



SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
ELEVENTH REGULAR SESSION
 Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia
 5-13 August 2013

ISSUES ARISING FROM THE COMMISSION

WCPFC-SC11-2015/GN-WP-03

Secretariat

ISSUES ARISING FROM SC10 AND WCPFC11

Issues	References	Outputs/Comments
ISSUES ARISING FROM SC10 (Report paragraphs indicated below)		
Data gaps	100. SC10 recommended that: a) the scientific services provider update the <i>Plan for the Improvement of the Availability and Use of Purse-seine Catch Composition Data</i> set out in SC8-WCPFC8-08 for consideration by SC11 and TCC11, noting the need for the Commission to adopt an integrated approach to improving purse-seine species composition data, including both scientific and compliance aspects. The update should take into account the outcomes of the work undertaken in Project 60, including the information in SC10-ST-WP-02. b) the information in SC10-ST-IP-02 regarding purse-seine species composition sampling protocols, spill bin size, and expectations of crew usage be forwarded to industry by CCMs to assess implications and operational constraints of wider use of spill sampling and report the feedback to SC11 and TCC11. c) as a carry-over from an SC9 recommendation, the scientific services provider provide to SC11 annual estimates of purse-seine catches based on: a) logbook reported species composition, b) observer grab samples (previous approach), and c) observer grab samples corrected for selectivity	Outputs for a) and c) are included in SC11-ST-WP-02: <i>Annual estimates of purse seine catches by species based on alternative data sources and a review of current purse seine catch estimation issues and future plans</i> . b) Through Circular No. 2015/20, 'Feedback on purse seine species composition sampling' was requested and so far as of today, no reports were received.

	<p>bias from spill sampling. Catch series from any variants on these should also be included. This will allow SC to follow changes in purse-seine catch estimates from historical methods. The work should also include any guidance on the implications of future estimates if only grab sampling occurs (e.g., Can the selectivity bias correction be used into the future?).</p>	
	<p>120b. The ROP-defined observer data, summarized in past and present SC papers that have not been provided to WCFPC, be provided to the WCPFC Secretariat as soon as possible. The observer data summarized in SC10-ST-IP-10 are an example of data that should be provided to the WCFPC Secretariat.</p>	<p>CCM's are encouraged to ensure all data collected by observers is sent to the data provider (SPC) or the Commission Secretariat within the required time frame guidelines agreed by the Commission.</p>
	<p>139. SC10 recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the outcomes from the WCPFC e-reporting and e-monitoring workshop (March 2014) are taken to TCC10, in particular, the urgent need for developing standards for formats and validation checks of the potential e-reporting and e-monitoring data to be submitted to WCPFC that ensure accordance with agreed WCPFC data standards and take into consideration existing standards; and b) the e-reporting and e-monitoring trials continue to be supported and expanded, leading to large-scale implementation, where appropriate 	<p>The first ER and EM intersessional WG meeting was held in Nadi, Fiji, 8-10 July 2015 and the WG report is posted as SC11-ST-WP-06: <i>Summary Report: First E-Reporting and E-Monitoring Intersessional Working Group Meeting</i></p>
Skipjack tuna	<p>313. SC10 recommended that further research on range contraction of skipjack tuna be conducted in the framework of Project 67.</p>	<p>The results of this study is posted, SC11-SA-WP-06: <i>An examination of trends in skipjack abundance outside the tropical area</i></p>
North Pacific blue shark	<p>467. SC10, noting the significant and substantial uncertainty associated with the current F, recommended that all targeted shark fisheries be required to submit management plans with robust catch limits to the Commission by WCPFC12.</p>	<p>Japan and Chinese Taipei submitted "Management plan for longline fisheries targeting sharks" and posted as SC11-EB-IP-14 and 15.</p>
	<p>468. Given the uncertainties regarding the estimated catch and choice of input parameters for the assessment, SC10 recommended that the catch and fishing effort on blue shark should be carefully monitored. Attaining the required 5% longline observer coverage, as well as continued research into the fisheries, biology and ecology of blue shark in the North Pacific are recommended to make improvements prior to the next assessment. SC10 encouraged WCPFC to adopt appropriate reference points.</p>	<p>No discussion was made at WCPFC11.</p>
Limit reference points for the	<p>513. Noting the adoption by WCPFC10 of the 10-year time-window (t_1-t_2) for estimating the average unfished biomass in the LRP $20\%SB_{(t_1-t_2),F=0}$, and the</p>	<p>This was covered by WCPFC11-2004-15: <i>Evaluation of CMM 2013-01</i> (reposted as</p>

WCPFC	<p>request to SC10 for further clarification of the implications of accepting various alternative levels of acceptable risk, which should be applied to breaching an LRP, SC10 considered the work described in working paper SC10-MI-WP-01 and recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the approach described in this paper be adopted for evaluating the implications of alternative levels of permissible risk of falling below an agreed biomass LRP; b) the axes of uncertainties and associated weighting to be included in the structural grid of assessment runs be incorporated into these analyses be based on those shown in Attachment G; and c) further analyses be undertaken for bigeye tuna, yellowfin tuna, skipjack tuna and South Pacific albacore, and the results presented to the Management Objectives Workshop 3 (if it takes place) and WCPFC11. 	SC11-WCPFC11-02)
	514. SC10 recommended that WCPFC11 identify the level of acceptable risk that should be applied to breaching an LRP for the key target species, noting that the UN Fish Stocks Agreement states that the risk of exceeding LRPs should be very low.	No decision was made at WCPFC11.
	<p>515. SC10 made the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the Commission support the tiered, species-specific approach to specify the values of the LRPs for key shark species; b) That the Commission support the proposal to hold an expert working group to compile and review life history data for use in LRPs for sharks; and c) That other work necessary to support the development of LRPs for sharks should be identified and included in the updated shark research plan. 	<p>Most of these issues are covered by the following papers: SC11-EB-WP-01. <i>Draft Research plan for WCPFC key shark species, 2016-2020</i> SC11-EB-WP-04. <i>Indicator analysis for WCPFC key shark species</i> SC11-EB-IP-13. <i>Report of the Pacific shark life history expert panel workshop, 28-30 April 2015</i></p>
Implementation of CMM 2013-01	584. Noting the request in para 29 of CMM 2013-01, SC10 recommended that an impact analysis of associated sets or unassociated sets on fishing mortality for skipjack be conducted.	SC11-MI-WP-05. <i>Relative impacts of FAD and free-school purse seine fishing on skipjack tuna stock status.</i>
SEAPODYM	598. SC10 recommended that the Commission encourages an external review of the SEAPODYM project to assist with guiding the Commission in evaluating potential applications and future directions.	SC11-EB-IP-01. <i>SEAPODYM applications in WCPO – progress report.</i>
Sharks	<p>625. SC10 recommended that the Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consider the analysis of longline shark mitigation methods in order to inform WCPFC11’s further consideration of revising shark CMMs to incorporate shark mitigation requirements that reduce catch rates and at-vessel mortality. b) Task TCC with identifying barriers to implementing the mitigation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A supplementary shark measure was adopted at WCPFC11, CMM 2014-05: <i>CMM for sharks</i> b) WCPFC11, Para 368: “WCPFC11 agreed to add identifying barriers to implementing the mitigation

	methods raised in SC10-EB-WP-05 (e.g. costs, operational issues and safety), along with any considerations raised by WCPFC11, and develop solutions where appropriate.	<i>methods raised in SC10-EB-WP-05 along with any considerations raised by WCPFC11, and develop solutions where appropriate, to TCC's agenda."</i>
	647. SC10 recommended the following priority order for funding research projects in 2015: a) Monte Carlo simulation of mitigation options (see SC10-EB-WP-01 for details) b) Expert panel work on the identification of appropriate life history parameters for use in developing shark LRPs	a) SC11-EB-WP-02: <i>Monte Carlo analysis of measures to mitigate longline fishery impacts on silky and oceanic whitetip sharks.</i> b) SC11-EB-IP-13: <i>Report of the Pacific shark life history expert panel workshop, 28-30 April 2015.</i>
Unobligated budget	691. SC10 also ranked the projects listed in Table 2 for funding under the Unobligated Budget if no other priority demands on these funds by WCPFC11.	This budget was not reflected during FAC8.
Rapporteur	707-717. SC10 considered that SC meeting should be supported by professional rapporteurs, and a proposal on this is submitted to WCPFC11.	The Commission did not approve an additional budget for this proposal.
ISSUES ARISING FROM WCPFC11 (Report paragraphs indicated below)		
NP blue shark	399. In response to NC10's request, WCPFC11 agreed to task SC11 to prioritise work on determining the designation of NP blue shark as a northern stock, including establishing a criteria and process for the designation of northern stocks. WCPFC11 noted that the NC has requested the ISC to provide relevant information for the SC's consideration of this issue at SC11.	This will be covered under SC11 Agenda 4.3.4.1a: <i>Evaluation of North Pacific blue shark as a northern stock.</i>
Compliance with the data submission rule	478. WCPFC11 adopted the tier scoring system for evaluating compliance with the provision of scientific data to the Commission, on the understanding that TCC will keep looking at the process of refining the CMR. The tiered scoring system would be sent to the SC for its consideration. (Attachment J)	This will be considered under SC11 Agenda 3.1.1b: <i>Review of the tier scoring system for scientific data submission</i>
Swordfish	507. TCC10 recommended to WCPFC11 that the Secretariat be tasked to complete two outstanding tasks in the TCC9 recommendations and to present additional information to SC11. These were: (i) distribution of swordfish catches between EEZs and high seas, to the extent possible, and (ii) identify mitigation measures to help address and avoid overfishing.	Table 1 and 2 in SC10-GN-WP-01 are all information that can be provided at this stage. According to SPC, it is not possible to do a clearer breakdown by EEZ without full operational-level data
Port coordinator programme	542. WCPFC11 agreed: c) Relevant Members, SPC-OFP and WCPFC Secretariat will jointly report to SC and TCC (in 2015 and 2016), on the implementation of the trial WCPFC port coordinators programme	GN-IP-04: <i>Report on the implementation of the trial WCPFC port coordinators.</i>