

## PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPEB11

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT<sup>1</sup> AND CHAIR  
LAST UPDATED: 8 APRIL 2015

### PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 11<sup>th</sup> WPEB with an update on the progress made in implementing those recommendations from the previous Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB) 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 10<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPEB, 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 WPEB was provided to the SC for its endorsement at its December 2014 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.

**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.

<sup>1</sup> [secretariat@iotc.org](mailto:secretariat@iotc.org); Dr. David Wilson: [david.wilson@iotc.org](mailto:david.wilson@iotc.org)



---

In addition to the Recommendations endorsed by the SC at its 17<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 WPEB11.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the WPEB **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations and requests of the 10<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPEB, and consider whether revised recommendations need to be sent to the SC for its consideration.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix I:** [Progress made on the Recommendations and Requests of WPEB10](#)

## APPENDIX I

### Progress made on the recommendations and requests of WPEB10 and SC17

WPEB10 Rec. No.	Recommendation from WPEB10	SC17 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC17	Progress/Comments
WPEB10. 01	<p><b>Meeting participation fund</b></p> <p>(para. 12) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee consider revising the MPF rules of procedure, so that a <u>Draft</u> paper be submitted to the relevant Working Party MPF Selection Panel earlier than the current 15 days before the meeting, so that the Panel may review the full paper rather than just the abstract, and provide guidance on areas for improvement and the suitability of the application to receive funding using the MPF. The justification of this request is based upon the reduced funds available and the need to maximise benefits. However, some participants did not want the deadline to be brought earlier than the current 15 day deadline.</p>	<p>SC17. Para. 112.</p> <p>SC17.33</p>	<p><b>Meeting participation fund</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> the various comments made by many of the developing CPCs in attendance at the meeting, that the IOTC MPF was crucial for the success of the WPNT, and that the benefits are clearly being seen in terms of increased active engagement at each meeting by recipients, as well as the rapidly increasing quality of the scientific papers being submitted, the SC <b>REQUESTED</b> that the funding of national scientists from developing Contracting Parties to attend the WPNT be considered a high priority.</p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that the MPF was used to fund the participation of a reduced number of national scientists to the Working Parties in 2014, 49 national scientists to the Working Party meetings and the SC in 2014 (58 in 2013; 42 in 2012), all of which were required to submit and present a working paper at the meeting, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>), and now incorporated into the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), was established for the purposes of supporting scientists and representatives from IOTC Contracting Parties who are developing States to attend and contribute to the work of the Commission, the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.</li> <li>• The Commission has made the following directives to the IOTC Secretariat:</li> </ul>	<p><b>Update:</b> [Ongoing] – The MPF will be announced in the upcoming WPEB11 meeting announcement circular.</p>



		<p>Para. 119</p> <p>Para. 122</p>	<p>a) The Commission had directed the IOTC Secretariat (via Resolution 10/05 and now via the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)) to ensure that: (para. 88 of the S18 Report)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 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.</li> <li>ii. the MPF 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.</li> <li>iii. thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing Contracting Party scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.</li> </ol> <p>b) The Commission had directed the IOTC Secretariat 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In accordance with para. 89 of the S18 Report, the IOTC Secretariat is actively seeking extra budgetary funding sources to supplement the MPF budget from individual Contracting Parties as well as other interested groups. However, the SC was informed by the IOTC Secretariat that other sources should actively be sought by interested candidates, including the UNFSA meeting fund, as well as through their own domestic budgetary processes.</li> </ul> <p>The SC strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that this fund be maintained into the future and increased back to its original allocation of \$200,000 per year.</p> <p>The SC <b>REQUESTED</b> CPCs send a relevant scientist to consecutive Working Party meetings where possible,</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------	---	--



		Para 123	<p>rather than having a different participant each year, to strengthen capacity and provide continuity.</p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the MPF rules of procedure be modified, so that a <u>Draft</u> working document, rather than an abstract, be submitted to the relevant Working Party MPF Selection Panel 45 days before the meeting, so that the Panel may review the full paper rather than just the abstract, and provide guidance on areas for improvement and the suitability of the application to receive funding using the MPF. The justification of this request is based upon the reduced funds available and the need to maximise benefits. The SC <b>AGREED</b> that until such time as the Commission revises the IOTC Rules of Procedure the MPF selection panels may choose to follow this proposal.</p>	
WPEB10.02	<p><b>Identification cards for shark, seabirds and marine turtles</b></p> <p>(<a href="#">para. 21</a>) <b>NOTING</b> the recent online survey distributed by the IOTC Secretariat, the WPEB strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat ensure that hard copies of the identification cards continue to be printed in hard copy form as many CPCs scientific observers, both on board and port, still do not have smart phone technology/hardware access and need to have hard copies on board. At this point in time, electronic formats, including 'applications or apps' are only suitable for larger scale vessels, and even in the case of EU purse seine vessels, the use of hard copies is relied upon due to on board fish processing and handling conditions, as well as weather conditions.</p>	SC17.38	<p><b>IOTC species identification cards</b></p> <p>(<a href="#">para. 129</a>) <b>NOTING</b> the recent online survey distributed by the IOTC Secretariat, the SC strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat ensure that hard copies of the identification cards continue to be printed as many CPCs scientific observers, both on board and port, still do not have smart phone technology/hardware access and need to have hard copies on board. At this point in time, electronic formats, including 'applications or apps' are only suitable for larger scale vessels, and even in the case of EU purse seine vessels, the use of hard copies is relied upon due to on board fish processing and handling conditions, as well as weather conditions.</p>	<p><b>Update:</b> IOTC Secretariat <b>[Ongoing]</b> – It is the intention that hard copies will continue to be printed of the ID Cards, and a gradual transition to electronic formats will occur in the coming years. Funds for printing will come from a range of sources, including the IOTC regular budget.</p>
WPEB10.03	<p><b>Observer trip reporting template</b></p> <p>(<a href="#">para. 57</a>) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee <b>ADOPT</b> the revised versions of the observer reporting templates (see <a href="#">para. 55</a> of the WPEB10 Report), consistent with Resolution 11/04 "...the IOTC Scientific Committee will elaborate an observer working manual, a template to be used for reporting (including minimum data fields) and a training program".</p>	SC17 (Para 161)	<p><b>Observer trip reporting template</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that improving the quality of data submissions is a process that evolves and develops over time, the SC <b>ADOPTED</b> the revised observer templates as interim reporting templates for immediate use by CPCs where ready and for preliminary use by CPCs where further time is required for review. The SC <b>AGREED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat will make these templates available in 2015</p>	<p><b>Update:</b> IOTC Secretariat <b>[Ongoing]</b></p>



			and update the guidance in the manual accordingly. Following implementation in interim format, the SC <b>AGREED</b> that these will be reviewed and modified further as appropriate in 2015.	
WPEB10.04	<p><b>Assessing the need for an NPOA</b></p> <p>(para. 65) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> the following process should be followed by CPCs when requesting the IOTC Secretariat apply a status of 'Not applicable (n.a.)' for an NPOA, in the 'Table of progress in implementing NPOA-sharks, NPOA-seabirds and the FAO guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing operations', available on the IOTC website: <a href="http://iotc.org/science/table-progress-implementing-npoa-sharks-npoa-seabirds-and-fao-guidelines-reduce-sea-turtle-mortality">http://iotc.org/science/table-progress-implementing-npoa-sharks-npoa-seabirds-and-fao-guidelines-reduce-sea-turtle-mortality</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each CPC requesting a status of 'Not applicable (n.a.)' for the development of an NPOA shall present the following to the WPEB:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of species of seabirds/sharks recorded in the area of fishing activities of the CPC;</li> <li>Evidence (scientific surveys/research) that clearly indicate the level of interactions of seabirds/sharks with gears used in the CPCs fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species in the IOTC area of competence; such surveys should cover all seasons with multiple trips to ensure that relatively rare events such as seabird bycatch can be detected, and similarly should include a high degree of spatial coverage of fishing effort by gear type; where fishing effort overlaps with marine Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (available at: <a href="http://54.247.127.44/marineIBAs/default.html">http://54.247.127.44/marineIBAs/default.html</a>), those areas should be prioritised for survey effort.</li> <li>Application to WPEB to consider a recommendation to the Scientific Committee to apply a status of 'not applicable (n.a.)' for the CPCs fisheries as having non-detrimental interactions with seabirds/sharks in the IOTC</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	SC17 (Paras 62, 63, 64)	<p><b>Assessing the need for an NPOA</b></p> <p>The SC <b>AGREED</b> that the process should require the following three elements 1) a scientifically-based approach to be taken; 2) to contain a requirement for the Precautionary approach, as adopted by the IOTC in Resolution 12/01 <i>On the implementation of the precautionary approach</i>; and 3) that the FAO guidelines concerning developments of NPOAs be followed.</p> <p>The SC <b>ADOPTED</b> the process detailed in <a href="#">Appendix VII</a>, for all CPCs to follow when requesting the IOTC Secretariat to apply a status of 'Not applicable (n.a.)' for an NPOA, in the 'Table of progress in implementing NPOA-sharks, NPOA-seabirds and the FAO guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing operations'.</p> <p>The SC <b>NOTED</b> the difficulties faced by the IOTC Secretariat when summarising and standardising information on reported seabird and marine turtle interactions across all CPCs given the number of sources and range in type of information reported. Given the increasing amount of information being reported, the SC therefore <b>REQUESTED</b> the WPEB discuss and develop new ideas to update and improve how these data are presented and summarised in the future.</p>	Update: IOTC Secretariat <b>[Ongoing]</b>



	<p>area of competence, and thus, an NPOA is not required at that point in time.</p> <p>d) A plan of periodic review of the need for an NPOA by the CPC, including the calendar years when periodic review should be undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The WPEB shall review (at its annual session) applications detailed in paragraph 1, and provide its advice to the Scientific Committee on whether it should 1) approve or reject the application; or 2) request additional supporting information from the CPC.</li> <li>The SC should consider the advice from the WPEB and either 1) accept or reject the advice relevant to the application; or 2) request additional supporting information from the CPC be provided to the WPEB for its consideration.</li> </ul>			
WPEB10.05	<p><b>Review of data needs and way forward for the evaluation of shark stocks - catch data reconstruction</b></p> <p>(para. 174) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> a short inter-session meeting is conducted with a small group of scientists to work mainly on blue shark catch data reconstruction to be used for stock assessment in 2015.</p>	SC17.11 ( <a href="#">para. 43</a> )	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that a short inter-session meeting is conducted with a small group of scientists to work mainly on blue shark catch data reconstruction to be used for stock assessment in 2015. Ideally, and to reduce costs, all participants should fund their own participation at a venue to be decided, or work electronically.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
WPEB10.06	<p><b>Resolution 11/04 on a regional observer program</b></p> <p>(para. 211) <b>RECALLING</b> the objectives of Resolution 11/04 on a regional observer scheme as follows:          “Para 1: <i>The objective of the IOTC Observer Scheme shall be to collect verified catch data and other scientific data related to the fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species in the IOTC area of competence</i>”          and <b>NOTING</b> that the objective of the ROS contained in Resolution 11/04, and the rules contained in Resolution 12/02 <i>On data confidentiality policy and procedures</i> makes no reference to the data collected not being used for compliance purposes, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that at the next revision of Resolution 11/04, it be clearly stated that the data collected shall not be used for compliance</p>	SC17.26 ( <a href="#">para. 90</a> )	<b>Resolution 11/04 On a regional observer scheme</b>  <b>NOTING</b> that the objective of the Regional Observer Scheme contained in Resolution 11/04, and the rules contained in Resolution 12/02 <i>On data confidentiality policy and procedures</i> makes no reference to the data collected not being used for compliance purposes, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that at the next revision of Resolution 11/04, it be clearly stated that the data collected within the Regional Observer Scheme shall not be used for compliance purposes.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>



	purposes.			
WPEB10.07	<p><b>Revision of the WPEB Program of Work 2015–2019</b> (para. 249) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC consider and endorse the WPEB Program of Work (2015–2019), as provided at <a href="#">Appendix XVIII</a>.</p>	<p>SC17. Para. 177</p> <p>SC17. Para 178</p>	<p><b>Program of Work (2015–2019) and assessment schedule</b></p> <p>The SC <b>NOTED</b> the proposed Program of Work and priorities for each of the Working Parties and <b>AGREED</b> to a consolidated Program of Work as outlined in <a href="#">Appendix XXXVIII</a>. 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>The SC <b>REQUESTED</b> that during the 2015 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 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.</p>	<p>Update: <b>[Ongoing]</b></p> <p>The Program of Work for 2015–2019, as adopted by the Scientific Committee is available for download from the IOTC website: <a href="http://iotc.org/science/wp/working-party-billfish-wpb">http://iotc.org/science/wp/working-party-billfish-wpb</a></p>
WPEB10.08	<p><b>Development of priorities for an Invited Expert/s at the next Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch meeting</b> (para. 252) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that an Invited Expert be brought to the WPEB in 2015 so as to further increase the capacity of the WPEB to undertake work on sharks, and for this to be included in the IOTC budget for 2015.</p>	<p>SC17.47</p> <p>(para. 181)</p>	<p><b>Invited Experts</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that at least one 'Invited Expert' be brought to each of the science Working Parties in 2015 and in each subsequent year, so as to further increase the capacity of the Working Parties to undertake the work detailed in the Program of Work (<a href="#">Appendix XL</a>). The IOTC regular budget shall include travel funds (flights, DSA) for this purpose. The Invited Expert for each meeting will continue to be selected based on the process adopted by the Scientific Committee and provided at <a href="#">Appendix XL</a>.</p>	<p>Update: One invited expert with be Invited to the WPEB11.</p>
WPEB10.09	<p><b>Consolidated recommendations of the 10<sup>th</sup> Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch</b> (para. 256) The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of</p>		<p>As per the above and in the SC17 Report.</p>	<p>Update: – <b>[Pending]</b> – To be considered at the next Commission meeting.</p>

	<p>recommendations arising from WPEB10, provided at <a href="#">Appendix XIX</a>, as well as the management advice provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each of the seven shark species, as well of those for marine turtles and seabirds:</p> <p><b>Sharks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix IX</a></li> <li>○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix X</a></li> <li>○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XI</a></li> <li>○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XII</a></li> <li>○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIII</a></li> <li>○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIV</a></li> <li>○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XV</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Other species/groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marine turtles – <a href="#">Appendix XVI</a></li> <li>○ Seabirds – <a href="#">Appendix XVII</a></li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

WPEB10 Report	WPEB10 REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 17	<p><i>Update/progress paper</i></p> <p>The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat continue to prepare a paper on the progress of the recommendations arising from the previous WPEB, incorporating the final recommendations adopted by the Scientific Committee and endorsed by the Commission, as well as any updates and requests.</p>	Update: <b>Completed</b> for 2015 and <b>Ongoing</b> annually.
Para. 28	<p><i>IOTC database</i></p> <p>The WPEB <b>NOTED</b> the main data issues that are considered to negatively affect the quality of the statistics for bycatch (including byproduct) species available at the IOTC Secretariat, by species group, type of dataset and fishery, which are provided</p>	Update: <b>Pending</b>

	in <a href="#">Appendix V</a> , 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 WPEB at its next meeting.	
Para. 42	<b>Regional observer scheme – Update (Resolution 11/04 On a regional observer scheme)</b> <b>NOTING</b> the low levels of observer coverage achieved by CPCs to date, the WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the planned capacity building activities to take place in 2015 support national programs, while possibilities such as self-sampling schemes should be considered in the meantime as an intermediate stage towards full implementation of the requirements set out in IOTC Resolution 11/04.	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a>
Para. 55	<b>Observer trip reporting template</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat finalise the revision of the observer reporting templates inter-sessionally based on the gear-specific recommendations made by the breakout group meetings held during the current working party meeting, and for these revisions to be provided to the WPDCS for its consideration and then the Scientific Committee for adoption.	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a>
Para. 67	<b>Updated status of development and implementation of National Plans of Action for seabirds and sharks, and the implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations (CPCs).</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat continue to periodically revise the table summarising progress towards the development of NPOA-Sharks, NPOA-Seabirds, and the implementation of the FAO guidelines to reduce marine turtle mortality in fishing operations, by each CPC for the consideration at each WPEB and the SC meeting. The current version is provided at <a href="#">Appendix VIII</a> .	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a> Will be updated periodically.
Para. 71	<b>Marine turtle national management plans/strategies</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> the IOTC and IOSEA Secretariats work collaboratively with any CPC requesting assistance to develop their national management plans for the reduction of marine turtle bycatch in tuna fisheries.	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a>
Para. 80	<b>Regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that each individual CPC begin work on the recommendation from the SC (SC16.14) at a national level through data mining and research activities. The IOTC Secretariat may be able to provide assistance in this regard on a case by case basis through inter-sessional small group workshops.	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a>
Para. 83	<b>GEF-tuna ABNJ Project</b> The WPEB <b>THANKED</b> the GEF tuna-ABNJ project for funding the participation of the Technical Coordinator-Sharks and Bycatch (Dr Shelley Clarke), <b>NOTING</b> her excellent and highly relevant contributions to the session and <b>REQUESTED</b> funding for her participation next year.	Update: <a href="#">[Pending]</a>

Para. 121	<b>Blue shark hotspots in the southwest Indian Ocean</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the authors test the predictive capability of the model through various approaches such as sub-setting the data. The method used to separate out operational information to obtain a set of predictive variables which are solely environmental, assumes that operational and environmental variables are independent.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
Para. 132	<b>Report of the IO-ShYP01</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat liaise with CPCs to collate previous and ongoing research programs on shark in the Indian Ocean, as the IO-ShYP report is unlikely to document all sources of potentially useful information.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
Para. 135	<b>NOTING</b> the number of shark tagging projects taking place in the Indian Ocean, the WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> the IOTC Secretariat to create a shark portal on the IOTC website, whereby information could be shared. The STAGIS platform currently in use by SPC and the Metadatabase used by ICCAT may be used as examples.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b> Resources limited at the IOTC Secretariat.
Para. 142	<b>EU,Portugal blue shark CPUE</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> the authors to trial the use of regression trees on a full suite of potential explanatory variables and use backwards model selection.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
Para. 157	<b>CPUE discussion summary</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that any future CPUE analysis papers include model comparisons and residual diagnostics, as per the 'Guidelines for the presentation of stock assessment models' adopted by the SC in 2012 (IOTC-2014-WPEB10-INF01). Comparison of catch to derived CPUE should be examined and detailed in the meeting paper.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
Para. 173	<b>Review of data needs and way forward for the evaluation of shark stocks - catch data reconstruction</b> The WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the WPEB Chair work with CPCs individually or jointly if possible, to develop and refine data which can be used in catch reconstruction. In doing so, full account should be taken of data quality with respect to deficiencies in accurate reporting, as well as for the estimation of catch and discards. This would be done in collaboration with the IOTC Secretariat inter-sessionally. CPCs should facilitate the sharing of information for this task, including information coming from national observer programs, guaranteeing that it will be used under strict confidentiality rules.	Update: <b>[Pending]</b>
Para. 181	<b>Development of technical advice on the status of the shark stocks</b> The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for a subset of shark species commonly caught in IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species, as provided in the draft resource stock status summaries and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary for sharks with the latest 2013 catch data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft	Update: <b>Completed.</b>

	<p>Executive Summary, for its consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix IX</a></li> <li>○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix X</a></li> <li>○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XI</a></li> <li>○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XII</a></li> <li>○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIII</a></li> <li>○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIV</a></li> <li>○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XV</a></li> </ul>	
Para. 193	<p><b>Development of technical advice on the status of marine turtle species</b> The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for marine turtles, as provided in the draft status summary and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary with the latest 2013 interaction data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marine turtles (<a href="#">Appendix XVI</a>)</li> </ul>	Update: <b>Completed</b> .
Para. 228	<p><b>Development of technical advice on the status of seabird species</b> The WPEB <b>ADOPTED</b> the management advice developed for seabirds, as provided in the draft status summary and <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary with the latest 2013 interaction data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Seabird (<a href="#">Appendix XVII</a>)</li> </ul>	Update: <b>Completed</b> .
Para. 254	<p><b>Date and place of the 11<sup>th</sup> Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch</b> The WPEB <b>AGREED</b> on the importance of having IOTC working party meetings within key CPCs catching species of relevance to the working party, in this case on sharks, noting that this meeting should be held in conjunction with the WPB. Following a discussion on who would host the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Sessions of the WPEB in 2015 and 2016 respectively, the WPEB <b>REQUESTED</b> that the IOTC Secretariat liaise with EU, Portugal to determine if they would be able to host the 11<sup>th</sup> Session. The WPEB should continue to be held in conjunction with the Working Party on Billfish. An offer was also made by the Secretariat to hold the meeting in the Seychelles. The meeting locations will be communicated by to the SC for its consideration at its next session to be held in December 2014 (<a href="#">Table 5</a>).</p>	Update: The next meeting of the WPEB will be held in Olhao, Portugal from 6-10 September 2015.