
PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPB11

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 10 SEPTEMBER 2014

PURPOSE

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

To provide participants at the 12th WPB with an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous WPB meeting which were endorsed by the SC, and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants as appropriate given any progress.

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 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.

Process:

- 1) **WPB** – At the 11th Session of the WPB, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the IOTC Secretariat on a range of issues;
- 2) **SC** – The recommendations were considered by the SC in December 2013. At the SC16 meeting, the recommendations of the WPB11 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 WPB, 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 IOTC 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 IOTC Secretariat has undertaken a review of the recommendations arising from the previous WPB 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 WPB meeting has been provided.



RECOMMENDATION

That the WPB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IOTC–2014–WPB12–06 which detailed the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPB11, 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 WPB12, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

APPENDICES

[Appendix A](#): Progress made on the recommendations of WPB11.

APPENDIX A

Progress made on the recommendations of WPB11

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12
WPB11.01 (para. 3)	SC16.54 (para. 133)	<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>), 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.</p>	S18 (para. 89, 90)	<p>The Commission REQUESTED that the Secretariat seek voluntary contributions from Contracting Parties and other interested groups to supplement the MPF.</p> <p>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.</p>
WPB11.02 (para. 5)	SC16.55 (para. 134)	<p>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 “<i>The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditure of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.</i>” 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.</p>	S18 (para. 88)	<p>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 “<i>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.</i>” 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.</p> <p>The Commission AGREED that the IOTC MPF exclude</p>

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12																				
				funding for Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, as they currently do not contribute to the IOTC budget.																				
WPB11.03 (para. 20)	SC16.57 (para. 141)	<p>Billfish species identification</p> <p>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.</p>	Yes, as a generic approval of the budget proposed.	See below.																				
WPB11.04 (para. 21)	SC16.58 (para. 142)	<p>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).</p> <p>TABLE 13. Estimated translation, production and printing costs for 1000 sets of identification guides for billfish.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Translation (per language)</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>7</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Typesetting</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>4</td> <td>4,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Billfish ID cards</td> <td>\$6</td> <td>1000</td> <td>6,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Total estimate (US\$)</td> <td>17,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Translation (per language)	\$1000	7	7,000	Typesetting	\$1000	4	4,000	Billfish ID cards	\$6	1000	6,000	Total estimate (US\$)			17,000	Yes, as a generic approval of the budget proposed.	<p>US\$12,000 was approved by the Commission for this purpose.</p> <p><i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat is seeking additional funds from CPCs and others to translate and print the ID cards. A discussion on media type would be beneficial at the WPB12</i></p>
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																					
Translation (per language)	\$1000	7	7,000																					
Typesetting	\$1000	4	4,000																					
Billfish ID cards	\$6	1000	6,000																					
Total estimate (US\$)			17,000																					
WPB11.05 (para. 24)	SC16.34 (para. 77)	<p>Length-age keys</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A	<p><i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i></p> <p><i>No new data have been received by the IOTC Secretariat since the last WPB meeting in 2013.</i></p>																				
WPB11.06		Catch, Catch-and-effort, Size data	N/A	<i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i>																				

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12
(para. 25)		The WPB RECOMMENDED that all CPCs assess and improve the status of catch-and-effort data for marlins (by species) and sailfish, noting that improvements to the data for the EU fleets and its provision to the IOTC Secretariat, would be most beneficial to the work of the WPB.		<i>No improvement identified by the IOTC Secretariat since the last WPB meeting in 2013.</i>
WPB11.07 (para. 39)	SC16.35 (para. 79)	Data support 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.	Yes, as a generic approval of the budget proposed.	<i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i> <i>IOTC Data Coordinator will be in attendance at the WPB12.</i>
WPB11.08 (para. 44)	SC16 (para. 80)	Pakistan gillnet fishery RECALLING IOTC Resolution 12/12 to prohibit the use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas in the IOTC area, paragraph 1, which states: “1. The use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas within the IOTC area of competence shall be prohibited.” “Large-scale driftnets” are defined as gillnets or other nets or a combination of nets that are more than 2.5 kilometers in length whose purpose is to enmesh, entrap, or entangle fish by drifting on the surface of, or in, the water column.”, the SC NOTED the findings of the study that gillnets in excess of the 2.5 km limit are being used by the gillnet fleets of Pakistan on the high seas, in contravention of Resolution 12/12.	N/A	<i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i>

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12
WPB11.09 (para. 75)	SC16.36 (para. 81)	<p>Mozambique Channel billfish fishery</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A	<i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i>
WPB11.10 (para. 84)	SC16.37 (para. 82)	<p>Recreational and sports fisheries for billfish</p> <p>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.</p>	N/A	<i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i>
WPB11.11 (para. 151)	SC16.38 (para. 83)	<p>Parameters for future analyses: stock assessments</p> <p>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</p>		<p><i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12 (CPUE series)</i></p> <p><i>The IOTC Secretariat disseminated data for the assessments of SWO (1950–2012) by 31 July 2014, more than 2 months before the WPB meeting. Other data was released more than a month before the WPB, as recommended.</i></p>

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12
		<p>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: —<i>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.</i> (IOTC–2011–SC14–R; p68)</p>		
<p>WPB11.12 (para. 182)</p>	<p>SC16.39 (para. 84)</p>	<p>Swordfish: Nominal and standardised CPUE indices 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.</p>		<p><i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i></p>
<p>WPB11.13 (para. 192)</p>	<p>SC16 (para. 193)</p>	<p>Revision of the WPB workplan The SC NOTED the proposed work plans and priorities of each of the Working Parties and AGREED to the revised work plans as outlined in Appendix XXXIV. The Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each working party 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>	<p>N/A</p>	<p><i>Update: To be discussed at WPB12</i></p>

WPB10 Rec. No.	SC15 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPB12
WPB11.14 (para. 204)	SC16.73 (para. 210)	<p><i>Election of a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson for the next biennium</i></p> <p>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, <i>as well as the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each of the Working Parties</i> as provided in Appendix VII.</p>	Yes	N/A
WPB11.15 (para. 205)	SC16.02 (para. 164)	<p>The SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission note the management advice developed for each billfish species as provided in the Executive Summary for each species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Swordfish (<i>Xiphias gladius</i>) – Appendix XII ○ Black marlin (<i>Makaira indica</i>) – Appendix XIII ○ Blue marlin (<i>Makaira nigricans</i>) – Appendix XIV ○ Striped marlin (<i>Tetrapturus audax</i>) – Appendix XV ○ Indo-Pacific sailfish (<i>Istiophorus platypterus</i>) – Appendix XVI 		<p>The WPB RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPB12, provided at Appendix ???, as well as the management advice provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each of the five billfish species under the IOTC mandate, and the combined Kobe plot for the ??? species assigned a stock status in 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Black marlin (<i>Makaira indica</i>) – Appendix ??? ○ Blue marlin (<i>Makaira nigricans</i>) – Appendix ??? ○ Striped marlin (<i>Tetrapturus audax</i>) – Appendix ??? ○ Indo-Pacific sailfish (<i>Istiophorus platypterus</i>) – Appendix ??? <p>Swordfish (<i>Xiphias gladius</i>) – Appendix ???</p>