
PROGRESS ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPDCS07

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 1 DECEMBER 2011

PURPOSE

To provide an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from previous Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS) meetings, and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants.

BACKGROUND

At the Seventh Session of the WPDCS, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the Secretariat on a range of issues. The subsequent table developed and agreed to by the WPDCS also contained specific responsibilities for those who were expected to undertake the tasks recommended, without any deadlines.

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) to carry out other technical activities of relevance to the Commission.

Noting the core tasks of the SC, and hence the WPDCS, and the fact that the Scientific Committee, Commission and CPCs in general have struggled to implement previous recommendations from the WPDCS, the Secretariat undertook a review and subsequent revision of recommendations from the WPDCS07 meeting in an attempt to provide clearer direction and delegation of responsibility for each recommendation.

The revised recommendations are contained in Attachment A for the consideration and potential endorsement by the WPDCS.

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPDCS **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Second Session of the WPDCS, and consider the proposed draft revisions to those recommendations yet to be completed.

That the WPDCS **AGREE** to the revised recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from WPDCS08, noting that these will be provided to the Scientific Committee for their endorsement.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Progress made on the recommendations of WPDCS07.

ATTACHMENT A:

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPDCS07

#	Recommendation	Revise (Y/ N)	Revision of recommendation	Responsibility	Due date
1	<p>The WPDCS stressed the need to maximize participation of scientists from coastal countries to future meetings of the WPDCS urging countries in the region to make the necessary arrangements to attend future meetings.</p> <p><i>Update: Progress: The Secretariat informed all CPC's (IOTC Circular 2011/63 sent on 31/08/2011) about the WPDCS Meeting in 2011. In particular, the Secretariat noted that the Commission has agreed to allocate funds, through the establishment of an IOTC Meeting Participation Fund, to assist the participation of scientists from developing countries to IOTC meetings, inviting the parties interested to request assistance, where required.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretariat received requests from 4 parties, making the necessary arrangements to facilitate the participation of 4 scientists to the WPDCS.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, 3 coastal countries and 3 other CPCs used their own resources to fund the participation of 6 and 3 scientists respectively to the WPDCS Meeting.</i></p>	N	–		
2	<p>The WPDCS noted that the issues listed on paragraphs 17 and 18 of the WPDCS Report represent a first attempt to identify the main problems existing at present, recommending that these issues be addressed as a matter of priority.</p> <p><i>Update: Covered in 3 and 4 below.</i></p>	N	–		
3	<p>Statistics not available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very incomplete statistics from the industrial longline fishery of India. <p><i>Update: India reported very incomplete information for its commercial longline fishery. The amount of longline vessels fishing for tunas flagged in India is also uncertain. The IOTC Secretariat has estimated catches for this component using alternative data. However, the catches estimated are thought to be highly uncertain as the number of vessels in activity is not fully known.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete lack of statistics from the artisanal fisheries in Yemen. <p><i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat estimated catches for the artisanal fisheries in Yemen in recent years, using data collected in previous missions to Yemen (2009) and catch trends derived from the data available for similar fisheries in other countries, like Oman. However, the catches estimated are thought to</i></p>	Y	To be decided at WPDCS	CPCs listed	WPDCS09

<p><i>be highly uncertain.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete lack of statistics from industrial longliners operating under flags of non-reporting countries. <p><i>Update: The amount of catches that the IOTC Secretariat has estimated under this component has decreased considerably in recent years, following re-flagging of vessels from non-IOTC CPCs to flags of CPCs and improved reporting from most CPCs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of size frequency data for the fresh-tuna longline fisheries of Taiwan,China. <p><i>Update: Completed: In 2011, Taiwan,China reported length frequency data for its fresh-tuna longline fleet for the first time, as derived from samples collected by observers and fishermen during 2010.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of statistics from industrial longliners of Indonesia and Malaysia not based in their territories. <p><i>Update: To date, Indonesia and Malaysia have not reported catches of longliners based outside their territories. The IOTC Secretariat estimated the catches of these vessels using the information available, in particular reports from Thailand, Maldives, Mauritius, Sri Lanka, Singapore, and other countries, on the activities of foreign fresh-tuna longliners in their ports or EEZ.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of catch-and-effort data for longliners from Indonesia. <p><i>Update: During the WPTT in 2011 a participant from Malaysia informed that Malaysia has not implemented minima requirements for catch-and-effort data for longliners flagged in Malaysia, as requested by the IOTC</i></p> <p><i>In 2010 Indonesia informed the IOTC Secretariat that it was initiating a logbook programme to cover longline and other fisheries in Indonesia. However, to date Indonesia has failed to report catch-and-effort data for its surface and longline fleets, as per the IOTC requirements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of catch-and-effort data and detailed size frequency data for the oceanic gillnet fisheries of Pakistan and Iran and the gillnet/longline fishery of Sri Lanka. <p><i>Update: To date, Pakistan has not reported catch-and-effort and size frequency data to the IOTC. The IOTC Secretariat was unable to visit Pakistan during 2011 due to the situation in this country.</i></p> <p><i>During the WPTT in 2011 a participant from the Islamic Republic of Iran provided more detailed information on catches and effort and size data for vessels flagged in Iran for 2010, in particular vessels using purse seines and gillnets. The WPTT noted that while the new information reported represented an improvement with regards to previous reports, it still fell short of IOTC requirements, prompting Iran to report statistics for 2010 and</i></p>				
--	--	--	--	--

<p><i>previous years as per the IOTC standards.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, in a mission of the IOTC Secretariat to Iran, Iran informed that it is implementing a pilot logbook programme on vessels flagged in Iran and will be able to report data in accordance to IOTC standards in the future.</i></p> <p><i>The IOTC-OFCE Project is assisting the Fisheries Organization of Iran (SHILAT) to strengthening its Data Management System with a view to facilitate data computerization, validation and reporting. The new system will be fully operational by the second quarter of 2012.</i></p> <p><i>To date, Sri Lanka has not reported catch-and-effort and size frequency data to the IOTC as per the IOTC requirements. The IOTC-OFCE Project is assisting the Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Sri Lanka in the implementation of a Centralized Database System with a view to facilitate data computerization, validation and reporting in the future. The new system will be fully operational by the second quarter of 2012.</i></p> <p><i>During 2010 the IOTC Secretariat received a request for assistance from the National Aquatic Resources and Development Agency of Sri Lanka (NARA) towards strengthening of Sri Lanka's data collection system for coastal and offshore fisheries. Following this request, the IOTC Secretariat prepared draft Terms of Reference for the activities and forwarded them to NARA for review and approval. The IOTC Secretariat had to postpone implementation of these activities due to a lack of response from NARA.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of catch-and-effort and size frequency data for the artisanal fisheries of India. <p><i>Update: To date India has not provided catch-and-effort and size data to the IOTC for its coastal fisheries.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete lack of statistics from the artisanal fisheries of Madagascar and Comoros. <p><i>Update: To date, Madagascar has not implemented a data collection system for its coastal fisheries. In October 2011 the IOTC Secretariat received a request for assistance from Madagascar in the implementation of a data collection system. The IOTC-OFCE Project will consider a visit to Madagascar during the first half of 2012, where possible.</i></p> <p><i>In 2010 the "Direction des Ressources Halieutiques" of Comoros implemented a fisheries census and sampling of the coastal fisheries with the assistance of the IOTC-OFCE Project and additional funds from the IOTC. The implementation of these activities will allow Comoros to report statistics as per the IOTC requirements for 2010 and later years.</i></p>					
4	Statistics incomplete:	Y	To be decided at WPDCS	CPCs listed	WPDCS09

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient time-area coverage for size sampling data for important longline fleets, in particular Japan. <i>Update: While Japan has reported more size data in recent years, following the implementation of the IOTC Observer Scheme, the amount of data and time-area coverage are still insufficient.</i> Catches not fully by species and/or gear for large-scale and medium-scale purse seine fisheries of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand and for the gillnet/longline fishery of Sri Lanka. <i>Update: To date, none of these countries has reported revised catches for the above fisheries.</i> Size frequency statistics not reported by IOTC standards for the fisheries of Japan, Indonesia and Malaysia. <i>Update: In 2011 Japan reported length-frequency data as per the IOTC standards for the first time. However, Japan is still to re-submit historical data as per the IOTC standards (1952-2008).</i> <i>Update: To date, Indonesia and Malaysia have not reported size data as per the IOTC requirements. However, both countries have reported sizes of main tuna species aggregated by month.</i> Total levels of bycatch of sharks, seabirds and marine turtles unknown. <i>Update: During 2011 some parties reported statistics of some species of sharks, as per the IOTC requirements, and some data on incidental catches of marine turtles and seabirds. However, reporting is still very poor.</i> 				
5	<p>The WPDCS noted the changes in the estimates of catches of albacore following a review by the Secretariat using data provided by the ISSF and Export Statistics from Indonesia. The WPDCS noted that the new catches estimated for 2003-09 represent more than twice catch values in the past. It was also noted that the new catches derived for the fisheries in Madagascar may be too high. The WPDCS requested the Secretariat to follow-up on these issues to ensure that the catches in the IOTC database are as accurate as possible.</p> <p><i>Update: The catches estimated for Madagascar and Indonesia (albacore) have not changed since the last meeting.</i></p> <p><i>During 2011, following a request from the Commission in 2010, the IOTC Secretariat hired the services of a consultant, Dr. Moreno, to assess the status of data collection and reporting systems for IOTC fisheries in coastal countries of the IOTC region. Dr. Moreno visited Madagascar in 2011 and a report on the situation in this and other countries will be presented to the Scientific Committee. In October 2011 the IOTC Secretariat received a request for assistance from Madagascar in the implementation of a data collection system. The IOTC-OFCF Project will consider a visit to Madagascar during the first half of 2012, where possible.</i></p>	N	-		

	<i>In March 2012, the IOTC-OFCF Project will assist Indonesia in the organization of a Catch Estimation Workshop, with the main purpose of revising catch estimation procedures and recent catch figures for the coastal, surface and longline fisheries in the Indian Ocean.</i>				
6	The WPDCS urged countries having fisheries for neritic tuna species to collect the data requested as soon as possible and report this information to the IOTC. <i>Update: The first meeting of the WPNT was held in Chennai (India) in November 2011. The IOTC Secretariat presented a report concerning the status of data in the IOTC databases for neritic tuna species. The completeness and quality of data on catches, effort, and size, remains very poor for these species.</i>	N	–		
7	The WPDCS reiterated the need for Japan to increase length frequency sampling on its longline fleet, including length frequency data for main shark species. <i>Update: In 2011 Japan reported length-frequency data as per the IOTC standards for the first time, including size frequency data for blue shark, mako sharks, and porbeagle. However, the number of fish sampled and time-area coverage remains poor.</i>	N	–		
8	The WPDCS noted that, to date, no countries have provided lists of certified observers or observer reports to the Secretariat, urging the countries concerned to provide this information as soon as possible. <i>Update: Reporting of this information remains very poor. To date, the IOTC Secretariat has received reports from two observer trips (China and EU,Portugal), and lists of certified observers from 7 countries – Comoros, EU,France, EU,Portugal, France(OT), Japan, Madagascar and Seychelles. In addition, UK(BIOT) informed the secretariat that there is no UK(BIOT) fleet operating in the Indian Ocean,and therefore there is no observer). A paper has been developed for the SC's consideration.</i>	N	–		
9	The WPDCS endorsed the process currently being undertaken by the Secretariat to develop a scoring system to assess the quality of data being reported to the Secretariat. The WPDCS noted that the allocation of scores to all data items in the IOTC databases will require a lot of time and effort from the Secretariat, agreeing that the process shall be implemented gradually, with yellowfin tuna, bigeye tuna and swordfish assessed at the start. <i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat was unable to complete this work, due to lack of time.</i>	Y	The WPDCS RECOMMENDED that the IOTC Secretariat commence the process to develop a scoring system to assess the quality of data being reported to the Secretariat, noting that the allocation of scores to all data items in the IOTC databases will require a substantial investment of resources by Secretariat. The process shall be implemented gradually, with yellowfin tuna, bigeye tuna and swordfish data as priorities.	Secretariat	WPDCS09
10	The WPDCS noted that although there are some concerns in describing additional uncertainty in stock assessment advice to the Commission, it was agreed that the inclusion of upper and lower bounds for possible catch histories would be important to include in sensitivity analysis during the stock assessment process.	N	–		

	<i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat was unable to complete this work, due to lack of time.</i>				
11	The WPDCS recommended that the Secretariat develop a range of uncertainty estimates (alternate catch histories) for a single species for consideration by the WPTT and/or WPDS in 2011. <i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat was unable to complete this work, due to lack of time.</i>	N	–		
12	The WPDCS noted that Iran has requested the assistance of the IOTC Secretariat to address the recommendations from the IOTC Scientific Committee, recommending that the Secretariat plans for a visit to Iran during 2011 and reports back on the findings to the next meeting of the WPDCS. <i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat visited Iran in February and September 2011, in order to assess the status of data collection and reporting in this country.</i> <i>During the last visit, the IOTC-OFCF Project agreed to assist the fisheries Organization of Iran (SHILAT) in the strengthening of its Data Management System with a view to facilitate data computerization, validation and reporting. The new system will be fully operational by the second quarter of 2012.</i> <i>In addition, the IOTC is considering support to the strengthening of port sampling in several landing places in Iran.</i>	N	–	–	–
13	The WPDCS recommended that Sri Lanka reports the catch-and-effort data available to the IOTC, as per the existing IOTC standards. <i>Update: To date, Sri Lanka has not reported catch-and-effort and size frequency data to the IOTC as per the IOTC requirements. The IOTC-OFCF Project is assisting the Ministry of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources of Sri Lanka in the implementation of a Centralized Database System with a view to facilitate data computerization, validation and reporting in the future. The new system will be fully operational by the second quarter of 2012.</i>	Y	Incorporated in 3 above.	–	–
14	The WPDCS expressed concern that, to its knowledge, no actions have been undertaken to address these issues, recommending the Secretariat to contact Pakistan to follow-up on these issues. <i>Update: To date, Pakistan has not reported catch-and-effort and size frequency data to the IOTC. The IOTC Secretariat was unable to visit Pakistan during 2011 due to the situation in this country.</i>	Y	Incorporated in 3 above.	–	–
15	The WPDCS agreed on the need to implement minimum requirements for gillnet and pole-and-line fisheries as soon as possible, in line with those implemented for industrial purse seine and longline fisheries. The WPDCS agreed on the minimum requirements for gillnet (as presented in Appendix VI) and pole-and-line (as presented in Appendix VII) fisheries. The WPDCS also agreed that initially these requirements should apply only to decked vessels 15 meters length	Y	To be decided at the WPDCS08.	–	–

	overall or greater. <i>Update: In 2011 the Commission adopted a Recommendation including the proposed requirements, requesting further advice from the Scientific Committee before the implementation of a binding measure. The WPDCS will be revisiting the requirements during the present meeting.</i>				
16	The WPDCS noted that the identification of bigeye tuna, marlins, sharks and marine turtles by species may be difficult by fishermen onboard fishing vessels, recommending that the Secretariat disseminate identification cards for these and other species, in particular to countries having gillnet fisheries. <i>Update: The Secretariat will develop a set of identification cards for billfish which will be presented at the next session of the WPB.</i>	N	–	–	–
17	The WPDCS recalled its recommendation for scientists from the EU and Thailand to explore the use of size data collected on EU vessels for the same areas and periods to adjust the species composition from logbooks reported by Thai purse seiners. <i>Update: To date, the EU and Thailand have not conducted this work. At present, there is no purse seiners flagged in Thailand operating in the Indian Ocean, as they moved to the Atlantic Ocean and are now flagged in Belize.</i>	N	–	–	–
18	The WPDCS noted with concern that Indonesia and Malaysia have not reported catches or other statistics for longliners under their flag based outside their territories. The WPDCS urged these countries to make the necessary arrangements for these data to be collected and provided in the future. <i>Update: To date, Indonesia and Malaysia have not reported catches of longliners based outside their territories. The IOTC Secretariat estimated the catches of these vessels using the information available, in particular reports from Thailand, Maldives, Mauritius, Sri Lanka, Singapore, and other countries, on the activities of foreign fresh-tuna longliners in their ports or EEZ.</i>	Y	Incorporated in 3 above.	–	–
19	The WPDCS recommended that the Secretariat assist Iran in the estimation of catches and reporting of data to the IOTC. <i>Update: The IOTC-OFCF Project is assisting the Fisheries Organization of Iran (SHILAT) to strengthening its Data Management System with a view to facilitate data computerization, validation and reporting. The new system will be fully operational by the second quarter of 2012.</i>	Y	Incorporated in 3 above.	–	–
20	The WPDCS recommended that countries having sampling schemes or planning to implement those assess the precision of estimates of catches from those schemes considering different levels of coverage and report the results to the WPDCS. The WPDCS requested the IOTC Secretariat to assist countries, as required. <i>Update: To date, the IOTC Secretariat has not received estimates of precision</i>	Y	The WPDCS RECOMMENDED that countries having sampling schemes or planning to implement such schemes, assess the precision of estimates of catches from those schemes considering different levels of coverage and report the results to the WPDCS. The WPDCS requested the IOTC Secretariat to assist	Relevant CPCs	WPDCS09

	<i>for estimates of total catches or catches by species and gear from any country, or received calls for assistance concerning this task.</i>		countries, as required.		
21	<p>The WPDCS noted that paragraph 9 of Resolution 10/04 contains provisions for the reporting of numbers of fishing vessels monitored and the coverage achieved by gear type, by year to both, the Executive Secretary and the Scientific Committee. The WPDCS recommended that this information is also provided along with the statistics reported to the IOTC (IOTC Resolution 10/02).</p> <p><i>Update: To date, the IOTC Secretariat has not received information from any CPC concerning levels of coverage for their fisheries.</i></p>	Y	Noting that paragraph 9 of Resolution 10/04 contains provisions for the reporting of numbers of fishing vessels monitored and the coverage achieved by gear type, by year to both, the Executive Secretary and the Scientific Committee, the WPDCS RECOMMENDED that this information is also provided along with the statistics reported to the IOTC (IOTC Resolution 10/02).	All CPCs	WPDCS09
22	<p>The WPDCS noted that, to date, many countries have not completed questionnaires, encouraging countries to provide this information as soon as possible and requested the Secretariat to report progress to the next meeting of the WPDCS.</p> <p><i>Update: The IOTC Secretariat has not received new questionnaire from CPCs, in spite of requesting this information along with the routine statistics.</i></p>	Y	To be decided at WPDCS08.	–	–
23	<p>The WPDCS noted that Thailand and Mauritius are currently the only source for size frequency data for fresh-tuna longliners, as Indonesia has discontinued data collection for its fishery. The WPDCS recommended that, in order to increase sample numbers, the IOTC Secretariat considers providing assistance to these countries, where required.</p> <p><i>Update: Indonesia informed the IOTC Secretariat that it has resumed collection of size data from longliners based in Indonesian ports. However, to date Indonesia has not reported size frequency data for its longline fleet for 2009 and 2010.</i></p>	Y	The WPDCS RECOMMENDED that Indonesia reported size frequency data for its longline fleet for 2009 and 2010.	Indonesia	WPDCS09
24	<p>The WPDCS recommended that the Secretariat continue to provide assistance to the Maldives to improve its data holdings.</p> <p><i>Update: During 2011 the stock assessment expert of the IOTC Secretariat assisted Maldives to derive an abundance index of skipjack for Maldives pole-and-line fishery, making it possible a full assessment of skipjack tuna for the first time, presented at the WPTT Meeting in Maldives.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, during 2011, following a request from the Commission in 2010, the IOTC Secretariat hired the services of a consultant, Dr. Moreno, to assess the status of data collection and reporting systems for IOTC fisheries in coastal countries of the IOTC region. Dr. Moreno visited Maldives in 2011 and a report on the situation in this and other countries will be presented to the Scientific Committee.</i></p>	N	–	–	–
25	The WPDCS noted that, in addition to the activities implemented with the assistance of the IOTC-OFCE Project, the SWIOFP is to implement a catch	N	–	–	–

	assessment survey for fisheries around anchored FADs, recommending that IOTC-OFCF and SWIOFP coordinate their work so as to avoid duplication of efforts. <i>Update: Nil</i>				
26	The WPDCS noted that the same number of natural and artificial FADs have been reported for purse seiners under EU-France, agreeing that these figures are not reliable, as the numbers of FADs are likely to change significantly depending on the season. The WPDCS recommended EU scientists to look into this issue and report to the next meeting of the WPDCS. <i>Update: Scientists from EU-Spain and EU-France informed the IOTC Secretariat that they have implemented systems to monitor the number of FADs sets by their industrial purse seine fisheries, which will make it possible accurate reporting of this information in the future.</i>	Y	To be decided at WPDCS once EU reports.	EU	–
27	The WPDCS thanked the OFCF for extending its support to improving statistical systems in the region, to assist countries in the implementation of sampling schemes (IOTC Resolution 10/04), recommending that the Project considers extending assistance in the future. <i>Update: In 2011, the IOTC-OFCF Project was extended for one more year, with additional funds allocated to its activities during the year. At present, the Project has implemented activities in Comoros, Iran, Sri Lanka, and has plans for additional activities in Indonesia and, probably, Madagascar.</i>	N	–	–	–
28	The WPDCS recommended that countries that benefitted from activities funded by the IOTC or the IOTC-OFCF Project make every possible effort to maintain these activities once the support is discontinued. <i>Update: In most cases, the activities implemented by the IOTC-OFCF Project have not been maintained by the countries concerned. The IOTC-OFCF Project usually conducts follow-up activities in the countries where it has implemented activities in order to assess the status of implementation once that funding from the Project comes to an end. Detailed information on the status of implementation in each country can be found in the IOTC-OFCF Comprehensive Report for Phase II of the Project, available at the Secretariat.</i>	N	–	–	–