

PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUESTS OF WPM05 AND SC17

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT¹ AND CHAIR
LAST UPDATED: 2 OCTOBER 2015

PURPOSE

To provide participants at the 6th Working Party on Methods (WPM) 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 5th 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 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 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

¹ secretariat@iotc.org; Dr. David Wilson: david.wilson@iotc.org



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 17th 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 WPM06.

RECOMMENDATION

That the WPM **NOTE** the progress made in implementing the recommendations and requests of the 5th 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 WPM05](#)

APPENDIX I

Progress made on the recommendations and requests of WPM05 and SC17

WPM05 Rec. No.	Recommendation from WPM05	SC17 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC17	Progress/Comments
WPM05.01	<i>Update from the SC16 ad S18</i> (para. 6): The WPM RECOMMENDED the Scientific Committee considers how to best enhance scientific dialogue and communication and utilises the tools developed by the WPM to achieve their objectives.	Nil	Nil	Update: Nil
WPM05.02	<i>Skipjack tuna MSE update</i> (para. 20): The WPM also NOTED the difficulty of estimating MSY based reference levels for the most recent skipjack assessment and RECOMMENDED , in keeping with other RFMOs experiencing similar difficulties, to base reference points on biomass depletion ratios, which are generally more stable and less influenced by modelling assumption than MSY based reference points. WPM NOTED that other tRFMOs SCs have advised that in circumstances where information is insufficient for precise estimation of MSY based reference points, that a limit biomass reference level of $0.2B_0$ be applied in management procedures and that appropriate alternatives for B_{MSY} are generally in the range of $0.3-0.4B_0$. The WPM CONSIDERED that these reference points were also appropriate for IO Skipjack fisheries and NOTED that a value of $0.4B_0$ is commonly applied in other fishery management organizations for stocks which have limited information of use in estimating MSY reference levels.	See below	See below	Update: [Ongoing] – [See below]
WPM05.03	(para. 27): The WPM also NOTED that the consultancy that has been used to develop the simulation tools and initial evaluations of some candidate Management Procedures has run to completion. WPM also NOTED that additional work is required to support the Commission's desire to implement management approaches that can achieve its Convention Objectives. In this regard, the WPM RECOMMENDED that the Commission fully fund the work needed to support its requirement to achieve its Convention Objectives in	SC17.32 (para. 110)	The SC NOTED that the consultancy that has been used to develop the simulation tools and initial evaluations of some candidate Management Procedures has run to completion. Additional work is required to support the Commission's desire to implement management approaches that can achieve its objectives. In this regard, the SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission fully fund the work needed to support its requirement to achieve its objectives in particular facilitating the implementation of	Update: [Ongoing] – Various sources of funding external to IOTC have allowed the consultant to continue this work. No funds for this purpose were provided by the Commission.



	particular facilitating the implementation of Resolution 12/01.		Resolution 12/01.	
WPM05.04	Setting management objectives of MSE for IOTC stocks (para. 33): The WPM NOTED this list of management objectives presented in IOTC-2014-WPM05-09 is a starting point to provide an idea of the different possible objectives and means of measuring the performance against these objectives and RECOMMENDED the Scientific Committee review and develop this list (Table 1) as appropriate to help dialogue with the Commission (Resolution 14/03 <i>On Enhancing the Dialogue between fisheries scientists and managers</i>).	Nil	Nil	Update: [Ongoing] – The Table will be reviewed by the WPM06 and tabled for consideration and potential adoption by the SC in November 2015.
WPM05.05	(para. 37): The WPM AGREED that reference points are markers against which management procedures are evaluated, and around which they may be designed rather than something to be evaluated themselves. The WPM NOTED that the MSE process by itself will not result in new recommendations for limit reference points and, in the case of target reference points more specific guidance on tolerable risks will be required. The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC elicit discussion and subsequent guidance from the Commission.	Nil	Nil	Update: [Ongoing] – The matter has been part of the discussion during the MPD02, held prior to the Commission meeting in 2015. Resolution 15/10 requests again that “ <i>The IOTC Scientific Committee [...] to assess the appropriateness of the limit reference points (LRP) and target reference points (TRP)</i> ”
WPM05.06	Evaluation of current reference points and possible alternative reference points for management (para. 39): The WPM AGREED that in cases where MSY reference points are difficult to estimate, alternative reference point based on depletion ratios are preferable. Thus the WPM NOTED that an alternative would be to use reference points with respect to B_0 (i.e. targets that could be $0.4B_0$ or higher, and F would be the estimated F corresponding to the biomass target, if a precautionary buffer against reaching a biomass limit is desirable). The WPM NOTED that this is similar to what is currently taking place in other RFMOs such as WCPFC and RECOMMENDED that the use of this type of reference point is considered by the SC.	SC17.27 (para. 103) SC17.28 (para. 104) SC17.29 (para. 105)	Limit reference points The SC RECOMMENDED the Commission consider an alternative approach to identify biomass limit reference points, such as those based on biomass depletion levels, when the MSY-based reference points are difficult to estimate. In cases where MSY-based reference points can be robustly estimated, limit reference points may be based around MSY. Target reference points The SC RECOMMENDED that in cases where MSY-based reference points cannot be robustly estimated, biomass limit reference points be set at 20% of unfishable levels ($B_{LIM} = 0.2B_0$). Target reference points NOTING that the interim target reference points contained in Resolution 13/10 are also MSY-based and subject to the same difficulties with robust estimation, the SC RECOMMENDED that the Commission consider that stock biomass depletion levels equivalent to B_{MSY} are	Update: [Ongoing] – IOTC Resolution 15/10 adopts the use of Virgin biomass-based reference points for a stock for which estimation of MSY-based reference points is unreliable or not possible. The use of one or the other will depend on the view of Scientific Committee in 2015.



		<p>SC17.30 (para. 106)</p> <p>SC17.31 (para. 107)</p>	<p>expected to lie in the range of 30% to 40% of unfished levels ($0.3B_0$ to $0.4B_0$), when MSY-based levels cannot be accurately estimated. The Commission may wish to consider a value of $0.4B_0$ or higher, if a precautionary buffer against reaching a biomass limit is desirable.</p> <p>NOTING that the approach described in para. 105 is similar to what is currently taking place in other RFMOs such as WCPFC, the SC RECOMMENDED that the use of this type of reference point is adopted by the Commission. In considering target reference points, guidance will be required from the Commission on tolerable risks of exceeding limit reference points.</p> <p><i>Fishing Mortality Equivalents</i></p> <p>The SC RECOMMENDED that with respect to fishing mortality (F) reference points, for consistency between the definitions of overfished and overfishing, the Commission should consider using those F values that correspond to the biomass reference points. For example, given a biomass limit of $0.2B_0$, a consistent F limit reference point would be $F_{B20\%}$, the fishing mortality rate that reduces the biomass to 20% of unfished levels.</p>	
<p>WPM05.07</p>	<p>(para. 44): The WPM RECOMMENDED that the SC consider and endorse the WPM workplan identified in Appendix IV. In addition to the workplan, the WPM NOTED that in order to meet the deadlines set by the Commission, adequate resources to accomplish technical tasks need to be allocated. After that additional resources would be required to train CPCs to understand and agree to certain MPs with clear objectives that could be quantified.</p>	<p>SC17. Para. 177</p> <p>SC17. Para 178</p>	<p><i>Program of Work (2015–2019) and assessment schedule</i></p> <p>The SC NOTED the proposed Program of Work and priorities for each of the Working Parties and AGREED to a consolidated Program of Work as outlined in Appendix XXXVIII. 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 REQUESTED 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: [Ongoing] – See updated WPM Program of Work: Paper IOTC-2015-WPM06-07.</p>



WPM05.08	(para. 47): The WPM RECOMMENDED that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPM05, provided at Appendix V.	As per the above and in the SC17 Report.	Update: [Completed]
----------	---	--	---------------------

WPM05 Report	WPM05 REQUESTS	Update/Progress
Para. 17	<p><i>Skipjack tuna MSE: update</i> The WPM WELCOMED the contribution and NOTED that the approach is appropriate for advising the Commission on trade-offs related to multiple, and at times, conflicting management objectives. It was also NOTED that the modelling should encompass the most plausible range of parameters (e.g. growth curve, natural mortality, spatial structure etc.) based on expert knowledge and the WPM REQUESTED that an intersessional working group of WPTT scientists is held to review and revise this information as necessary, before April 2015. The WPM ENCOURAGED the authors to present the results of this work at the next WPTT in 2015.</p>	Update: Nil.