

## **Japan's comments on how to progress five issues**

### **Proposed process**

1. The WG implements, with format developed in the group, a questionnaire survey toward CCMs to grasp the current situation on issue #1 to #3. CCMs answer the survey through hearings with fishing industries and/or buy companies.
2. The WG reports WCPFC SC results of the survey.
3. After grasping FADs use in WCPO Fisheries (setting status, catch, etc.) of each area, WCPFC SC provides advice to the WG on issue #4.
4. With the results of the survey and SC's advice, the WG consider issue #5 and report the results to WCPFC TCC.
5. WCPFC TCC considers the report from the WG and provides the results to the Commission.

### *Issues noted in the terms of reference for the WG to review and to recommend ways forward to the Commission*

*(quote from WCPFC Circular 2015/26)*

1. *Collection of additional data on FADs and their use in WCPO fisheries;*
2. *FAD marking, and identification, and use of electronic signatures;*
3. *FAD monitoring, tracking and control*
4. *FAD management options; and*
5. *Advise on options for FAD marking and monitoring for WCPO wide application.*

### **Other things to be considered**

- ✓ The WG should recognize that number of FAD sets, not number of FAD, gives impacts on stocks of tuna species.
- ✓ Data on FADs are confidential business information for fishermen. Therefore the WG should take into consideration its confidentiality in use of the data for conservation and management of stocks.
- ✓ The WG shouldn't impose an excessive load, both in finance and in labor, on fishermen in collection of data on FADs and their use in WCPO fisheries.