

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPEB11

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT¹ AND CHAIR
LAST UPDATED: 18 AUGUST 2016

PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 12th 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 11th 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 2015 meeting.

DISCUSSION

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

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

Recalling that the SC, at its 16th Session adopted a set of reporting terminology SC16.07 (para. 23), which was subsequently endorsed by the Commission at its 18th 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.

¹ secretariat@iotc.org; Sarah Martin: sm@iotc.org



In addition to the Recommendations endorsed by the SC at its 18th 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 WPEB12.

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPEB **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations and requests of the 11th 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 WPEB11

APPENDIX I

Progress made on the recommendations and requests of WPEB11 and SC18

WPEB11 Rec. No.	Recommendation from WPEB11	SC18 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC18	Progress/Comments
WPEB11. 01	<p>Meeting participation fund</p> <p>(para. 10) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), for the administration of the Meeting Participation Fund be modified so that applications are due not later than 60 days (current deadline is 45 days), and that the full <u>Draft</u> paper be submitted no later than 45 days (current deadline is 15 days) before the start of the relevant meeting, so that the Selection Panel may review the full paper rather than just the abstract, and provide guidance on areas for improvement, as well as the suitability of the application to receive funding using the IOTC MPF. The earlier submission dates would also assist with Visa application procedures for candidates.</p>	SC18.24	<p>Meeting participation fund</p> <p>(para. 98) The SC RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014), for the administration of the Meeting Participation Fund be modified so that applications are due not later than 60 days, and that the full <u>Draft</u> paper be submitted no later than 45 days before the start of the relevant meeting. The aim is to allow the Selection Panel to review the full paper rather than just the abstract, and provide guidance on areas for improvement, as well as the suitability of the application to receive funding using the IOTC MPF. The earlier submission dates would also assist with Visa application procedures for candidates.</p>	Update: Ongoing
WPEB11. 02	<p>Identification cards for shark, seabirds and marine turtles</p> <p>(para. 16) NOTING that the Commission has approved US\$30,000 for the printing of the species identification cards in 2016, as confirmed by the IOTC Secretariat at the 19th Session of the Commission, the WPEB RECOMMENDED that the marine turtle, seabird and shark species identification cards already translated into languages other than English and French, be printed in the first quarter of 2016 for dissemination.</p> <p>(para. 19) The WPEB reiterated the RECOMMENDATION 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</p>	SC18	<p>IOTC species identification cards</p> <p>(para. 103) NOTING that the Commission has approved US\$30,000 for the printing of the species identification cards in 2016, as confirmed by the IOTC Secretariat at the 19th Session of the Commission, the SC REQUESTED that the species identification cards already translated into languages other than English and French, be printed in the first quarter of 2016 for dissemination.</p>	Update: IOTC Secretariat Ongoing – Printing is underway for the ID guides already translated into languages other than English and French, including Hindi and Telugu tuna and tuna-like species guides and Indonesian and Spanish turtle ID guides. All species ID guides have also now been translated and printed into Arabic and Farsi. Additional English seabird ID guides have also been printed in 2016. The IOTC Secretariat is continuing to distribute the ID guides at workshops and on request for the use of port samplers, observers and fishers.



	<p>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. Electronic versions may be developed as complementary tools.</p>			
WPEB11.04	<p>Review of the statistical data available for ecosystems and bycatch species</p> <p>(para. 26) NOTING the high level of uncertainty in the nominal catches of blue sharks and high proportion caught by Indonesia, the WPEB RECOMMENDED that the IOTC consultancy work that is currently taking place to improve the Indonesian nominal catch data series is extended in order to provide sufficient attention to sharks as well as tuna.</p>		Not taken forward	<p>Update: IOTC Secretariat – While sampling in Indonesia has continued, there has been very limited information collected on sharks, mostly due to the small number of gears and landing sites (i.e., 8 sites) selected for the pilot sampling in North and West Sumatra. The Secretariat will continue to monitor the results of the sampling, and report to the WPEB any information collected on sharks – although it is unlikely the pilot sampling results can be used to inform or review the current nominal catches of sharks in Indonesia due to the limited data available from sampling for shark species.</p>
WPEB11.05	<p>Regional observer scheme – Update (Resolution 11/04 On a regional observer scheme)</p> <p>(para. 38) NOTING the upcoming projects planned to support the ROS (including the development of an electronic reporting system, and a proposal for an electronic monitoring system), the WPEB RECOMMENDED that funding from the IOTC regular budget is allocated to support these activities over the next few years. The IOTC Secretariat has been tasked by the Commission to develop a proposal and budget for its consideration.</p> <p>(para. 47) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that capacity building activities continue to be supported via the</p>	SC18.30	<p>Observer data</p> <p>NOTING that training of observers and crew is long-term and necessarily meticulous work that should be done in a recurrent way in order to optimise the efficiency of observers, the SC RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat increases its effort in training observers, including species identification. This would only be possible if the Commission were to increase staffing at the IOTC Secretariat and allocate specific funding for the Regional Observer Scheme implementation.</p>	<p>Update: IOTC Secretariat [Ongoing] – Observer training was conducted for Oman, I.R.Iran and Pakistan: http://waw.iotc.org/sites/default/files/documents/data/IOTC-2015-ROSW02-R_-_Final_Report.pdf <i>Resolution 16/04 On the implementation of a pilot project in view of promoting the Regional Observer Scheme of the IOTC</i> was adopted at the 20th Session of the Commission</p>



WPEB11.06	Commission's annual budget, to improve the lack of compliance with the implementation of observer schemes by CPCs for their fleets and lack of reporting to the IOTC Secretariat as per the provisions contained within Resolution 11/04 <i>on a Regional Observer Scheme</i> .			
WPEB11.07	<p>Revision of Resolution 11/04 on a regional observer scheme</p> <p>(para. 48) RECALLING 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 NOTING 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 reiterated its RECOMMENDATION that at the next revision of Resolution 11/04, it be clearly stated that the data collected shall not be used for compliance purposes.</p>	SC18.31	<p>NOTING 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 RECOMMENDED 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.</p>	Update: [Pending]
WPEB11.08	<p>Pakistan shark bycatch in gillnet fisheries</p> <p>(para. 113) NOTING that gillnets are regularly being used in excess of 4,000 m (and up to 7,000 m) within and occasionally beyond the EEZ of Pakistan and other IOTC CPCs in the region, and that those used within the EEZ may sometimes drift onto the high seas in contravention of Resolution 12/12, the WPEB RECOMMENDED that the Commission should consider if a ban on large scale gillnets should also apply within IOTC CPC EEZ. This would be especially important given the negative ecological impacts of large scale drifting gillnets in areas frequented by marine mammals and turtles.</p>	SC18.12	<p>Pakistan shark bycatch in gillnet fisheries</p> <p>(para. 39) NOTING that gillnets are regularly being used with lengths in excess of 4,000 m (and up to 7,000 m) within and occasionally beyond the EEZ of Pakistan and other IOTC CPCs in the region, and that those used within the EEZ may sometimes drift onto the high seas in contravention of Resolution 12/12, the SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission should consider if a ban on large scale gillnets should also apply within IOTC CPC EEZ. This would be especially important given the negative ecological impacts of large scale drifting gillnets in areas frequented by marine mammals and turtles</p>	Update: [Pending]



<p>WPEB11.09</p> <p>WPEB11.10</p>	<p>Review of seabird mitigation measures in Resolution 12/06</p> <p>(para. 234) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that CPCs with significant fishing effort south of 25°S to undertake their own assessments on the levels and nature of implementation of Resolution 12/06 by their fleets, and present papers, similar to that presented in paper IOTC-2015-WPEB11-37 Rev_1, to the WPEB meeting in 2016.</p> <p>(para. 235) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that CPCs bring data to the WPEB meeting in 2016, as the Commission via Resolution 12/06 required the WPEB and SC to undertake this task in 2015, which has not been possible due to insufficient data, and that a collaborative analysis of the impacts of Resolution 12/06 be undertaken during the WPEB meeting, if feasible. CPC review papers and datasets should include the following information/data from logbooks and/or observer schemes, where appropriate and should cover the period 2011 to 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total effort south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Observed effort south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Observed seabird mortality rates south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Descriptions of fleet structure /target species by time and area, and an indication of observer coverage per fleet/target species for effort south of 25°S • Data on which seabird bycatch mitigation measures were used, on a set-by-set/cruise basis if possible or per vessel, or at the finest scale possible • Descriptions of the specifications of seabird bycatch mitigation measures used according to the fields in the Regional Observer Scheme manual and in relation to the specifications given in Res 12/06 		<p>Review of seabird mitigation measures in Resolution 12/06</p> <p>(para. 41) The SC RECOMMENDED that CPCs bring data to the WPEB meeting in 2016, as the Commission via Resolution 12/06 required the WPEB and SC to undertake this task in 2015, which has not been possible due to insufficient data, and that a collaborative analysis of the impacts of Resolution 12/06 be undertaken during the WPEB meeting, if feasible. CPC review papers and datasets should include the following information/data from logbooks and/or observer schemes, where appropriate and should cover the period 2011 to 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total effort south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Observed effort south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Observed seabird mortality rates south of 25°S by area and time, at the finest scale possible • Descriptions of fleet structure /target species by time and area, and an indication of observer coverage per fleet/target species for effort south of 25°S • Data on which seabird bycatch mitigation measures were used, on a set-by-set/cruise basis if possible or per vessel, or at the finest scale possible • Descriptions of the specifications of seabird bycatch mitigation measures used according to the fields in the Regional Observer Scheme manual and in relation to the specifications given in Res 12/06 	<p>Update: Pending</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--	---	-------------------------------



WPEB11.11	<p>Marine mammal identification cards</p> <p>(para. 251) RECALLING the Scientific Committee's recommendation SC17.21 (para. 54 of the C17 Report), the WPEB RECOMMENDED that the SC reiterate its previous recommendation for the Commission to allocate funds in its 2016 budget, to produce and print the IOTC best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled cetaceans. The guidelines could be incorporated into a set of IOTC cetacean identification cards: "<i>Cetacean identification for Indian Ocean fisheries</i>".</p>	SC18.27	<p>(para. 102) The SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission allocate funds in its 2016/2017 budget, to produce and print the IOTC best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled cetaceans. The guidelines could be incorporated into a set of IOTC cetacean identification cards: "<i>Cetacean identification for Indian Ocean fisheries</i>".</p>	Update: This recommendation has been provisionally adopted by S20, pending the final report adoption
WPEB11.12	<p>Revision of the WPEB Program of Work 2016–2020</p> <p>(para. 258) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that the SC consider and endorse the WPEB Program of Work (2016–2020), as provided at Appendix XVIII.</p>	SC18. Para. 153	<p>Program of Work (2016–2020) and assessment schedule</p> <p>The SC NOTED the proposed Program of Work and priorities for the Scientific Committee and each of the Working Parties and AGREED to a consolidated Program of Work as outlined in Appendix XXXIV. The Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of each working party shall ensure that the efforts of their working party are focused on the core areas contained within the appendix, taking into account any new research priorities identified by the Commission at its next Session.</p>	Update: [Ongoing] The Program of Work for 2016–2020, as adopted by the Scientific Committee is available for download from the IOTC website: http://iotc.org/science/wp/working-party-billfish-wpeb
WPEB11.13	<p>Election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for the WPEB for the next biennium</p> <p>(para. 270) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that the SC note that Dr Rui Coelho (EU,Portugal) was elected as Chairperson, and Mr Reza Shahifar (I.R. Iran) and Dr Ross Wanless (South Africa) were elected as Vice-Chairpersons of the WPEB for the next biennium, in accordance with the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014).</p>	SC18	Dr Rui Coelho (EU,Portugal) were noted as Chairperson, and Mr Reza Shahifar (I.R. Iran) and Dr Ross Wanless (South Africa) were elected as Vice-Chairpersons of the WPEB for the next biennium, in accordance with the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014) in Appendix VII.	Update: – [Completed]
WPEB11.14	<p>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the 11th Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch</p> <p>(para. 274) The WPEB RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPEB11, provided at Appendix XIX, as well as the management advice provided</p>	SC18.04	<p>Sharks</p> <p>(para. 125) The SC RECOMMENDED 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"> ○ Blue shark (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – Appendix XXIII 	Update: – [Completed]



	<p>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>Sharks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – Appendix IX ○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – Appendix X ○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – Appendix XI ○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – Appendix XII ○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – Appendix XIII ○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – Appendix XIV ○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – Appendix XV <p>Other species/groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marine turtles – Appendix XVI ○ Seabirds – Appendix XVII 	<p>SC18.05</p> <p>SC18.06</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Oceanic whitetip shark (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – Appendix XXIV ○ Scalloped hammerhead shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – Appendix XXV ○ Shortfin mako shark (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – Appendix XXVI ○ Silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – Appendix XXVII ○ Bigeye thresher shark (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – Appendix XXVIII ○ Pelagic thresher shark (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – Appendix XXIX <p>Marine turtles</p> <p>(para. 126) The SC RECOMMENDED 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"> ○ Marine turtles – Appendix XXX <p>Seabirds</p> <p>(para. 127) The SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission note the management advice developed for seabirds, as provided in the Executive Summary encompassing all species commonly interacting with IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seabirds – Appendix XXXI 	
--	---	-------------------------------	--	--

WPEB11 Report	WPEB11 REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 15	<p><i>Update/progress paper</i></p> <p>The WPEB REQUESTED 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>	<p>Update: Completed for 2016 and Ongoing annually.</p>

Para. 18	Identification cards for shark, seabirds and marine turtles The WPEB REQUESTED CPCs provide feedback on the usefulness of the printed card in improving species identification for all marine turtle and seabird interactions and shark catches in reported statistics, at each WPEB meeting.	Update: Pending
Para. 21	Review of the statistical data available for ecosystems and bycatch species The WPEB NOTED the main data issues that are considered to negatively affect the quality of the statistics for bycatch species available at the IOTC Secretariat, by species group, type of dataset and fishery, which are provided in Appendix V , and REQUESTED 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.	Update: Pending
Para. 23	NOTING that where there are serious issues with nominal catch data reported by CPCs the IOTC Secretariat provides estimates of total catches using alternative sources to obtain the best possible information to use for scientific advice, the WPEB REQUESTED the IOTC Secretariat describe these estimation processes (at a sufficient level of detail to allow reproduction of the results) prior to the next meeting in a reference document (Information Paper) to assist all scientists utilising the nominal catch series.	Update: Completed (Paper IOTC-2016-WPEB12-INF04)
Para. 24	The WPEB REQUESTED that CPCs improve the reporting of spatial effort data by longline fleets to assist the assessment of which fleets are likely to have significant interaction with seabirds.	Update: Pending .
Para. 25	NOTING that Appendix III of paper IOTC-2015-WPEB11-07, which describes the availability of catch data for the main shark species by gear, also includes information for the combination of species and gear that do not interact, thus, providing a biased overview of the situation on reporting of fleets, the WPEB REQUESTED that table is revised again for the next WPEB, including only species which are expected to interact with particular gears.	Update: Completed This has been updated in paper: IOTC-2016-WPEB12-07
Para. 33	Bycatch data exchange protocol The WPEB REQUESTED the IOTC Secretariat collate the observer data available, using the BDEP template as a trial format and aggregating data according to the guidelines in <i>Resolution 12/02 Data confidentiality policy and procedures</i> and present this for review at the next WPEB meeting.	Update: Completed This has been undertaken for a sample of the data as an example for WPEB12 to review
Para. 37	Regional observer scheme – Update (Resolution 11/04 On a regional observer scheme)	Update: Pending

	The WPEB REQUESTED CPCs to work with the IOTC Secretariat on the establishment of a set of regional training hubs for IOTC observers to be trained according to IOTC ROS standards, specialised by gear types, and ENCOURAGED offers from CPCs to host these centres.	
Para. 46	The WPEB REQUESTED that all observer data be submitted to the IOTC Secretariat in electronic format, NOTING that this may be any electronic format as long as the data corresponds to the minimum reporting requirements.	Update: ROS data submissions have been being received in e-format (excel/csv) from Australia, China (partial), Indonesia, Japan and Mauritius (partial).
Para. 56	<i>NPOA implementation overview</i> The WPEB REQUESTED that all CPCs without an NPOA-Sharks and/or NPOA-Seabirds expedite the development and implementation of a NPOA, and to report progress to the WPEB and SC in 2016, NOTING that NPOAs are a framework that should facilitate estimation of shark catches, seabird interactions, and development and implementation of appropriate management measures, which should also enhance the collection of bycatch data and compliance with IOTC Resolutions.	Update: Pending
Para. 57	The WPEB REQUESTED 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 Appendix VIII .	Update: Completed This has been provided for 2016 in paper IOTC-2016-WPEB12-10
Para. 71	<i>Bycatch from I.R. Iran fleets</i> NOTING that data were provided by I.R. Iran in aggregated form for all types of fisheries, the WPEB REQUESTED I.R. Iran to present bycatch data by gear and by species. In addition, papers of this nature should be for the entire history of the fishery available and not simply a single year's data.	Update: Pending
Para. 72	The WPEB REQUESTED I.R. Iran to provide information on fishing effort distribution, as well as details on data sampling system and strategy, at the next WPEB meeting.	Update: Pending
Para. 93	<i>System of verification of the code of good practices in purse seine fisheries</i> The WPEB REQUESTED the authors to present the first results for the Indian Ocean during next session of the WPEB in 2016, as a Working Paper for consideration.	Update: Pending
Para. 105	<i>Shark tagging programs: Indian Ocean</i> The WPEB ACKNOWLEDGED the importance of PSAT tagging for sharks to	Update: Pending

	study post-release mortality of species currently banned for retention in IOTC area of competence, and REQUESTED that the authors submit the revised Concept note for the consideration of the Scientific Committee and potential funding bodies	
Para. 124	Blue shark length composition: Indonesia longline NOTING the changes in fishing strategy that have been taking place in Indonesia fisheries, the WPEB REQUESTED that Indonesia provides in the future a document with a review of the Indonesian longline fleet operation mode and changes, including details on the use of shark lines attached directly to buoys.	Update: Pending
Para. 125	The WPEB REQUESTED Indonesia to investigate the possibility of providing a standardised blue shark CPUE series for use in the next stock assessment, as Indonesia is the fleet currently reporting the most blue shark catches in the Indian Ocean and operates mainly in the southeast Indian Ocean, an area for which very little information is currently available.	Update: Completed Paper IOTC-2016-WPEB12-19
Para. 149	CPUE discussion summary The WPEB REQUESTED that any future CPUE analysis papers include model comparisons and residual diagnostics, as per the 'Guidelines for the presentation of CPUE standardisations and stock assessment models' adopted by the SC in 2014 (IOTC-2015-WPEB11-INF01). Comparison of catch to derived CPUE should be examined and detailed in the meeting paper.	Update: Pending
Para. 169	Review of data needs and way forward for the evaluation of shark stocks - catch data reconstruction The WPEB REQUESTED that the WPEB Chairperson 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 schemes, guaranteeing that it will be used under strict confidentiality rules.	Update: Pending The Chairperson has been working with Indonesia to develop a standardised CPUE series. The IOTC Secretariat has also been sending individual requests to CPCs for more information on historical catches of BSH to update the IOTC database with and to enhance reconstructions from CPCs.
Para. 173.	Development of management advice for blue shark and update of the Executive Summary for the consideration of the Scientific Committee The WPEB ADOPTED the management advice developed for blue shark in IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species, as provided in the draft resource stock	Update: Completed The IOTC Secretariat updated the draft Executive Summaries for the Consideration of the SC. The SC18 ADOPTED a new Executive Summary for this stock, available for download from the IOTC website: http://iotc.org/science/status-summary-species-tuna-and-tuna-species-under-iotc-mandate-well-other-species-impacted-iotc

	status summary and REQUESTED that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary for blue shark with the latest 2015 catch data (if applicable), and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – Appendix IX 	
Para. 178	Value chain analysis: Madagascar shark fisheries The WPEB REQUESTED that once the shark catch history reconstruction is complete, that the authors share it with the IOTC Secretariat and WPEB for addition to the overall IOTC database for shark catches. Similarly, the WPEB ENCOURAGED all IOTC CPCs to undertake similar shark catch reconstructions and report to the IOTC Secretariat in 2016.	Update: Pending
Para. 186	Madagascar shark fisheries The WPEB REQUESTED that the authors provide additional information on targeting, and tuna and billfish species catch composition in future analysis in order to better understand shark catch levels reported as bycatch.	Update: Pending
Para. 193	Development of management advice on the status of other shark stocks and update of other shark species Executive Summaries for the consideration of the Scientific Committee The WPEB ADOPTED the management advice developed for a subset of other shark species commonly caught in IOTC fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species, as provided in the draft resource stock status summaries and REQUESTED that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary for sharks with the latest 2014 catch data (if applicable), and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for its consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – Appendix X Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – Appendix XI Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – Appendix XII Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – Appendix XIII Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – Appendix XIV Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – Appendix XV 	Update: Completed . The IOTC Secretariat updated the draft Executive Summaries for the Consideration of the SC. The SC18 ADOPTED a new Executive Summary for these stocks, available for download from the IOTC website: http://iotc.org/science/status-summary-species-tuna-and-tuna-species-under-iotc-mandate-well-other-species-impacted-iotc
Para. 207	Review of mitigation measures in Resolution 12/04 The WPEB ADOPTED the management advice developed for marine turtles, as provided in the draft status summary and REQUESTED that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary with the latest 2014 interaction data, and for the summary to be provided to the SC as part of the draft Executive Summary, for	Update: Completed . The IOTC Secretariat updated the draft Executive Summaries for the Consideration of the SC. The SC18 ADOPTED a new Executive Summary for marine turtles, available for download from the IOTC website: http://iotc.org/science/status-summary-species-tuna-and-tuna-species-under-iotc-mandate-well-other-species-impacted-iotc

	its consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine turtles (Appendix XVI) 	
Para. 211	<p>Reporting of seabird bycatch in longline fisheries</p> <p>The WPEB REQUESTED that BirdLife International should work intersessionally with interested CPCs and the IOTC Secretariat to prepare a summary table (example below) that can be presented to the next meeting of the SC for their consideration and discussion. Completing such a summary table would not replace the need for CPCs to formally submit data to the IOTC Secretariat as required by IOTC Resolutions.</p>	Update: This information has been provided to the Secretariat by South Africa, EU, Portugal and Australia. Taiwan, China has also submitted some information.
Para. 217	The WPEB REQUESTED that relevant CPCs and the IOTC Secretariat, including through the chairperson (or his/her delegate) of the WPEB, participate actively in the national scientist capacity building process, and in the implementation of a joint-tuna RFMO seabird bycatch assessment.	Update: Pending
Para. 236	<p>Development of management advice on the status of seabird species</p> <p>The WPEB ADOPTED the management advice developed for seabirds, as provided in the draft status summary and REQUESTED that the IOTC Secretariat update the draft stock status summary with the latest 2014 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"> Seabird (Appendix XVII). 	Update: Completed . The IOTC Secretariat updated the draft Executive Summaries for the Consideration of the SC. The SC18 ADOPTED a new Executive Summary for seabirds, available for download from the IOTC website: http://iotc.org/science/status-summary-species-tuna-and-tuna-species-under-iotc-mandate-well-other-species-impacted-iotc
Para. 247	<p>Depredation and incidental catches in longline fishery of southern Mozambique</p> <p>ASSUMING the possibility of limited awareness of Mozambique fishers on IOTC Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs), the WPEB REQUESTED that Mozambique distribute widely information on current IOTC CMMs focused on shark conservation.</p>	Update: Pending
Para. 262	<p>Southern hemisphere stock status assessment of porbeagle shark</p> <p>The WPEB THANKED the Common Oceans (ABNJ) Tuna Project for funding the participation of the Technical Coordinator-Sharks and Bycatch (Dr Shelley Clarke), NOTING her excellent and highly relevant contributions to the session and REQUESTED funding for her participation next year.</p>	Update: Dr Shelley Clarke will already be attending the WPEB12 through alternative funding sources.