG FA NO. 02 | (Flag unknown) |
| c) FU HSIANG FA NO. 06 | (Flag unknown) |
| d) FU HSIANG FA NO. 08 | (Flag unknown) |
| e) FU HSIANG FA NO. 09 | (Flag unknown) |
| f) FU HSIANG FA NO. 11 | (Flag unknown) |
| g) FU HSIANG FA NO. 13 | (Flag unknown) |
| h) FU HSIANG FA NO. 17 | (Flag unknown) |
| i) FU HSIANG FA NO. 21 | (Flag unknown) |
| j) FU HSIANG FA NO. 23 | (Flag unknown) |
| k) FU HSIANG FA NO. 26 | (Flag unknown) |
| l) FU HSIANG FA NO. 30 | (Flag unknown) |
| m) SRI FU FA 18 | (Flag unknown) |
| n) SRI FU FA 67 | (Flag unknown) |
| o) SRI FU FA 168 | (Flag unknown) |
| p) SRI FU FA 188 | (Flag unknown) |
| q) SRI FU FA 189 | (Flag unknown) |
| r) SRI FU FA 286 | (Flag unknown) |
| s) SRI FU FA 888 | (Flag unknown) |
| t) FU HSIANG FA NO. 20 | (Flag unknown) |

QIAN YUAN (Flagged to Cambodia)

CoC11.19 ([para. 93](#)) The CoC was unable to reach a conclusion and therefore, **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider whether the vessel *QIAN YUAN* be retained on the Provisional IUU Vessels List, as provided under Resolution 11/03 para. 14, until such an investigation and until further information is provided, and in the absence of these requirement the vessel should be moved onto the IOTC IUU Vessels List.

CoC11.20 ([para. 94](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat contact Cambodia to ask that they apply to become a Contracting Party of the IOTC and register its carrier vessels that are supplying fishing vessels listed on the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels and fishing in the IOTC area of competence.

MAAN YIH FENG (Flagged to Taiwan, Province of China)

CoC11.21 ([para. 98](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider retaining the *MAAN YIH FENG* on the Provisional IUU Vessels List, as provided under Resolution 11/03 para. 14, until sanctions of adequate severity have been applied and until an investigation is conducted and the report received. In the absence of these requirements the vessel should be moved onto the IUU list.

Review of FAD management plans

CoC11.22 ([para. 107](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat shall undertake an analysis of compliance with the requirements of Resolution 13/08 and to present it at each Session of the CoC.

Review of options for a regional high-seas boarding and inspection scheme for the IOTC area

CoC11.23 ([para. 110](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** the creation of either an informal, inter-sessional working group to discuss further the ‘*Regional high-seas boarding and inspection*’ scheme involving interested CPCs, or via the proposed Working Party on Compliance (IOTC–2014–S18–PropQ), if adopted by the Commission, in order to develop the guideline further and subsequent proposal for a Conservation and Management Measure. If a separate working group is formed, then the group should meet, to the extent possible, via electronic means to minimise costs.

CoC11.24 ([para. 113](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that all CPCs inform fishing vessel owners, companies and agents of the advisability of reporting intention to transit through another CPCs waters, and to provide details of the reporting formats, such as that for UK(OT) contained in Circular 2013–51.

CoC11.25 ([para. 114](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that all CPCs inform fishing vessel owners, companies and agents of the requirements to comply with IOTC CMMs and to include this within terms and conditions of licencing and fisheries legislation.

CoC11.26 ([para. 115](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that all IOTC coastal State enforcement bodies consider completing a common ‘Reporting Form for Activity Not Compliant with IOTC Resolutions’ for any inspections carried out on board vessels in transit through their waters, and report a summary of this to IOTC Secretariat for the CoC, at least annually.

CoC11.27 ([para. 116](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that as part of its review and consolidation of IOTC CMMs the Commission should revise all relevant CMMs such that they apply to any vessel, irrespective of its size, registered on the IOTC Record of Vessels which operate in the IOTC area of competence and which fish outside their national fisheries jurisdiction for species covered by the IOTC Agreement.

Update on Progress Regarding the Performance Review – Compliance related issues

CoC11.28 ([para. 125](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the current status of implementation for each of the recommendations arising from the Report of the IOTC Performance Review Panel, relevant to the CoC, as provided in [Appendix VIII](#).

Activities by the Secretariat in Support of Capacity Building for Developing CPCs

CoC11.29 ([para. 129](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider its continued support of the work of the Secretariat in 2014/15, to allow it to undertake additional capacity building missions to improve the implementation of CMMs by IOTC Members, and to consider further developing the plan of work for 2014/15.

CoC11.30 ([para. 130](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** the need to identify the root causes of non-compliance.

Review of Requests for Access to the Status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party

Senegal

CoC11.31 ([para. 134](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers renewing the status of Senegal as a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC.

Bangladesh

CoC11.32 ([para. 136](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers the application by Bangladesh for the status of a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC–2014–CoC110–CNCP02) at its 18th Session.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

CoC11.33 ([para. 138](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers the application by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC–2014–CoC11–CNCP03) at its 18th Session.

Djibouti

CoC11.34 ([para. 140](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers granting Djibouti the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party.

South Africa, Republic of

CoC11.35 ([para. 142](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission considers the application by South Africa for the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party of the IOTC (IOTC–2014–CoC11–CNCP05) at its 18th Session.

Date and place of the 12th Session of the Compliance Committee

CoC11.36 ([para. 144](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the next 12th Session of the CoC be held immediately prior to the 19th Session of the Commission. The exact dates and location would be decided by the Commission at its 18th Session.

Adoption of the Report of the 11th Session of the Compliance Committee

CoC11.37 ([para. 145](#)) The CoC **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from CoC11, provided at [Appendix IX](#).

APPENDIX XA
IOTC IUU VESSELS LIST (JUNE 2014)

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on IOTC IUU Vessels List	Lloyds/ IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous owners)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities
FU HSIANG FA NO. 01	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 02	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 06	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 08	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 09	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 11	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 13	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 17	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 20	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 21¹	Unknown	May 2013		Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2013-CoC10-07 Rev1[E]	OTS 024 or OTS 089	Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02
FU HSIANG FA NO. 21¹	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03

¹ No information on whether the two vessels **FU HSIANG FA NO. 21** are the same vessels.

IOTC-2014-S18-R[E]

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on IOTC IUU Vessels List	Lloyds/ IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous owners)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities
FU HSIANG FA NO. 23	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 26	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FU HSIANG FA NO. 30	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
FULL RICH	Unknown (Belize)	May 2013		Yes. Refer to report IOTC-2013-CoC10- 08a[E]	HMEK3	Noel International LTD (Noel International LTD)	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02
GUNUAR MELYAN 21	Unknown	June 2008				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02
HOOM XIANG 101	(Malaysia)	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
HOOM XIANG 103	(Malaysia)	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
HOOM XIANG 105	(Malaysia)	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
HOOM XIANG II	Unknown (Malaysia)	March 2010		Yes. Refer to report IOTC-S14-CoC13- add1[E]		Hoom Xiang Industries Sdn. Bhd.	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 09/03
OCEAN LION	Unknown (Equatorial Guinea)	June 2005	7826233			Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 02/04, 02/05, 03/05.
SHUEN SIANG	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 168	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 18	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on IOTC IUU Vessels List	Lloyds/ IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous owners)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities
SRI FU FA 188	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 189	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 286	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 67	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
SRI FU FA 888	Unknown	June 2014				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03
YU MAAN WON	Unknown (Georgia)	May 2007				Unknown	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 07/02

APPENDIX XB
PROVISIONAL IOTC IUU VESSELS LIST (JUNE 2014)

Current name of vessel (previous names)	Current flag (previous flags)	Date first included on IOTC IUU Vessels List	Lloyds/IMO number	Photo	Call sign (previous call signs)	Owner / beneficial owners (previous owners)	Operator (previous operators)	Summary of IUU activities
MAAN YIH FENG	Taiwan, Province of China	Not Applicable			BJ4377	LIANG JI PING	Unknown	Contravention of IOTC Resolution 11/03

APPENDIX XI
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 11TH SESSION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE (29 AND 31 MAY, 2014) TO THE COMMISSION

Note: Appendix reference refer to the Report of the 11th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (IOTC–2014–SCAF11–R)

Financial Statement

SCAF11–01 ([para. 11](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat request FAO Finance to report remittance advices from IOTC Membership to the Secretariat in real time, without delay and for Membership to label all remittances with an ‘IOTC’ reference and send a copy to the Secretariat in order to prevent delays in the transfer of funds to the IOTC’s account.

Programme of Work and Budget Estimates for 2014, 2015 and 2016

SCAF11–02 ([para. 34](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the ICRU related charges, applied by the FAO, be eliminated from the IOTC current and future expenditure accounts, and that the Chair of the Commission communicate this decision to FAO.

SCAF11–03 ([para. 38](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission direct the Scientific Committee to provide its work plan on a multi-year basis, with project priorities clearly identified. In doing so, the SC should consider the immediate and longer term needs of the Commission.

SCAF11–04 ([para. 41](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that capacity building activities, including workshops on science (stock assessment), compliance with IOTC CMMs, data collection and reporting, and bridging the gap between IOTC science and management advice, be continued in 2014 and financially supported through the IOTC budget and through voluntary contributions from Members and other interested parties.

SCAF11–05 ([para. 46](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission endorse the IOTC Secretariat’s programme of work for the financial period 01 January, 2014 to 31 December 2015, as outlined in paper IOTC–2014–SCAF11–05.

SCAF11–06 ([para. 47](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission adopt the budget for, and the scheme of contributions for 2014 and 2015 as outlined in [Appendix IV](#) and [Appendix V](#) respectively, with the understanding that areas of potential savings continue to be explored.

SCAF11–07 ([para. 48](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note that the programme of work for the IOTC Secretariat is based on the assumption that the nature and extent of the activities undertaken by the Secretariat will remain within the current scope. Any new activities agreed to during the 18th Session of the Commission (S18) that are likely to have budgetary consequences, will require an amendment of the figures presented to, and endorsed by the Commission.

SCAF11–08 ([para. 49](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that an analysis of the cost and the benefits of IOTC’s existence within and outside of FAO’s structure be undertaken to ascertain the viability of IOTC breaking from the UN administrative structure and mandate.

Performance Review Update (Resolution 09/01 on the performance review follow-up)

SCAF11–09 ([para. 53](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission note the current status of implementation for each of the recommendations arising from the Report of the IOTC Performance Review Panel, relevant to the SCAF, as provided in [Appendix VI](#).

Other Business

Options for replenishing the IOTC Meeting participation fund Recommendation/s

SCAF11–10 ([para. 56](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Secretariat seek voluntary contributions from Members and other interested groups to supplement the MPF.

SCAF11–11 ([para. 57](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the rules of procedure for the administration of the IOTC MPF be modified to exclude funding for Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, as they currently do not contribute to the IOTC budget.

SCAF11–12 ([para. 58](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the MPF is budgeted every year and priorities could be set on the use of available funds.

Membership of Sierra Leone and Guinea in the IOTC

SCAF11–13 ([para. 62](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider paper IOTC–2014–SCAF11–10 (Membership of Sierra Leone and Guinea in the IOTC) as the SCAF was unable to agree on a course of action.

Contributions outstanding

SCAF11–14 ([para. 71](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the IOTC Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Commission, to conduct bilateral discussion with the I.R. Iran with a view to find a mutually satisfactory method to recover the outstanding contributions and to detail a plan of action for payment to Membership.

SCAF11–15 ([para. 72](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that CPCs that did not reply to the communications sent by the Chair of the Commission, regarding the payment of outstanding contributions shall not benefit from any IOTC related activities in regard to MPF, workshops, training and related support. CPCs in arrears for more than five years and have no interim payment should not benefit from any IOTC related activities, with the exception of I.R. Iran on the basis of the difficulties highlighted in para 69.

SCAF11–16 ([para. 73](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that all Members with overdue IOTC contributions finalise payment of those contributions as soon as possible so as not to hinder the operation of the IOTC. To facilitate this process, the Chair of the Commission, with the assistance of the Secretariat and the FAO Legal Department, shall conduct bilateral discussion with each of the CPCs with contributions in arrears totaling more than the previous two years, with a view to recover the outstanding contributions and further assess their interest of continued involvement in the IOTC.. Responses from those CPCs should be circulated by the Secretariat to all CPCs for consideration at the 12th Session of the SCAF.

Election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for the next biennium

SCAF11–17 ([para. 75](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission confirms the election of the new Chair (Mr. Benjamin Tabios, Philippines) and Vice-Chair Mr. Bojrazsingh Boyramboli (Mauritius) of the SCAF for the next biennium.

Date and Place of the 12th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance

SCAF11–18 ([para. 77](#)) Following a discussion on who would host the 12th Session of the SCAF in 2015, the SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the 12th Session of the SCAF be held for two days, prior to the Commission meeting in 2015. The exact dates and location would be decided by the Commission.

Review of the Draft and Adoption of the Report of the 11th Session of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance

SCAF11–19 ([para. 78](#)) The SCAF **RECOMMENDED** that the Commission consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from SCAF11, provided at [Appendix VII](#).

APPENDIX XII
BUDGET FOR 2014/15 AND INDICATIVE BUDGET FOR 2016 (IN USD)

Budget item description		2013 Actual Expenditures	2014	2015	2016
<u>Administrative Expenditures</u>					
Gross salary costs (before deductions)					
Professional					
	Executive Secretary	157,435	160,787	167,219	173,907
	Deputy Secretary / Science Manager	133,530	142,814	146,103	151,947
	Fishery Officer (Data Coordinator)	138,860	147,290	153,181	159,308
	Fishery Officer (Compliance Coordinator)	105,909	112,901	117,417	122,114
	Fishery Officer (Stock Assessment)	127,367	135,005	140,405	146,022
	Fishery Officer (Compliance)	119,413	125,448	130,466	135,685
	Fishery Officer (Statistics)	89,852	95,892	99,728	103,717
	Fishery Officer (Science)	15,028	70,214	97,363	101,258
	Administrative Officer	49,104	100,749	104,779	108,970
	Compliance Officer	0	0	0	55,000
General Service					
	Administrative Assistant	12,143	12,420	12,927	13,445
	Compliance Assistant	12,777	10,852	9,664	10,050
	Programme Assistant	11,175	12,812	11,296	11,747
	Database Assistant	13,411	9,284	13,335	13,869
	Bilingual Secretary	6,766	6,914	7,172	7,459
	Driver	6,961	6,988	7,274	7,565
	Overtime	3,294	5,250	5,460	5,678
	Total Salary costs	1,003,024	1,155,619	1,223,789	1,327,740
	Employer contributions to Pension Fund and health insurance	283,363	309,403	321,780	354,651
	Employer contribution to FAO entitlement fund	478,683	546,951	568,829	606,582
	Improved Cost Recovery Uplift		124,036	131,006	142,556
	Total staff costs	1,765,069	2,136,009	2,245,403	2,431,529
Expenditure for Activities					
<u>Operating Expenditures</u>					
	Support Capacity Building	74,743	111,000	115,000	115,000
	Consultants	73,746	102,000	145,500	150,000
	Duty travel	205,473	181,471	191,400	200,000
	Meetings	166,438	46,235	55,000	70,000
	Interpretation	139,748	101,000	120,000	135,000
	Translation	91,063	101,783	105,000	115,000
	Equipment	22,407	15,775	16,500	25,000
	General Operating Expenses	47,238	61,500	69,300	77,000
	Printing	20,505	31,385	23,100	33,000
	Contingencies	5,432	6,000	6,600	8,000
	MPF	-	60,000	60,000	60,000
	Total Operating Expenditure	846,793	818,149	907,400	988,000
	SUB-TOTAL	2,611,862	2,977,658	3,152,803	3,419,529
	Additional Contrib. Seychelles	-19,714	-20,100	-20,100	-20,100
	FAO Servicing Costs	117,343	132,937	141,876	153,879
	GRAND TOTAL	2,709,491	3,066,995	3,274,579	3,553,308

APPENDIX XIII

SCHEME OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR 2014

Country	World Bank Classification in 2011	OECD Membership	Average catch for 2009- 2011 (in metric tons)	Base Contribution	Operations Contribution	GNP Contribution	Catch Contribution	Total Contribution
Australia	High	Yes	5,385	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$111,527	\$14,140	\$147,674
Belize	Middle	No	216	\$9,739	\$0	\$27,882	\$113	\$37,734
China	Middle	No	65,394	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$34,344	\$84,233
Comoros	Low	No	5,328	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$2,798	\$24,805
Eritrea	Low	No	962	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$505	\$22,512
European Community	High	Yes	203,172	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$111,527	\$533,513	\$667,047
France(Terr)	High	Yes	0	\$9,739	\$0	\$111,527	\$0	\$121,266
Guinea	Low	No	497	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$261	\$22,268
India	Middle	No	143,708	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$75,473	\$125,362
Indonesia	Middle	No	356,862	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$187,418	\$237,307
Iran, Islamic Republic of	Middle	No	168,437	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$88,460	\$138,349
Japan	High	Yes	19,901	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$111,527	\$52,259	\$185,793
Kenya	Low	No	767	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$403	\$22,410
Korea, Republic of	High	Yes	2,196	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$111,527	\$5,768	\$139,302
Madagascar	Low	No	8,650	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$4,543	\$26,550
Malaysia	Middle	No	26,498	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$13,916	\$63,805
Maldives	Middle	No	98,100	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$51,521	\$101,409
Mauritius	Middle	No	774	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$406	\$50,295
Mozambique	Low	No	2,813	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$1,478	\$23,484
Oman	High	No	19,988	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$111,527	\$10,498	\$144,032
Pakistan	Middle	No	52,940	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$27,803	\$77,692
Philippines	Middle	No	636	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$334	\$50,223
Seychelles	Middle	No	75,911	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$39,867	\$89,756
Sierra Leone	Low	No	0	\$9,739	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,739
Somalia	Low	No	0	\$4,792	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,792
Sri Lanka	Middle	No	96,165	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$50,504	\$100,393
Sudan	Middle	No	34	\$9,739	\$0	\$27,882	\$18	\$37,638
Tanzania	Low	No	4,382	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$0	\$2,301	\$24,308
Thailand	Middle	No	20,964	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$11,010	\$60,899
United Kingdom(Terr)	High	Yes	18	\$9,739	\$0	\$111,527	\$47	\$121,313
Vanuatu	Middle	No	179	\$9,739	\$0	\$27,882	\$94	\$37,715
Yemen	Middle	No	32,374	\$9,739	\$12,268	\$27,882	\$17,002	\$66,891
Total				306,700	306,700	1,226,798	1,226,798	3,066,995

*Total contributions may vary from the sum of the four components by up to one dollar due to rounding.

SCHEME OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR 2015 (USD)

Country	World Bank Classification in 2012	OECD Membership	Average catch for 2010-2012 (in metric tons)	Base Contribution	Operations Contribution	GNP Contribution	Catch Contribution	Total Contribution (in USD)
Australia	High	Yes	5,164	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$119,076	\$14,519	\$157,472
Belize	Middle	No	326	\$10,233	\$0	\$29,769	\$183	\$40,185
China	Middle	No	67,548	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$37,985	\$91,631
Comoros	Low	No	5,164	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$2,904	\$26,781
Eritrea	Low	No	837	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$471	\$24,348
European Community	High	Yes	199,224	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$119,076	\$560,159	\$703,112
France(Terr)	High	Yes	0	\$10,233	\$0	\$119,076	\$0	\$129,309
Guinea	Low	No	221	\$10,233	\$0	\$0	\$124	\$10,358
India	Middle	No	158,598	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$89,186	\$142,832
Indonesia	Middle	No	339,306	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$190,805	\$244,451
Iran, Islamic Republic of	Middle	No	184,879	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$103,965	\$157,611
Japan	High	Yes	16,479	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$119,076	\$46,334	\$189,287
Kenya	Low	No	658	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$370	\$24,247
Korea, Republic of	High	Yes	2,774	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$119,076	\$7,799	\$150,752
Madagascar	Low	No	8,712	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$4,899	\$28,776
Malaysia	Middle	No	28,188	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$15,851	\$69,497
Maldives	Middle	No	99,976	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$56,221	\$109,867
Mauritius	Middle	No	587	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$330	\$53,976
Mozambique	Low	No	3,680	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$2,069	\$25,946
Oman	High	No	23,690	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$119,076	\$13,322	\$156,274
Pakistan	Middle	No	55,573	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$31,251	\$84,897
Philippines	Middle	No	1,219	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$686	\$54,332
Seychelles	Middle	No	72,418	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$40,723	\$94,369
Sierra Leone	Low	No	0	\$10,233	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,233
Somalia	Low	No	0	\$10,233	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,233
Sri Lanka	Middle	No	100,739	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$56,650	\$110,296
Sudan	Middle	No	34	\$10,233	\$0	\$29,769	\$19	\$40,021
Tanzania	Low	No	6,433	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$0	\$3,617	\$27,495
Thailand	Middle	No	15,801	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$8,886	\$62,532
United Kingdom(Terr)	High	Yes	12	\$10,233	\$0	\$119,076	\$34	\$129,343
Vanuatu	Middle	No	190	\$10,233	\$0	\$29,769	\$107	\$40,109
Yemen	Middle	No	36,209	\$10,233	\$13,644	\$29,769	\$20,362	\$74,008
			Total	327,458	327,458	1,309,832	1,309,832	3,274,579

APPENDIX XIV INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION: RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014)

INDIAN OCEAN TUNA COMMISSION: RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014)

RULE I: DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of these Rules of Procedure, the following definitions apply:

Agreement: the Agreement for the Establishment of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission, approved by the FAO Council at its Hundred-and-Fifth Session in November 1993, and entered into force on 27 March 1996.

Commission: the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.

Conference: the Conference of the Organization.

Conservation and Management Measure (CMM): as specified in Article IX of the Agreement, CMMs consist of Resolutions, which are binding on Members, subject to Article IX para 5 of the IOTC Agreement, and Recommendations, which are non-binding, subject to Article IX para 8 of the Agreement.

Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs): Consisting of Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties.

Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (CNCP): any non-Member of the Commission, which voluntarily ensures that vessels flying its flag fish in a manner which conforms with the Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the IOTC and have completed the application process to become a Cooperating Non-contracting Party to the IOTC, as detailed in Appendix IV, and which the Commission has endorsed.

Council: the Council of the Organization.

Delegate: the representative of a Member as specified in Article VI.1 of the Agreement, or a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party as endorsed by the Commission.

Delegation: the delegate and his/her alternates, experts and/or advisers.

Director-General: the Director-General of the Organization.

Executive Secretary: the Secretary of the Commission, as specified and defined in Article VIII of the Agreement.

Information paper: documents which do not require a decision or conclusion to be developed, and which are provided purely for information purposes.

Members: Members of the Commission as specified in Article IV of the Agreement.

Observer Nations: Members of FAO which are not members of the Commission attending Sessions of the Commission as observers in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 1 of the Agreement.

Observer Associate Members: Associate Members of FAO which are not members of the Commission attending Sessions of the Commission as observers in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 1 of the Agreement.

Observer Non-member States of FAO: Non-member States of FAO which are not members of the Commission, but are members of the United Nations, any of its specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency, attending Sessions of the Commission as observers in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 2 of the Agreement.

Observer Intergovernmental Organizations: Intergovernmental Organizations attending Sessions of the Commission as observers in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 3 of the Agreement.

Observer Non-governmental Organizations: Non-governmental Organizations attending Sessions of the Commission as observers in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 3 of the Agreement.

Observer: the representative of an Observer Nation, Observer Associate Member, Observer Non- member State of FAO, Observer Intergovernmental Organization or Observer Non-governmental Organization.

Organization: the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Recommendations: Conservation and Management Measures which are non-binding on Members of the Commission, subject to Article IX, para 8 of the Agreement.

Resolutions: Conservation and Management Measures which are binding on Members of the Commission, subject to Article IX, para 1 to 7 of the Agreement.

Scientific Committee: the permanent committee provided for in Article XII.1 of the Agreement.

Session: Any meeting of the Commission or its subsidiary bodies.

Working paper: any document which requires the direct attention of the Commission or subsidiary body to develop conclusions and/or decisions.

RULE II: SESSIONS OF THE COMMISSION

1. In accordance with Article VI.4 of the Agreement, the regular Sessions of the Commission shall be held once a year. They shall be convened by the Chairperson of the Commission.
2. In pursuance with Article VI.5 of the Agreement, during intervals between regular Sessions, the Chairperson of the Commission may convene special Sessions of the Commission, if so requested by at least one third of its Members.
3. The dates of the Sessions shall be determined by the Commission.
4. Should a Session of the Commission be held in a place which is not the seat of the Commission, the Director-General, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXXVII.4 of the General Rules of the Organization, should, before that Session be convened, be assured that the Government hosting the Session is willing to grant to all delegates, alternates, experts, advisers, observers and members of the Secretariat of the Commission and of the Secretariat of the Organization and other persons entitled to attend such Session, the privileges and immunities that are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Session.
5. Invitations to a regular Session of the Commission shall be prepared by the Executive Secretary and issued by the Chairperson of the Commission not less than 90 days in advance of the date fixed for the opening of the Session. Invitations to special Sessions shall be issued not less than 30 days in advance of the date fixed for the opening of the Session.

RULE III: CREDENTIALS

1. At each Session the Executive Secretary shall receive the Letter of Credentials of each delegation issued by, or on behalf of, the Head of state, the head of government, the minister for foreign affairs or the minister concerned, indicating clearly the head of delegation and the alternate, as well as the list of advisors and experts who will be part of the delegation. Such Letter of Credentials shall conform to the standard set out in [Appendix I](#). The Executive Secretary shall report to the Commission the Letter of Credentials received and recommendations for any action if required.

RULE IV: AGENDA

1. A provisional agenda for each regular Session of the Commission shall be drawn up by the Executive Secretary and sent to the Members following the approval of the Chairperson. The provisional agenda will also be sent to the Observer Nations and Observer Associate Members, which attended the previous regular Session of the Commission or have requested to attend the next Session. It shall be sent not less than sixty days before the date of the Session, together with the reports and documents available in connection with the Session.
2. For Observer Non-member States of FAO, Observer Intergovernmental Organizations or Observer Non-governmental Organizations, such information shall be sent if a decision to invite them to attend the Session of the Commission has already been taken. In accordance with Rule XIII.10, invitations will also be sent to intergovernmental organizations or institutions having concluded with the Commission, under Article XV of the Agreement, an agreement formally providing for the participation of these organizations and institutions in Commission Sessions.
3. The Executive Secretary shall send a provisional agenda with comments, including any proposal by members, not less than thirty days before the Session.
4. The provisional agenda of the regular Sessions shall include:
 - a) election of the Chairperson and of the Vice-chairpersons as provided for under Article VI.6 of the Agreement, as appropriate
 - b) adoption of the agenda
 - c) reports and recommendations of the Commission's subsidiary bodies as appropriate
 - d) approval of a Programme of Work and Budget of the Commission for the ensuing financial period
 - e) applications for membership in accordance with Article IV.2 of the Agreement, and for acquisition of the Cooperating Non-Contracting Party status, in accordance with the process agreed to by the Commission
 - f) proposals relating to the Conservation and Management Measures pursuant to Article IX of the Agreement
 - g) items approved at the previous Session
 - h) proposals for amendments to the Agreement, the Rules of Procedure and the Financial Regulations of the Commission, as appropriate
 - i) items referred to the Commission by the Conference, the Council or the Director-General.
5. The provisional agenda may also include:
 - a) items proposed by the subsidiary bodies of the Commission
 - b) items proposed by a Member.

6. The agenda of a special Session shall consist only of items relating to the purpose for which the Session was called.

RULE V: THE SECRETARIAT

1. The Secretariat shall consist of the Executive Secretary and such staff appointed by him/her and under his/her supervision.
2. The Executive Secretary of the Commission shall be elected by the Commission and appointed by Director-General, in accordance with the procedure set out at [Appendix II](#).
3. The Executive Secretary shall be appointed for a term of three years renewable for two further terms of three years each.
4. The Executive Secretary will remain in function until a successor has taken up duties.
5. The Executive Secretary shall be responsible for implementing the policies and activities of the Commission and shall report thereon to the Commission. In the exercise of his/her functions, the Executive Secretary will have direct contact with all Members of the Commission as well as with FAO at all levels.
6. The duties of the Executive Secretary are listed in [Appendix II](#).
7. Copies of all communications concerning the affairs of the Commission shall be sent to the Executive Secretary by the Members for purposes of information and record.

RULE VI: MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION

1. In accordance with Article VII of the Agreement, meetings of the Commission shall be open to Observers. When the Commission decides to hold a private meeting, it shall at the same time determine the scope of such a decision with respect to observers.
2. The meetings of the Scientific Committee, the sub-commissions, the committees, working parties and other subsidiary bodies, which may be established, shall be open to Delegations only unless otherwise decided by the Commission.

RULE VII: ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSONS

1. Pursuant to Article VI.6 of the Agreement, the Commission shall, at the end of its regular Session in each alternate year or sooner if an office falls vacant, elect its Chairperson and no more than two Vice-Chairpersons, who shall hold office until their successors are elected.
2. Nominees must be delegates or alternates attending the meeting. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons shall not be eligible for re-election if they have held the positions for two consecutive terms preceding the elections to fill these positions.

RULE VIII: FUNCTIONS OF THE CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSONS

1. The Chairperson shall exercise the functions conferred on him/her in the Agreement and in these Rules and in particular shall:
 - a) declare the opening and closing of each Session of the Commission
 - b) direct the discussions at such meetings and ensure observance with these Rules, accord the right to speak, put questions to the vote and announce decisions

- c) rule on points of order
- d) subject to these Rules, have control over the proceedings of the meeting.
2. In the absence of the Chairperson or at his/her request, the functions of the Chairperson shall be exercised by one of the Vice-Chairpersons.
3. The Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson acting as Chairperson has a right to vote if he is acting as only representative of his country.
4. In the interval between two Sessions of the Commission, the Chairperson shall exercise the functions assigned to him/her by the Agreement or the Rules of Procedure, as well as any function entrusted to him/her by the Commission.

RULE IX: COOPERATING NON-CONTRACTING PARTY STATUS

1. The Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson acting as Chairperson of the Commission, shall annually send a letter to all non-Contracting Parties known to be fishing in the IOTC area of competence for species covered by the Agreement to urge them to become a Contracting Party to IOTC or attain the status of a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party. In doing so, the Chairperson or the Vice-Chairperson shall instruct the Executive Secretary to provide a copy of all relevant Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission.
2. The application process for requesting the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party is provided at [Appendix III](#).

RULE X: VOTING ARRANGEMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS

1. Except as provided for in paragraph 4 of this Rule, votes at meetings of the Commission shall be by show of hands unless a member requests that the vote be taken by a roll call or secret ballot, and that this request is seconded.
2. A vote by roll call shall be taken by calling the names of the members of the Commission entitled to vote in the English alphabetical order, beginning with the member which has been chosen by lot.
3. A record of any roll call vote or postal vote shall show the vote cast by each delegate and any abstention.
4. Unless the Commission decides otherwise, voting on matters relating to individuals, including the election of officers of the Commission and, if applicable, the recommendation regarding the name of the Executive Secretary to be forwarded to the Director-General for appointment, shall be by secret ballot.
5. When no nominee for an office obtains on the first ballot a majority of the votes cast, there shall be taken a second ballot confined to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If the votes are equally divided on the second ballot, as many ballots as necessary will be held to determine the elected candidate.
6. Votes cast means votes "in favour" and "against".
7. If the Commission is equally divided when a vote is taken on a question other than an election and the recommendation regarding the name of the Executive Secretary to be forwarded to the Director-General for appointment, a second vote and a third vote may be taken at the current Session at the request of the proposer. If the Commission remains equally divided, the proposal shall not be further considered at the current Session.
8. Voting arrangements and other related matters not specifically provided for in the Agreement or in these Rules shall be governed *mutatis mutandis* by the provisions of the General Rules of the Organization.

RULE XI: THE COMMITTEES

1. Pursuant to Articles XII.1 and XII.5 of the Agreement, the Commission establishes the following permanent committees which will act as advisory bodies to the Commission.
 - a) Scientific Committee
 - b) Compliance Committee
 - c) Standing Committee on Administration and Finance.
2. Unless otherwise decided by the Commission, the terms of reference, and rules of procedure outlined in Appendices following will govern the procedures to be applied to the Committees.
 - a) [Appendix IV](#) – Scientific Committee
 - b) [Appendix V](#) – Compliance Committee
 - c) [Appendix VI](#) – Standing Committee on Administration and Finance.

RULE XII: THE SUB-COMMISSIONS

1. Pursuant to Article XII.2 of the Agreement, the Commission may establish sub-commissions to deal with one or more of the stocks covered by the Agreement.
2. Sub-commissions shall be open to Members of the Commission which are coastal States lying on the migratory path of the stocks concerned in the sub-commission or are States whose vessels participate in the fisheries of these stocks.
3. Pursuant to Article XII.4 a sub-commission provides a forum for consultation and cooperation on matters related to the management of the stocks concerned and in particular:
 - a) to keep under review the stocks concerned and to gather scientific and other relevant information relating to the stocks concerned
 - b) to assess and analyse the conditions and trends of the stocks concerned
 - c) to examine management options and recommend to the Commission appropriate management measures
 - d) to coordinate research and studies of the stocks
 - e) to report to the Commission on its findings
 - f) to consider any matter referred to it by the Commission.
4. A majority of the members of a sub-commission shall constitute a quorum.
5. Recommendations and proposals of the sub-commissions can be adopted by simple majority. However, the preference would be to take the decision by consensus. Each member of the sub-commission will have the right to have its opinion included in the report.
6. The procedures of the sub-commissions established in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article XII of the Agreement shall be governed *mutatis mutandis* by the Rules of Procedure of the Commission.

RULE XIII: THE OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES OF THE COMMISSION

1. Pursuant to Article XII.5 the Commission may also establish such committees, working parties or other subsidiary bodies as may be necessary for the purposes of the Agreement.
2. Pursuant to Article XII.5 of the Agreement, the Commission establishes the following permanent working parties which will act as advisory bodies to the Scientific Committee or the Commission
 - a) Working Party on Billfish (WPB)
 - b) Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS)
 - c) Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB)
 - d) Working Party on Methods (WPM)
 - e) Working Party on Neritic Tunas (WPNT)
 - f) Working Party on Temperate Tunas (WPTmT)
 - g) Working Party on Tropical Tunas (WPTT).
3. Unless otherwise decided by the Commission, the terms of reference, and rules of procedure outlined in the [Appendix VII](#) will govern the procedures to be applied to the Working Parties.

RULE XIV: PARTICIPATION BY OBSERVERS

1. The Director-General or a representative designated by him, shall have the right to participate without vote in all meetings of the Commission as well as the Committees and of any other subsidiary body of the Commission.
2. Members and Associate Members of the Organization that are not Members of the Commission are, upon their request, invited to be represented by an observer at Sessions of the Commission.
3. States which are not Members of the Commission, nor Members of the Organization, but that are Members of the United Nations, any of its Specialized Agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency, may, upon request and subject to the concurrence of the Commission through its chairperson and to the principles relating to the granting of observer status to Nations adopted by the Conference, be invited to attend Sessions of the Commission in an observer capacity.
4. The Commission may, on their request, invite intergovernmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission, to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify.
5. The Commission may invite, upon request, non-governmental organizations having special competence in the field of activity of the Commission to attend such of its meetings as the Commission may specify. The list of the NGOs wishing to be invited will be submitted beforehand by the Executive Secretary to the Members of the Commission, no later than 60 days before the Session. If one of the Members of the Commission objects giving in writing its reasons within 30 days, the matter will then be subject to decision of the Commission out of Session by written procedure.
6. The Commission, on proposal of its Executive Secretary, may decide to request a contribution towards the additional administrative costs arising from the attendance of observers at its Sessions, subject to reciprocity in the case of intergovernmental organizations.
7. Participation of regional economic integration organizations in the work of the Commission and the relations between the Commission and such organizations shall be governed by the relevant provisions of the Constitution

and the General Rules of the Organization, as well as by the rules on the relations with international regional economic integration organizations adopted by the Conference or the Council.

8. Unless the Commission expressly determines otherwise, observers may attend the plenary meetings of the Commission. Observer nations and Observer Associate Members may submit memoranda and participate without vote in the discussions. Observer Non-Member States of FAO as well as Observer intergovernmental organizations or Observer non-governmental organizations may be invited by the Commission to submit memoranda and deliver oral statements.
9. The Commission may invite consultants or experts, in their individual capacity, to attend the meetings or participate in the work of the Commission as well as the Committees and the other subsidiary bodies of the Commission.
10. In accordance with Article XV of the Agreement, the Commission may enter into agreements with other intergovernmental organizations and institutions, especially those active in the fisheries sector, which might contribute to the work and further the objectives of the Commission. Such agreements may provide that these organizations or institutions may be represented as observers in the Sessions of the Commission. Observers from these organizations or institutions will be authorized to submit memoranda and, as appropriate, to participate in the discussions of the Commission, the Committees and the other subsidiary bodies of the Commission, without voting right.

RULE XV: RECORDS, REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A report shall be adopted at the end of each Session of the Commission; the report of the Session shall be published together with such technical papers and other documents, as the Commission may wish to publish.
2. The report adopted shall embody the Commission's decisions and recommendations, including, when requested, a statement of minority views.
3. At the closure of each Session, the report as well as the decisions and recommendations, together with the schedule for their implementation by the Members of the Commission, shall be transmitted to the Director-General. The Executive Secretary shall circulate them to the Members of the Commission, to all FAO Members and Associate Members, to non-members of the Commission, non-members of FAO, which are coastal States situated wholly or partly within the area defined in Article II of the Agreement or are States whose vessels engage in fishing in the area for stocks covered by the Agreement as well as to other States and international organizations that were represented at the Session.
4. Decisions and recommendations which might have policy, programme or financial implications for the Organization shall be brought by the Director-General to the attention of the Conference through the Council for action.
5. Subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph, the Chairperson may request the Members of the Commission to supply the Commission or the Director-General with information on action taken on the basis of decisions and recommendations made by the Commission.
6. This rule shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to the subsidiary bodies of the Commission established in accordance with paragraph 5 of Article XII of the Agreement.

RULE XVI: MEETING PARTICIPATION FUND

1. A special Meeting Participation Fund (MPF) is established for the purposes of supporting scientists and representatives of IOTC Contracting Parties (Members) who are developing States to attend and/or contribute to the work of the Commission, Committees and other subsidiary bodies.

2. The MPF shall be financed from extra-budgetary contributions, including voluntary contributions from Members and such other sources as the Commission may identify.
3. The Fund will be administered by the Executive Secretary, in accordance with the same financial controls as regular budget appropriations, and in accordance with the IOTC Financial Regulations and the rules set out in [Appendix VIII](#).
4. The Executive Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Commission on the status of the Fund, including a financial statement of contributions to and disbursements from the Fund;
5. The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditures of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.
6. Applicants should note that alternative avenues of funding are available to developing State Members who wish to send scientists to IOTC scientific meetings. For example, a fund has been established under Part VII of UNFSA to assist developing States that are signatories of the UNFSA to implement its provisions, including participation in the work of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations. For those eligible Members of IOTC, this could provide for an alternative source of funding to participate in meetings of the Commission and subsidiary bodies or to fund attendance at IOTC meetings as training and capacity building required to fulfill the obligations under the UNFSA.

RULE XVII: AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT

1. As provided for in Article XX.2 of the Agreement, proposals for the amendment of the Agreement may be made by any Member of the Commission or by the Director-General. Proposals made by a Member of the Commission shall be addressed to both the Chairperson of the Commission and the Director-General and those made by the Director-General shall be addressed to the Chairperson of the Commission, not later than 120 days before the Session of the Commission at which the proposal is to be considered. The Director-General shall immediately inform all Members of the Commission of all proposals for amendments.
2. No action on a proposal of amendment to the Agreement shall be taken by the Commission at any Session unless it has been included in the provisional Agenda of the Session.

RULE XVIII: AMENDMENT OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

Amendments or additions to these Rules may be adopted on the motion of any delegation by a two-thirds majority of the Members of the Commission at any plenary meeting of the Commission provided that copies of the proposals for amendment or addition have been distributed or circulated to the delegations at least 60 days before the Session of the Commission.

RULE XIX: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

The official languages of the Commission shall be English and French.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX I
LETTER OF CREDENTIALS

Dear IOTC Executive Secretary,

Upon instructions of [the Head of state, the head of government, the minister for foreign affairs or the minister concerned] I wish to inform you that [name of IOTC Contracting Party (Member)] will participate in the [...Number...] Session of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) [and/or any Committee of the Commission] and will be represented by the following delegation (or by [Title and Name] if the delegation is constituted by one person):

[Title and Name] – Head of delegation

[Title and Name] – Alternate

[Title and Name] – Expert

[Title and Name] – Adviser

[Title and Name], Head of Delegation or, in his/her absence, the alternate or any other member of the Delegation designated by him/her, is authorised to fully take part in the proceedings of the Session and take, on behalf of the Government (or Authority concerned for Regional Economic Integration Organisation e.g. EU) of [name of IOTC Member], any action or any decision required in relation with this Session.

.....Signature.....

[on behalf of, Head of state, the head of government, the minister for foreign affairs or the minister concerned]

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX II

PROCEDURE FOR THE SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

1. The vacancy announcement will be advertised (including required qualifications and the terms of reference (detailed below)) through international means, including the FAO website and the Commission's website;
2. Applications to be received by the Secretariat with a deadline of 45 days after the publication of the vacancy announcement and distributed to Members no later than 15 days after the deadline;
3. Five candidates are to be classed in order of preference by Members on a point score of five to one within 60 days of receiving the applications from the Secretariat. Rankings to be transmitted by each Member to the Secretariat, collated, and the ranking of all qualified candidates conveyed to all Members as soon as possible;
4. The three candidates with the greatest number of points are to be invited to the next Session of the Commission for interview by Heads of Delegation of Members of the Commission. The interviews may take place immediately prior to, or during the regular Session;
5. The new Executive Secretary to be elected by the Heads of Delegation of Members of the Commission, via a secret ballot;
6. The Director General of FAO to be informed of the decision of the Commission in order to proceed with the appointment of the new Executive Secretary.

Qualifications and benefits

1. The applicant should have university level qualifications, preferably at post-graduate level, in fisheries biology, fisheries science, fisheries economics or related field. He/she should have at least fifteen years of experience in fisheries management, policy formulation, preferably including bilateral and international relations. He/she should have the ability to exercise a high degree of professional initiative. The applicant should also be conversant with the preparation of budgets, documents and the organization of international meetings. He/she should have working knowledge, level C on the FAO scale, of either English or French. Preference may be given to candidates who have working knowledge in both languages.
2. Other essential requirements include competence in the selection of staff; demonstrated ability to supervise professional matters in subject field; and familiarity with the use of word processing, spread sheets and database management systems.
3. Desirable requirements include: a high degree of adaptability and ability to cooperate effectively with people of different nationalities and of various social and cultural backgrounds and education levels, as well as experience on fisheries related issues in the region.
4. The Executive Secretary will be graded at the D-1 level based on the United Nations salary scheme for professional and higher categories. He/she will in addition, be entitled to a variable element for post adjustment, pension, insurance, etc. The Executive Secretary is appointed under the same terms and conditions as staff members of FAO.

Terms of reference

Pursuant to Article VIII.2 of the Agreement, the Executive Secretary shall be responsible for implementing the policies and activities of the Commission and shall report thereon to the Commission. He/she shall also act as Executive Secretary to the subsidiary bodies established by the Commission, as required.

The incumbent will have overall responsibility for planning, coordination and administration of the Commission in accordance with the Agreement and the decisions of the Commission.

He/she shall, for administrative purposes, be responsible to the Director-General of FAO.

He/she will in particular:

- a) receive and transmit the Commission's official communications;
- b) maintain high level contacts with appropriate government officials, fishery institutions and international organizations concerned with tuna fisheries to facilitate consultation and cooperation between them on information collection and analysis;
- c) maintain an active and effective network of national focal points for routine communication of progress and results of the activities of the Commission;
- d) prepare and implement work programmes, prepare budgets and ensure timely reporting to the Commission;
- e) authorize disbursement of funds in accordance with the Commission's budget;
- f) account for the funds of the Commission;
- g) stimulate interest among Members of the Commission and potential donors in the activities of the Commission and in possible financing or in implementing of pilot projects and complementary activities;
- h) promote, facilitate and monitor the development of databases for resource assessment and biological and socio-economic research to provide a sound basis for conservation management;
- i) coordinate the Members' programmes of research when required;
- j) organize sessions of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and other related *ad hoc* meetings, and to maintain records of the proceedings;
- k) prepare background papers and a report on the Commission's activities and the programme of work for submission to the Commission at the regular sessions, and arrange the subsequent publication of the report and the proceedings of the Commission as well as its subsidiary bodies and related *ad hoc* meetings;
- l) perform other related duties as required by the Commission.

Managerial competencies – Standard FAO requirements

1. Strategic vision: Capacity to develop a vision, mission statement and strategies and to focus on the needs of member countries and to adjust strategies to take changing circumstances into account.
2. Managing people: Fosters team spirit through building trust and commitment to common objectives and recognizing team successes.

-
3. Result Orientation: Demonstrates an ability to manage programmes and projects efficiently under shifting priorities, in order to achieve targets.
 4. Partnering: Negotiates effectively with partners to enable successful outcomes for all stakeholders and actively supports interdisciplinarity across the Commission.
 5. Strong Communication Skills: Demonstrates a high level of communication skills in negotiations with stakeholders and promoting the Commission’s messages.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX III

ON COOPERATION WITH NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES

Application process to become a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party to the IOTC

1. Any non-Contracting Party requesting the status of a Cooperating Non-Contracting Party shall apply to the Executive Secretary. Requests must be received by the Executive Secretary no later than ninety (90) days in advance of an Annual Session of the Commission, to be considered at that meeting.
2. Non-Contracting Parties requesting the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party shall provide the following information in order to have this status considered by the Commission:
 - a) where available, data on its historical fisheries in the IOTC area, including nominal catches, number/type of vessels, name of fishing vessels, fishing effort and fishing areas;
 - b) all the data that Contracting Parties have to submit to IOTC based on the Resolutions adopted by IOTC;
 - c) details on current fishing presence in the IOTC area, number of vessels and vessel characteristics and;
 - d) information on any research programmes it may have conducted in the IOTC Area and the information and the results of this research.
3. An applicant for Cooperating Non-Contracting Party shall also:
 - a) confirm its commitment to respect the Commission's Conservation and Management Measures and;
 - b) inform IOTC of the measures it takes to ensure compliance by its vessels of IOTC Conservation and Management Measures
4. The Compliance Committee shall be responsible for reviewing requests for cooperating status and for recommending to the Commission whether or not an applicant should receive cooperating status. In this review, the Compliance Committee shall also consider information regarding the applicant available from other RFMOs as well as data submission of the applicant. Caution shall be used so as not to introduce into the IOTC Area the excessive fishing capacity of other regions or IUU fishing activities by granting cooperating status to the applicant.
5. Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties status shall be annually reviewed and renewed unless revoked by the Commission due to non-compliance with IOTC Conservation and Management Measures.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX IV

THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. Unless otherwise decided by the Commission, the following procedures will apply to the Scientific Committee.
2. Pursuant to Article XII.1 of the Agreement, the Commission establishes a permanent Scientific Committee which shall act as an advisory body to the Commission.
3. The Scientific Committee shall be constituted of scientists; each Member of the Commission shall have the right to appoint a representative and an alternate, if needed, both with suitable scientific qualifications, who may be accompanied by experts and advisers.
4. The Commission may invite experts, in their individual capacity, to enhance and broaden the expertise of the Scientific Committee and of its working parties.
5. The Members of the Commission shall finance the participation of their representatives, alternates, experts and advisers to the Scientific Committee meetings, as well as to its working parties. They will also finance the out of Session work, within the framework of the Scientific Committee, of these representatives, alternates, experts and advisers. The Commission may finance the participation of the experts invited in their individual capacity to participate in its meetings or in the working parties meetings.
6. The Chairperson of the Scientific Committee shall have, during the Scientific Committee meetings, the same powers and duties as the Chairperson of the Commission has in relation to meetings of the Commission itself.
7. The Chairperson of the Scientific Committee shall, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Commission, convene Sessions of the Scientific Committee. In the interval between two Sessions of the Scientific Committee he/she will also exercise any function entrusted to him/her by the Scientific Committee.
8. Pursuant to Article VIII.2 of the Agreement the Executive Secretary of the Commission, or his/her delegate, shall act as Executive Secretary to the Scientific Committee.
9. All documents submitted to the Scientific Committee shall be submitted to the IOTC Secretariat no later than 15 days prior to the start of the Scientific Committee meeting. Any documents submitted less than 15 days prior, shall be considered for information purposes only.
10. The Scientific Committee shall:
 - 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 and other interested parties, 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.

11. The Scientific Committee will carry out its work at annual meetings held before those of the Commission. With the approval of the Commission, the Chairperson of the Scientific Committee may convene special meetings between its annual meetings. In consultation with the Secretariat of the Commission, the Chairperson of the Scientific Committee may initiate and direct some work to be carried out by the Scientific Committee through correspondence.
12. The Chairperson of the Scientific Committee, in consultation with the Secretariat of the Commission, may also convene working parties of scientists for the purpose of stock assessment, preparation of management advice and any other research in support of fisheries management. They shall be constituted of scientists who are directly involved in and/or who may significantly contribute to the proposed work of the working parties. These scientists may also include scientists from non-Members of the Commission that are eligible to become Members and experts in their individual capacity.
13. The procedures of the Scientific Committee shall be governed *mutatis mutandis* by the Rules of Procedure of the Commission.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX V

THE COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. Meeting of the Compliance Committee

The meetings of the Compliance Committee shall be held for a period of at least 2 days to assess individual IOTC Contracting Parties (Members) and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties' (hereinafter referred together as "CPCs") compliance and enforcement with their obligations as Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties of IOTC.

2. Mandate and Objectives of the Compliance Committee

- a) The Compliance Committee shall be responsible for reviewing all aspects of CPCs individual compliance with binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures in the IOTC area of competence
- b) The Compliance Committee shall report directly to the Commission on its deliberations and recommendations
- c) The Compliance Committee shall cooperate closely with other IOTC subsidiary bodies in order to remain informed on all issues concerning compliance with binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures
- d) The work of the Compliance Committee shall be guided by the following overall objectives:
 - i) To provide a structured forum for discussion of all problems related to effective implementation of, and compliance with, binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures in the IOTC Area
 - ii) To gather and review information relevant to compliance with IOTC Conservation and Management Measures from IOTC subsidiary bodies, and from Reports of Implementation submitted by CPCs
 - iii) To identify and discuss problems related to the implementation of, and compliance with, binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures, and to make recommendations to the Commission on how to address these problems.

3. The terms of reference of the Compliance Committee shall be to:

- a) Review each individual CPC's compliance with binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission and make such recommendations to the Commission as may be necessary to ensure their effectiveness, notably in relation to:
 - i) The mandatory statistical requirements and all issues related to obligatory reporting and data providing, including non targeted species
 - ii) The level of CPC's conformity with binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures
 - iii) The CPC's conformity with the resolutions concerning the limitation of the fishing capacity
 - iv) The status of implementation of resolutions for monitoring, control, surveillance and enforcement adopted by the Commission (e.g. Port inspections, VMS, follow-up on infringements and market related measures)
 - v) The reporting on authorised as well as active vessels in IOTC area of competence, in particular in relation to the IOTC Resolution on fishing effort limitation.
- b) The Compliance Committee shall also be tasked to:

-
- i) Compile reports, with the help of the IOTC Secretariat, based on information submitted by CPCs in accordance to the various Resolutions adopted by the Commission and, which will form the basis for the compliance examination process
 - ii) Develop a structured, integrated approach to evaluate the compliance of each CPC against the IOTC Resolutions in force. The Chairman of the Compliance Committee, assisted by the IOTC Secretariat, will identify, select and transmit the significant non compliance issues to each CPC and submit them for discussion at the Compliance Committee meeting
 - iii) Issue its opinion on the compliance status of each CPC at the end of the meeting. Non compliance with the binding IOTC Conservation and Management Measures will lead to a declaration of non compliance by the Compliance Committee and recommend suitable actions for consideration of the Commission
 - iv) Develop a scheme of incentives and sanctions and a mechanism for their application to encourage compliance by all CPCs
 - v) Perform such other tasks as directed by the Commission.

4. IOTC Compliance Committee preparatory works:

4.1 In preparation for the meeting of the IOTC Compliance Committee the IOTC Secretariat will:

- i) send each CPC, 4 months prior to the annual meeting, a standard questionnaire on compliance with the various IOTC Resolutions governing conservation and management for receiving comments and answers from the concerned CPCs within 45 days;
- ii) circulate to all CPCs, 2 months prior the annual meeting, the comments and answers provided by each CPC in response to the questionnaire and invite comments and possible questions from all other CPCs;
- iii) compile CPCs' initial replies to the questionnaire and comments and questions provided by other CPCs in the form of draft tables that will form the basis for the compliance examination process. The draft tables will present all available information relating to each CPC's implementation of obligations for review by the IOTC Compliance Committee. The draft tables will be provided to the relevant CPC on a secure section of the IOTC website [or emailed to the relevant authority]. Upon website posting [or emailing] of the relevant draft tables, each CPC may reply to the IOTC Secretariat within 15 days in order to (where appropriate):
 - a) provide additional information, clarifications, amendments or corrections to information contained in its draft report;
 - b) identify any particular difficulties with respect to implementation of any obligations; or
 - c) identify technical assistance or capacity building needed to assist the CPC with implementation of any obligations.
- iv) The IOTC Secretariat will then produce finalised tables for each CPC that will form the basis for the compliance examination process. These tables will be distributed to CPCs for discussion during the IOTC Compliance Committee session. This table could be updated up to one week prior to the commencement of the Compliance Committee.

- 4.2 The Chairperson of the IOTC Compliance Committee, assisted by the IOTC Secretariat, will identify, select and transmit the significant non-compliance issues to each concerned CPC and submit them for discussion in the IOTC Compliance Committee meeting at least 30 days in advance.

5. Opinion of the Compliance Committee

At the end of the meeting the Compliance Committee shall issue its opinion on the compliance status of each CPC.

6. The procedures of the Compliance Committee shall be governed *mutatis mutandis* by the Rules of Procedure of the Commission.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX VI

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE – TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The Standing Committee on Administration and Finance shall advise the Commission on such matters of an administrative and financial character as are remitted to it by the Commission and shall annually:
 - a) examine the operating budget for the current year
 - b) examine the draft budget for the ensuing and following year.
2. The Standing Committee on Administration and Finance may draw to the attention of the Commission any matter of an administrative or financial character.
3. The Standing Committee on Administration and Finance may appoint from amongst its members a smaller, informal group to give preliminary consideration, in consultation with the Executive Secretary, to matters before it.
4. The Standing Committee on Administration and Finance shall prepare a report of each meeting of the Committee for transmission to the Commission.
5. The procedures of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance shall be governed *mutatis mutandis* by the Rules of Procedure of the Commission.

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX VII

WORKING PARTY (SCIENCE) – TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

These general Terms of Reference for the IOTC Working Party's that support the scientific process, reflect the Scientific Committee's mandate to provide the Commission with the information it needs to manage IOTC stocks in accordance with the IOTC Agreement.

The work of the Working Parties will include the specific tasks listed below:

1. Review new information on the biology and stock structure of the relevant species, their fisheries and environmental data.
2. Coordinate and promote collaborative research on the species and their fisheries.
3. Develop and identify agreed models and procedures for the assessment of stock status of each species.
4. Conduct stock assessments for each of each species or stock.
5. Provide technical advice on management options, the implications of management measures and other issues.
6. Identify research priorities, and specify data and information requirements that are necessary for the Working Party to meet its responsibilities.

The Terms of Reference for each of the following working parties shall be those adopted by the Scientific Committee.

- Working Party on Billfish
- Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics
- Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch
- Working Party on Methods
- Working Party on Neritic Tunas
- Working Party on Temperate Tunas
- Working Party on Tropical tunas

IOTC RULES OF PROCEDURE (2014): APPENDIX VIII

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE IOTC MEETING PARTICIPATION FUND

1) Definitions

Developing Contracting Party, is any Contracting Party (Member) that was under the categories of “Low” or “Middle” income, according to the criteria used in the most recent calculation of the contributions (see Annex of the IOTC Financial Regulations).

The **Selection Panel**, in the case of Working Parties, is composed by the Chair of the scientific body concerned, the Chair of the Scientific Committee, or their delegates, and the Secretariat.

Non-scientific meetings are regular and special Sessions of the Commission, including Sessions of the Compliance Committee and the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance, and other non-scientific subsidiary bodies of the Commission.

2) Eligibility criteria

Meeting Participation Fund for IOTC Working Parties and technical workshops

- Any nominated scientist from a developing Contracting Party (Member), submitting a complete application before the set deadline, including a working paper or document relevant to the subject of the meeting, is eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund. Priority will be given to scientists from least developed countries.
- Delegates from Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission which are in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Commission are not be eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the two preceding calendar years

Meeting Participation Fund for IOTC Scientific Committee Sessions

- Any delegate from a developing Contracting Party (Member) of IOTC, submitting a complete application before the set deadline, including the National Report and an official Letter of Credentials, is eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund. Priority will be given to delegates from least developed countries.
- Delegates from Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission which are in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Commission are not be eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the two preceding calendar years.

Meeting Participation Fund for Sessions of the Commission (including Compliance Committee and Standing Committee on Administration and Finance) and other non-scientific meetings

- Any delegate from a developing Contracting Party (Member) of IOTC submitting an application before the set deadline, including the relevant reports (if applicable) and an official Letter of Credentials, is eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund. Priority will be given to delegates from least developed Contracting Parties (Members).

- If Contracting Parties (Members) have access to other sources of funding, such as the Assistance Fund from Part VII of the UNFSA⁴, they are encouraged to make use of these funds.
- Delegates from Contracting Parties (Members) of the Commission which are in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Commission are not eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the two preceding calendar years.

Meeting Participation Fund for IOTC Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons

- Any nominated Chairperson and/or Vice-Chairperson from a developing Contracting Party (Member), submitting a complete application before the set deadline, including a working paper or document relevant to the subject of the meeting, is eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund to attend the meeting in which they act as Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson. The Guidelines for the preparation of papers as part of the MPF application process set out in Annex A will apply to Chairs and Vice-Chairs funded by the MPF.
- Any nominated Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson from a developing Contracting Party (Member), is eligible to benefit from the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund to attend the Scientific Committee meeting to present the report of the Working Party in which they are Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson.

3) Application for support to attend Working Parties and technical workshops

As the main goal of the MPF is to increase the participation of scientists of developing Contracting Parties (Members) to scientific meetings of IOTC, and in line with [Rule XVI, paragraph 1](#), applications to the MPF should only be considered if the applicant intends to produce and present a working paper, relevant to the work of the working party that he or she wishes to attend. Guidelines for the preparation of such a document are provided in [Annex A](#).

Timeline for the selection of Meeting Participation Fund recipients for workings parties and workshop

	Action Item	Responsibility	Due date
1	Circular to CPCs and message distributed through the IOTC relevant mailing lists calling for applications to the MPF. The call for applications will include terms and conditions and timeline for the selection of MPF recipients.	Secretariat	No later than 90 days prior to the commencement of the meeting.
2	Deadline for submissions of application, including: - Official nomination letter with request of support signed by the director of fisheries or any other relevant authority; - Contact details of the nominee and a copy of his/her passport - Abstract of the scientific paper or document to be presented at the meeting.	MPF applicants	No later than 45 days prior to the meeting.
3	The Secretariat to: (i) Review applications to determine those who meet eligibility criteria; (ii) Offer non-eligible applicants an additional three-day period to complete the application	Secretariat	Within 2 days of the due date for applications (Step 2 above), or earlier.
4	The Secretariat to distribute the list of complete applications to the Selection Panel	Secretariat	3 days after step 3 (no later than 40 days before the meeting)
5	The Selection Panel to review the list of complete applications within five days to assess the relevance of the document to the subject of the meeting.	Selection Panel	5 days after step 4 (no later than 35 days before the meeting)
6	The Secretariat to issue an invitation to successful applicants, and commence travel arrangements.	Secretariat	1 day after step 5 (no later than 34 days before the meeting)
7	Documents by applicants to be submitted and published in the relevant IOTC meeting webpage.	Secretariat	No later than 15 days before the meeting.

⁴ UNFSA refers to the Agreement for the implementation of the provisions of the Convention of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks.

4) Application for support to attend Scientific Committee

The template for the preparation of the National Report (an eligibility requirement for applicants for the Scientific Committee) can be downloaded from the IOTC website or be obtained through the Secretariat.

Timeline for the selection of Meeting Participation Fund recipients for the Scientific Committee.

	Action Item	Responsibility	Due date
1	Circular to CPC's and message distributed through the relevant IOTC mailing lists calling for applications to the MPF. The call for applications will include terms and conditions and the timeline for the selection of MPF recipients.	Secretariat	No later than 90 days prior to the commencement of the SC meeting.
2	Deadline for submissions of application, including: - Official nomination letter with request of support signed by the director of fisheries or any other relevant authority. - Letter of credentials (see Rule X.3 of the IOTC rules of procedure) - Contact details of the nominee and a copy of his/her passport - CPC National Report.	MPF applicants	No later than 45 days prior to the meeting.
3	The Secretariat to: (i) Review applications to determine those who meet eligibility criteria; (ii) Offer non-eligible applicants an additional three-day period to complete the application	Secretariat	Within 2 days of the due date for applications (Step 2 above), or earlier.
4	The Secretariat to issue an invitation to successful applicants, and commence the travel arrangements.	Secretariat	3 days after step 3 (no later than 40 days before the meeting)

5) Application for support to attend non-scientific meetings

In line with Rule XV, paragraph 1, it is mandatory for funded participants “to present reports relevant to the meeting in question”. In the case of the Compliance Committee, SCAF and Commission meetings, the relevant report is the Report of Implementation (as described in Article X, para. 2 of the IOTC Agreement) and, therefore, applications to the MPF should only be considered if the CPC of the applicant has submitted its Report of Implementation.

When the Compliance Committee and the SCAF meetings are held in conjunction with the regular Sessions of the Commission, only one participant from each CPC will be supported from the MPF.

Timeline for the selection of Meeting Participation Fund recipients for non-scientific meeting, in particular Commission meeting.

	Action Item	Responsibility	Due date
1	Circular to CPCs for applications to the MPF. The call for applications will include terms and conditions and timeline for the selection of MPF recipients.	Secretariat	No later than 90 days prior to the commencement of the Commission meeting.
2	Deadline for submissions of application, including: - Official nomination letter with request of support. - Letter of credentials (see Rule X.3 of the IOTC rules of procedure) - Contact details of the nominee and a copy of his/her passport - CPC Report of Implementation.	MPF applicants	No later than 60 days prior to the Commission meeting.
3	The Secretariat to: (i) Review applications to determine those who meet eligibility criteria; (ii) Offer non-eligible applicants an additional three-day period to complete the application	Secretariat	Within 2 days of the due date for applications (Step 2 above), or earlier.
4	The Secretariat to issue an invitation to successful applicants, and commence travel arrangements.	Secretariat	3 days after step 2 (no later than 45 days before the meeting)

ANNEX A (of the Rules of Procedure for the MPF)

**GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF PAPERS AS PART OF THE MEETING PARTICIPATION
FUND APPLICATION PROCESS**

As stated in para. 6 of the Resolution “*Priority will be given to those applicants that will contribute a scientific document on a subject of interest to the meeting they wish to attend*”.

The working document to be prepared by the applicant to the Meeting Participation Fund should follow the guidelines below:

FOR A SESSION OF THE COMMISSION, the working document to be submitted should be:

- a Report of Implementation following the template produce by the Secretariat which is sent through an IOTC Circular at least 90 days before the Session. Please note that the deadline for submitting the Report of Implementation is 60 days before the Session.

FOR A SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE, the document to be submitted should be:

- a National Report following the guidelines adopted by the Scientific Committee at its thirteenth Session (IOTC–2010–SC13–R, Appendix VI). Please note that the deadline for submitting the National Report is 30 days before the Session of the Scientific Committee.

FOR A WORKING PARTY OR ANY OTHER AD HOC WORKSHOP, the working document to be submitted should relate specifically to the topic of interest of the meeting, and should be:

- a document related to the biology (e.g. growth, genetic, etc.) of one particular species, or group of species, under the mandate of the Working Party the applicant wishes to attend, or
- a document on the fisheries targeting one particular species, or group of species, under the mandate of the Working Party the applicant wishes to attend. This should include a description of the fleet, gear used, fishing zones, data collection system and its short comings, related research, relevant legislation, socio-economic issues and fisheries statistics such as nominal catch, catch and effort, length frequency, CPUEs, etc..., or
- a document describing an analysis conducted for one particular species under the mandate of the Working Party the applicant wishes to attend such as a CPUE standardization, a stock assessment, etc..., or

any other specific document requested by the chair of the Working Party the applicant wishes to attend and endorsed by the chair of the Scientific Committee and the Executive Secretary.

APPENDIX XV

UPDATE ON PROGRESS REGARDING RESOLUTION 09/01 – ON THE PERFORMANCE REVIEW FOLLOW-UP

(NOTE: NUMBERING AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS PER APPENDIX I OF RESOLUTION 09/01)

ON THE IOTC AGREEMENT – REFORM	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/ TIMELINE	PRIORITY
0. The IOTC Agreement needs to be revised or replaced to: 1) allow the full participation of all fishing players, 2) take into account modern principles for fisheries management.	<i>Commission</i>	Pending: No new developments have taken place in this area [to be updated after the 18 th Session].		High
ON THE IOTC AGREEMENT – A LEGAL ANALYSIS	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/ TIMELINE	PRIORITY
1. The final conclusion of the Panel is that the Agreement is outdated and there are many areas for improvement. The weaknesses and gaps identified are, or have a potential to be, major impediments to the effective and efficient functioning of the Commission and its ability to adopt and implement measures aimed at long-term conservation and sustainable exploitation of stocks, according to model fisheries management instruments. More fundamentally, these deficiencies are likely to prevent the Commission from achieving its basic objectives.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending: No new developments have taken place in this area.		High
2. Consequently, the Panel recommends that the IOTC Agreement either be amended or replaced by a new instrument. The decision on whether to amend the Agreement or replace it should be made taking into account the full suite of the deficiencies identified.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending: No new developments have taken place in this area.		High

ON CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
Data collection and sharing				
<i>The Panel identified a poor level of compliance by many IOTC Members. with their obligations, notably those related to the statistical requirements on artisanal fisheries and sharks, and recommends that:</i>				
3. The timing of data reporting be modified to ensure that the most recent data are available to the working parties and the Scientific Committee.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Completed: Currently CPCs are required to submit information on their flag vessels by 30 th June every year. The timeline for coastal CPCs who license foreign vessels has been brought forward to 15 th February every year. The timing of the Working Parties will be reviewed annually to ensure that assessments can be completed and results reported to the Scientific Committee each year.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
4. The deadline to provide data on active vessels be modified to a reasonable time in advance of the meeting of the Compliance Committee. This deadline is to be defined by the Compliance Committee.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	Completed: Resolutions 10/07 and 10/08 have modified the reporting date for active vessels, which is now in the month preceding the meeting of the Compliance Committee. Resolution 10/08 establishes February 15 th as the new deadline for submission of the list of active vessels for the previous year.	Periodic review of Resolutions.	Low
5. The scheduling of meetings of the working parties and Scientific Committee be investigated based on the experience of other RFMOs. This should bear in mind the optimal delivery of scientific advice to the Commission.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Completed: Given the large number of meetings of other RFMOs, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a schedule of meetings that would be better than the one currently in practice. However, the Working Parties and the Scientific Committee will annually review the timing of the Working Parties.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Low
6. The Commission task the Scientific Committee with exploring alternative means of communicating data to improve timeliness of data provision.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: The Secretariat encourages members to utilise electronic means to expedite reporting. A study was commissioned for 2011 to determine the feasibility of reporting near real-time for various fleets. Outcome: Real time reporting not currently possible for most CPCs.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium

<p>7. Non-compliance be adequately monitored and identified at individual Member level, including data reporting.</p>	<p><i>Compliance Committee</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: Resolution 10/09 has partially been developed for this purpose. Reports on compliance with data reporting requirements have been regularly reviewed by the Compliance Committee, as well as discussed at the species Working Parties, the Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics and the Scientific Committee. For the Compliance Committee meetings, country-based reports have been prepared for this purpose since the 2011 meeting.</p> <p>A first implementation of this approach took place in the Compliance Committee meeting 2011 (Colombo, Sri Lanka)</p> <p>There remains a need to setup a scheme of penalties and incentives.</p>	<p>Annual review at Compliance Committee meeting</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>8. The causes of non-compliance be identified in cooperation with the Member concerned.</p>	<p><i>Compliance Committee</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: The Terms of Reference of the Compliance Committee was revised in 2010 (Resolution 10/09) and provides for the assessment of compliance by CPCs. The Secretariat, via the Compliance Section, maintains contact with national officers to determine the reasons for non-compliance, in particular, concerning data reporting.</p> <p>The identification of non-compliance causes started with the country based approach (Compliance Committee meeting 2011 – Colombo, Sri Lanka).</p> <p>Starting in 2013 the Compliance Section has begun conducting Compliance Support Missions (CSM). Sri Lanka and Indonesia have already benefitted from this initiative.</p> <p>During the intersessional period, staff of the Secretariat have conducted CSMs in Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, Oman, Mauritius and Kenya, where a Compliance Action Plan have been developed with these CPCs.</p> <p>The Capacity Building activities planned for 2014/15 are detailed in the annual Programme of work and budget for the Secretariat. Refer: IOTC-2014-SCAF11-05</p>	<p>Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting</p>	<p>High</p>

9. When the causes of non-compliance are identified and all reasonable efforts to improve the situation are exhausted, any Member or non-Member continuing to not comply be adequately sanctioned (such as market related measures).	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	Pending: Resolution 10/10 provides the necessary framework in which to apply market related measures, following an appropriate process. Reductions in future quota allocation have been proposed as deterrents for non-compliance. Process still to be implemented	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting	High
10. There is a need to improve the quality and quantity of the data collected and reported by the Members, including the information necessary for implementing the ecosystem approach. The most immediate emphasis should be placed on catch, effort and size frequency. The Panel also recommends that:	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Ongoing: See below recommendation 11. Other sources and cooperative arrangements will continue (e.g. IOTC-OFCF Project) or might be available in the future (e.g. SWIOFC, COI, etc.). The Secretariat continues to collaborate with these initiatives.		High
11. Support for capacity building be provided to developing States – the Commission should enhance funding mechanisms to build developing country CPCs' capacity for data collection, processing and reporting infrastructures, in accordance with the Commission requirements.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance and Finance</i>	Ongoing: In 2010 The Commission allocated USD\$400,000 for a range of projects related to capacity building in data collection and reporting. The Commission allocated USD\$60,000 for Capacity Building in the 2011 budget, USD\$78,000 in 2012 and US\$80,000 in 2013. Further increases have been proposed for the 2014 and 2015 budgets. One workshop was organized in 2011, in Chennai, India involving representatives of several CPCs. Other sources and cooperative arrangements will continue (e.g. IOTC-OFCF Project; CPCs) or might be available in the future	Review annually at IOTC meetings.	High
12. A regional scientific observer programme to enhance data collection (also for non-target species) and ensure a unified approach be established, building on the experience of other RFMOs, Regional standards on data collection, data exchanged and training should be developed.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Partially completed: Resolution 11/04 (superseding Res.09/04 and Res. 10/04) provides CPCs with the necessary framework for putting in place national scientific observer programmes. The Regional Observers Scheme commenced July 1 st 2010, and is based on national implementation. The Secretariat coordinated the preparation of standards for data requirements, training and forms. Implementation by CPCs has been limited to date.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	High

13. Actions be taken so that fishing fleets, especially Maldives, Taiwan, Province of China and Yemen participate in data collection and reporting.	<i>Commission</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: Maldives became a Member in July 2011 and is complying with its mandatory data requirements. Taiwan, Province of China, submits data from its fishing fleet on a regular basis and complies with most of the IOTC mandatory data requirements. The Yemen became a Member in July 2012.		
14. A relationship with Taiwan, Province of China be developed in order to have data access when needed, to all its fleet data as well as historical series, and address the problems deriving from the current legal framework.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: Taiwan, Province of China, provides data from its fishing fleet on a regular basis and routinely allows access to historical data. It also continues to participate in the Regional Observer Programme to monitor transshipment at sea.		High
15. The Secretariat's capacity for data dissemination and quality assurance be enhanced, including through the employment of a fisheries statistician.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance via Scientific Committee Commission</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: The existing post of Data Analyst was converted to a Fisheries Statistician to join the Data Section of the Secretariat. The position was filled in September 2012. Further efforts continue to be made to improve data dissemination, including through an online data atlas, planned for 2014/15.	Staffing needs to be assessed annually at IOTC meetings.	Medium
16. A statistical working party be established to provide a more efficient way to identify and solve the technical statistical questions.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Completed: The Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics resumed its annual meeting in 2009, 2010 and 2011. However, no meeting is being scheduled for 2012 as the SC felt that this WP meeting should only be held when there are specific tasks to be considered.	Annual meeting.	High
17. The obligation incumbent to a flag State to report data for its vessels be included in a separate Resolution from the obligation incumbent on Members to report data on the vessels of third countries they licence to fish in their exclusive economic zones (EEZs).	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	Completed: Resolutions 12/07 (formerly 10/07) and 10/08 address the reporting requirements of flag and coastal States responsibilities, with regards to vessels that are active in the IOTC Area.	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meetings	Medium

<p><i>In relation to non-target species, the panel recommends that:</i></p> <p>18. The list of shark species for which data collection is required in Recommendation 08/04 be expanded to include the five species identified by the Scientific Committee (blue shark, shortfin mako, silky shark, scalloped hammerhead, oceanic whitetip), and apply to all gear types.</p>	<p><i>Commission</i></p>	<p>Partially Completed & Ongoing: The Commission meetings in 2012 and 2013 considered several proposals in this regard, and Resolution 12/03 was subsequently adopted and then revised in 2013 as Resolution 13/03. The Scientific Committee has identified several remaining gaps which will be considered at the S18 meeting.</p>	<p>The Commission to revisit in 2014, taking into account the SC recommendations.</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<p>19. The Secretariat's capacity to provide support to developing States' Members should be enhanced.</p>	<p><i>Commission and Standing Committee on Administration and Finance</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: Resolution 10/05 provides a mechanism for financial support to facilitate scientists and representatives from developing IOTC CPCs to attend and/or contribute to the work of the Commission, the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties. In 2012, 2013 and 2014, capacity building funds were provided and utilized in workshops to enhance understanding of the IOTC process among officials of member countries, The Secretariat has also collaborated directly and indirectly with other regional initiatives, including, inter alia, to the EU, BOBLME, OFCF, SWIOFC and SWIOFP, ACP Fish II and COL.</p>	<p>Review annually at IOTC meetings.</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>20. Cooperative capacity building efforts amongst Members and, as appropriate external organisations, should be encouraged.</p>	<p><i>Members and Secretariat</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: In November 2011, the first of a series of Capacity Building workshops was held in Chennai, India (17–18 November). The theme was 'Bridging the gap between IOTC science and management'. See also Recommendations 13 and 21. Support was received from the ACP Fish II Project for other workshops in 2012. Further workshops are planned for 2014 in Phuket, Thailand and other localities.</p>	<p>Seek opportunities through other regional projects, and funding directly from CPCs.</p>	<p>High</p>
<p>21. Innovative or alternative means of data collection (e.g. port sampling) should be explored and, as appropriate, implemented.</p>	<p><i>Scientific Committee</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: The Secretariat has been implementing sampling programmes since 1999. The IOTC–OFCF Programme has supported sampling programmes and other means of data collection since 2002. In 2011, the SC recommended the continuation of the IOTC-OFCF project.</p> <p>The Secretariat continues to work with CPCs to improve their data collection programs.</p>	<p>Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.</p>	<p>Medium</p>



22. Avenues to collect data from non-Members should be explored.	<i>Secretariat</i>	<p>Ongoing: The activities of the IOTC–OFCF Project have not been limited to IOTC Members, and, in the past, have extended to important non-member fishing countries such as Yemen (now a Member).</p> <p>Participation at IOTC Working Party meetings by scientists from non-IOTC CPCs has been and will continue to be encouraged.</p>	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
Quality and provision of scientific advice				
23. For species with little data available, the Scientific Committee should be tasked with making use of more qualitative scientific methods that are less data intensive.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	<p>In progress: The species Working Parties have been using informal analyses of stock status indicators when data are considered insufficient to conduct full assessments for some time. However, a formal system that reviews those qualitative indicators and provides a recommendation on the current status, based on the weight-of-evidence is currently being developed.</p> <p>In 2013, data poor approaches to determining stock status was applied to a range of marlin and neritic tunas species. This resulted in a stock status being applied to striped marlin, blue marlin and longtail tuna for the first time.</p>	<p>To be considered at the WPM and others.</p> <p>Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.</p>	High
24. More emphasis should be given to adherence to data collection requirements.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: The Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics and the species Working Parties evaluate the availability and quality of data, and make recommendations to the Scientific Committee on how to improve data quality. The country-based compliance report submitted to the Compliance Committee provides information on the timeliness and completeness of the reporting of data required by the various Resolutions of the Commission.</p> <p>A Regional Workshop was conducted in February 2014 to address the issue data reporting, for compliance with IOTC requirements. A conclusion from the Regional Workshop is that the Secretariat will need to conduct in country missions in several of the Member States.</p>	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting.	High

25. Confidentiality provisions and issues of accessibility to data by the scientists concerned needs to be clearly delineated, and/or amended, so that analysis can be replicated.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Ongoing: Input, output and executable files for the assessment of major stocks are archived with the Secretariat to allow replication of analyses. Access to operational data under cooperative arrangements, and those subject to confidentiality rules is still limited. In some cases the Secretariat is bound by the domestic data confidentiality rules of Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties. The SC recommended to include observer data under the confidentiality policy of IOTC, which was Adopted by the Commission in 2012 as Resolution 12/02.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
26. The resources of the IOTC Secretariat should be increased. Even though some progress will be made with recruitment of the stock analysis expert, some additional professional staffing is required.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance on advice from Committees and the Commission</i>	Ongoing: The Secretariat will propose a budget for 2014 and 2015 that includes additional resources for projects requested by the Scientific Committee and Commission.	Review annually at IOTC meetings.	High
27. To enhance the quality of scientific advice and the technical soundness of the papers being considered by the Scientific Committee and its working parties, and to encourage publication of IOTC scientific papers in relevant journals, future consideration should be given to the establishment of a scientific editorial board within the Scientific Committee	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: Guidelines for the presentation of stock assessment papers were revised and agreed to by the Scientific Committee in 2010 and 2012. The SC actively encourages national scientists to publish in peer reviewed journals, as is the case following the Tuna tagging Symposium held in 2012.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
28. An online IOTC Data Summary should be established	<i>Secretariat</i>	Pending: Budgetary provisions to be renewed for 2014/15.	Review at SCAF meeting.	Medium

29. Ongoing peer review by external experts should be incorporated as standard business practice of working parties and the Scientific Committee.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Pending: External experts (Invited Experts) are regularly invited to provide additional expertise at Working Party meetings, although this does not constitute a formal process of peer review. The Scientific Committee in 2010 and 2011, agreed that once stock assessment models were considered robust, that peer review would be advantageous and funds will be requested to undertake peer reviews of stock assessments. The Scientific Committee reviewed the processes for Invited Experts, Consultants and Peer review at its 14 th Session in 2011.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
30. New guidelines for the presentation of more user friendly scientific reports in terms of stock assessments should be developed. In this respect, Kobe plots are considered to be the most desirable method of graphical presentation, especially to non-technical audience.	<i>Scientific Committee</i>	Partially completed & Ongoing: All recent stock assessment results have been presented using the Kobe plot, and the species Working Parties are progressing in presenting the Kobe matrix. The 2010, 2011 and 2012 Scientific Committee reports included Kobe Matrices for stock assessments where available. The format of the Working Party reports and the resultant Executive Summaries continues to be refined to improve readability and content.	Review annually at IOTC WP and SC meetings.	Medium
31. A special fund to support the participation of scientists from developing States should be established.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance</i>	Partially completed: A Meeting Participation Fund was established via Resolution 10/05. The Resolution provides a funding mechanism to facilitate scientists and other representatives from developing IOTC CPCs to attend and/or contribute to the work of the Commission, the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties. The fund is financed, initially, by accumulated funds, with no provisions for long-term support yet agreed. The fund was replenished to USD\$200,000 at S17 from accumulated funds. An ongoing process of replenishment of this fund needs to be developed and a proposal to continue the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund will be consider during the S18 Session.	Review annually at IOTC SCAF and Commission meetings. A procedure for supplying funds to the MPF should be developed and presented at S18.	High
32. The Commission should renew efforts to convene meetings of the Working Party on Neritic Tunas	<i>Commission</i>	Completed: The first Session of the WPNT took place in India, 14–16 November 2011. The 4 th Session will be held in Phuket, Thailand in June/July 2014.	Annual meeting.	High

Adoption of conservation and management measures				
33. As the IOTC has faced the management of the main targeted stock under its purview only through a regulation of the fishing effort; other approaches should be explored, such as those envisioned in Resolution 05/01, including catch limits, total allowable catch (TAC) or total allowable effort (TAE).	<i>Commission</i>	In progress: Resolution 10/01, superseded by Resolution 12/13 provides the starting point in the process of moving towards a total allowable catch limit. The first meeting of the Technical Meeting on Allocation Criteria was held in Nairobi, Kenya from 16–18 February 2011 and the Second meeting was held in Muscat, Oman from 18–20 February, 2013. The Commission revised Resolution 12/13.	Annual meeting.	Very High
34. Within the system of the freezing of fishing effort in terms of number of vessels and correspondent capacity in gross tonnage, a deadline should be agreed for the implementation of fleet development plans.	<i>Commission</i>	Completed: Some CPCs have cited the global financial crisis as the reason for their inability to implement their fleet development plan and have therefore signalled to the Commission that their plan will be revised. A deadline of 31 st December, 2010, was set for submission of all revised or new fleet development plans.	Review annually at the CoC and Commission meeting.	Low/Medium
35. IOTC should consider developing a framework to take action in the face of uncertainty in scientific advice.	<i>Scientific Committee and Commission</i>	In progress: The Scientific Committee has agreed that the development of a Management Strategy Evaluation process be initiated to provide better advice that would incorporate explicit consideration of uncertainty. The 2012 meeting of the Working Party on Methods focused on this process. A smaller group of experts met twice in 2013 to advance this work, once in April and again in October.	Intersessional start of the MSE process by correspondence, as of Jan.2012 Progress at WPM annual meeting.	High
36. IOTC should use the full range of decision making processes available to it under the Agreement.	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: For the first time in its history of adopting Conservation and Management Measures, the Commission took a vote on a proposed resolution during its 14 th Annual Session.	Annual meeting.	High
37. The IOTC Agreement needs to be amended or replaced in order to incorporate modern fisheries management principles, such as the precautionary approach.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing. The Commission addressed this matter through the adoption of Resolution 12/01 <i>on the implementation of the precautionary approach</i> . Some elements of Precautionary Approach were also adopted in Resolution 13/10 <i>on interim target and limit reference point and a decision framework</i> .	–	High
38. Pending the amendment or replacement of the Agreement, the Commission should implement the precautionary approach as set forth in the UNFSA.	<i>Commission</i>	Pending: see also Recommendations 35 and 37.	For consideration at S17.	High

39. Measures to regulate shark fisheries should be considered by the Commission.	<i>Commission</i>	In progress: Resolution 05/05 provides the framework for combating the practice of shark finning and Resolution 12/09 is aimed at the conservation of sharks of the family Alopiidae. Resolution 13/06 <i>on a scientific and management framework on the conservation of sharks species caught in association with IOTC managed species.</i>	For consideration at S18.	High
40. There is a need to develop and take into account modern principles for fisheries management, including ecosystem based approach, protection of marine biodiversity and reducing the harmful impacts of fishing on marine environment.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Ongoing: Resolutions 10/06, 12/06, 12/04, 12/12, 13/04 and 13/05, are all aimed at encouraging fishing practices that protect marine biodiversity and reducing the harmful impacts of fishing on the marine environment or on species that are incidentally caught in association with IOTC species.	For further consideration at S18.	Medium
41. These concepts should be integrated in the IOTC Agreement.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending. See Recommendations 1 and 2 above.		High
Capacity management				
42. IOTC should establish a stronger policy on fishing capacity to prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity.	<i>Working Party on Fishing Capacity Scientific Committee Commission</i>	Ongoing: The Commission has since 2003 adopted a series of Resolutions (03/01, 06/05, 07/05 and 09/02) with the objective of addressing the issue of fishing capacity. However, to date these resolutions have not resulted in a strong control on fishing capacity, and the concern remains that overcapacity might result from this lack of control. The Secretariat is actively involved in developing the global vessels record for vessels fishing for tuna and tuna-like species that would contribute to the assessment of existing fishing capacity. A second fishing capacity study was conducted in 2013.	See Recommendation 33, which has been agreed as the priority path in this regard.	Medium
43. Loopholes in the current systems of fishing capacity limitation, such as the establishment of fleet development plans and exemptions for vessels less than 24 meters, should be closed.	<i>Working Party on Fishing Capacity Commission</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: Resolution 09/02, superseded by Resolution 12/11, and the decisions made at IOTC 14, establishing a new deadline to file fleet developments plans, aim at establishing firm capacity targets.	See Recommendation 33, which has been agreed as the priority path in this regard.	Medium

44. IOTC should endorse the recommendation of the Scientific Committee to create a Working Group on Fishing Capacity.	<i>Commission</i>	Partially completed and Ongoing: The first Working Party on Fishing Capacity was convened in 2009. In 2010 and all years since, as no new documents were presented, it was amalgamated into the Working Party on Tropical Tunas as a theme session. A review and compliance to Resolution 12/11 on fishing the capacity resolution to be included in the second performance review of the IOTC.	See Recommendation 33, which has been agreed as the priority path in this regard.	Medium
Compatibility of management measures				
45. IOTC Members should be invited to promptly implement IOTC conservation and management measures through their national legislation.	<i>Secretariat and Commission</i>	Ongoing: CPCs are reminded annually about the responsibility of integrating IOTC Conservation and Management Measures in their national legislation. The Secretariat is cooperating with CPCs by assisting in the assessment of the legal needs to effectively implement IOTC measures.	Annually review at CoC and Commission meetings.	Very high
Fishing allocations and opportunities.				
46. IOTC should explore the advantages and disadvantages of implementing an allocation system of fishing quota, expressed as TAC or TAE system. Such an investigation should include consideration of how significant catches by current non-Members would be accounted for.	<i>Commission</i>	In progress: Resolution 10/01, superseded by Resolution 12/13 has begun the process of moving towards the implementation of a total allowable catch limit for IOTC species. The Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria met twice to discuss on proposed guidelines and methods to allocate future quota. No allocation criteria have been decided so far.	See Recommendation 33, which has been agreed as the priority path in this regard.	Medium
ON COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
Flag State duties				
47. Any amendment to or replacement of the IOTC Agreement should include specific provisions on Member's duties as flag States, drawing on the relevant provisions of the UNFSA.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending.		High



Port State measures				
48. Any amendment to or replacement of the IOTC Agreement should include specific provisions on Member's duties as port States.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending.		High
49. IOTC should explore the possible implementation of the FAO Model Scheme on Port State Measures.	<i>Commission</i>	<p>Completed: Resolution 10/11 is inspired by the FAO Port State Measures Agreement. By adopting this resolution, IOTC CPCs have agreed to implement the conditions of this agreement even before it becomes globally binding, and it became the first RFMO to do so. Implementation begun as of 1st March 2011.</p> <p>An evaluation of legal needs and training for officials of coastal CPCs was organised by the Secretariat in May 2011 with the support of the ACP Fish II Programme. Seychelles and Mozambique organized a training for inspectors in November 2011, in collaboration with the Secretariat.</p>	Review annually at the CoC meeting.	High
50. The IOTC should duly note the outcome of the current process for establishment of a globally binding agreement on port State measures.	<i>Commission</i>	Completed: see Recommendation 49.		

Monitoring, Control and Surveillance				
<p>51. IOTC should develop a comprehensive monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) system through the implementation of the measures already in force, and through the adoption of new measures and tools such a possible on-board regional observers' scheme, a possible catch documentation scheme as well as a possible system on boarding and inspection.</p>	<p><i>Compliance Committee</i></p>	<p>Ongoing: IOTC already has an extensive number of MCS related measures. However, the implementation of these measures are the duty and responsibility of the CPCs. Proposals to introduce a catch documentation scheme, especially for the major IOTC species, have until now not received the agreements CPCs. As a way forward, the Commission agreed to set up an IOTC Intersessional Working Party to make progress on a catch documentation scheme for tropical tuna species.</p> <p>Resolution 11/04 – observers and field samplers are required to monitor the landing and unloading of catches respectively.</p> <p>The IOTC Regional Observer Programme (ROP) has over the last two years been expanded in scope to include the verification of documents on board fishing vessels (flag State Authorisation To Fish and fishing logbook), marking of vessels (consistent with information in the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels) as well as their VMS.</p> <p>At the request of the Commission (S17), the Secretariat is presenting a document at the CoC11, which concerns a study on options for a regional high-seas boarding and inspection scheme, for the IOTC Area.</p>	<p>Review annually at IOTC meetings.</p>	<p>High</p>
Follow-up on infringements				
<p>52. The current IUU resolution should be amended to allow the inclusion of vessels flagged to Members.</p>	<p><i>Commission</i></p>	<p>Completed: Resolution 09/03, which supersedes Resolution 06/03, and now superseded by Resolution 11/03, was adopted for this purpose.</p>	<p>Review annually at IOTC meetings</p>	<p>High</p>

53. IOTC should explore options concerning the possible lack of follow-up on infringements by CPCs.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: The Compliance Committee, under its revised terms of reference, is in a better position to assess such cases through the country-based Compliance Reports, and will continue to do so in 2014.</p> <p>Infringements detected under the ROP are communicated to the concerned fleets for their investigation and provision of explanations and/or actions taken.</p> <p>There remains a need to setup a scheme of penalties and incentives.</p>	Review annually at IOTC meetings	Medium
54. IOTC should establish a sanction mechanism for non-compliance, and task the Compliance Committee to develop a structured approach for cases of infringement.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Pending: The Compliance Committee, under its revised terms of reference, shall develop a scheme of incentives and sanctions and a mechanism for their application to encourage compliance by all CPCs.</p> <p>There remains a need to setup a scheme of penalties and incentives.</p>	<p>Attempts over the last two years to introduce a scheme of penalties to be applied in case of non-fulfilment of reporting obligations have so far not received the required support for adoption.</p> <p>There is a need to continue these efforts.</p>	High
55. Provisions for follow-up on infringement should be included in any amended/replaced Agreement.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending:		High
Cooperative mechanisms to detect and deter non-compliance				
56. A structured, integrated approach to evaluate the compliance of each of the Members against the IOTC Resolutions in force should be developed by the Compliance Committee.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: Since the 2011 Compliance Committee meeting, country-based reports have been prepared for this purpose on the basis of Resolution 10/09.</p>	Review annually at the Compliance Committee meeting	High

57. CPCs should be reminded of their duty to implement in their national legislations the conservation and management measures adopted by IOTC.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: CPCs are reminded annually about the responsibility of integrating IOTC conservation and management measures in their national legislation. The Reports of Implementation, mandated in the IOTC Agreement, provide a mechanism to monitor progress of implementation at the national level.</p> <p>A project proposal to the WB/IOC grant for <i>Global Partnership for Oceans</i>, to develop a model legal framework to facilitate CPCs to efficiently transpose conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission into their national legislation, has been approved. Two offers for this work are under review, and the contract with the successful bidder is expected to be signed in June 2014.</p>	Review annually at IOTC meetings	High
58. The requirement to present national reports on the implementation of IOTC measures should be reinforced.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: Reminders are sent to CPCs prior to the Commission meeting and a template, which is revised annually, is provided by the Secretariat to facilitate CPCs preparation of national reports on implementation of IOTC measures. Compliance with this requirement is assessed in the country-based compliance reports. With the introduction of the country-based Compliance Reports, this reporting requirement has gone from 56% for 2010 to 84% for 2012.</p>	Review annually at IOTC meetings	High
59. The sense of accountability within IOTC seems to be very low; therefore more accountability is required. There is probably a need for an assessment of the performance of CPCs.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: The revised terms of reference of the Compliance Committee now facilitates this assessment in the form of the country reports prepared for the Compliance Committee meeting.</p> <p>Through the Compliance Support Mission, CPCs are becoming more conscious of their role in ensuring the effectiveness of the Commission.</p>	Review annually at IOTC meetings	High
60. Establishment of formal mechanisms of MCS (e.g. observers programmes) should be considered	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	<p>Ongoing: Resolution 12/05 provides for an observer programme to monitor at sea transshipments, by placing observers on carrier vessels. Resolution 11/04 (superseding Resolution 09/04 and 10/04) establishes a Regional Observer Scheme that includes observers on board fishing vessels and port sampling for artisanal fisheries.</p> <p>Implementation remains pending for a number of CPCs.</p>	Review annually at IOTC meetings	Medium

Market related measures				
61. As IOTC action in terms of measures relating to the exercise of rights and duties of its Members as market States are very weak, the non-binding market related measure should be transformed into a binding measure.	<i>Commission</i>	Partially completed: Resolution 10/10 partially meets this requirement.	Review annually at IOTC meetings	Medium
62. The bigeye statistical document programme should be applied to all bigeye products (fresh and frozen). Catch documentation schemes for target species of high commercial value should be considered. Alternatively, expanding the scope of the current statistical document programme to address current loopholes should be considered.	<i>Commission</i>	In progress: Proposals for a resolution to introduce a catch documentation scheme, especially for the major IOTC species, was not endorsed by CPCs at its 14 th , 15 th or 16 th annual Sessions.	Commission to consider proposals from CPCs at its annual session.	High
ON DECISION MAKING AND DISPUTE SETTLEMENT	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
Decision making				
63. In order to improve the IOTC practices of decision making and adoption of measures, when every effort to achieve consensus has been exhausted, invoking the procedure of voting should be explored	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: Resolution 10/12 (superseded by Resolution 12/09) was voted upon by CPCs at the IOTC's 14 th Annual Session. It was the first time that the voting procedure was used in IOTC for the adoption of a resolution.	To be implemented as necessary.	High
64. Amending the objection procedure so that it is more rigorous, and in line with other RFMO Conventions, featuring restricted grounds for the bases to object is recommended.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending.		High
Dispute settlement				
65. A provision on dispute settlement should be amended in line with the requirements of UNFSA.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending.		High

ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION	RESPONSIBILITY	UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
Transparency				
66. The active vessels list should be made available on the IOTC website.	<i>Commission Secretariat</i>	Completed: Resolutions 07/02, 10/07 and 10/08. The lists of authorised and active vessels are hosted on the IOTC website.	Periodic revision.	High
67. The Commission, in consultation with the Scientific Committee, should review the availability of critical data sets used in development of scientific advice and take steps to assure that these data are held at the Secretariat and available for validation of analyses, subject to the appropriate confidentiality requirements.	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: See Recommendations on Data collection and sharing above.		
Relationship to cooperating non Members				
68. The legal framework of the IOTC Agreement should be amended or replaced in order to enable fishing players active in the area to discharge their obligations in line with the UNFSA.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending: In the meantime, alternative ways of participation of active fishing fleets in the activities of the Commission are being pursued.		High
Relationship to non cooperating non Members				
69. Although the IOTC has strengthened its action towards non-Members in order to have all important fishing players included under its remit, diplomatic approaches should be made by IOTC Members to non-Members with active vessels in the area.	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: The Secretariat has been active in contacting relevant non-Members to encourage their participation. The Secretariat has also responded to queries, briefed representatives about membership from the DPR of Korea, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Myanmar and Somalia.		High
70. When non-cooperation is identified and all reasonable efforts to improve the situation are exhausted, any non-Members continuing not to cooperate should be adequately sanctioned by, for example, market related measures.	<i>Compliance Committee</i>	Ongoing: Resolution 10/10 provides the necessary framework in which to apply market related measures. Actions are to be taken by the Compliance Committee, under its revised terms of reference. However, the creation of a scheme of incentives and sanctions and a mechanism for their application to encourage compliance by all CPCs is still pending .	Review annually at IOTC meetings	High

Cooperation with other RFMOs				
71. IOTC should establish mechanisms for a mutual recognition of IUU lists with other RFMOs.	<i>Commission</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: This issue is addressed in the Resolutions dealing with capacity transfers insofar as to vessels found on IUU lists of other tuna RFMOs should not be flagged by CPCs.	Review other RFMO IUU Lists upon request to add new vessels to the IOTC Record of Authorised Vessels.	High
72. IOTC should develop cooperative mechanisms, such as MoUs, to work in a coordinated manner on issues of common interest, in particular non-target species and an ecosystem approach with other RFMOs especially with SIOFA.	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: The Secretariat is active in identifying opportunities for collaboration, for the consideration of the Commission. The KOBE process also facilitates the interaction of tRFMO's. In 2011 the first bycatch joint technical working group was held. This will be held periodically. MoUs have been signed with ICCAT and CCSBT for the implementation of the regional Observer Programme. IOTC and WCPFC has a MoU to exchange information at the Secretariat level on matters of common interest.	Annual review	Medium
73. IOTC should annually agree on a Member attending other tuna RFMO meetings as an observer on its behalf and reporting back to the Commission on matters of interest	<i>Commission</i>	Ongoing: Pending annual financial approval by the Commission.	Annual review.	Low
Special requirements of developing States				
74. A specific fund to assist capacity building should be put in place.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance</i>	Partially completed & Ongoing. A Meeting Participation Fund was established via Resolution 10/05 (See 19 and 31) and needs ongoing financial contributions. Additional funding for capacity building provided in 2012 and 2013 and proposed in the budgets for 2014 and 2015. See also para. 11 above.	S18 will need to consider proposed budget lines for capacity building funds.	High.

75. Members, that are Parties of UNFSA, should make use of the part VII Fund, established under UNFSA.	<i>Members</i>	Ongoing: Regular reminders are sent to CPCs.	Annually for each IOTC meeting. Currently unknown to what degree CPCs are utilizing this fund. Feedback from delegates sought.	Medium
Participation				
76. Financial support, in particular for attendance in the scientific activities to developing States, is needed.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance</i>	Partially completed & Ongoing: A Meeting Participation Fund was established via Resolution 10/05. The Resolution provides a funding mechanism to facilitate scientists and other representatives from CPCs who are developing States to attend IOTC meetings. The fund is financed, initially, by accumulated funds, with no provisions for long-term support yet agreed.	Annually for each IOTC meeting. A procedure for supplying funds to the MPF should be developed and presented at S18 by a CPC.	High
77. The legal framework of the IOTC should be amended or replaced in order to enable fishing players active in the area to discharge their obligations in line with the UNFSA.	<i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending.	Commence in 2014. Small working group of CPCs to lead.	High
ON FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES		UPDATE/STATUS	WORKPLAN/TIMELINE	PRIORITY
Availability of resources for RFMO activities – efficiency and cost-effectiveness				
78. The IOTC Agreement as well as financial management rules should be amended or replaced in order to increase Members' as well as Secretariat's control of all the budget elements, including staff costs of the budget. This would also improve transparency.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance</i> <i>Commission and Members</i>	Pending. See Recommendations 1 and 2.		High
79. Prior to the Commission assuming full control of the budget, the Commission meeting at which the budget is considered should be held as close as possible to the commencement of the financial year to which this budget relates and if possible in advance of that year.	<i>Commission</i>	Partially Completed & Ongoing: The 2013 and 2014 meeting of the Commission was moved further away from the beginning of the financial year (calendar), thus increasing the difficulties of operating without a budget. A proposal is being considered by the SCAF to address this problem.	Annual consideration by the Commission.	Medium



80. A fee system should be considered as a possible funding mechanism for possible new activities.	<i>Commission</i>	Pending: The IOTC Regional Observer Program (monitoring transshipment at sea) is fully funded by the participants through such a fee system.		Medium
81. The agreed external financial audit should be implemented as soon as possible, and should include a focus on whether IOTC is efficiently and effectively managing its human and financial resources, including those of the Secretariat.	<i>Standing Committee on Administration and Finance Commission</i>	Pending.		Medium

APPENDIX XVI

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CRITERIA TO CONDUCT THE SECOND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF THE IOTC

1. Terms of reference for the implementation of the second performance review of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

Composition of the Review Panel

- a) A Chair with legal fisheries background and good understanding of Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMO) not affiliated with the IOTC Membership to Chair the Review Panel and draft the report of the review.
- b) A science expert not affiliated with the IOTC Membership, and with expertise on tuna, tuna-like species and bycatch species caught by IOTC fisheries (To be determined by the Panel).
- c) Six representatives of IOTC Members as follows: EU, Japan, Maldives, Mauritius Oman and Seychelles.
- d) Two Non-Governmental Organisations: ISSF and PEW Charitable Trust.
- e) Two members (not already Members of the IOTC) from other Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organisations: WCPFC and ICCAT.

The IOTC Secretariat will not be a part of the Review Panel but it will act as a facilitator of its activities, providing access to information and facilities that the Review Panel will require to conduct its work. Review Panel meetings will take place in the Seychelles. Member countries will cover the costs associated with the participations of their representatives. However, the attendance of developing coastal countries to the Review Panel meetings may be funded under the Meeting Participation Fund or any special fund that the Commission may set up for this purpose.

Scope of the review

The review will evaluate progress made on the recommendations arising from the first performance review. In addition it will focus on the effectiveness of the Commission to fulfil its mandate, in accordance to the criteria set forth below. The review will not include an audit of the finances of the Commission.

In doing the review, the strengths, weakness, opportunities and risks to the organisation should be evaluated.

Work schedule

The report of the Review Panel will be completed and made available no later than 60 days prior to the 20th Session of the Commission (2016) and published on the IOTC website.

2. Criteria for the second performance review of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission

CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT

Status of living marine resources

- Status of fish stocks under the purview of the IOTC in relation to maximum sustainable yield or other relevant biological standards.
- Trends in the status of those stocks.
- Status of species that belong to the same ecosystems as, or are associated with or dependent upon, the IOTC species (hereinafter “non-target species”).
- Trends in the status of non-target species.

Data collection and sharing

- Extent to which the IOTC has agreed formats, specifications and timeframes for data submission, taking into account UNFSA Annex I.
- Extent to which IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, individually or through the IOTC, collect and share complete and accurate fisheries data concerning target stocks and non-target species and other relevant data in a timely manner.
- Extent to which fishing data and fishing vessel data are gathered by the IOTC and shared among Members and other RFMOs.
- Extent to which the IOTC is addressing any gaps in the collection and sharing of data as required.
- Extent to which the IOTC has set standards for the collection of socio-economic data from the fisheries, as specified in the IOTC Agreement; and extent to which this information is used to inform decisions from the Commission.
- Extent to which the IOTC has set security and confidentiality standards and rules for sharing of sensitive science and operational/compliance data.

Quality and provision of scientific advice

- Extent to which the IOTC receives and/or produces the best scientific advice relevant to the fish stocks and other living marine resources under its purview, as well as to the effects of fishing on the marine environment.
- Extent to which science data that impacts compliance processes is shared, discussed and utilised.

Adoption of Conservation and Management Measures

- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted Conservation and Management Measures for both target stocks and non-target species that ensure the long-term sustainability of the ecosystem as well as of such stocks and species and are based on the best scientific evidence available.
- Extent to which the IOTC has applied the precautionary approach as set forth in UNFSA Article 6 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.5, including the application of precautionary reference points and harvest control rules.
- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted and is implementing effective rebuilding plans for depleted or overfished stocks.
- Extent to which the IOTC has moved toward the adoption of Conservation and Management Measures for previously unregulated fisheries, including new and exploratory fisheries.
- Extent to which the IOTC has taken due account of the need to conserve marine biological diversity and minimise harmful impacts of fisheries on living marine resources and marine ecosystems.
- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted measures to minimise pollution, waste, discards, catch by lost or abandoned gear, catch of non-target species, both fish and non-fish species, and impacts on associated or dependent species, in particular endangered species, through measures including, to the extent practicable, the development and use of selective, environmentally safe and cost-effective fishing gear and techniques.

Capacity management

- Extent to which the IOTC has identified fishing capacity levels commensurate with long-term sustainability and optimum utilisation of relevant fisheries.
- Extent to which the IOTC has taken actions to prevent or eliminate excess fishing capacity and effort, including the management and intentions expressed in the fleet development plans.

Compatibility of management measures

- Extent to which measures have been adopted as reflected in UNFSA Article 7.

Fishing allocations and opportunities

- Extent to which the IOTC agrees on the allocation of allowable catch or levels of fishing effort, including taking into account requests for participation from new Members or participants as reflected in UNFSA Article 11.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

Flag State duties

- Extent to which IOTC Members are fulfilling their duties as flag States under the treaty establishing the IOTC, pursuant to measures adopted by the IOTC, and under other international instruments, including, inter alia, the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention, the UNFSA and the 1993 FAO Compliance Agreement, as applicable.

Port State measures

- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted measures relating to the exercise of the rights and duties of its members as port States, as reflected in UNFSA Article 23 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 8.3 and the FAO Port State Agreement (yet to enter into force).
- Extent to which these measures are effectively implemented.

Monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS)

- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted integrated MCS measures (e.g., required use of VMS, observers, catch documentation and trade tracking schemes, restrictions on transshipment, boarding and inspection schemes).
- Extent to which these measures are effectively implemented.

Follow-up on infringements

- Extent to which the IOTC, its Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties follow up on infringements to management measures.

Cooperative mechanisms to detect and deter non-compliance

- Extent to which the IOTC has established adequate cooperative mechanisms to both monitor compliance and detect and deter non-compliance (e.g., compliance committees, vessel lists, sharing of information about non-compliance, joint patrols, common Minimum Terms and Conditions for access, harmonized regulatory mechanisms, boarding schemes, regional/compatible VMS equipment and operational criteria, observer schemes, with common training standards for inspectors and observers, intra-regional cooperation, etc.).
- Extent to which these mechanisms are being effectively utilised.
- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted new measures to foster (reward/penalise) compliance within IOTC and effectiveness of such measures.

Market-related measures

- Extent to which the IOTC has adopted measures relating to the exercise of the rights and duties of its Members as market States.
- Extent to which these market-related measures are effectively implemented.

Fishing Capacity

- Extent to which the IOTC has implemented and complied with the Conservation and Management Measures relating to fishing capacity, in particular, the developments plans as required by the Resolutions 03/01 and 12/11.

DECISION-MAKING AND DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

Decision-making

- Extent to which IOTC has transparent and consistent decision-making procedures that facilitate the adoption of Conservation and Management Measures in a timely and effective manner.

Dispute settlement

- Extent to which the IOTC has established adequate mechanisms for resolving disputes.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Transparency

- Extent to which the IOTC is operating in a transparent manner, as reflected in UNFSA Article 12 and the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries Article 7.1.9.
- Extent to which IOTC decisions, meeting reports, scientific advice upon which decisions are made, and other relevant materials are made publicly available in a timely fashion.

Relationship to Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties

- Extent to which the IOTC facilitates cooperation between Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, including through the adoption and implementation of procedures for granting cooperating status.

Relationship to Non-Cooperating Non-Members (Non-CPCs)

- Extent of fishing activity by vessels of non-members that are not cooperating with the IOTC, as well as measures to deter such activities.

Cooperation with other RFMOs

- Extent to which the IOTC cooperates with other RFMOs, including through the network of Regional Fishery Body Secretariats.
- Extent to which IOTC works intra-regionally to adopt common regulatory principles, standards and operational schemes, and processes where appropriate, e.g., observer coverage, FADs management, access rules and appropriate financial mechanisms.

Special requirements of developing States

- Extent to which the IOTC recognizes the special needs of developing States and pursues forms of cooperation with developing States, including with respect to fishing allocations or opportunities, taking into account UNFSA Articles 24 and 25, and the Code of Conduct of Responsible Fisheries Article 5.
- Extent to which IOTC Members, individually or through the IOTC, provide relevant assistance to developing States, as reflected in UNFSA Article 26.

Participation

- Number of member coastal states / total number of coastal states.

-
- Number of member countries / total number of countries.
 - Extent to which all fishing entities active in the area discharge their obligations in line with the UNFSA.

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Availability of resources for IOTC activities

- Extent to which financial and other resources are made available to achieve the aims of the IOTC and to implement the Commission's decisions, including analysis on the payment of servicing cost from annual and extraordinary/voluntary contributions and the new Improved Cost Recovery Uplift that should be examined and evaluated in terms of any new support provided from FAO to IOTC.

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness

- Extent to which the IOTC is efficiently and effectively managing its human and financial resources, including those of the Secretariat and eligibility of the staff to all entitlements paid to FAO.
- Extent to which the IOTC is managing its budget as well as its capacity to monitor and audit annual and multiannual expenditures.
- The extent of IOTC's viability within and outside of the FAO structure in term of the cost and the benefits of breaking from the UN administrative structure and mandate.

FAO

Support to IOTC

- Extent to which the FAO supports IOTC activities and fulfilment of the IOTC objectives, notably regarding its institutional and legal obligations.

FIRST PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Recommendations

See paper IOTC-2014-S18-07 for the current state of play of the implementation of the first Performance Review recommendations.

APPENDIX XVII RESOLUTION 14/01

ON THE REMOVAL OF OBSOLETE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

RECOGNISING the desirability of improving the coherence, interpretation and accessibility of its Conservation and Management Measures;

NOTING the concerns raised by some CPCs during the Fifteenth Session of the Commission that many coastal States are not yet able to fully implement many of the Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission;

ALSO NOTING the intent of [Resolution 11/01](#) *Regarding consolidation of IOTC Resolutions and recommendations*;

ADOPTS in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article IX of the IOTC Agreement, that:

1. The following Conservation and Management Measures previously adopted by the Commission shall be revoked since they are considered to have been fulfilled or are obsolete, as they have been replaced without being superseded or are no longer relevant to the conservation and management of tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean:

Recommendations:

- a) Recommendation 01/01 *Concerning the national observer programmes for tuna fishing in the Indian Ocean*
- b) Recommendation 02/06 *On the implementation of the Resolution concerning the IOTC Record of Vessels*
- c) Recommendation 03/04 *Concerning enhancement of effectiveness of IOTC measures to eliminate IUU activities in the IOTC area*
- d) Recommendation 03/05 *Concerning trade measures*
- e) Recommendation 03/06 *Recommendation to commission a report on management options for tuna and tuna-like species*
- f) Recommendation 05/06 *Concerning the terms of references for an IOTC Working Party on Management Options*
- g) Recommendation 02/07 *Concerning measures to prevent the laundering of catches by IUU large-scale tuna longline fishing vessels*

Resolutions:

- a) Resolution 98/03 *On southern bluefin tuna*
- b) Resolution 99/01 *On the management of fishing capacity and on the reduction of the catch of juvenile bigeye tuna by vessels, including flag of convenience vessels, fishing for tropical tunas in the IOTC area of competence*
- c) Resolution 99/03 *On the elaboration of a control and inspection scheme for IOTC*
- d) Resolution 00/01 *On compliance with mandatory statistical requirements for IOTC Members and requesting Cooperation with Non-Contracting Parties*
- e) Resolution 00/02 *On a survey of predation of longline caught fish*

-
- f) Resolution 01/04 *On limitation of fishing effort of non members of IOTC whose vessels fish bigeye tuna*
 - g) Resolution 01/07 *Concerning the support for the IPOA-IUU plan*
 - h) Resolution 02/08 *On the conservation of bigeye and yellowfin tuna in the Indian Ocean*
 - i) Resolution 03/07 *Recognising the contributions of David Ardill*
 - j) Resolution 11/01 *Regarding consolidation of IOTC Resolutions and Recommendations*
2. The following Conservation and Management Measures previously adopted by the Commission are considered to be of a procedural or administrative nature and shall be incorporated into the IOTC Rules of Procedure:
- a) Resolution 98/05 *On Cooperation With Non-Contracting Parties*
 - b) Resolution 02/09 *Establishment of the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF)*
 - c) Resolution 03/02 *On criteria for attaining the status of Cooperating Non-Contracting Party*
 - d) Resolution 10/05 *On the establishment of a meeting participation fund for developing IOTC Members and Non-Contracting Cooperating Parties (CPCs)*
 - e) Resolution 10/09 *Concerning the functions of the Compliance Committee*
3. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/01 *On the removal of obsolete Conservation and Management Measures* as well as the Conservation and Management Measures detailed in paragraphs 1 and 2.

APPENDIX XVIII
RESOLUTION 14/02

**FOR THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF TROPICAL TUNAS STOCKS IN THE IOTC
AREA OF COMPETENCE**

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

RECOGNISING that based on past experience in the fishery, the potential production from the resource can be negatively impacted by excessive fishing effort;

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT the available scientific information and advice, in particular the IOTC Scientific Committee conclusions whereby the yellowfin tuna stock might have been over or fully exploited and the bigeye tuna stock may have been fully exploited in recent years; RECOGNISING that during the 12th IOTC scientific meeting held in Seychelles from 30 November to 04 December 2009, the IOTC Scientific Committee recommended that yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna catches should not exceed the MSY levels which have been estimated at 300,000 tonnes for yellowfin tuna and at 110,000 tonnes for bigeye tuna;

ACKNOWLEDGING that the implementation of a TAC without a quota allocation would result in an inequitable distribution of the catches and fishing opportunities among the IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs) and non-CPCs;

FURTHER RECOGNISING that the tuna artisanal fisheries sector needs strengthening in terms of catch statistics reporting in order to more closely follow the catch situations and notwithstanding improvement in the industrial fishery catch statistics reporting requirements;

NOTING the importance of applying the precautionary approach for the management of the tropical tuna and swordfish stock, in particular yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna in the Indian Ocean;

ADOPTS, in accordance with the provisions of Article IX, paragraph 1 of the IOTC Agreement, the following:

1. CPCs shall implement the following action plan:
 - a) Establishment of an allocation system (Quota) or any other relevant measures based on the IOTC Scientific Committee recommendations for the main targeted species under the IOTC competence;
 - b) Advise on the best reporting requirement of the artisanal tuna fisheries and implementation of an appropriate data collection system.
2. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 12/13 *For the conservation and management of tropical tunas stocks in the IOTC area of competence.*

APPENDIX XIX
RESOLUTION 14/03

ON ENHANCING THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN FISHERIES SCIENTISTS AND MANAGERS

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

HAVING responsibility for the sustainable utilisation of tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean;

RECOGNISING the need for action to ensure the achievement of IOTC objectives to conserve and manage tuna resources in the IOTC area of competence;

RECALLING that Article 6, paragraph 3, of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea of December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (UNFSA), on the strengthening of existing organisations and arrangements;

NOTING recommendation 30 of the Performance Review Panel, adopted by the Commission as Resolution 09/01 *on the performance review follow-up* requesting that new guidelines for the presentation of more user-friendly scientific reports in terms of stock assessments should be developed;

RECALLING that the IOTC Scientific Committee has initiated a process leading to a Management Strategy Evaluation process to improve upon the provision of scientific advice on Harvest Control Rules (HCRs);

ACKNOWLEDGING that continuing dialog between scientists and managers is necessary to define appropriate HCRs for the IOTC tuna and tuna-like stocks;

CONSIDERING scientific advice provided by the Scientific Committee as the corner stone for establishing an effective management framework for stocks and fisheries under the purview of the IOTC;

RECOGNISING that the Commission has limited time during its annual Sessions to consider the level of detail contained within the annual report of the Scientific Committee, and that a dedicated Science-Management Dialogue process be instituted to assist in the synthesis of the SC recommendations and in particular on how they may be used to develop scientifically-based Conservation and Management Measures would be highly beneficial to the IOTC process;

HIGHLIGHTING the need to further enhance the dialogue between fisheries managers and scientists in the coming years in order to achieve the Agreement objectives in the most efficient and effective way;

STRESSING that such enhanced dialogue should, in particular, allow the Commission to focus on the establishment of management frameworks that take into account the recommended interim Target and Limit Reference Points, consistent with Resolution 13/10 *on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework*, or any subsequent revision;

RECALLING that provisions laid down in Resolution 10/05 *on the establishment of a meeting participation fund for developing IOTC Member and Non-Contracting Cooperating Parties (CPC's)*, establishing a meeting participation fund should ease the attendance of fisheries scientist and managers from developing Contracting Parties and therefore contribute to an inclusive and participative dialogue;

EMPHASISING that the Commission management decisions should be based on the best available science independently developed by the Scientific Committee;

ADOPTS in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article IX of the IOTC Agreement, that:

1. A Science and Management Dialogue process dedicated to enhance the decision making response of managers to existing Resolutions and recommendations made by the Scientific Committee to the IOTC, is established with the objective of:

-
- a) Enhancing communication and to foster mutual understanding between fisheries managers, stakeholders and scientists;
 - b) Promoting the efficient use of scientific resources and information;
2. In order to achieve the aforementioned objectives
- a) The Secretariat shall institute a series of Science and Management Dialogue Workshops;
 - b) These Science and Management Dialogue Workshops shall be held in 2015, 2016 and 2017, as needed, prior to the respective Commission Annual Sessions;
 - c) The Commission shall review the products of the Workshops at its Annual Session and also provide further directions to the Secretariat for conduct of subsequent Science and Management Dialogue Workshops; In the light of this review, the Commission may suggest additional topics to be examined by this dialogue.
 - d) The Science and Management Dialogue Workshops shall be open to Contracting Parties, Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, advisers, Scientific Committee members and accredited observers. Other experts may be invited depending on the topics to be discussed;
 - e) The structure of the meetings shall include an open forum/dialogue;
 - f) To the degree possible, the Secretariat should investigate all sources of funding including the Meeting Participation Fund to support participation by up to two individuals from each CPC requiring such support.
3. The Terms of Reference, for the Science and Management Dialogue Workshops should include:
- a) Identifying and recommending management strategies for the IOTC fisheries, which are consistent with the objectives of the IOTC Agreement, including such as, socioeconomics, food security, etc., identified by the Commission, ecosystem-based approach to fisheries and the precautionary approach for the consideration of the Commission. Specifically, consideration of the following:
 - b) Overarching management objectives to guide the development of management strategies for the IOTC fisheries;
 - c) Target and Limit Reference Points with reference to the use of interim B_{MSY} and F_{MSY} or other proxies as Target and Limit Reference Points as identified in Resolution 13/10 *on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework* (or any subsequent revision);
 - d) Harvest Control Rules (HCRs), and associated probabilities of achieving these targets or limits, allowing, in particular, the implementation of a precautionary approach as required by Resolution 13/10 *on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework* (or any subsequent revision);
 - e) Risks to the fishery and the resource at these limit and target reference points in the context of different hypothetical HCR's and assessing the time and probability to rebuild stocks to the prescribed targets for stocks identified in Resolution 13/10 *on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework* (or any subsequent revision).
4. The effectiveness of the Science and Management Dialogue Workshops shall be reviewed no later than at the Annual Session of the Commission in 2018.

APPENDIX XX
RESOLUTION 14/04
CONCERNING THE IOTC RECORD OF VESSELS AUTHORISED TO OPERATE IN THE IOTC
AREA OF COMPETENCE

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

RECALLING that IOTC has been taking various measures to prevent, deter and eliminate the IUU fisheries conducted by large-scale tuna fishing vessels;

FURTHER RECALLING that IOTC adopted the [Resolution 01/06](#) *Concerning the IOTC Bigeye Tuna Statistical Document Programme* at its 2001 meeting;

FURTHER RECALLING that IOTC adopted the Resolution 01/02 [superseded by [Resolution 13/02](#)] *Relating to Control of Fishing Activities* at its 2001 meeting;

NOTING that large-scale fishing vessels are highly mobile and easily change fishing grounds from one ocean to another, and have high potential to operate in the IOTC area of competence without timely registration with the Commission;

RECALLING that the FAO Council adopted on 23 June 2001 an International Plan of Action aiming to prevent, to deter and to eliminate illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing (IPOA), that this plan stipulates that the regional fisheries management organisations should take action to strengthen and develop innovative ways, in conformity with international law, to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing and in particular to establish records of vessels authorised and records of vessels engaged in IUU fishing;

RECALLING that the IOTC Record of Active Vessels was established by the Commission on 1 July 2003, via Resolution 02/05 *Concerning the establishment of an IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence*;

RECOGNISING the need to take further measures to effectively eliminate the IUU large scale tuna fishing vessels;

ADOPTS, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article IX of the IOTC Agreement, that:

1. The Commission shall maintain an IOTC Record of fishing vessels that are:
 - a) 24 metres in length overall or above; or
 - b) in case of vessels less than 24 meters, those operating in waters outside the Economic Exclusive Zone of the Flag State;

and that are authorised to fish for tuna and tuna-like species in the IOTC area of competence (hereinafter referred to as 'authorised fishing vessels', or AFVs). For the purpose of this Resolution, AFVs that are not entered in the Record are deemed not to be authorised to fish for, retain on board, tranship or land tuna and tuna-like species.
2. Each Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (hereinafter referred to as "CPC") shall submit electronically, where possible, to the IOTC Executive Secretary for those vessels referred to 1.a) and for those vessels referred to 1.b), the list of its AFVs that are authorised to operate in the IOTC area of competence. This list shall include the following information:
 - a) Name of vessel(s), register number(s);
 - b) IMO number (if eligible);

To allow the necessary time for CPCs to obtain an IMO number for eligible vessels that do not already have one, paragraph 2.b on IMO number is effective as of 1 January 2016. As of this date,

CPCs shall ensure that all their fishing vessels that are registered on the IOTC Record of fishing vessels have IMO numbers issued to them. Paragraph 2.b on IMO number does not apply to vessels which are not eligible to receive IMO numbers.

- c) Previous name(s) (if any);
- d) Previous flag(s) (if any);
- e) Previous details of deletion from other registries (if any);
- f) International radio call sign(s) (if any);
- g) Port of Registration;
- h) Type of vessel(s), length and gross tonnage (GT);
- i) Name and address of owner(s) and operator(s);
- j) Gear(s) used;
- k) Time period(s) authorised for fishing and/or transshipping.

In assessing compliance with the paragraph above, the Commission shall take into account exceptional circumstances in which a vessel owner is not able to obtain an IMO number despite following the appropriate procedures. Flag CPCs shall report any such exceptional situations to the Secretariat.

3. All CPCs which issue authorisations to fish to their flag vessels to fish for species managed by the IOTC shall submit to the IOTC Executive Secretary, by 15 February of 2014, an updated template of the official authorisation to fish outside National Jurisdictions, and update this information whenever this information changes. This information includes:
- a) name of the Competent Authority;
 - b) name and contact of personnel of the Competent Authority;
 - c) signature of the personnel of the Competent Authority;
 - d) official stamp of the Competent Authority.

The IOTC Executive Secretary shall publish the above information in a secure part on the IOTC website for MCS purpose.

4. The template in paragraph 3 shall be used exclusively for monitoring, control and surveillance purposes and a difference between the template and the authorisation carried onboard the vessel does not constitute an infraction, but will prompt the controlling State to clarify the issue with the identified Competent Authority of the flag State of the vessel in question.
5. Each CPC shall promptly notify, after the establishment of their initial IOTC Record, the IOTC Executive Secretary of any addition to, any deletion from and/or any modification of the IOTC Record at any time such changes occur.
6. The IOTC Executive Secretary shall maintain the IOTC Record, and take any measure to ensure publicity of the Record through electronic means, including placing it on the IOTC website, in a manner consistent with confidentiality requirements noted by CPCs.
7. The flag CPCs of the vessels on the record shall:
- a) authorise their vessels to operate in the IOTC area of competence only if they are able to fulfil in respect of these vessels the requirements and responsibilities under the IOTC Agreement and its Conservation and Management Measures;

-
- b) take necessary measures to ensure that their AFVs comply with all the relevant IOTC Conservation and Management Measures;
 - c) take necessary measures to ensure that their AFVs on the IOTC Record keep on board valid certificates of vessel registration and valid authorisation to fish and/or tranship;
 - d) ensure that their AFVs on the IOTC Record have no history of IUU fishing activities or that, if those vessels have such a history, the new owners have provided sufficient evidence demonstrating that the previous owners and operators have no legal, beneficial or financial interest in, or control over those vessels; the parties of the IUU incident have officially resolved the matter and sanctions have been completed; or that having taken into account all relevant facts, their AFVs are not engaged in or associated with IUU fishing;
 - e) ensure, to the extent possible under domestic law, that the owners and operators of their AFVs on the IOTC Record are not engaged in or associated with tuna fishing activities conducted by vessels not entered into the IOTC Record in the IOTC area of competence;
 - f) take necessary measures to ensure, to the extent possible under domestic law, that the owners of the AFVs on the IOTC Record are citizens or legal entities within the flag CPCs so that any control or punitive actions can be effectively taken against them.
8. CPCs shall review their own internal actions and measures taken pursuant to paragraph 7, including punitive actions and sanctions and, in a manner consistent with domestic law as regards disclosure, report the results of the review to the Commission annually. In consideration of the results of such review, the Commission shall, if appropriate, request the flag CPCs of AFVs on the IOTC Record to take further action to enhance compliance by those vessels with IOTC Conservation and Management Measures.
9. a) CPCs shall take measures, under their applicable legislation, to prohibit the fishing for, the retaining on board, the transshipment and landing of tuna and tuna-like species by the vessels which are not entered into the IOTC Record.
- b) To ensure the effectiveness of the IOTC Conservation and Management Measures pertaining to species covered by Statistical Document Programs:
- i. Flag CPCs shall validate statistical documents only for the vessels on the IOTC Record;
 - ii. CPCs shall require that the species covered by Statistical Document Programs caught by AFVs in the IOTC area of competence, when imported into the territory of a Contracting Party, be accompanied by statistical documents validated for the vessels on the IOTC Record; and
 - iii. CPCs importing species covered by Statistical Document Programs and the flag States of vessels shall cooperate to ensure that statistical documents are not forged or do not contain misinformation.
10. Each CPC shall notify the IOTC Executive Secretary of any factual information showing that there are reasonable grounds for suspecting vessels not on the IOTC Record to be engaged in fishing for and/or transhipment of tuna and tuna-like species in the IOTC area of competence.
11. a) If a vessel mentioned in paragraph 10 is flying the flag of a CPC, the IOTC Executive Secretary shall request that Party to take measures necessary to prevent the vessel from fishing for tuna and tuna-like species in the IOTC area of competence;
- b) If the flag of a vessel mentioned in paragraph 10 cannot be determined or is of a non-Contracting Party without cooperating status, the IOTC Executive Secretary shall compile and circulate such information to all CPCs, without delay.
-

12. The Commission and the CPCs concerned shall communicate with each other, and make the best effort with FAO and other relevant regional fishery management bodies to develop and implement appropriate measures, where feasible, including the establishment of records of a similar nature in a timely manner so as to avoid adverse effects upon tuna resources in other oceans. Such adverse effects might consist of excessive fishing pressure resulting from a shift of the IUU fishing vessels from the Indian Ocean to other oceans.
13. Each Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with the IOTC shall:
 - a) Ensure that each of its fishing vessels carry on board documents issued and certified by the competent authority of that Contracting Party or of that Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with IOTC, including, at a minimum, the following:
 - i. License, permit or authorisation to fish and terms and conditions attached to the licence, permit of authorisation;
 - ii. Vessel name;
 - iii. Port in which registered and the number(s) under which registered;
 - iv. International call sign;
 - v. Names and addresses of owner(s) and where relevant, the charterer;
 - vi. Overall length;
 - vii. Engine power, in KW/horsepower, where appropriate.
 - b) Verify above documents on a regular basis and at least every year;
 - c) Ensure that any modification to the documents and to the information referred to in 13.a) is certified by the competent authority of that Contracting Party or of that Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with the IOTC.
14. Each Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with the IOTC shall ensure that its fishing vessels authorised to fish in the IOTC area of competence are marked in such a way that they can be really identified with generally accepted standards such as the FAO Standard Specification for the Marking and Identification of Fishing vessels.
15.
 - a) Each Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with the IOTC shall ensure that each gear used by its fishing vessels authorised to fish in the IOTC area of competence is marked appropriately, e.g., the ends of nets, lines and gear in the sea, shall be fitted with flag or radar reflector buoys by day and light buoys by night sufficient to indicate their position and extent;
 - b) Marker buoys and similar objects floating and on the surface, and intended to indicate the location of fixed fishing gear, shall be clearly marked at all time with the letter(s) and/or number(s) of the vessel to which they belong;
 - c) Fish aggregating devices shall be clearly marked at all time with the letter(s) and / or number(s) of the vessel to which they belong.
16. Each Contracting Party and Cooperating Non-Contracting Party with the IOTC shall ensure that all their respective fishing vessels of 24 meters or above and vessels less than 24 meters if fishing outside their EEZ, and are registered on the IOTC Record of fishing vessels and authorised to fish in the IOTC area of competence, keep a bound fishing national logbook with consecutively numbered pages. The original recordings contained in the fishing logbooks shall be kept on board the fishing vessel for a period of at least 12 months.
17. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/02 *Concerning the establishment of an IOTC record of vessels authorised to operate in the IOTC area.*

APPENDIX XXI
RESOLUTION 14/05

**CONCERNING A RECORD OF LICENSED FOREIGN VESSELS FISHING FOR IOTC SPECIES IN
THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE AND ACCESS AGREEMENT INFORMATION**

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

RECOGNISING that coastal States have sovereign rights in a 200-nautical mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) with respect to their natural resources;

CONSCIOUS of the provisions of Article 62 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea;

NOTING that the information on vessels licensed to fish in the EEZ of IOTC Contracting Parties and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (collectively, CPCs), constitutes a means to identify potential unreported fishing activities;

MINDFUL of the recommendation 17 of the Performance Review Panel, as listed in [Resolution 09/01](#) on the *performance review follow-up*, that the obligation incumbent to a flag State to report data for its vessels be included in a separate Resolution from the obligation incumbent on Members to report data on the vessels of third countries they licence to fish in their EEZs;

AWARE of the data reporting requirements for all CPCs and the importance of complete statistical reporting to the work of the IOTC Scientific Committee, its Working Parties and the Commission;

MINDFUL of the need to ensure transparency among CPCs, in particular to facilitate joint efforts to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing;

RECALLING the duties of CPCs concerning IUU fisheries as stated in the [Resolution 11/03](#) *establishing a list of vessels presumed to have carried out illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in the IOTC area of competence* which requires CPCs to ensure that their vessels do not conduct fishing activities within areas under the national jurisdiction of other States without authorisation and/or infringe the coastal State's laws and Resolutions;

ADOPTS, in accordance with the provisions of Article IX, paragraph 1 of the IOTC Agreement, the following:

PRIVATE ACCESS AGREEMENTS:

1. All CPCs which issue licenses to foreign flag vessels to fish in their EEZ for species managed by the IOTC in the IOTC area of competence (hereinafter referred to as “the Area”), shall submit to the IOTC Executive Secretary, by 15 February every year, a list of all foreign flag vessels to which such licences have been issued during the previous year.
2. This list shall contain the following information for each vessel:
 - a) IOTC Number;
 - b) Name and registration number;
 - c) IMO number (if eligible);

To allow the necessary time to obtain an IMO number for eligible vessels that do not already have one, paragraph 2.c on IMO number is effective as of 1 January 2016. As of this date, CPCs shall ensure that all the fishing vessels that are registered on the IOTC Record of licenced fishing vessels have IMO numbers issued to them. Paragraph 2.c on IMO number does not apply to vessels which are not eligible to receive IMO numbers.
 - d) The flag at the time of issuing the licence;
 - e) International radio call sign (if any);

-
- f) Vessel type, length, and gross tonnage (GT);
 - g) Name and address of owner, and/or charterer and/or operator;
 - h) Main target species; and
 - i) Period of licence.

In assessing compliance with the paragraph above, the Commission shall take into account exceptional circumstances in which a vessel owner is not able to obtain an IMO number despite following the appropriate procedures. The CPC which has issued the licence to this vessel shall report any such exceptional situation to the IOTC Secretariat.

GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT ACCESS AGREEMENTS:

3. In cases where coastal CPCs allow foreign-flagged vessels to fish in waters in their EEZ in the IOTC Area for species managed by IOTC through a Government to Government access agreement, CPCs involved in the referred agreement shall submit jointly to the IOTC Executive Secretary the information concerning these agreements, including:
 - a) The CPCs involved in the agreement;
 - b) The time period or periods covered by the agreement;
 - c) The number of vessels and gear types authorised;
 - d) The stock or species authorised for harvest, including any applicable catch limits;
 - e) The CPC's quota or catch limit to which the catch will be applied, where applicable;
 - f) Monitoring, control, and surveillance measures required by the flag CPC and coastal CPC involved;
 - g) Data reporting obligations stipulated in the agreement, including those between the parties involved, as well as those regarding information that must be provided to the Commission;
 - h) A copy of the written agreement.
4. For agreements in existence prior to the entry into force of this Resolution, the information specified in paragraph 3 shall be provided, at the least, 60 days in advance of the 2013 Commission meeting.
5. When an access agreement is modified in a manner that changes any of the information specified in paragraph 3, these changes shall be promptly notified to the IOTC Executive Secretary.

COMMON PROVISIONS FOR ACCESS AGREEMENTS:

6. The CPCs shall notify the ship owner and flag State concerning foreign flagged fishing vessels that requested a license under a private access agreement or under a government to government access agreement and for which the request of license was denied. If the reason for denial is related to an infringement of IOTC CMMs, the IOTC Compliance Committee shall address the issue at the next session accordingly.
7. All CPCs which issue licenses to foreign flag vessels to fish in their EEZs for species managed by the IOTC in the IOTC Area, under a private access agreement or under a government to government access agreement, shall submit to the IOTC Executive Secretary within two (2) months of the entry into force of this Resolution a template of the official coastal State fishing License and translated version in one of the official Languages of the IOTC, with:
 - a) The terms and conditions of the coastal State fishing license;
 - b) The name of the Competent Authority;

- c) The name and contact of the personnel of the Competent Authority;
- d) The signature of the personnel of the Competent Authority;
- e) The official stamp(s) of the Competent Authority.

The IOTC Executive Secretary shall publish the template of the coastal State fishing license and the above information in a secure part of the IOTC website for MCS purposes. The information mentioned in sub-paragraph b) to e) must be provided in the form of the **Annex I**.

8. When a coastal State fishing license is modified in a manner that changes the template, any of the information provided in it or the information provided in a) to e) of paragraph 7, these changes shall be promptly notified to the IOTC Executive Secretary.
9. The IOTC Secretariat shall report the information specified in this Resolution annually to the Commission at its annual meeting.
10. This Resolution shall be consistent with domestic confidentiality requirements of the coastal CPC and the flag CPC concerned.
11. This Resolution supersedes Resolution 13/07 *Concerning A Record Of Licensed Foreign Vessels Fishing For IOTC Species In The IOTC Area Of Competence And Access Agreement Information*.

ANNEX I

COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Coastal State Fishing licence

Country:	
Name of the Competent Authority as stated in the Authorisation To Fish (ATF):	
Address of the Competent Authority:	
Name and contact of personnel of the Competent Authority (email, telephone, fax):	
Signature of the personnel of the Competent Authority:	
Government seal used on the fishing licence:	

APPENDIX XXII RESOLUTION 14/06

ON ESTABLISHING A PROGRAMME FOR TRANSHIPMENT BY LARGE-SCALE FISHING VESSELS

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

TAKING ACCOUNT of the need to combat illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing activities because they undermine the effectiveness of the Conservation and Management Measures already adopted by the IOTC;

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN that organized tuna laundering operations have been conducted and a significant amount of catches by IUU fishing vessels have been transhipped under the names of duly licensed fishing vessels;

IN VIEW THEREFORE OF THE NEED to ensure the monitoring of the transhipment activities by large-scale longline vessels in the IOTC area of competence, including the control of their landings;

TAKING ACCOUNT of the need to collect catch data of such large scale long-line tuna to improve the scientific assessments of those stocks;

ADOPTS, in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article IX of the IOTC Agreement, that:

SECTION 1. GENERAL RULE

1. Except under the programme to monitor transhipments at sea outlined below in Section 2, all transhipment operations of tuna and tuna-like species and sharks caught in association with tuna and tuna-like fisheries in the IOTC area of competence (hereinafter referred to as “tuna and tuna-like species and sharks”) must take place in port.
2. The flag Contracting Party, Cooperating Non-Contracting Party (CPCs) shall take the necessary measures to ensure that large scale tuna vessels (hereafter referred to as the “LSTVs”) flying their flag comply with the obligations set out in **Annex I** when transhipping in port.

SECTION 2. PROGRAMME TO MONITOR TRANSHIPMENTS AT SEA

3. The Commission hereby establishes a programme to monitor transhipment at sea which applies only to large-scale tuna longline fishing vessels (hereafter referred to as the “LSTLVs”) and to carrier vessels authorised to receive transhipments from these vessels at sea. No at-sea transhipment of tuna and tuna-like species and sharks by fishing vessels other than LSTLVs shall be allowed. The Commission shall review and, as appropriate, revise this Resolution.
4. The CPCs that flag LSTLVs shall determine whether or not to authorise their LSTLVs to tranship at sea. However, if the flag CPC authorises the at-sea transhipment by its flag LSTLVs, such transhipment shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures defined in Sections 3, 4 and 5, and **Annexes II** and **III** below.

SECTION 3. RECORD OF VESSELS AUTHORISED TO RECEIVE TRANSHIPMENTS-AT-SEA IN THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

5. The Commission shall establish and maintain an IOTC Record of Carrier Vessels authorised to receive tuna and tuna-like species and sharks at sea in the IOTC area of competence from LSTLVs. For the purposes of this Resolution, carrier vessels not entered on the record are deemed not to be authorised to receive tuna and tuna-like species and sharks in at-sea transhipment operations.
6. Each CPC shall submit, electronically where possible, to the IOTC Executive Secretary the list of the carrier vessels that are authorised to receive at-sea transhipments from its LSTLVs in the IOTC area of competence. This list shall include the following information:
 - a) The flag of the vessel;
 - b) Name of vessel, register number;

-
- c) Previous name (if any);
 - d) Previous flag (if any);
 - e) Previous details of deletion from other registries (if any);
 - f) International radio call sign;
 - g) Type of vessels, length, gross tonnage (GT) and carrying capacity;
 - h) Name and address of owner(s) and operator(s);
 - i) Time period authorised for transshipping.
7. Each CPC shall promptly notify the IOTC Executive Secretary, after the establishment of the initial IOTC Record, of any addition to, any deletion from and/or any modification of the IOTC Record, at any time such changes occur.
8. The IOTC Executive Secretary shall maintain the IOTC Record and take measures to ensure publicity of the record through electronic means, including placing it on the IOTC website, in a manner consistent with confidentiality requirements notified by CPCs for their vessels.
9. Carrier vessels authorised for at-sea transshipment shall be required to install and operate a Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).

SECTION 4. AT-SEA TRANSHIPMENT

10. Transshipments by LSTLVs in waters under the jurisdiction of the CPCs are subject to prior authorisation from the Coastal State concerned. CPCs shall take the necessary measures to ensure that LSTLVs flying their flag comply with the following conditions:

Flag State Authorization

11. LSTLVs are not authorised to tranship at sea, unless they have obtained prior authorisation from their flag State.

Notification obligations

Fishing vessel:

12. To receive the prior authorisation mentioned in paragraph 11 above, the master and/or owner of the LSTLV must notify the following information to its flag State authorities at least 24 hours in advance of an intended transshipment:
- a) The name of the LSTLV, its number in the IOTC Record of Vessels, and its IMO number, if issued;
 - b) The name of the carrier vessel, its number in the IOTC Record of Carrier Vessels authorised to receive transshipments in the IOTC area of competence, and its IMO number, and the product to be transhipped;
 - c) The tonnage by product to be transhipped;
 - d) The date and location of transshipment;
 - e) The geographic location of the catches.
13. The LSTLV concerned shall complete and transmit to its flag State, not later than 15 days after the transshipment, the IOTC transshipment declaration, along with its number in the IOTC Record of Fishing Vessels, in accordance with the format set out in **Annex II**.

Receiving carrier vessel:

14. Before starting transshipment, the master of the receiving carrier vessel shall confirm that the LSTLV concerned is participating in the IOTC programme to monitor transshipment at sea (which includes payment of the fee in paragraph 13 of **Annex III**) and has obtained the prior authorisation from their flag State referred to in paragraph 11. The master of the receiving carrier vessel shall not start such transshipment without such confirmation.
15. The master of the receiving carrier vessel shall complete and transmit the IOTC transshipment declaration to the IOTC Secretariat and the flag CPC of the LSTLV, along with its number in the IOTC Record of Carrier Vessels authorised to receive transshipment in the IOTC area of competence, within 24 hours of the completion of the transshipment.
16. The master of the receiving carrier vessel shall, 48 hours before landing, transmit an IOTC transshipment declaration, along with its number in the IOTC Record of Carrier Vessels authorised to receive transshipment in the IOTC area of competence, to the competent authorities of the State where the landing takes place.

Regional Observer Programme:

17. Each CPC shall ensure that all carrier vessels transshipping at sea have on board an IOTC observer, in accordance with the IOTC Regional Observer Programme in **Annex III**. The IOTC observer shall observe the compliance with this Resolution, and notably that the transhipped quantities are consistent with the reported catch in the IOTC transshipment declaration.
18. Vessels shall be prohibited from commencing or continuing at-sea transshipping in the IOTC area of competence without an IOTC regional observer on board, except in cases of “force majeure” duly notified to the IOTC Secretariat.

SECTION 5. GENERAL PROVISIONS

19. To ensure the effectiveness of the IOTC Conservation and Management Measures pertaining to species covered by Statistical Document Programs:
 - a) In validating the Statistical Document, flag CPCs of LSTLVs shall ensure that transshipments are consistent with the reported catch amount by each LSTLV;
 - b) The flag CPC of LSTLVs shall validate the Statistical Documents for the transhipped fish, after confirming that the transshipment was conducted in accordance with this Resolution. This confirmation shall be based on the information obtained through the IOTC Observer Programme;
 - c) CPCs shall require that the species covered by the Statistical Document Programs caught by LSTLVs in the IOTC area of competence, when imported into the territory of a Contracting Party, be accompanied by statistical documents validated for the vessels on the IOTC record and a copy of the IOTC transshipment declaration.
20. The CPCs shall report annually before 15 September to the IOTC Executive Secretary:
 - a) The quantities by species transhipped during the previous year;
 - b) The list of the LSTLVs registered in the IOTC Record of Fishing Vessels which have transhipped during the previous year;
 - c) A comprehensive report assessing the content and conclusions of the reports of the observers assigned to carrier vessels which have received transshipment from their LSTLVs.
21. All tuna and tuna-like species and sharks landed or imported into the CPCs either unprocessed or after having been processed on board and which are transhipped, shall be accompanied by the IOTC transshipment declaration until the first sale has taken place.

22. Each year, the IOTC Executive Secretary shall present a report on the implementation of this Resolution to the annual meeting of the Commission which shall review compliance with this Resolution.
23. The IOTC Secretariat shall, when providing CPCs with copies of all raw data, summaries and reports in accordance with paragraph 10 of **Annex III** to this Resolution, also indicate evidence indicating possible infraction of IOTC regulations by LSTLVs/carrier vessels flagged to that CPC. Upon receiving such evidence, each CPC shall investigate the cases and report the results of the investigation back to the IOTC Secretariat three months prior to the IOTC Compliance Committee meeting. The IOTC Secretariat shall circulate among CPCs the list of names and flags of the LSTLVs/Carrier vessels that were involved in such possible infractions as well as the response of the flag CPCs 80 days prior to the IOTC Compliance Committee meeting.
24. Resolution 12/05 *On establishing a programme for transhipment by large-scale fishing vessels* is superseded by this Resolution.

ANNEX I

Conditions relating to in-port transhipment by LSTVs

General

1. Transhipment operations in port may only be undertaken in accordance with the procedures detailed below:

Notification obligations

2. Fishing vessel:
 - 2.1. Prior to transhipping, the Captain of the LSTV must notify the following information to the port State authorities, at least 48 hours in advance:
 - a) the name of the LSTV and its number in the IOTC record of fishing vessels;
 - b) the name of the carrier vessel, and the product to be transhipped;
 - c) the tonnage by product to be transhipped;
 - d) the date and location of transhipment;
 - e) the major fishing grounds of the tuna and tuna-like species and sharks catches.
 - 2.2. The Captain of a LSTV shall, at the time of the transhipment, inform its Flag State of the following:
 - a) the products and quantities involved;
 - b) the date and place of the transhipment;
 - c) the name, registration number and flag of the receiving carrier vessel;
 - d) the geographic location of the tuna and tuna-like species and sharks catches.
 - 2.3. The captain of the LSTV concerned shall complete and transmit to its flag State the IOTC transhipment declaration, along with its number in the IOTC Record of Fishing Vessels, in accordance with the format set out in **Annex II** not later than 15 days after the transhipment.
3. Receiving vessel:

Not later than 24 hours before the beginning and at the end of the transhipment, the master of the receiving carrier vessel shall inform the port State authorities of the quantities of tuna and tuna-like species and sharks transhipped to his vessel, and complete and transmit the IOTC transhipment declaration, to the competent authorities within 24 hours.



Landing State:

4. The master of the receiving carrier vessel shall, 48 hours before landing, complete and transmit an IOTC transshipment declaration, to the competent authorities of the landing State where the landing takes place.
5. The port State and the landing State referred to in the above paragraphs shall take the appropriate measures to verify the accuracy of the information received and shall cooperate with the flag CPC of the LSTV to ensure that landings are consistent with the reported catches amount of each vessel. This verification shall be carried out so that the vessel suffers the minimum interference and inconvenience and that degradation of the fish is avoided.
6. Each flag CPC of the LSTVs shall include in its annual report each year to IOTC the details on the transshipments by its vessels.



ANNEX II

IOTC Transshipment declaration

Carrier Vessel	Fishing Vessel
Name of the Vessel and Radio Call Sign:	Name of the Vessel and Radio Call Sign:
Flag:	Flag:
Flag State license number:	Flag State license number:
National Register Number, if available:	National Register Number, if available:
IOTC Register Number, if available:	IOTC Register Number, if available:

Day Month Hour Year |2_|0_|_|_| Agent's name: Master's name of LSTV: Master's name of Carrier:

Departure |_|_| |_|_| |_|_| from |_____|

Return |_|_| |_|_| |_|_| to |_____| Signature: Signature: Signature:

Transshipment |_|_| |_|_| |_|_| |_____|

Indicate the weight in kilograms or the unit used (e.g. box, basket) and the landed weight in kilograms of this unit: |_____| kilograms

LOCATION OF TRANSHIPMENT

Species	Port		Sea	Type of product									
				Whole	Gutted	Headed	Filletted						

If transshipment effected at sea, IOTC Observer Name and Signature:

ANNEX III

IOTC Regional Observer Programme

1. Each CPC shall require carrier vessels included in the IOTC Record of Carrier Vessels authorised to receive transhipments in the IOTC area of competence and which tranship at sea, to carry an IOTC observer during each transhipment operation in the IOTC area of competence.
2. The IOTC Executive Secretary shall appoint the observers and shall place them on board the carrier vessels authorised to receive transhipments in the IOTC area of competence from LSTLVs flying the flag of Contracting Parties and of Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties that implement the IOTC observer program.

Designation of the observers

3. The designated observers shall have the following qualifications to accomplish their tasks:
 - a) sufficient experience to identify species and fishing gear;
 - b) satisfactory knowledge of the IOTC Conservation and Management Measures;
 - c) the ability to observe and record information accurately;
 - d) a satisfactory knowledge of the language of the flag of the vessel observed.

Obligations of the observer

4. Observers shall:
 - a) have completed the technical training required by the guidelines established by IOTC;
 - b) not be, to the extent possible, nationals of the flag State of the receiving carrier vessel;
 - c) be capable of performing the duties set forth in point 5 below;
 - d) be included in the list of observers maintained by the IOTC Secretariat;
 - e) not be a crew member of an LSTLV or an employee of an LSTLV company.
5. The observer tasks shall be in particular to:
 - a) On the Fishing Vessel intending to tranship to the carrier vessel and before the transhipment takes place, the observer shall:
 - i. check the validity of the fishing vessel's authorisation or licence to fish tuna and tuna-like species and sharks in the IOTC area of competence;
 - ii. check and note the total quantity of catch on board, and the quantity to be transferred to the carrier vessel;
 - iii. check that the VMS is functioning and examine the logbook;
 - iv. verify whether any of the catch on board resulted from transfers from other vessels, and check documentation on such transfers;
 - v. in the case of an indication that there are any violations involving the fishing vessel, immediately report the violations to the carrier vessel's master,
 - vi. report the results of these duties on the fishing vessel in the observers report.

-
- b) On the Carrier Vessel:
Monitor the carrier vessel's compliance with the relevant Conservation and Management Measures adopted by the Commission. In particular the observers shall:
- i. record and report upon the transshipment activities carried out;
 - ii. verify the position of the vessel when engaged in transshipping;
 - iii. observe and estimate products transhipped;
 - iv. verify and record the name of the LSTLV concerned and its IOTC number;
 - v. verify the data contained in the transshipment declaration;
 - vi. certify the data contained in the transshipment declaration;
 - vii. countersign the transshipment declaration;
 - viii. issue a daily report of the carrier vessels transshipping activities;
 - ix. establish general reports compiling the information collected in accordance with this paragraph and provide the captain the opportunity to include therein any relevant information;
 - x. submit to the IOTC Secretariat the aforementioned general report within 20 days from the end of the period of observation;
 - xi. exercise any other functions as defined by the Commission.
6. Observers shall treat as confidential all information with respect to the fishing operations of the LSTLVs and of the LSTLVs owners and accept this requirement in writing as a condition of appointment as an observer.
7. Observers shall comply with requirements established in the laws and regulations of the flag State which exercises jurisdiction over the vessel to which the observer is assigned.
8. Observers shall respect the hierarchy and general rules of behaviour which apply to all vessel personnel, provided such rules do not interfere with the duties of the observer under this program, and with the obligations of vessel personnel set forth in paragraph 9 of this program.

Obligations of the flag States of carrier vessels

9. The responsibilities regarding observers of the flag States of the carrier vessels and their captains shall include the following, notably:
- a) Observers shall be allowed access to the vessel personnel and to the gear and equipment;
 - b) Upon request, observers shall also be allowed access to the following equipment, if present on the vessels to which they are assigned, in order to facilitate the carrying out of their duties set forth in paragraph 5:
 - i. Satellite navigation equipment;
 - ii. Radar display viewing screens when in use;
 - iii. Electronic means of communication.
 - c) Observers shall be provided accommodation, including lodging, food and adequate sanitary facilities, equal to those of officers;
 - d) Observers shall be provided with adequate space on the bridge or pilot house for clerical work, as well as space on deck adequate for carrying out observer duties; and
-

-
- e) The flag States shall ensure that captains, crew and vessel owners do not obstruct, intimidate, interfere with, influence, bribe or attempt to bribe an observer in the performance of his/her duties.
10. The IOTC Executive Secretary, in a manner consistent with any applicable confidentiality requirements, shall provide to the flag State of the carrier vessel under whose jurisdiction the vessel transhipped and to the flag CPC of the LSTLV, copies of all available raw data, summaries, and reports pertaining to the trip four months prior to the IOTC Compliance Committee meeting.

Obligations of LSTLV during transhipment

11. Observers shall be allowed to visit the fishing vessel, if weather conditions permit it, and access shall be granted to personnel and areas of the vessel necessary to carry out their duties set forth in paragraph 5.
12. The IOTC Executive Secretary shall submit the observer reports to the IOTC Compliance Committee and to the IOTC Scientific Committee.

Observer fees

13. The costs of implementing this program shall be financed by the flag CPCs of LSTLVs wishing to engage in transhipment operations. The fee shall be calculated on the basis of the total costs of the program. This fee shall be paid into a special account of the IOTC Secretariat and the IOTC Executive Secretary shall manage the account for implementing the program.
14. No LSTLV may participate in the at-sea transhipment program unless the fees, as required under paragraph 13, have been paid.

APPENDIX XXIII

RECOMMENDATION 14/07

TO STANDARDISE THE PRESENTATION OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION IN THE ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE REPORT AND IN WORKING PARTY REPORTS

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC),

RECOGNISING the importance of sound scientific advice as the centre piece for the conservation and management of tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean and adjacent seas in line with international law and the information needs of the Commission;

NOTING that participants of the first Global Summit of Tuna RFMOs in 2007 in Kobe, Japan agreed that stock assessment results be presented in a standardised "four quadrant, red-yellow-green-orange" format that is now referred as the "Kobe Plot" which is widely embraced as a practical, user-friendly method to present stock status information;

FURTHER NOTING that, at the Second Joint Meeting of Tuna RFMOs in June 2009 in San Sebastian, Spain, a "Strategy Matrix" was adopted to provide fisheries managers with the statistical probability of meeting management targets, including ending overfishing and rebuilding overfished stocks, in a standardised manner as a result of potential management actions;

ACKNOWLEDGING that the Strategy Matrix is a harmonised format for RFMO science bodies to convey advice, and that this format for presenting stock assessment results facilitates the application of the precautionary approach by providing Commissions with the basis to evaluate and adopt management options at various levels of probability of success;

RECALLING recommendations of the Kobe II Workshop of Experts to Share Best Practices on the Provision of Scientific Advice and of the Kobe III recommendations, in particular on development on research activities to better quantify the uncertainty and understand how this uncertainty is reflected in the risk assessment inherent in the Kobe II strategy matrix;

FURTHER RECALLING the provisions of the Recommendation 12/15 *on the best available science*, that requests the provision of clear, transparent, and standardised formats for scientific advice delivered to the Commission;

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT that Resolutions 12/01 *on the implementation of the precautionary approach* and 13/10 *on interim target and limit reference points and a decision framework*, make possible the implementation of the precautionary approach thanks to the adoption of interim target and limit reference points;

NOTING the excellent work to date by the Scientific Committee, its working parties and the IOTC Secretariat to standardise the presentation of scientific information in their annual reports, including via the '*Executive Summaries*' for each stock;

STRESSING the importance of further refining the presentation of scientific information to facilitate appropriate utilisation by the Commission;

RECOMMENDS, in accordance with paragraph 8 of Article IX of the IOTC Agreement, that:

1. In support of the scientific advice made available by the IOTC Scientific Committee, the '*Executive Summaries*' within the annual IOTC Scientific Committee report which present stock assessment results, include when possible:

Stock status

- a) A Kobe plot/chart showing:
 - i. Any Target and Limit Reference Points adopted by the Commission, e.g. F_{MSY} and F_{LIM} , SB_{MSY} and SB_{LIM} or B_{MSY} and B_{LIM} , depending on the assessment models used by the Scientific Committee, or proxies where available;

- ii. The stock estimates, expressed in reference to Target Reference Points adopted by the Commission, e.g. as F_{CURRENT} on F_{MSY} and as SB_{CURRENT} on SB_{MSY} or as B_{CURRENT} on B_{MSY} ;
 - iii. The estimated uncertainty around estimates, provided that statistical methods to do so have been agreed upon the Scientific Committee and that sufficient data exist;
 - iv. The stock status trajectory.
- b) A graphical representation showing the proportion of model outputs of the years used for advice from the last stock assessment that are within the green quadrant of the Kobe plot/chart (not overfished, not subject to overfishing), the yellow and orange quadrants (overfished or subject to overfishing) and the red quadrant (overfished and subject to overfishing).

Model outlooks

- c) Two Kobe II strategy matrices:
- i. A first one indicating the probability of complying with the Target Reference Points adopted by the Commission, e.g. the probability of either $SB > SB_{\text{MSY}}$ or $B > B_{\text{MSY}}$ and of $F < F_{\text{MSY}}$ for different levels of catch across multiple years;
 - ii. A second one indicating the probability of being inside safe biological limits expressed through Limit Reference Points adopted by the Commission, e.g. the probability of either $SB > SB_{\text{LIM}}$ or $B > B_{\text{LIM}}$ and of $F < F_{\text{LIM}}$ for different levels of catch across multiple years;
 - iii. When the Commission agrees on acceptable probability levels associated with the target and limit reference points on a stock by stock basis, the Scientific Committee could prepare and include, in the annual report, the Kobe II strategy matrices using colour coding corresponding to these thresholds.

Data quality and limitations of the assessment models

- d) A statement qualifying the quality, the reliability and where relevant the representativeness of input data to stock assessments, such as, but not limited to:
- i. Fisheries statistics and fisheries indicators (e.g. catch and effort, catch-at size and catch at age matrices by sex and, when applicable, fisheries dependent indices of abundance);
 - ii. Biological information (e.g. growth parameters, natural mortality, maturity and fecundity, migration patterns and stock structure, fisheries independent indices of abundance);
 - iii. Complementary information (e.g. consistencies among available abundance indices, influence of the environmental factors on the dynamic of the stock, changes in fishing effort distribution, selectivity and fishing power, changes in target species).
- e) A statement qualifying the limits of the assessment model with respect to the type and the quality of the input data and expressing the possible biases in the assessment results associated with uncertainties of the input data;
- f) A statement concerning the reliability of the projections carried out over the long term.

Alternative approach (data poor stocks)

2. When, due to data or modelling limitations, the IOTC Scientific Committee is unable to develop Kobe II strategy matrices and associated charts or other estimates of current status relative to benchmarks, the IOTC Scientific Committee will develop its scientific advice on available fisheries-dependant and fisheries-independent indicators and provide similar caveats as those detailed in paragraph 1(d).

Additional information and review of the structure and templates of the 'Executive Summaries'

3. The Commission encourages the IOTC Scientific Committee to include either in its annual report or in the detailed reports, where possible and if considered as relevant and useful, any other tables and/or graphics supporting scientific advice and management recommendations. In particular, the IOTC Scientific Committee will include, where possible, information on the recruitment trajectories, on the stock-recruitment relationship and some ratio such as yield per recruit or biomass per recruit.
4. As far as needed, the IOTC Scientific Committee shall review recommendations and templates for the Kobe II strategy matrices, plot and graphical representations as laid down in this Recommendation and will advise the Commission on possible improvements.

APPENDIX XXIV

STATEMENT OF THE IOTC PLENARY ON PIRACY IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE IOTC AREA OF COMPETENCE

The Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC):

- *Recalls* its statements on piracy off the coast of Somalia.⁵ Despite a significant drop in pirate attacks in 2013, piracy against humanitarian, commercial and fishing vessels in the western Indian Ocean remains a real threat.
- *Continues* to be deeply concerned by the acts of piracy which put at risk the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the population of Somalia. Piracy continues to have a serious impact on merchant shipping and legitimate fishing activities in the western part of the IOTC area of competence subject to international laws and regulations and where their activities are monitored by IOTC members in accordance with its management measures.
- *Welcomes* the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR)⁶ on piracy off the coast of Somalia and urges all States to continue contributing to their rapid and effective implementation. The most recent UN Security Resolution 2125 was adopted on 18 November 2013. The Security Council renewed for another year the authorizations, first agreed in 2008, for international action to fight the crimes in cooperation with the Government of the Federal Republic of Somalia, whom it requested to create a national legal framework for the effort.
- The implementation of these resolutions helps to ensure the protection of all fishermen from piracy, and enables them to carry out their fishing activities. Fishing is their livelihood that also generates a significant amount of economic activities in coastal countries of the Indian Ocean.
- *Welcomes* the recent accession of the Federal Republic of Somalia to IOTC membership, on 22nd May 2014, as it is paving the way for better management procedures for highly migratory species in the waters of Somalia, and therefore is participating to the fight against piracy in the IOTC area of competence.
- *Expresses* its satisfaction with the ongoing efforts of organisations and states, including the Federal Republic of Somalia, contributing to fight piracy off the coast of Somalia. It calls for the international community to devote sufficient means to fully implement the UNSC resolutions. The implementation of these resolutions along with the incorporation of self-protection measures on board the fishing vessels most exposed to piracy attacks, helps to ensure the protection of all fishermen from piracy and enables them to carry out their fishing activities.
- *Recalls* the relevant provisions included in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), notably those included in its article 105, for fighting acts of piracy and calls on State parties to that Convention to take the necessary action in their national legislations to make full use of those provisions.
- *Commends* the comprehensive approach by the EU in addressing the situation both through actions such as EUNAVFOR ATALANTA recently extended to December 2016, the Maritime Security Programme which will also pave the way for more substantial and comprehensive intervention in 2014, the MASE Programme, to promote Maritime security and fight piracy in Eastern and Southern Africa and the Western Indian Ocean and the efforts undertaken by EU CAP NESTOR⁷. This mission aims to assist with development in the Horn of Africa and the western Indian Ocean States to provide self-sustainability for continued enhancement of maritime security, including

⁵ 6 May 2008, March 2009, March 2010, March 2011, March 2012 and May 2013

⁶ (UNSCR) 1814, 1816, 1838, 1846, 1851, 1897, 1918, 1950, 1976, 2015, 2020 and 2077

⁷ EU COUNCIL DECISION 2012/389/CFSP of 16 July 2012 on the European Union Mission on Regional Maritime Capacity Building in the Horn of Africa (EUCAP NESTOR)

counter-piracy, and maritime governance. EUCAP NESTOR's geographical focus is on Djibouti, Kenya, the Seychelles and Somalia. It is also deployed in Tanzania.

- *Also commends* all new international initiatives to curb piracy in the western Indian Ocean.

- *Recalls* the efforts made by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), with its robust code of conduct on piracy and armed robbery against ships for States from the western Indian Ocean and Gulf of Aden areas of 2009 – the Djibouti Code of Conduct. It urges all eligible states to sign. - *Stresses* the need to promptly report incidents of piracy and armed robbery, including attempts, thus providing timely and accurate information on the scope of the problem. Sharing relevant information with coastal States and other States potentially affected by such incidents is crucial to addressing the issue.

- *Commends*, in the context of a regional approach, the important role of the IMO in implementing the Djibouti Code of Conduct with the support of donor countries. The IOTC commends the work of the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia in facilitating coordination among its members.

- *Believes* that military resources to contain piracy remain necessary and have contributed to curbing attacks along the coast of Somalia and the western Indian Ocean.

- *Recognises* that recent technological developments have made ship self-reporting systems⁸ much more affordable. The value of the maritime awareness resulting from their use for maritime safety and security, including counter-piracy, has been demonstrated e.g. in recent EU projects⁹, and will continue to be demonstrated in the Indian Ocean region¹⁰.

The IOTC calls on the government of the Federal Republic of Somalia

- to complete the process to adopt and implement anti-piracy legislation
- to lead counter piracy messaging efforts to Somalis
- to take all necessary action to combat piracy activities on the Somali coast

The IOTC calls on the International Community

- For its support to ensure the safety of all fishing vessels and their crew in the region from acts of piracy. We encourage full implementation by flag States of the Best Management Practices as agreed by the international maritime community - vessels are encouraged to fully adopt these to help repel piracy attacks while acknowledging the decision to approve these measures should remain with the flag State. Best management practices should continue to be applied consistently.
- For strong and concerted action on the international and political scene. The Regional Strategy on Piracy and Maritime Security and its Plan of Action adopted in Mauritius in October 2010 by 22 Countries of the region, is a major step towards a regional response to piracy. Although measures are in place to prosecute suspected pirates and to install a proper rule of law in Somalia.
- For its support to the Federal Republic of Somalia to fight against piracy and its root causes on its territory and in its waters.

⁸ AIS – Automatic Identification System, and VMS – Vessel Monitoring System.

⁹ Pilot projects on Piracy, Maritime Awareness and Risks (PMAR) (<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/fileadmin/docs/JRC69765.pdf>).

¹⁰ PMAR project under the MASE program, coordinated by the IOC, to provide a maritime picture over the ESA/IO region during 2014.

-
- For actions that should focus on targeting financiers and coordinating databases to increase the understanding of the pirate business model. Tracking and disrupting those financial flows can break down this model.
 - For Stimulating of extended usage of ship self-reporting systems and the establishment of the proper monitoring centres.



APPENDIX XXV
SCHEDULE OF SUBSIDIARY BODY MEETINGS FOR 2014, AND TENTATIVELY FOR 2015

	2014			2015 (tentative)		
		Date	Location		Date	Location
Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria (TCAC)	Nil	Nil	Nil	3 rd	TBD	TBD
Compliance Committee (CoC)	11 th	26–28 June (3d)	Colombo, Sri Lanka	12 th	April, 2014	Busan, Rep. of Korea
Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF)	11 th	29 and 31 June (2d)	Colombo, Sri Lanka	12 th	April, 2014	Busan, Rep. of Korea
Commission	18 th	1–5 June (5d)	Colombo, Sri Lanka	19 th	April, 2014	Busan, Rep. of Korea
Working Party on Neritic Tunas (WPNT)	4 th	2–5 July (4d)	Phuket, Thailand	5 th	1–9 July (4d)	TBD
Working Party on Temperate Tunas (WPTT)	5 th	28–31 July (4d)	Busan, Korea	Nil	Nil	Nil
Working Party on Billfish (WPB)	12 th	21–25 Oct (5d)	Tokyo, Japan	13 th	Early June (5d) or Late-October (5d)	Algarve, EU, Portugal
Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB)	10 th	27–31 Oct (5d)	Tokyo, Japan	11 th	Prior to the WPEB (5d)	Algarve, EU, Portugal
Working Party on Tropical Tunas (WPTT)	16 th	17–21 Nov (5d)	Bali, Indonesia	17 th	13–17 / 20–24 Oct (5d)	TBD
Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS)	10 th	2–4 Dec (3d)	Victoria, Seychelles	11 th	TBD	TBD
Working Party on Methods (WPM)	5 th	5–6 Dec (2d)	Victoria, Seychelles	6 th	TBD	TBD
Scientific Committee (SC)	17 th	8–12 Dec (5d)	Victoria, Seychelles	18 th	TBD	TBD
Working Party on Fishing Capacity (WPFC)		Nil	Nil		Nil	Nil