

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF WPM11 AND SC23

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT
LAST UPDATED: 08 OCTOBER 2021

PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 12th Working Party on Methods (WPM12) 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 11th 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 2020.

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 23rd 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 WPM12.

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 WPM11 and SC23

WPM11 Rec. No.	Recommendation from WPM07	SC23 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC23	Progress/Comments
WPM011.01	<p>Revision of the WPM Program of work (2021–2025)</p> <p>(para.77) The WPM RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider and endorse the WPM Programme of Work (2021–2025), as provided in Appendix IV.</p>		<p>(para. 157) 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 and in accordance with the IOTC Strategic Science Plan 2020-2024. The Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of each working party will ensure that the efforts of their respective working parties 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>	<p>Update: Completed.</p>
WPM11.02	<p>Date and place of the 12th and 13th sessions of the WPM</p> <p>(para 81) The WPM NOTED that the global Covid-19 pandemic has resulted in international travel being almost impossible and with no clear end to the pandemic in sight, it was impossible to finalise arrangements for the meeting in 2021. The Secretariat will continue to liaise with CPCs to determine their interest in hosting these meetings in the future when this once again becomes feasible. The WPM RECOMMENDED the SC consider mid October 2021 as a preferred time period to hold the WPM12 in 2021. As usual it was also AGREED that this meeting should continue to</p>			<p>Update: Completed</p>

	be held back-to-back with the WPTT, with the WPM taking place before the WPTT (Para. 81).			
WPM11.03	<p><i>Development of priorities for Invited Expert(s) at the next WPM meeting</i></p> <p>(para 83) 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>		(para. 162) The SC REQUESTED that at least one 'scientific expert' be invited to each of the working parties in 2020 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.	Update: Completed.
WPM11.04	<p><i>Review of the draft, and adoption of the Report of the 11th Session of the WPM</i></p> <p>(para. 85) The WPM RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPM11, provided in Appendix VI.</p>			Update: Completed

WPM11 Report	WPM11 REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 61	<p><i>Internal and External Peer review</i></p> <p>The WPM NOTED that a peer-review process for the MSE work has been discussed in the past. The WPM AGREED that such a process would be beneficial for the MSE work at IOTC, and for its acceptance by all parties involved. The WPM ACKNOWLEDGED that such a process will need to go beyond the participation of an invited expert at WPM meeting, given that the work required to review and evaluate the MSE work is quite substantial. The WPM REQUESTED the Secretariat to explore with the WPM chair possible mechanisms and sources of funding to carry out these reviews</p>	Update: Ongoing. This issue was raised by the TCMP as well. Work is ongoing to determine how best and at what level a review should be done.
Para. 64	<p><i>Update on the development of the joint CPUE indices for 2020 & 2021.</i></p> <p>The WPM NOTED that for, both yellowfin and bigeye, MSE different hypothesis of CPUE (e.g. targeting using cluster or hooks between floats) are needed to account for uncertainty related to CPUE standardization. Thus, the WPM REQUESTED that CPUE joint working group to develop and produce different CPUE series, using</p>	Update: Ongoing. An update will be provided by the CPUE joint working group.

	different methods for targeting and/or different standardization methods, to be included in yellowfin and bigeye OMs.	
Para. 72	<p>Review the approach used to provide stock status and management advice relative to reference points</p> <p>The WPM REQUESTED that for the SKJ assessment in 2020 the outcome of assessment would be presented as whether the stock is above or below the target reference point based on depletion levels, whether the stock is above or below B_{MSY} and F_{MSY} (so showing traditional overfished or overfishing status) and whether it is above or below the limit reference point. All of these will be presented alongside their associated probabilities.</p>	<p>Update: Completed. In 2020 these additional indicators were presented.</p>
Para. 73	<p>The WPM REQUESTED that further meetings/correspondence of the ad hoc Reference Point Working Group take place to continue to address these important issues and provide advice to the 2021 TCMP meeting.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. An updated document from this group was presented to the TCMP (IOTC-2021-TCMP04-12).</p>
Para. 76	<p>Revision of the WPM Program of work (2021–2025)</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 (2021–2025) that are yet to be funded, for circulation to potential funding bodies.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing.</p>
Para. 78	<p>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 REQUESTED additional work to address the reviewed comments made.</p>	<p>Update: Ongoing. Updates will be presented to the WPM12</p>