



**The Intersessional Meeting to Progress the Draft Bridging Measure for Tropical Tunas
Hilton Hawaiian Village Beach Resort & Spa
Honolulu, Hawaii
24 August 2017**


Chair's Summary of Issues for Further Discussion at WCPFC14

Traffic Light Dashboard


	On track for agreement
	Progress possible
	Significant negotiation required





NOTE: This document is the Chair's attempt to capture the key outstanding issues that will form the basis of discussion at WCPFC14. It is not an agreed record of discussion and is not intended to exclude or prevent other issues being raised.

INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPHS 1-11


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles for Application of the Measure 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement and drafting of provisions in the Bridging Measure, relating to SIDS

PURSE SEINE FISHERY – FAD Management


ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Closures vs FAD set limits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCM-based FAD set limits Zone-based FAD closures High seas FAD closures 		<p><u>Small Working Group outputs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1 - CCM 2016-01 (2017 FAD closure limits), 4 month FAD closure/flag state option for 4th month+ high seas FAD closure (Kiribati exemption and footnote3). Option 2 - 2a - PNA, 3 Month FAD closure + High Seas FAD closure (Kiribati exempt); 2b - 3 Month FAD closure and 5 month high seas FAD closure. Option 3 - 3a - USA, No FAD closure, hard FAD set limits option 3a USA to provide hard limit; 3b - ask SPC to calculate limit necessary to meet objective.

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 4 - Japan, 4 month closure/flag state option for 4th month + high seas FAD closure (no Kiribati exemption), 5th month FAD closure for non-SIDS fleets averaging >500mt of Bigeye per purse seiner. 350 FAD limit (cannot be assessed by SPC). - Option 5 - Zone-based FAD set limits, with equal SIDS allocation on the high seas.
Definition of FADs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differing views on amending the definition
Exploratory FAD fishing in EEZ		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Niue proposal
Philippines fleet in HSP1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuation of application of existing measure
Ecological impact of FADs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need concrete proposal on non-entangling FADs


PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Effort Control

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Purse seine effort control:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EEZ vs High Seas • Olympic allocation system for high seas limits • CCM-based limits/control • Exemptions (dependent on limits) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coastal States to set effort (or catch) limits within their EEZs - No purse seine fishing in the high seas area, south of 20S and restrict north of 20N to 2010 levels - Quarterly limits on the high seas effort (and the Olympic system) - CCM-based limits throughout the Convention area; or between 20S and 20N - Quarterly limits on the high seas, based on 2010 level (and the Olympic system) - Non-PNA SIDS proposal



PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Yellowfin catch limits

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Setting yellowfin catch limits</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differing views on need for hard limits


PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Capacity

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Limit number of vessels</p> <p>Restructure fleet</p> <p>Exemptions</p>		<p>Possible options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing provisions from CMM 2016-01 (some or all paragraphs 49-55) - No provisions on Capacity - Pending outcome of discussions on zone-based vs flag-based FAD and effort limits


PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Transferability of effort limits

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Global transferability that covers both catch limits and effort limits</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion required on concept
<p>Transferability for non-PNA SIDS</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transferring of in-zone limits to other CCMs to be used on the high seas



PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Catch Retention

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Inclusion of longline</p>		<p>Possible options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of standalone proposal on longline discard ban - Not having longline catch retention clauses


PURSE SEINE FISHERY – Research

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Level of obligation to conduct research on yellowfin and bigeye fisheries</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification of obligation and drafting


LONGLINE FISHERY – Catch and effort limits

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<p>Zone-based / flag-based</p> <p>Area of application</p> <p>Exemptions</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global limit on the high seas effort (and the Olympic system) with no SIDS exemption - Zone-based management and high seas bigeye catch limits with SIDS exemption - CCM-based limits between 20S and 20N, with no SIDS exemption - CCM-based catch limits with most SIDS having a minimum catch limit of 2,000 mt
<p>Yellowfin catch limits</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differing views on need for hard limits



LOONGLINE FISHERY – Capacity

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
Limits on vessel numbers and types Fleet structure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differing views on need for capping vessel numbers - Pending discussions on capacity limits

OTHER COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
Setting a hard limit or taking a stepwise approach		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PNA and US will work together to agree an approach

MCS PROVISIONS

ISSUE	STATUS	FURTHER DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transshipment - LL • VMS - LL • Observer Coverage - LL 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Differing views on transshipment ban or additional controls on transshipment at sea – Differing views on manual reporting ban for longline – Differing views on increasing observer coverage on longline vessels; discussion of e-monitoring – Differing views on the area of application of MCS measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charters – PS and LL • Monthly BE Reporting - LL 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Differing views on removal vs retention of provisions in the bridging measure – SWG on LL measures proposed deletion of monthly BE reporting requirement in the bridging measure; deletion subject further strengthening of other MCS tools

PREAMBLE: Not yet discussed; pending finalization of operative provisions.