

---

## PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPEB08

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 28 AUGUST 2013

---

### PURPOSE

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

### BACKGROUND

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

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

### Process:

- 1) **WPEB** – At the Eighth Session of the WPEB, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the Secretariat on a range of issues;
- 2) **SC** – The recommendations were considered by the SC in December 2012. At the SC15 meeting, the recommendations of the WPEB08 were either rejected or revised and then adopted as those of the SC;
- 3) **Commission** – The refined recommendations were then passed to the Commission for its consideration and possible endorsement.

### DISCUSSION

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

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

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

### RECOMMENDATION

That the WPEB **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPEB08 and consider the proposed draft revisions to those recommendations yet to be completed.

That the WPEB **AGREE** to the revised recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from the WPEB08, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

### APPENDICES

**Appendix A:** [Progress made on the recommendations of WPEB08 and SC15.](#)

## APPENDIX A

### Progress made on the recommendations of WPEB08 and SC15

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
WPEB08.01 (para. 24)	SC15.52 (para.220)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission consider how to address the lack of implementation of observer programmes by CPCs for their fleets and reporting to the IOTC Secretariat as per the provision of Resolution 11/04 <i>on a Regional Observer Scheme</i> , noting the update provided in <a href="#">Appendix XXXIII</a> .	Noted	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09 as no specific action taken by the Commission other than noting.
WPEB08.02 (para. 27)	SC15.42 (para.181)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate additional funds in 2013 to print further sets of the shark, seabird and marine turtle identification cards developed by the IOTC Secretariat, noting that expected costs are in the vicinity of US\$6,000 per 1000 sets of cards.	No	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09. Consider requesting that the Secretariat include in the 2014 Budget (Printing or Capacity Building lines), and not 'to be determined'.  In addition, funds remaining in the Capacity Building Budget line for 2013 could be used.
WPEB08.03 (para. 36)	-	Endorsed – To CPCs.	N/A	Retain WPEB08 Recommendation for WPEB09: The WPEB <b>NOTED</b> the main shark 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 <a href="#">Appendix xx</a> , and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the CPCs listed in the Appendix, make efforts to remedy the data issues identified and to report back to the WPEB at its next meeting, noting the status and type of datasets that need to be provided for sharks, and other bycatch species provided at <a href="#">Appendix xx</a> .
WPEB08.04 (para. 38)	SC15.18 (para.96)	<b>NOTING</b> that the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory	Yes	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09 as many CPCs are yet to meet this Recommendation.

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that all CPCs collect and report catches of sharks (including historical data), catch-and-effort and biological data on sharks, as per IOTC Resolutions, so that more detailed analysis can be undertaken for the next WPEB meeting.		
WPEB08.05 (para. 39)	SC15.19 (para.97)	<b>NOTING</b> 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 <b>AGREED</b> 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 this regard, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocates funds for this activity, in the 2013 IOTC budget.	No	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09. Consider requesting that the Secretariat include in the 2014 Budget (Printing or Capacity Building lines), and not 'to be determined'.
WPEB08.06 (para. 41)	SC15.14 (para.89)	<b>NOTING</b> that despite the mandatory reporting requirements detailed in Resolutions 05/05, 10/02, 10/06, 12/03 and 12/04, bycatch data remain largely unreported by CPCs and the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Compliance Committee and the Commission address this non-compliance by taking steps to develop mechanisms which would ensure that CPCs fulfil their bycatch reporting obligations.	Noted, no specific action.	<b>NOTING</b> that despite the mandatory reporting requirements detailed in Resolutions 13/03, 12/06, 12/04, 10/02 and 05/05, bycatch data remain largely unreported by CPCs, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Compliance Committee and the Commission address this non-compliance by taking steps to develop mechanisms which would ensure that CPCs fulfil their bycatch reporting obligations. The Secretariat shall provide this recommendation to the Chair of the Compliance Committee, if adopted by the SC.
WPEB08.07 (para. 48)	SC15.75 (para.98)	The SC <b>NOTED</b> the absence of information on shark catches from artisanal fisheries in Mozambique and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that information on shark catches from those fisheries is collected and reported in due course.	Yes	Determine at WPEB if still required.

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09																								
WPEB08.028 (para. 87)	SC15.44 (para.184)	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 <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat develop an identification guide for hooks and pelagic gears used in IOTC fisheries, as staffing and financial resources permit, and to distribute the guide to all CPCs once completed. The SC also <b>AGREED</b> that circle hooks are defined by hooks having their point turned at least 90° from their shank.	No	<p>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 WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds in the 2014 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\$16,200 (Table 1). 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.</p> <p><b>TABLE 1.</b> Estimated production and printing costs for 1000 sets of tuna species identification cards (11 species of tropical, temperate and neritic tunas and mackerels)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1350 853 2089 1189"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Purchase images</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>25</td> <td>2,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>US\$350</td> <td>20</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing plates / plate</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>15</td> <td>1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing /1000 sets</td> <td>US\$5500</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Total estimate (US\$)</td> <td><b>16,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500	Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000	Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500	Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500	Total estimate (US\$)			<b>16,500</b>
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																									
Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500																									
Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000																									
Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500																									
Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500																									
Total estimate (US\$)			<b>16,500</b>																									
WPEB08.09 (para. 112)		The SC <b>NOTED</b> paper IOTC-2012-SC15-INF10 which provide the results of a preliminary ecological risk assessment (ERA) of shark species caught in the Indian Ocean by longline and purse seine gears, which was a request made by the Commission at its 15 <sup>th</sup> Session in 2011. The SC <b>RECOGNISED</b> the highly valuable information provided by this ERA which produced a ranked list of the most vulnerable		The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the list of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to longline gear ( <a href="#">Table 1</a> ) and purse seine gear ( <a href="#">Table 2</a> ) 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 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC</i>																								

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		<p>shark species to longline and purse seine gears as detailed below.</p> <p>The SC <b>NOTED</b> the list of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to longline gear (<a href="#">Table 4</a>) and purse seine gear (<a href="#">Table 5</a>), as determined by the productivity susceptibility analysis, compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded for each gear, contained in Resolution 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i>.</p> <p><b>TABLE. 4.</b> 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 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i>.</p> <p><b>TABLE. 5.</b> 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 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i>.</p>		<p><i>area of competence.</i></p> <p><b>TABLE. 1.</b> 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 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i>.</p> <p><b>TABLE. 2.</b> 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 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i>.</p> <p><b>NOTING</b> the paragraph above, at the next revision to Resolution 13/03, the Commission may wish to add the missing species/groups of sharks and rays.</p>
WPEB08.10 (para. 118)	SC15.04 (para. 212)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXIV</a></li> <li>○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXV</a></li> <li>○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXVI</a></li> <li>○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXVII</a></li> <li>○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix</a></li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for marine turtles as provided in the draft resource stock status summaries for sharks, and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft resource stock status summaries for sharks with the latest 2012 catch data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration in December 2013.</p>

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		<p><a href="#">XXVIII</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXIX</a></li> <li>○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XXX</a></li> </ul>		
WPEB08.11 (para. 119)	–	N/A	N/A	The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft shark Executive Summaries with the latest 2012 catch data, and for these to be provided to the SC for its consideration in December 2013.
WPEB08.12 (para. 120)	SC15.15 (para.90)	The SC <b>NOTED</b> that gillnet fisheries are expanding rapidly in the Indian Ocean, with gillnets often being longer than 2.5 km in contravention with UN and IOTC Resolutions, and that their use is considered to have a substantial impact on marine ecosystems. <b>NOTING</b> that in 2012 the Commission adopted Resolution 12/01 on the implementation of the precautionary approach, the majority of the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission freeze catch and effort by gillnet fisheries in the Indian Ocean in the near future, until sufficient information has been gathered to determine the impact of gillnet fleets on IOTC stocks and bycatch species caught by gillnet fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species, noting that the implementation of any such measure would be difficult.	No	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09.
WPEB08.13 (para. 121)	SC15.17 (para.92)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds to carry out training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on species identification, bycatch mitigation and data collection methods and also to identify other potential sources of assistance to carry out such activities.	No	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09.
WPEB08.14 (para. 122)	SC15.21 (para.100)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> research and development of mitigation measures to minimise bycatch of the oceanic	Yes	Given that the Commission adopted Resolution 13/06 <i>On a scientific and management framework on the conservation of</i>

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09																														
		whitetip shark and its unharmed release for all types of fishing gears, and that CPCs with data on oceanic whitetip sharks (i.e. total annual catches, CPUE time series and size data) make these available to the next WPEB meeting.		<i>shark species caught in association with IOTC managed fisheries</i> , which includes a requirement to undertake research on oceanic whitetip sharks, the WPEB may wish to reword this recommendation.																														
WPEB08.15 (para. 124)	SC15.20 (para.99)	<p><b>NOTING</b> that Resolution 10/02 <i>mandatory statistical requirements for IOTC members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPC's)</i>, makes provision for data to be reported to the IOTC on “<i>the most commonly caught shark species and, where possible, to the less common shark species</i>”, without giving any list defining the most common and less common species, and recognising the general lack of shark data being recorded and reported to the IOTC Secretariat, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 10/02 is revised in order to include the list of most commonly caught elasmobranch species (Table 3) for which nominal catch data shall be reported as part of the statistical requirement for IOTC CPCs.</p> <p><b>TABLE 3.</b> List of the most commonly caught elasmobranch species</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="448 1029 1153 1439"> <thead> <tr> <th>Common name</th> <th>Species</th> <th>Code</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manta and devil rays</td> <td>Mobulidae</td> <td>MAN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Whale shark</td> <td><i>Rhincodon typus</i></td> <td>RHN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thresher sharks</td> <td><i>Alopias spp.</i></td> <td>THR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mako sharks</td> <td><i>Isurus spp.</i></td> <td>MAK</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Silky shark</td> <td><i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i></td> <td>FAL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oceanic whitetip shark</td> <td><i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i></td> <td>OCS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blue shark</td> <td><i>Prionace glauca</i></td> <td>BSH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hammerhead shark</td> <td>Sphyrnidae</td> <td>SPY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Sharks and rays</td> <td>–</td> <td>SKH</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Common name	Species	Code	Manta and devil rays	Mobulidae	MAN	Whale shark	<i>Rhincodon typus</i>	RHN	Thresher sharks	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	THR	Mako sharks	<i>Isurus spp.</i>	MAK	Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	FAL	Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	OCS	Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	BSH	Hammerhead shark	Sphyrnidae	SPY	Other Sharks and rays	–	SKH	Yes, but not included in Res.	<p>Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09, with the following additions:</p> <p>Paragraph 3 of Resolution 10/02 should be revised as follows: These provisions, applicable to tuna and tuna-like species, shall also be applicable to the most commonly caught elasmobranch species not already listed in Resolution 13/03, and, where possible, to the less commonly caught elasmobranch species, as well as other species listed in Resolution 13/03.</p> <p>Paragraph 1 of Resolution 10/02 should include definitions to make the Resolution easier to interpret:</p> <p>Species: refers to all species under the IOTC mandate as detailed in the IOTC Agreement, and the most commonly caught elasmobranch species (Annex I).</p> <p>1. CPC's shall provide the following information to the IOTC Secretariat according to the timelines specified below and definitions:</p> <p><b>DEFINITIONS</b></p> <p><b>Coastal fisheries:</b> Fisheries other than longline or surface, as defined below, also called artisanal fisheries.</p> <p><b>IOTC area of competence:</b> as detailed in Annex A of the IOTC Agreement, noting that the Commission, at its</p>
Common name	Species	Code																																
Manta and devil rays	Mobulidae	MAN																																
Whale shark	<i>Rhincodon typus</i>	RHN																																
Thresher sharks	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	THR																																
Mako sharks	<i>Isurus spp.</i>	MAK																																
Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	FAL																																
Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	OCS																																
Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	BSH																																
Hammerhead shark	Sphyrnidae	SPY																																
Other Sharks and rays	–	SKH																																

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09						
				<p>4<sup>th</sup> Session in 1999 agreed to modify the western boundary of the IOTC area of competence from 30°E to 20°E, thus eliminating the gap between the areas covered by IOTC and ICCAT.</p> <p><b>Longline fisheries:</b> Fisheries undertaken by vessels in the IOTC Record of Authorized Vessels that use longline gear.</p> <p><b>Species:</b> refers to all species under the IOTC mandate and other species or species groups according to the provisions of Resolution 13/03 or any subsequent superseding Resolutions.</p> <p><b>Support vessels:</b> Any types of vessels that operate in support of the fishing activities of purse seine vessels.</p> <p><b>Surface fisheries:</b> 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.</p>						
WPEB08.16 (para. 128)	SC15.26 (para.114)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that IOTC Resolution 12/04 <i>on the conservation of marine turtles</i> is strengthened to ensure that CPCs report annually on the level of incidental catches of marine turtles by species, as provided at Table 6.</p> <p><b>TABLE 6.</b> Marine turtle species reported as caught in fisheries within the IOTC area of competence.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="488 1310 1115 1441"> <thead> <tr> <th>Common name</th> <th>Scientific name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flatback turtle</td> <td><i>Natator depressus</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green turtle</td> <td><i>Chelonia mydas</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Common name	Scientific name	Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>	Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Yes, but not included in Res.	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09.
Common name	Scientific name									
Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>									
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>									



WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		<p>Hawksbill turtle <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i></p> <p>Leatherback turtle <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i></p> <p>Loggerhead turtle <i>Caretta caretta</i></p> <p>Olive ridley turtle <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i></p>		
WPEB08.17 (para. 129)	–	The SC <b>NOTED</b> that the lack of data from most CPCs on interactions and mortalities of marine turtles in the Indian Ocean is a substantial concern, resulting in an inability of the WPEB to estimate levels of marine turtle bycatch. There is an urgent need to quantify the effects of fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean on marine turtle species, and it is clear that little progress on obtaining and reporting data on interactions with marine turtles has been made. This data is necessary to allow the IOTC to respond and manage the adverse effects on marine turtles, and other bycatch species.	N/A	Retain SC text for WPEB09.
WPEB08.18 (para. 130)	SC15.27 (para.117)	The SC <b>NOTED</b> that it is mandatory for marine turtles (in number) to be recorded on logbooks for purse seine and gillnet but not for longline and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that marine turtles, as a group, be added to Resolution 12/03 <i>on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence</i> , in Annex II (Record once per set/shot/operation) paragraph 2.3 (SPECIES) for longline gear.	Yes, added to Resolution 13/03.	No – Completed.
WPEB08.19 (para. 131)	SC15.28 (para.118)	<b>NOTING</b> that Resolution 10/02 does not make provisions for data to be reported to the IOTC on marine turtles, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> 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.	Yes, but not added to Res. 10/02	<p><b>NOTING</b> that Resolution 10/02 does not make provisions for data to be reported to the IOTC on marine turtles, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 10/02 be revised in order to make the reporting requirements coherent with those stated in Resolution 12/04 on the conservation of marine turtles.</p> <p>Assuming that the proposal above for WPEB08.15 is adopted for defining what 'species' are:</p> <p><b>Species:</b> refers to all species under the IOTC mandate and</p>

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
				<p>other species or groups of species according to the provisions of Resolution 13/03 or any subsequent superseding Resolutions.</p> <p>Specifically, paragraph 2 of Resolution 10/02 should be amended as follows:</p> <p>2. Nominal catch data:</p> <p>Estimates of the total catch for each calendar year, by species, gear, IOTC area, and month, for all fisheries, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catches retained on board, in metric tons;</li> <li>• Catches discarded, in number of fish, or weight.</li> </ul>
WPEB08.20 (para. 145)	SC15.05 (para. 213)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marine turtles – <a href="#">Appendix XXXI</a></li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for marine turtles as provided in the draft status summary – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a>, and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft status summary for marine turtles with the latest 2012 catch data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration in December 2013.</p>
WPEB08.21 (para. 147)	–	N/A	N/A	<p>WPEB08.21 (para.147) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft marine turtle Executive Summary with the latest 2011 interaction data, and for these to be provided to the SC for its consideration in December 2013.</p>
WPEB08.22 (para. 152)	SC15.31 (para.124)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the following in regards to the requests to the SC outlined in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12/04:</p> <p>...</p> <p>...</p>	Yes	No – Completed.
WPEB08.23 (para. 168)	SC15.06 (para. 214)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the management advice developed for seabirds, as provided in the</p>	Yes	<p>The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for seabirds as provided in the draft status summary – <a href="#">Appendix</a></p>

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		<p>Executive Summary encompassing all species commonly interacting with IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Seabirds – <a href="#">Appendix XXXII</a></li> </ul>		<p>..., and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft status summary for seabirds with the latest 2012 catch data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration in December 2013.</p>
WPEB08.24 (para. 180)	SC15.16 (para.91)	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission considers allocating funds to support a regional review of the data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean. The scientists from all CPCs having gillnet fleets in the Indian Ocean should provide at the next session of the WPEB, a report summarising the known information on bycatch in their gillnet fisheries, including sharks, marine turtles and marine mammals, with estimates of their likely order of magnitude where more detailed data are not available.</p>	No	Retain SC Recommendation for WPEB09.
WPEB08.25 (para. 184)	SC15.48 (para.195)	<p><b>NOTING</b> the rapidly increasing scientific workload at the IOTC Secretariat, including a wide range of additional science related duties assigned to it by the SC and the Commission, and that the current Fishery Officer supporting the IOTC scientific activities will depart at the end of February 2013, the SC strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission approve the hiring of a Fishery Officer (Science) to work on a range of matters in support of the scientific process, including but not limited to science capacity building, bycatch and regional observer schemes.</p>	Yes	Complete. Recruitment process underway.
WPEB08.026 (para. 185)	–	<p>The SC <b>NOTED</b> the proposed workplans and priorities of each of the Working Parties and <b>AGREED</b> to the revised workplans as outlined in <a href="#">Appendix XXXV</a>. The Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each working part shall ensure that the efforts of their working party is focused on the core areas contained within the appendix, taking into account any new research priorities identified by the –Commission at its next Session.</p>	N/A	To be developed at the WPEB09.

WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
		The SC <b>ADOPTED</b> a revised assessment schedule for the tuna and tuna-like species under the IOTC mandate, as well as the current list of key shark species of interest, as outlined in <a href="#">Appendix XXXVI</a> . Following the uncertainty remaining in the bigeye tuna assessment carried out for the previous WPTT meetings in 2010 and 2011, the WPTT <b>AGREED</b> that bigeye tuna would be the priority species for stock assessments in 2013. Only stock status indicators (i.e standardised CPUE series) should be updated for skipjack tuna and yellowfin tuna.		
WPEB08.27 (para. 190)	SC15.58 (para.234)	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission endorse the schedule of Working Party and Scientific Committee meetings for 2013, and tentatively for 2014 (Table 10).	Yes	To be developed at WPEB09.
WPEB08.28 (para. 192)	-	The SC <b>NOTED</b> the options provided to it by the WPEB, highlighting that as quantitative information on sharks becomes available, there should be the possibility for simple stock status analyses based on fisheries and biological indicators. Expertise in stock assessment from other IOTC working parties, e.g. the WPTT or the WPB, would be of value for such analyses. The SC <b>AGREED</b> that the WPEB should be retained in its current form, but that the Chair shall ensure that each five day meeting alternatives its core focus among the species covered under its mandate.	N/A	To be developed at WPEB09.
WPEB08.29 (para. 194)	-	The SC <b>NOTED</b> the report of the Eighth Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (IOTC-2012-WPEB08-R), including the consolidated list of recommendations provided as an appendix to the report. The SC <b>EXPRESSED</b> its satisfaction on the large attendance and participation by national scientists working on ecosystem and bycatch topics (48 participants) which resulted in the presentation of 40 working documents.	Yes	The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPEB09, provided at <a href="#">Appendix ...</a> , as well as the management advice provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each of the species or species groups species under the mandate of the WPEB: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix...</a></li> <li>○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li> </ul>



WPEB08 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC15	Endorsed at S17	Comments and proposal for consideration at WPEB09
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Marine turtles – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li><li>○ Seabirds – <a href="#">Appendix ...</a></li></ul>