

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF WPM10 AND SC22

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT
LAST UPDATED: 25 SEPTEMBER 2020

PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 11th Working Party on Methods (WPM11) with an update on the progress made in implementing those recommendations from the previous WPM 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 10th Session of the WPM, 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 WPM was provided to the SC for its endorsement at its meeting in December 2019.

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.

In addition to the Recommendations endorsed by the SC at its 22nd 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 WPM11.

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPM **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations and requests of the 10th Session of the WPM, 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 WPM10

APPENDIX I

Progress made on the recommendations and requests of WPM10 and SC22

WPM10 Rec. No.	Recommendation from WPM07	SC22 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC22	Progress/Comments
WPM010.01	<p>Update on the status of the joint CPUE indices (yellowfin tuna, albacore).</p> <p>(para.72) The WPM RECOMMENDED exploring options for regular joint-tRFMO workshops on Joint CPUE Standardization to initially take place in 2020. The options include requesting a workshop through the Kobe Steering Committee, to consider formats such as a CAPAM workshop coordinated by the IATTC, or to directly approach other RFMOs such as ICCAT and the IATTC.</p>			<p>Update: The issue was raised at the 8th Workshop on Management Strategy Evaluation (WPM subgroup). The issue has also been tabled for discussion during the WPM10 meeting.</p>
WPM10.02	<p>Revision of the WPM Program of work (2020–2024)</p> <p>(para 125) The WPM RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider and endorse the WPM Programme of Work (2019–2023), as provided in Appendix IV.</p>	SC21.23	<p>Program of Work (2020–2024) and assessment schedule</p> <p>(para. 138) The SC NOTED the proposed Program of Work and priorities for the SC and each of the working parties and AGREED to a consolidated Program of Work as outlined in Appendix 35a-g. The Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of each working party will ensure that the efforts of their respective 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>Update: Completed</p>
WPM10.03	<p>(para. 126) The WPM reviewed the progress of the MSE work conducted to date, and subject to the comments held in this report, endorsed the MSE conducted thus far and RECOMMENDED</p>			<p>Update: Ongoing</p>

	additional work to address the reviewed comments made.			
WPM10.04	<p>Development of priorities for Invited Expert(s) at the next WPM meeting</p> <p>(para 137) Given the importance of external peer review, the WPM RECOMMENDED that the Commission continues to allocate sufficient budget for a regular invited expert to be invited to meetings of the WPM.</p>			Update: Ongoing.
WPM10.05	<p>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the 10th Session of the WPM</p> <p>(para. 144) The WPM RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPM10, provided in Appendix V.</p>			Update: Completed

WPM10 Report	WPM10REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 36	<p>Bigeye tuna and yellowfin tuna MSE: update</p> <p>The WPM NOTED the following points for the next iteration of the YFT MSE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WPM did not request any modifications to the reference set OM or robustness tests, but noted that the reference set OM will have to be evaluated in relation to the 2019 assessment at the WPTT to see if reconditioning is required. The WPM REQUESTED that specific criteria for deciding whether or not reconditioning is required should be developed at the next session of the WPM 	Update: Ongoing. This issue will be discussed at the WPM11. No recent YFT assessment has been adopted and so there are no official changes since the last assessment on which the MSE is based.
Para. 48	<p>The WPM NOTED the following points for the next iteration of the BET MSE:</p>	Update: Ongoing. This issue will be discussed at the WPM11. The status of BET has changed since the previous assessment and this will require careful consideration when proceeding with the MSE

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WPM did not request any modifications to the reference set OM or robustness tests, but noted that the reference set OM will have to be evaluated in relation to the 2019 assessment at the WPTT to see if reconditioning is required. The WPM REQUESTED that specific criteria for deciding whether or not reconditioning is required should be developed at the next session of the WPM. 	
Para. 59	<p>Swordfish MSE: Update</p> <p>The WPM NOTED that the operating model includes 4 separate regions with no movement between them. The observed CPUE trends differ among regions, but for the projections a one area model is used (due to a limitation of the FLR modelling tool), and only one CPUE can be used; which assumes for the projections that all areas have the same trend. The WPM REQUESTED that the WPB consider how this may affect the results and suggested that it may be useful to focus on one region at a time, such as the southwest where there was more depletion.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. This issue will be discussed at the WPM11 taking into account the results of the 2020 SWO assessment.</p>
Para. 67	<p>General MSE Issues</p> <p>The WPM REQUESTED that the MSE Task Force with the assistance of the WPDCS explore alternative catch history assumptions for both OM conditioning and catch reporting biases in the MSE projections.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. The task force meeting in 2020 was cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic.</p>
Para. 69	<p>Joint CPUE Standardisation</p> <p>The WPM NOTED that there is limited effect of including discards in the standardized CPUE and that discarding would only be problematic if discarding practices have systematically changed over time. The WPM also NOTED discards are only considered for the Taiwanese CPUE, so that effect could be disguised in the joint-standardization model that is fitted across fleets. The WPM REQUESTED that the secretariat facilitate further analyses to isolate the discard effect. The WPM further NOTED that logbook reported discard rates were lower than might be expected perhaps indicating that clarification is needed regarding the nature of what is defined in the discards and the need for comparison with observer data.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. An updated paper on the Joint CPUE Standardisation will be presented to the WPM11.</p>
Para. 73	<p>The WPM NOTED that the lack of access to the operational level longline CPUE, except during the limited time available for joint meetings between authors, greatly reduces the efficiency of the process, limits the degree of capacity building for participating scientists, and reduces the ability to check results and ensure quality. In the interest of normalizing the process for producing joint longline CPUE for future assessments, the WPM REQUESTED that the Secretariat continue discussions with</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. An updated paper on the Joint CPUE Standardisation will be presented to the WPM11. The future work on the joint CPUE analysis is likely to be conducted by the national scientists of the longline fishing nations and therefore this confidentiality issue may be reduced.</p>

<p>Para. 76</p>	<p>the affected CPCs to develop a confidential data repository. This repository would be managed either by the IOTC or by some other group acceptable to the interested parties, so as to permit more detailed evaluation of these data as well as assuring the confidentiality of the information.</p> <p>The WPM NOTED that it is important to evaluate the effects of individual covariates on the standardized abundance index. To address this, the WPM REQUESTED that the authors include influence plots of covariates should be included as part of the analysis</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. To be addressed by the authors</p>
<p>Para. 98</p>	<p>Stock Status Guidance</p> <p>The WPM REQUESTED that existing methodological studies on CKMR be presented to the WPM so that the technique can be thoroughly reviewed for use in IOTC stocks. Feasibility of the technique for tropical tuna species should be discussed by the WPTT. The WPM was informed that feasibility studies for CKMR have been developed for North Atlantic Bluefin tuna and another in underway for sharks species in the Indian Ocean. These studies may prove useful for guiding the discussions of the WPM.</p> <p>The WPM REQUESTED that the secretariat investigate potential project management solutions to be able to manage initiatives such as that conducted for the YFT assessment but also general document management, file sharing and code/model warehousing.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. The CKMR results have already been presented to the WPNT, WPB and WPEB. They are also scheduled to be presented to the WPTT.</p> <p>Update: Ongoing. The secretariat is looking at methods to facilitate this project management and warehousing of data and code.</p>
<p>Para. 124</p>	<p>Revision of the WPM Program of work (2020–2024)</p> <p>The WPM REQUESTED that the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the WPM, in consultation with the IOTC Secretariat, develop Terms of Reference (ToR) for each of the projects detailed on the WPM Programme of Work (2020–2024) that are yet to be funded, for circulation to potential funding bodies.</p>	<p>Update: Completed. Annually since 2019 the secretariat has presented the highest priority research needs from each WP to the Commission and the Commission has provided dedicated funding for them through the discussions at the SCAF.</p>



Para. 134

Date and place of the 11th and 12th sessions of the WPM

The WPM **REQUESTED** that the IOTC Secretariat liaise with CPCs intersessionally to determine if they would be willing to host the 11th and 12th sessions of the WPM in conjunction with the WPTT (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

Update: Ongoing. Due to the travel restrictions related to the Covid-a9 pandemic, physical meetings are not envisioned for the near future. Once these are once again feasible, the secretariat will liaise with CPCs to host the meetings accordingly.