

---

## PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPTT18

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT<sup>1</sup>, 6 OCTOBER 2016

---

### PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 18<sup>th</sup> WPTT with an update on the progress made in implementing those recommendations from the previous Working Party on Tropical Tunas (WPTT) meeting which were endorsed by the Scientific Committee (SC), and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants as appropriate given any progress.

### BACKGROUND

At the 17<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPTT, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the IOTC Secretariat on a range of issues. The subsequent table developed and agreed to by the WPTT was provided to the SC for its endorsement at its December 2015 meeting.

### DISCUSSION

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

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

Recalling that the SC, at its 16<sup>th</sup> Session adopted a set of reporting terminology SC16.07 (para. 23), which was subsequently endorsed by the Commission at its 18<sup>th</sup> Session in 2014 (S18, para 10), to further improve the clarity of information sharing from, and among the science bodies, the following two term levels should be noted when interpreting the Reports and [Appendix I](#) to this paper:

**Level 1:** From a subsidiary body of the Commission to the next level in the structure of the Commission:

**RECOMMENDED, RECOMMENDATION:** Any conclusion or request for an action to be undertaken, from a subsidiary body of the Commission (Committee or Working Party), which is to be formally provided to the next level in the structure of the Commission for its consideration/endorsement (e.g. from a Working Party to the Scientific Committee; from a Committee to the Commission). The intention is that the higher body will consider the recommended action for endorsement under its own mandate, if the subsidiary body does not already have the required mandate. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for completion.

---

<sup>1</sup> [secretariat@iotc.org](mailto:secretariat@iotc.org); James Geehan ([james.geehan@iotc.org](mailto:james.geehan@iotc.org))

**Level 2:** From a subsidiary body of the Commission to a CPC, the IOTC Secretariat, or other body (not the Commission) to carry out a specified task:

**REQUESTED:** This term should only be used by a subsidiary body of the Commission if it does not wish to have the request formally adopted/endorsed by the next level in the structure of the Commission. For example, if a Committee wishes to seek additional input from a CPC on a particular topic, but does not wish to formalise the request beyond the mandate of the Committee, it may request that a set action be undertaken. Ideally this should be task specific and contain a timeframe for the completion.

In addition to the Recommendations endorsed by the SC at its 18<sup>th</sup> Session, the SC also made several requests which, although are not passed to the Commission for its endorsement, are considered actions which the Scientific Committee has the mandate to issue. The revised recommendations are contained in [Appendix I](#) for the consideration and potential endorsement by the WPTT18.

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the WPTT:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IOTC–2016–WPTT18–06 which detailed the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPTT17, and the requests of the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the Scientific Committee (SC17), taking into consideration the recommendations from the SC and decisions of the Commission;
- 2) **AGREE** to consider and revise as necessary, the recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from the WPTT18, noting that these will be provided to the SC for its endorsement.

#### APPENDICES

**Appendix I:** Progress made on the Recommendations and Requests of WPTT17

## APPENDIX I

### Progress made on the recommendations of WPTT17

WPTT17 Rec. No.		SC18 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC18	Endorsed at S20	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPTT18
WPTT17.01 (para. 82)	<b>Skipjack tuna Management Strategy Evaluation process update</b> The WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee consider endorsing the skipjack tuna Operating Model for evaluating management procedures, as stipulated in Resolution 15/10.	(paras. 64-65)	<b>Skipjack tuna MSE update</b> The SC <b>ENDORSED</b> the use of the Operating Model for skipjack tuna as the basis for the provision of advice to the Commission on the performance of alternative Management Procedure, <b>NOTING</b> that external reviewers have considered the skipjack tuna work MSE and largely endorsed the approach taken, while recommending a number of improvements to be incorporated.  The SC <b>NOTED</b> that Resolution 15/10 calls for completing the work on assessing the appropriateness of interm target and limit reference points and evaluating candidate harvest control rules as per the decision framework for skipjack tuna and albacore for presentation to the Commission in 2016.	N/A	<b>Update:</b> Nil
WPTT17.02 (para. 111)	<b>Report of the 2nd CPUE workshop on longline fisheries</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the Taiwan,China longline CPUE in southern regions is affected by the rapid recent growth of the oilfish fishery, and that this is a new fishery with substantially lower catchability for tunas, it is important for CPUE indices to adjust for this change in catchability. Thus, the WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that future tuna CPUE standardisations should use appropriate methods to identify effort targeted at oilfish and related species, and either remove it from the dataset, or include a categorical variable for targeting method in the standardisation. The oilfish data variable should be provided to data analysts producing the CPUE index.	(para. 82)	<b>Report of the 2nd CPUE workshop on longline fisheries</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the Taiwan,China longline CPUE in southern regions is affected by the rapid recent growth of the oilfish fishery, and that this is a new fishery with substantially lower catchability for tunas, it is important for CPUE indices to adjust for this change in catchability. Thus, the SC <b>AGREED</b> that future tuna CPUE standardisations should use appropriate methods to identify effort targeted at oilfish and related species, and either remove it from the dataset, or include a categorical variable for targeting method in the standardisation. The oilfish data variable should be provided to data analysts producing the CPUE index.	N/A	<b>Update:</b> Nil
WPTT17.03 (para. 112)	The WPTT <b>NOTED</b> that differences between the Japan and Taiwan,China longline CPUE indices were examined and attributed to either low sampling coverage of logbook data (between 1982–2000) or misreporting across oceans (Atlantic and Indian oceans) for bigeye tuna catches	SC18.22 (para. 83)	<b>NOTING</b> the advice from the WPTT that differences between the Japan and Taiwan,China longline CPUE indices were examined and attributed to either low sampling coverage of logbook data (between 1982–2000) or misreporting across oceans (Atlantic and Indian oceans)	YES	<b>Update:</b> On-going. The issues have been addressed, to some extent, by the on-going work to develop a joint LL CPUE series (for the Japanese, Tawianese and Korean fleets).



WPTT17 Rec. No.		SC18 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC18	Endorsed at S20	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPTT18
	<p>between 2002–04 for Taiwan,China. The WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> the 1) development of minimum criteria (e.g. 10% using a simple random stratified sample) for logbook coverage to use data in standardisation processes; and 2) identifying vessels through exploratory analysis that were misreporting, and excluding them from the dataset in the standardisation analysis.</p>		<p>for bigeye tuna catches between 2002–04 for Taiwan,China, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> the 1) development of minimum criteria (e.g. 10% using a simple random stratified sample) for logbook coverage to use data in standardisation processes; and 2) identifying vessels through exploratory analysis that were misreporting, and excluding them from the dataset in the standardisation analysis.</p>		
<p>WPTT17.04 (para. 113)</p>	<p>The WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more credence should be given to CPUE indices based on operational data, since analyses of these data can take more factors into account, and analysts are better able to check the data for inconsistencies and errors.</li> <li>• Taiwan,China fleets provide all available logbook data to data analysts, representing the best and most complete information possible. This stems from the fact that the dataset currently used by scientists from Taiwan,China is incomplete and not updated with logbooks that arrive after finalisation.</li> <li>• that vessel identity information for the Japanese fleets for the period prior to 1979 should be obtained either from the original logbooks or from some other source, to the greatest extent possible to allow estimation of catchability change during this period and to permit cluster analysis using vessel level data. During this period there was significant technological change (e.g. deep freezers) and targeting changes (e.g. yellowfin tuna to bigeye tuna).</li> <li>• examining operation level data across all longline fleets (Rep. of Korea, Japan and Taiwan,China) will give us a better idea of what is going on with the fishery and stock especially if some datasets have low sample sizes or effort in some years, and others have higher sample sizes and effort, so we have a representative sample covering the broadest areas in the Indian Ocean. This will also avoid having no information in certain strata if a fleet were not operating there, and avoid combining two indices in that case.</li> </ul>	<p>SC18.23 (para. 84)</p>	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more credence should be given to CPUE indices based on operational data, since analyses of these data can take more factors into account, and analysts are better able to check the data for inconsistencies and errors.</li> <li>• Taiwan,China fleets provide all available logbook data to data analysts, representing the best and most complete information possible. This stems from the fact that the dataset currently used by scientists from Taiwan,China is incomplete and not updated with logbooks that arrive after finalisation.</li> <li>• that vessel identity information for the Japanese fleets for the period prior to 1979 should be obtained either from the original logbooks or from some other source, to the greatest extent possible to allow estimation of catchability change during this period and to permit cluster analysis using vessel level data. During this period there was significant technological change (e.g. deep freezers) and targeting changes (e.g. yellowfin tuna to bigeye tuna).</li> <li>• examining operation level data across all longline fleets (Rep. of Korea, Japan and Taiwan,China) will give us a better idea of what is going on with the fishery and stock especially if some datasets have low sample sizes or effort in some years, and others have higher sample sizes and effort, so we have a representative sample covering the broadest areas in the Indian Ocean. This will also avoid having no information in certain strata if a fleet were not operating there, and avoid combining two indices in that case.</li> </ul>	<p>YES</p>	<p><b>Update:</b> IOTC consultant to update WPTT18/WPM07 further development of the joint-CPUE, taking into account the issues raised by WPTT17 and endorsed by SC18.</p>



WPTT17 Rec. No.		SC18 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC18	Endorsed at S20	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPTT18
WPTT17.05 (para. 144)	<b>NOTING</b> paragraph 113, the WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that continued work on joint analysis of operational catch and effort data from multiple fleets be undertaken, to further develop methods and to provide indices of abundance for IOTC stock assessments.	SC18.23 (para. 84)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> : • that continued work on joint analysis of operational catch and effort data from multiple fleets be undertaken, to further develop methods and to provide indices of abundance for IOTC stock assessments.	YES	<b>Update:</b> IOTC consultant to update WPTT18/WPM07 on progress of the joint-CPUE, including a summary of the follow-up work conducted during the CPUE workshop held in Shanghai, China in July 2016.
WPTT17.06 (para. 155)	<b>Revision of the WPTT Program of Work (2016–2020)</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the current IOTC Guidelines for the presentation of CPUE standardisations and stock assessment models (IOTC-2015-WPTT17-INF01) may need revising, as it was felt that the current Stock Status summary table, which is the principal communication tool regarding stock status used on the IOTC website, understates uncertainty in stock status evaluations, the WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the following be reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the annual status coding scheme;</li><li>• the historic coding scheme;</li><li>• consideration of the status coding scheme for years when no quantitative stock assessment is available.</li></ul>	(para. 95)	<b>Revision of the IOTC Guidelines for the presentation of CPUE standardisations and stock assessment models</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the current IOTC Guidelines for the presentation of CPUE standardisations and stock assessment models (IOTC-2015-SC18-INF01) may need revising, as it was felt that the current Stock Status summary table, which is the principal communication tool regarding stock status used on the IOTC website, may understate the uncertainty in stock status evaluations, the SC <b>AGREED</b> that the following should be reviewed, and presented to each Working Party meeting in 2016 for their consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the annual status coding scheme;</li><li>• the historic coding scheme;</li><li>• consideration of the status coding scheme for years when no quantitative stock assessment is available.</li></ul>	N/A	<b>Update:</b> On-going. To be reviewed by Working Parties, as required.
WPTT17.07 (para. 159)	The WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC consider and endorse the WPTT Program of Work (2016–2020), as provided at Appendix IX.	(paras. 153-154)	<b>Program of Work (2016–2020) and assessment schedule</b> The SC <b>NOTED</b> the proposed Program of Work and priorities for the Scientific Committee and each of the Working Parties and <b>AGREED</b> to a consolidated Program of Work as outlined in Appendix XXXIV. The Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of each working party shall ensure that the efforts of their working party are focused on the core areas contained within the appendix, taking into account any new research priorities identified by the Commission at its next Session.  The SC <b>REQUESTED</b> that during all future Working Party meetings, each group not only develop a Draft Program of Work for the next five years containing low, medium and high priority projects, but that all High Priority projects are ranked. The intention is that the SC	N/A	<b>Update:</b> Nil.



WPTT17 Rec. No.		SC18 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC18	Endorsed at S20	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPTT18
			would then be able to review the rankings and develop a consolidated list of the highest priority projects to meet the needs of the Commission. Where possible, budget estimates should be determined, as well as the identification of potential funding sources.		
WPTT17.08 (para. 164)	<p><b>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the 17th Session of the WPTT</b></p> <p>The WPTT <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPTT17, provided at Appendix X, as well as the management advice provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each of the three tropical tuna species under the IOTC mandate, and the combined Kobe plot for the three species assigned a stock status in 2015 (Fig. 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bigeye tuna (<i>Thunnus obesus</i>) – Appendix VI</li> <li>• Skipjack tuna (<i>Katsuwonus pelamis</i>) – Appendix VII</li> <li>• Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>) – Appendix VIII</li> </ul>	(para. 81)	The SC <b>NOTED</b> the report of the 17th Session of the Working Party on Tropical Tunas (IOTC-2015-WPTT17-R), including the consolidated list of recommendations provided as an appendix to the report. The meeting was attended by 44 participants (52 in 2014), including 6 recipients of the MPF (6 in 2014).	N/A	<b>Update:</b> Nil.

WPTT17 Report	WPTT17 REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 15	<p><b>Review of the statistical data available for tropical tunas</b></p> <p>The WPTT <b>NOTED</b> the main tropical tuna data issues that are considered to negatively affect the quality of the statistics available at the IOTC Secretariat, by type of dataset and fishery, which are provided in Appendix V, and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the CPCs listed in the Appendix, make efforts to remedy the data issues identified and to report back to the WPTT at its next meeting.</p>	<b>Update:</b> [Ongoing] Countries to provide updates during WPTT18, as required.
Para. 21	<p><b>Mauritius tropical tuna fishery</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that, due to lack of enumerators, tuna catches at anchored FADs around Mauritius are not yet reported to the IOTC, the WPTT <b>REQUESTED</b> that Mauritius to overcome this problem as soon as possible.</p>	<b>Update:</b> [Pending] Mauritius to provide update at WPTT18. Following an IOTC Data Compliance mission to Mauritius in August 2016, Mauritius confirmed that no data collection is currently taking place for small-scale FAD fisheries, due to limited resources.
Para. 41	<p><b>I.R. Iran fisheries</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> the limited amount of logbook data collected by I.R. Iran for the gillnet fishery and,</p>	<b>Update:</b> [Pending] I.R. Iran to provide update at WPTT18.





	the WPTT <b>REQUESTED</b> that efforts are made to expand the data collected from logbooks and observers from the gillnet fishery and to provide those data to the IOTC Secretariat.	
Para. 52	<b>Review of the statistical data available for bigeye tuna</b> <b>NOTING</b> the on-going issue regarding the accuracy of total catch estimates related to the capture and identification of juvenile bigeye tuna, the WPTT <b>REQUESTED</b> that CPCs catching large numbers of juvenile tuna improve the enumeration and classification of this species.	<b>Update:</b> [Ongoing]
Para. 71	<b>Review of the statistical data available for skipjack tuna</b> <b>NOTING</b> the decline in skipjack tuna catches reported by the Maldives pole-and-line fleet since the mid-2000s, the WPTT <b>REQUESTED</b> that the Maldives, in collaboration with the IOTC Secretariat, assess the extent to which the changes in catches of skipjack tuna are related to the improvements in the data collection and introduction of logbooks, as compared to changes in the fishery (e.g. a shift from pole-and-line targeting skipjack tuna to handlines targeting yellowfin tuna).	<b>Update:</b> [Pending] Due to resourcing issues at the IOTC Secretariat, no progress has been made during 2016.
Para. 118	<b>India longline standardised CPUE</b> The WPTT <b>ENCOURAGED</b> continuation of the survey, and <b>REQUESTED</b> further analyses for future use in the IOTC stock assessment process. Suggestions included provision of a detailed description of the survey methodology and alternative statistical models for admitting the large number of zero observations. These analyses should be pursued in conjunction with the CPUE standardisation analyses including partitioning of the survey areas by model assessment regions.	<b>Update:</b> [Pending] India to provide update at WPTT18.
Para. 142	<b>Parameters for future analyses: Yellowfin tuna CPUE standardisation and stock assessments</b> The WPTT <b>REQUESTED</b> that EU and Seychelles scientists work on a standardized purse seine CPUE for large yellowfin tuna caught in free-swimming schools.	<b>Update:</b> [Pending] EU to provide update at WPTT18.
Para. 148	<b>Yellowfin tuna Management Strategy Evaluation process update</b> While the timeline in the program of work is consistent with the requirements of Resolution 15/10, WPTT <b>NOTED</b> that additional work may well be required to fully meet the requests of the Commission and thus <b>REQUESTED</b> the Secretariat in coordination with the Chairs of WPTT, WPM and Scientific Committee evaluate the need for expanding the contract currently in place.	<b>Update:</b> [Ongoing]