

PROGRESS ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPNT02

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT AND CHAIR, 17 JUNE 2013

PURPOSE

To provide an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous Working Party on Neritic Tunas (WPNT) 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 Second Session of the WPNT, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the Secretariat on a range of issues. The subsequent table developed and agreed to by the WPNT was provided to the SC for its endorsement.

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.

Noting the core tasks of the SC, and hence the WPNT, and the fact that the SC, Commission and CPCs in general have struggled to implement previous recommendations from the IOTC working parties, the Chair and Secretariat undertook a review and subsequent revision of recommendations from the WPNT02 meeting in an attempt to provide clearer direction and delegation of responsibility for each recommendation as appropriate.

The revised recommendations are contained in [Appendix A](#) for the consideration and potential endorsement by the WPNT03.

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPNT:

- 1) **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Second Session of the WPNT, and consider the proposed draft revisions to those recommendations yet to be completed.
- 2) **AGREE** to the revised recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from WPNT03, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: [Progress made on the recommendations of WPNT02.](#)

APPENDIX A

Progress made on the recommendations of WPNT02

Recommendation number	Recommendation from WPNT02	Adopted by SC15	Proposed revision for consideration at WPNT03
WPNT02.01 (para. 7)	<p>Outcomes of the Scientific Committee</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note that the neritic tuna and tuna-like species under the IOTC mandate 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 605,359 t being landed in 2011, and as a result, should be receiving appropriate management resources from the IOTC.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted by the SC, and a similar recommendation was made to the Commission for its consideration at S17.</i></p>	Yes	The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note that the neritic tuna and tuna-like species under the IOTC mandate continue to be 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 605,359 t being landed in 2011, and as a result, should be receiving appropriate management resources from the IOTC.
WPNT02.02 (para. 18)	<p>IOTC database</p> <p>The WPNT NOTED the main data issues that are considered to negatively affect the quality of the statistics for neritic tunas available at the IOTC Secretariat, by type of dataset and fishery, which are provided in Appendix VI, and RECOMMENDED that the CPCs listed in the Appendix, make efforts to remedy the data issues identified and to report back to the WPNT at its next meeting.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted by the SC, and adopted as that of the SC.</i></p>	Yes	The WPNT NOTED the main data issues that are considered to negatively affect the quality of the statistics for neritic tunas available at the IOTC Secretariat, by type of dataset and fishery, which are provided in Appendix VI and RECOMMENDED that the CPCs listed in the Appendix, make efforts to remedy the data issues identified and to report back to the WPNT at its next meeting.
WPNT02.03 (para. 22)	<p>Species identification</p> <p>The WPNT AGREED that the development of species identification cards for neritic tuna and tuna-like species, at various life history stages interacting with IOTC fisheries, needs to be developed and RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat, in collaboration with relevant experts, develop species identification cards by the next WPNT meeting.</p>	Yes	–
WPNT02.04 (para. 23)	<p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC request that the Commission allocate funds in the 2013 budget to develop and print sets of the identification cards, noting that expected printing costs are in the vicinity of US\$7,500 per 1000 sets of cards.</p>		
WPNT02.05 (para. 24)	<p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that IOTC CPCs translate, print and disseminate the identification cards to their observers and field samplers (Resolution 11/04), and as feasible, to their fishing fleets targeting neritic tuna and tuna-like species.</p>		

	<p>This would allow accurate observer, sampling and logbook data on neritic tuna and tuna-like species to be recorded and reported to the IOTC Secretariat as per IOTC requirements.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC, and a recommendation was made to the Commission to fund the development and printing of the cards. The Commission approved the request and the Secretariat is in the process of identifying a contractor to undertake the work.</i></p>		
WPNT02.06 (para. 26)	<p>General discussion on data</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC request the Commission to increase the IOTC Capacity Building budget line so that capacity building workshops/training can be carried out in 2013 and 2014 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.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC, and a recommendation was made to the Commission to increase the capacity building budget line. However, the commission did not increase the budget line for 2013.</i></p>	Yes	The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC request the Commission increase the IOTC Capacity Building budget line so that additional 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.
WPNT02.07 (para. 27)	<p>The WPNT NOTED that some CPCs do not currently have a sampling scheme dedicated to record catch and size frequency data for neritic tunas, and RECOMMENDED that such systems are developed.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. Updates will be provided by participants during the WPNT03 meeting.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.08 (para. 30)	<p>The WPNT reiterated its previous RECOMMENDATION that the IOTC Secretariat request that any datasets for neritic tuna species held by SWIOFP be provided to the IOTC Secretariat before the next meeting of the WPNT.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. SWIOFP have been asked for any datasets, however, as yet, no additional information has been received.</i></p>	Yes	–
WPNT02.09 (para. 48)	<p>Kawakawa – Development of technical advice on the status</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note the management advice developed for kawakawa (<i>Euthynnus affinis</i>) as provided in the draft resource stock status summary – Appendix IX</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.

WPNT02.10 (para. 64)	<p>Longtail Tuna – Development of technical advice on the status</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note the management advice developed for longtail tuna (<i>Thunnus tonggol</i>) as provided in the draft resource stock status summary – Appendix X</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.11 (para. 76)	<p>Narrow-Barred Spanish Mackerel – Development of technical advice on the status</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note the management advice developed for narrow-barred Spanish mackerel (<i>Scomberomorus commerson</i>) as provided in the draft resource stock status summary – Appendix XII</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.12 (para. 83)	<p>Thailand neritic tuna fisheries</p> <p>NOTING that the nominal catch (NC) data provided at the WPNT02 meeting were found to conflict with the NC data history provided by Thailand in recent years, and for catch-and-effort data for most of the history of the gillnet fleet, the WPNT RECOMMENDED that Thailand liaise with the IOTC Secretariat to provide a fully justified revised catch history which will replace the data currently held by the IOTC Secretariat before the next WPNT meeting.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC as a recommendation to Thailand. Thailand reported data for 2009–11 in 2012. However, no data for previous years was reported to the IOTC Secretariat. The IOTC-OFCF Project has proposed the implementation of a Data Mining Project in Thailand in order to compile the data available on neritic tunas.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03. Possibly endorsement by the WPNT.
WPNT02.13 (para. 90)	<p>India neritic tuna fisheries</p> <p>NOTING the efforts by India to revise its catch data since 2007 for all species, that now includes catch from Lakshadweep and the Andaman islands, the WPNT RECOMMENDED that this revised data is reported to the IOTC Secretariat, preferably before the next WPNT meeting.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC as a recommendation to India. During 2012 the catch series of India was revised by an independent consultant, using information from several sources, mainly the CMFRI repository and a historical review conducted under the Sea Around Us Project of the University of British Columbia. More details about the review are presented in the Paper from the IOTC Secretariat to the WPNT.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.14 (para. 96)	<p>Indonesia neritic tuna fisheries</p> <p>NOTING that the nominal catch (NC) data provided at the WPNT02 meeting were found to conflict with the NC data history provided by Indonesia in recent years, and for catch-and-effort data for most of the history of the gillnet fleet, the</p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03. The WPNT may wish to consider supporting the IOTC-OFCF project.

	<p>WPNT RECOMMENDED that Indonesia liaise with the IOTC Secretariat to provide a fully justified revised catch history which will replace the data currently held by the IOTC Secretariat before the next WPNT meeting.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC as a recommendation to Indonesia. During 2012 the catch series of Indonesia was revised by an independent consultant, using information from several sources, in particular the Directorate General for Capture Fisheries of Indonesia, samples collected by the Indo-Pacific Tuna Project in the early 1980's and documents from various sources. More details about the review are presented in the Paper from the IOTC Secretariat to the WPNT. The IOTC-OFCF Project has proposed implementation of a Pilot Project to sample catches in port in Indonesia and assess if the catches reported by Indonesia for each neritic tuna species are accurate.</i></p>		
WPNT02.15 (para. 106)	<p>India Indo-Pacific king mackerel catches</p> <p>NOTING that monofilament gillnets are recognised to have highly detrimental impacts on fishery 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 WPNT RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat facilitate a review of the use of monofilament gillnets by IOTC CPCs to i) determine the number of CPCs using then, ii) estimate total catch and bycatch, etc., taken by monofilament gillnets in comparison to other net material, and iii) to report the findings at the next WPNT meeting.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC as a recommendation to India.</i></p>	Yes	NOTING that monofilament gillnets are recognised to have highly detrimental impacts on fishery 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 WPNT 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.
WPNT02.16 (para. 124)	<p>Data sets available</p> <p>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 WPNT reiterated its previous RECOMMENDATION that this data, as well as data for 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.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC as a recommendation to these CPCs. No progress. The IOTC-OFCF Project has proposed the implementation of a Data Mining Project in Thailand and Malaysia in order to compile the data available on neritic tunas and assess if those datasets can be used to derive abundance indices for the assessments of neritic tuna species</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03. The WPNT may wish to consider supporting the IOTC-OFCF project.
WPNT02.17 (para. 129)	<p>Development of management advice for other neritic tuna species</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note the management advice developed for bullet tuna, frigate tuna and Indo-Pacific king mackerel as provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each species:</p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bullet tuna (<i>Auxis rochei</i>) – Appendix VII • frigate tuna (<i>Auxis thazard</i>) – Appendix VIII • Indo-Pacific king mackerel (<i>Scomberomorus guttatus</i>) – Appendix IX <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC.</i></p>		
WPNT02.18 (para. 131)	<p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC note that neritic tuna species are in many cases, the major commercial tuna and tuna-like species being exploited by the majority of Indian Ocean coastal states and as such, should be given the same status in terms of time and resource investment.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted by the SC, and a similar recommendation was made to the Commission for its consideration at S17. Similar to Recommendation 01 above.</i></p>	Yes	–
WPNT02.19 (para. 136)	<p>Risk-Based Approaches to Determining Stock Status</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat facilitate a process to provide the necessary information to the SC so that it may consider the Weight-of-Evidence approach to determine species stock status, as an addition to the current approach of relying solely on fully quantitative stock assessment techniques.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. Time permitting, the Secretariat will provide additional information to the WPNT, or other IOTC working parties throughout 2013.</i></p>	Yes	–
WPNT02.20 (para. 139)	<p>Research Recommendations and Priorities – Revision of the WPNT work plan</p> <p>Stock structure</p> <p>The WPNT AGREED that Table 2 should be used as a starting point for research project development to delineate potential stock structure for neritic tunas in the Indian Ocean, and RECOMMENDED that the SC note that in the absence of reliable evidence relating to stock structure, a precautionary approach should be undertaken whereby bullet tuna, frigate tuna, kawakawa, longtail tuna, Indo-Pacific king mackerel and narrow-barred Spanish mackerel are assumed to exist as single stocks throughout the Indian Ocean, until proven otherwise.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. Updates will be provided by participants at the WPNT03 meeting and a general discussion of the options available for the WPNT shall be discussed.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.21 (para. 151)	<p>CPUE standardisation</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat undertake a series of initial training workshops/capacity building exercises on CPUE standardisation, stock assessments and other data analysis in 2013 and 2014, and for the SC to request that the Commission allocate additional funds for this purpose in the IOTC budget.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. A recommendation was made to the</i></p>	Yes	–

	<i>Commission, however it was not endorsed and no funds were set aside for this purpose. The Secretariat is seeking alternative sources of funding as appropriate.</i>		
WPNT02.22 (para. 154)	<p>Priority projects for 2013 and 2014</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the SC endorse the list of priority research topics for neritic tunas as provided in Table 3, and those CPCs and others, who have committed to undertake / commence the projects in 2013.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. Updates will be provided throughout the course of the WPNT03 meeting.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.23 (para. 156)	<p>Development of priorities for an Invited Expert at the next WPNT meeting</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED the following core areas of expertise and priority areas for contribution that need to be enhanced for the next meeting of the WPNT in 2013, by an Invited Expert:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expertise: stock structure/connectivity; including from regions other than the Indian Ocean; data poor assessment approaches. • Priority areas for contribution: kawakawa, longtail tuna and narrow-barred Spanish mackerel biology, ecology and fisheries. <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. Dr. Shijie Zhou from CSIRO Australia was selected and will attend the WPNT03 meeting.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.24 (para. 158)	<p>Date and place of the Third WPNT</p> <p>Following a discussion on who would host the Third Session of the WPNT, the WPNT RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat liaise with Tanzania to determine if it would be feasible to hold the next meeting of the WPNT in Dar es Salaam or Zanzibar, in June/July 2013. The exact dates and meeting location will be confirmed and communicated by the IOTC Secretariat to the SC for its consideration at its next session to be held in December 2012.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.
WPNT02.25 (para. 159)	<p>Meeting participation fund</p> <p>NOTING that the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund (MPF), adopted by the Commission in 2010 (Resolution 10/05 <i>On the establishment of a Meeting Participation Fund for developing IOTC Members and non-Contracting Cooperating Parties</i>), allowed the participation of 10 national scientists to the WPNT02 meeting, the WPNT RECOMMENDED that this fund be maintained into the future, as neritic tunas are very important resources for many of the coastal countries of the Indian Ocean.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. The Commission agreed and replenished the MPF to USD\$200,000 for 2013.</i></p>	Yes	NOTING that the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund (MPF), adopted by the Commission in 2010 (Resolution 10/05 <i>On the establishment of a Meeting Participation Fund for developing IOTC Members and non-Contracting Cooperating Parties</i>), allowed the participation of 11 national scientists to the WPNT03 meeting, the WPNT RECOMMENDED that this fund be maintained into the future, as neritic tunas are very important resources for many of the coastal countries of the Indian Ocean.
WPNT02.26	The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the rules of procedure for the administration of the IOTC MPF be modified to include funding for Chairs and Vice-Chairs from	Yes	–

(para. 160)	<p>IOTC developing coastal states, noting that without access to this fund, the ability of developing coastal state scientists to offer their services as Chairs and Vice-Chairs will be very limited. The same rules for document provision shall apply to Chairs and Vice-Chairs funded by the MPF.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and adopted by the SC. A recommendation was made to the Commission which was endorsed. The MPF was used to fund the attendance of both the Chair and Vice-Chair of the WPNT to the WPNT03 meeting.</i></p>		
<p>WPNT02.27 (para. 161)</p>	<p>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the Second WPNT</p> <p>The WPNT RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPNT02, provided at Appendix IV.</p> <p><i>Progress: Noted and considered by the SC.</i></p>	Yes	To be developed at WPNT03.