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Operations and Terms of Reference

1. The FFA Secretariat will provide coordination and Secretariat functions to the Working Group and will prepare progress and concept reports for the Forum Fisheries Committee and the WCPFC.

2. The working group will be open to all CCMs. However, a small technical group of interested parties will provide key impetus in the formulation process. It is envisaged that this group would comprise personnel from the WCPFC, FFA and SPC Secretariats, representation from WCPFC CCMs, inputs from other RFMO’s and industry representation.

3. The principal task of the working group is to develop and propose a strategy for a CDS for key target and bycatch species for WCPFC adoption.

4. This strategy shall take account of representations to date within the WCPFC and be mindful of the key principles in Attachment A. In particular, the strategy and recommendations shall take into account MCS and information collection systems already introduced by FFA members.

5. This will include but not be limited to all matters of relevance to the design and operation of a WCPFC CDS including explicit consideration of the following:
   a. The Recommendation to Tuna RFMOs on Harmonisation and Improvement of Catch Tracking Programs (Raleigh 2007) and the broader consensus on CDS reached at the 2010 Kobe MCS meeting in Barcelona.
   b. Existing and proposed catch documentation schemes in other RFMOs (including ICCAT, CCSBT and CCAMLR), noting the particular areas of uniqueness within the WCPFC, such as the prevalence of coastal states and small island developing states and territories.
   c. Existing commercial catch tracking programs including those implemented and/or being developed by FFA members.
   d. Operational issues and capacity requirements of data collection, submission, handling, analysis, reconciliation and dissemination.
   e. The resources that would be required within CCMs (and particularly small island developing states and territories) to implement and operate a CDS. This will necessarily include consideration of capacity building and training programs, and associated costs.
   f. The roles and responsibilities for certification and verification by states, with particular emphasis on port and market States, noting the ongoing roles of flag and chartering states and the WCPFC secretariat to implement and manage a CDS.
   g. Opportunities to utilise emerging technology to increase efficiency and decrease cost, with particular reference to electronic transmission of data and forms.
   h. The integration of CDS within the monitoring, control and surveillance framework of WCPFC.
i. The integration of CDS with the overall management framework of the WCPFC including other data reporting obligations.

j. The specifics of proposed CDS documentation and process including the preparation of draft CDS forms/data reporting options.

**Timeframe**

The working group shall commence in the first quarter of 2011.

The working group shall report progress to the TCC7 with a view to presenting a Provisional CDS proposal to WCPFC 8 or 9 (depending on development progress) that would be considered for adoption on a trial basis in the period 2012 – 2013. The trial may focus either on candidate species, sub-components of the market chain or specific zones within the Convention Area.

Pending the trial introduction, WCPFC would then consider incremental adoption of the scheme on a wider basis, such as through inclusion on additional species, additional components of the fishery or areas.
Attachment A – WCPFC Catch Documentation Scheme Guiding Principles

1. In establishing the CWG, the group should be guided by thematic guiding principles as established in the FFA CDS consultation process to date. These include:

2. The development of a CDS must consider the specific characteristics of the fisheries within the Pacific Islands region, particularly existing monitoring and reporting systems such as commercial catch tracking programs including those implemented and being developed by FFA members and other CCMs, as well as the best practices in this field acknowledging the general aim of moving the fight against IUU towards higher levels of control.

3. The objectives of a WCPFC CDS need to be clearly defined and could potentially address the following at a minimum:
   a. Catch verification and validation;
   b. Provision of scientific and fisheries management information; and
   c. Traceability to final market destination.

4. CDS should not be viewed as a system in its own right, but rather as a component of an overall fisheries monitoring system.

5. An important feature of a CDS is to be able to have traceability of all catches through to market.

6. The fisheries management arrangements in the WCP region, which are largely zone-based, justify in many instances, the coastal States being the appropriate entity to validate catch documents.

7. Noting the role of flag States in international law, Chartering States are also likely to be more appropriate validating authorities than flag States in many cases, including in high seas.

8. A WCPFC CDS need not necessarily be centrally based and the role of the Commission WCPFC Secretariat in implementing a CDS needs to be clearly defined and cost effective.

9. A decentralised model for CDS, would may have the advantage of being able to cater for a range of different coastal State responses to market requirements such as EU IUU regulation. It would likely could rely on some form of summary reporting from CCMs on catches in national waters covered by national CDS.

10. The development of a CDS system needs to take account of the capacity of developing small island States, in whose waters most of the fishing takes place.

11. A phased approach to CDS introduction, with provision for prioritising system testing, operational trials and review and an initial focus on key species, should be considered.

12. Operational efficiency, including the use of electronic reporting or documentation systems shall be fully considered.

13. The system shall be reviewed after [2] years of implementation.