

---

## PROGRESS MADE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF WPEB09

PREPARED BY: IOTC SECRETARIAT, 30 SEPTEMBER 2014

---

### PURPOSE

To provide an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB), which were endorsed by the Scientific Committee (SC), and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants.

To provide participants at the 10<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPEB with an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations from the previous WPEB meeting which were endorsed by the SC, and to provide alternative recommendations for the consideration and potential endorsement by participants as appropriate given any progress.

### BACKGROUND

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 and other interested parties, 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) to carry out other technical activities of relevance to the Commission.

### Process:

- 1) **WPEB** – At the 9<sup>th</sup> Session of the WPEB, participants agreed on a series of actions to be taken by participants, CPCs, and the IOTC Secretariat on a range of issues;
- 2) **SC** – The recommendations were considered by the SC in December 2013. At the SC16 meeting, the recommendations of the WPEB09 were either rejected or revised and then adopted as those of the SC;
- 3) **Commission** – The refined recommendations were then passed to the Commission for its consideration and possible endorsement.

### DISCUSSION

Noting the core tasks of the SC, and hence the WPEB, participants are reminded that any recommendations developed during a Session, must be carefully constructed so that each contains the following elements:

- 1) a specific action to be undertaken (deliverable);
- 2) clear responsibility for the action to be undertaken (i.e. a specific CPC of the IOTC, the IOTC Secretariat, another subsidiary body of the Commission or the Commission itself);
- 3) a desired time from for delivery of the action (i.e. by the next working party meeting, or other date).

The IOTC Secretariat has undertaken a review of the recommendations arising from the previous WPEB meeting and compared them against those endorsed by the SC [Appendix A](#). Any subsequent actions taken



by the Commission at the most recent meeting have also been added to the Appendix. In cases where a recommendation is yet to be fulfilled, a proposal for consideration at the WPEB meeting has been provided.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the WPEB:

- 1) **NOTE** paper IOTC–2014–WPEB10–06 which detailed the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the WPEB09, taking into consideration the recommendations from the SC and decisions of the Commission;
- 2) **AGREE** to consider and revise as necessary, the recommendations, and for these to be combined with any new recommendations arising from the WPEB10, noting that these will be provided to the SC for their endorsement.

#### **APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**: Progress made on the recommendations of WPEB09.

## APPENDIX A

### Progress made on the recommendations of WPEB09

WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
WPEB09.01 (para. 3)	<b>Meeting participation fund</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund (MPF), adopted by the Commission in 2010 (Resolution 10/05 <i>On the establishment of a Meeting Participation Fund for developing IOTC Members and non-Contracting Cooperating Parties</i> ), was used to fund the participation of 11 national scientists to the WPEB09 meeting (7 in 2012), all of which were required to submit and present a working paper at the meeting, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that this fund be maintained into the future.	SC16.54 ( <a href="#">para. 133</a> )	<b>Meeting participation fund</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the IOTC Meeting Participation Fund (MPF), adopted by the Commission in 2010 (Resolution 10/05 <i>On the establishment of a Meeting Participation Fund for developing IOTC Members and non-Contracting Cooperating Parties</i> ), was used to fund the participation of 58 national scientists to the Working Party meetings and SC in 2013 (42 in 2012), all of which were required to submit and present a working paper at the meeting, the SC strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that this fund be maintained into the future. The MPF is currently funded through accumulated IOTC budgetary funds and voluntary contributions by CPCs. The Commission may need to develop and implement a procedure for supplying funds to the MPF in the future, as specified in Resolution 10/05.	S18 (para. 89, 90)	The Commission <b>REQUESTED</b> that the Secretariat seek voluntary contributions from Contracting Parties and other interested groups to supplement the MPF.  The Commission <b>AGREED</b> that any cost savings made on the annual IOTC budget, shall also be used to further supplement the \$60,000 currently budgeted for the MPF. The priorities for the funds use shall be consistent with the 75:25 split between the science meetings (SC and its Working Parties) and non-scientific meetings of the Commission, in accordance with the Rules adopted by the Commission.  <i>Update: 9 Applications were received by the due date at the IOTC Secretariat. 5 were approved and 4 were rejected for budget reasons.</i>
WPEB09.02 (para. 5)	<b>NOTING</b> that the Commission had directed the Secretariat (via Resolution 10/05) to ensure that the MPF be utilised, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing CPCs in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties, rather than non-science meetings, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Secretariat strictly adhere to the directives of the Commission contained in Resolution 10/05, including paragraph 8 which states that <i>'The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditures of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.'</i> Thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing CPC scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.	SC16.55 ( <a href="#">para. 134</a> )	<b>NOTING</b> that the Commission had directed the Secretariat (via Resolution 10/05) to ensure that the MPF be utilised, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing CPCs in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties, rather than non-science meetings, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Secretariat strictly adhere to the directives of the Commission contained in Resolution 10/05, including paragraph 8 which states that <i>"The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditure of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings."</i> Thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing CPC scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.	S18 (para. 88)	<b>NOTING</b> that the Commission had directed the Secretariat to ensure that the MPF be utilised, as a first priority, to support the participation of scientists from developing Contracting Parties in scientific meetings of the IOTC, including Working Parties, rather than non-science meetings, the Commission <b>REQUESTED</b> that the Secretariat strictly adhere to the directives of the Commission contained in Rule XVI in the IOTC Rules of Procedure (2014)), including paragraph 5 which states that <i>'The Fund will be allocated in such a way that no more than 25% of the expenditures of the Fund in one year is used to fund attendance to non-scientific meetings.'</i> Thus, 75% of the annual MPF shall be allocated to facilitating the attendance of developing Contracting Parties scientists to the Scientific Committee and its Working Parties.  The Commission <b>AGREED</b> that the IOTC MPF exclude funding for Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties, as they currently do not contribute to the IOTC budget.

WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
WPEB09.03 (para.12)	<b>Employment of a Fisheries Officer</b> <b>NOTING</b> the rapidly increasing scientific workload at the IOTC Secretariat, including a wide range of additional duties on ecosystems and bycatch assigned to it by the SC and the Commission, and that the new Fishery Officer (Science) supporting the IOTC scientific activities has not been given a mandate by the Commission to work on ecosystems and bycatch matters, the WPEB strongly <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission approve the hiring of a Fishery Officer (Bycatch) to work on bycatch matters in support of the scientific process.	SC16.27 ( <a href="#">para. 56</a> )	<b>Employment of a Fisheries Officer (Bycatch)</b> <b>NOTING</b> the rapidly increasing scientific workload at the IOTC Secretariat, including a wide range of additional duties on ecosystems and bycatch assigned to it by the SC and the Commission, and that the new Fishery Officer (Science) supporting the IOTC scientific activities has not been given a mandate by the Commission to work on ecosystems and bycatch matters, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission approve the hiring of a Fishery Officer (Bycatch) to work on bycatch matters in support of the scientific process.	-	Not considered by the Commission as it was not included in the budget proposed by the IOTC Secretariat to the Standing Committee on Administration and Finance (SCAF).
WPEB09.04 (para.35)	<b>Regional observer scheme</b> The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Compliance Committee and Commission consider how to address the lack of implementation of regional observer schemes by CPCs for their fleets and reporting to the IOTC Secretariat as per the provision of Resolution 11/04 <i>on a Regional Observer Scheme</i> , noting the update provided in <a href="#">Appendix VI</a> .	SC16.64 ( <a href="#">para. 176</a> )	<b>Implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme</b> The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Compliance Committee and the Commission consider how to address the continued lack of compliance with the implementation of regional observer schemes by CPCs for their fleets and lack of reporting to the IOTC Secretariat as per the provision of Resolution 11/04 <i>on a Regional Observer Scheme</i> , noting the update provided in <a href="#">Appendix XXXII</a> .	N/A	Nil action taken by the CoC.
WPEB09.05 (para.37)	The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that as a priority, the IOTC Secretariat should immediately commence work with CPCs that are yet to develop and implement a Regional Observer Scheme that would meet the requirements contained in Resolution 11/04, and provide an update at the next session of the WPEB.	SC16.65 ( <a href="#">para. 177</a> )	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that as a priority, the IOTC Secretariat should immediately commence work with CPCs that are yet to develop and implement a Regional Observer Scheme that would meet the requirements contained in Resolution 11/04, and provide an update at the next session of the WPEB.	N/A	The new Fishery Officer (Science) is spending approximately 50% of her time working on the ROS.
WPEB09.06 (para.38)	<b>Identification cards for shark, seabirds and marine turtles</b> The WPEB <b>EXPRESSED</b> its thanks to the IOTC Secretariat and other experts involved in the development of the identification cards for marine turtles, seabirds and sharks and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the cards be translated into the following languages, in priority order: Farsi, Arabic, Spanish and Portuguese, and that the Commission allocate funds for this purpose.	SC16.59 ( <a href="#">para. 143</a> )	<b>Identification cards for shark, seabirds and marine turtles</b> The SC <b>EXPRESSED</b> its thanks to the IOTC Secretariat and other experts involved in the development of the identification cards for marine turtles, seabirds and sharks and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the cards be translated into the following languages, in priority order: Farsi, Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese and Indonesian, and that the Commission allocate funds for this purpose.	Yes	See below.
WPEB09.07 (para.39)	The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate additional funds in 2014 to translate and print further sets of the shark, seabird and marine turtle identification cards (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 2</a> ). <b>TABLE 2.</b> Estimated translation, production and printing	SC16.60 ( <a href="#">para. 144</a> )	The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate additional funds in 2014-15 to translate and print further sets of the shark, seabird and marine turtle identification cards (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 14</a> ). <b>TABLE 2.</b> Estimated translation, production and printing	Yes	The SCAF and Commission endorsed the proposed budget. US\$12,000 was approved for 2014 under the IOTC budget. <i>Update: Work deferred until next year or until external funds are identified.</i>



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10																																																								
	costs for 1000 sets of identification guides for marine turtles, seabirds and sharks. <table border="1" data-bbox="235 384 734 592"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Translation (per language)</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>3</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Typesetting</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>3</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marine turtles ID cards</td> <td>\$5</td> <td>1000</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seabird ID cards</td> <td>\$7</td> <td>1000</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shark ID cards</td> <td>\$7</td> <td>1000</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Translation (per language)	\$1000	3	3,000	Typesetting	\$1000	3	3,000	Marine turtles ID cards	\$5	1000	5,000	Seabird ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000	Shark ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,000</b>		costs for 1000 sets of identification guides for marine turtles, seabirds and sharks. <table border="1" data-bbox="963 384 1462 592"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Translation (per language)</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>3</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Typesetting</td> <td>\$1000</td> <td>3</td> <td>3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marine turtles ID cards</td> <td>\$5</td> <td>1000</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Seabird ID cards</td> <td>\$7</td> <td>1000</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shark ID cards</td> <td>\$7</td> <td>1000</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Translation (per language)	\$1000	3	3,000	Typesetting	\$1000	3	3,000	Marine turtles ID cards	\$5	1000	5,000	Seabird ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000	Shark ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,000</b>		
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																										
Translation (per language)	\$1000	3	3,000																																																										
Typesetting	\$1000	3	3,000																																																										
Marine turtles ID cards	\$5	1000	5,000																																																										
Seabird ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000																																																										
Shark ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000																																																										
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,000</b>																																																										
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																										
Translation (per language)	\$1000	3	3,000																																																										
Typesetting	\$1000	3	3,000																																																										
Marine turtles ID cards	\$5	1000	5,000																																																										
Seabird ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000																																																										
Shark ID cards	\$7	1000	7,000																																																										
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,000</b>																																																										
WPEB09.08 (para.52)	<p><b>Regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean</b></p> <p>The WPEB reiterated its previous <b>RECOMMENDATION</b> that the Commission considers allocating funds to support a regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean. As an essential contribution to this review, scientists from all CPCs having gillnet fleets in the Indian Ocean, in particular those from I.R. Iran, Oman, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, should collate the known information on bycatch in their gillnet fisheries, including sharks, marine turtles and marine mammals, with estimates of the likely order of magnitude where more detailed data are not available. A consultant should be hired for 30 days to assist CPCs with this task (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 3</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 3.</b> Estimated costs for the hiring of a consultant to undertake a regional review of gillnet fleets.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="257 1150 714 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>\$350</td> <td>30</td> <td>10,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (field)</td> <td>\$3,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>9,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs to attend WPEB</td> <td>\$5,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Contract days	\$350	30	10,500	Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000	Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>	SC16.1 (para. 38)	<p><b>Regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean</b></p> <p>The SC reiterated its previous <b>RECOMMENDATION</b> that the Commission considers allocating funds to support a regional review of the current and historical data available for gillnet fleets operating in the Indian Ocean. As an essential contribution to this review, scientists from all CPCs having gillnet fleets in the Indian Ocean, in particular those from I.R. Iran, Oman, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, should collate the known information on bycatch in their gillnet fisheries, including sharks, marine turtles and marine mammals, with estimates of the likely order of magnitude where more detailed data are not available. A consultant should be hired for 30 days to assist CPCs with this task (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 3</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 3.</b> Estimated costs for the hiring of a consultant to undertake a regional review of gillnet fleets.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="974 1134 1442 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>\$350</td> <td>30</td> <td>10,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (field)</td> <td>\$3,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>9,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs to attend WPEB</td> <td>\$5,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Contract days	\$350	30	10,500	Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000	Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>	No	–																
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																										
Contract days	\$350	30	10,500																																																										
Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000																																																										
Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000																																																										
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>																																																										
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																										
Contract days	\$350	30	10,500																																																										
Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000																																																										
Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000																																																										
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>																																																										
WPEB09.09 (para.64)	<p><b>Training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on species identification, bycatch mitigation and data collection methods and also to identify other potential sources of assistance – Development of plans of action</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds in its 2014 and 2015 budgets for the IOTC Secretariat to carry out training for CPCs having gillnet</p>	SC16.15 (para. 39)	<p><b>Training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on species identification, bycatch mitigation and data collection methods and also to identify other potential sources of assistance – Development of plans of action</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds in its 2014 and 2015 budgets for the IOTC</p>	Yes	The Commission approved US\$19,000 for this project in 2014 under the IOTC budget.																																																								



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10																																																
	<p>fleets on bycatch mitigation methods, species identification, and data collection methods (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 4</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 4.</b> Estimated costs for CPCs with large gillnet fleets on bycatch mitigation methods, species identification and data collection methods. Two training workshops: I.R. Iran/Oman and Sri Lanka.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="215 528 754 756"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Production of training material</td> <td>\$1,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)</td> <td>\$4,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)</td> <td>\$4,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>2</td> <td>\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>25,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Production of training material	\$1,000	1	1,000	Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000	Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000	Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts	\$0	2	\$0	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>25,000</b>		<p>Secretariat to facilitate training for CPCs having gillnet fleets on bycatch mitigation methods, species identification, and data collection methods (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 4</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 4.</b> Estimated costs for CPCs with large gillnet fleets on bycatch mitigation methods, species identification and data collection methods. Two training workshops: I.R. Iran/Oman and Sri Lanka.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="943 555 1482 783"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Production of training material</td> <td>\$1,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)</td> <td>\$4,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)</td> <td>\$4,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>12,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts</td> <td>\$0</td> <td>2</td> <td>\$0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>25,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Production of training material	\$1,000	1	1,000	Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000	Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000	Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts	\$0	2	\$0	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>25,000</b>		
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Production of training material	\$1,000	1	1,000																																																		
Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000																																																		
Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000																																																		
Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts	\$0	2	\$0																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>25,000</b>																																																		
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Production of training material	\$1,000	1	1,000																																																		
Travel costs (IOTC Staff) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000																																																		
Travel costs (Experts) (I.R.Iran/Oman, Sri Lanka)	\$4,000	3	12,000																																																		
Workshop venue – to be paid by hosts	\$0	2	\$0																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>25,000</b>																																																		
WPEB09.10 (para.68)	<p><b>Sharks and rays</b></p> <p><b>Review of new information on the status of sharks and rays</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that all CPCs collect and report catches of sharks (including historical data), catch-and-effort and length frequency data on sharks, as per IOTC Resolutions, so that more detailed analysis can be undertaken for the next WPEB meeting.</p>	SC16.16 (para. 40)	<p><b>Sharks and rays</b></p> <p><b>Review of new information on the status of sharks and rays</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that the information on retained catches and discards of sharks contained in the IOTC database remains very incomplete for most fleets despite their mandatory reporting status, and that catch-and-effort as well as size data are essential to assess the status of shark stocks, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that all CPCs collect and report catches of sharks (including historical data), catch-and-effort and length frequency data on sharks, as per IOTC Resolutions, so that more detailed analysis can be undertaken for the next WPEB meeting.</p>	N/A	–																																																
WPEB09.11 (para.69)	<p><b>NOTING</b> that there is extensive literature available on pelagic shark fisheries and interactions with fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species, in countries having fisheries for sharks, and in the databases of governmental or non-governmental organisations, the WPEB <b>AGREED</b> on the need for a major data mining exercise in order to compile data from as many sources as possible and attempt to rebuild historical catch series of the most commonly caught shark species. In this regard, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocates funds for this activity, in the 2014 and 2015 IOTC budgets</p>	SC16.17 (para. 41)	<p><b>NOTING</b> that there is extensive literature available on pelagic shark fisheries and interactions with fisheries targeting tuna and tuna-like species, in countries having fisheries for sharks, and in the databases of governmental or non-governmental organisations, the SC <b>AGREED</b> on the need for a major data mining exercise in order to compile data from as many sources as possible and attempt to rebuild historical catch series of the most commonly caught shark species, in particular blue shark and oceanic whitetip shark. In this regard, the SC</p>	Yes	The Commission approved US\$60,000 for this task in 2015 under the IOTC budget.																																																



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10																																																
	<p>(budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 5</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 5.</b> Estimated costs for the hiring of a consultant to undertake a literature review of shark interactions.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="241 416 725 592"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>\$350</td> <td>30</td> <td>10,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (field)</td> <td>\$3,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>9,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs to attend WPEB</td> <td>\$5,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Contract days	\$350	30	10,500	Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000	Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>		<p><b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocates funds for this activity, in the 2014 and 2015 IOTC budgets (budget estimate: <a href="#">Table 5</a>).</p> <p><b>TABLE 5.</b> Estimated costs for the hiring of a consultant to undertake a literature review of shark interactions.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="969 472 1453 647"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>\$350</td> <td>30</td> <td>10,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs (field)</td> <td>\$3,000</td> <td>3</td> <td>9,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Travel costs to attend WPEB</td> <td>\$5,000</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>24,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Contract days	\$350	30	10,500	Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000	Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>										
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Contract days	\$350	30	10,500																																																		
Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000																																																		
Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>																																																		
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Contract days	\$350	30	10,500																																																		
Travel costs (field)	\$3,000	3	9,000																																																		
Travel costs to attend WPEB	\$5,000	1	5,000																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>24,500</b>																																																		
<p>WPEB09.12 (para.117)</p>	<p><b>Review new information on the biology, stock structure, bycatch mitigation measures, fisheries and associated environmental data</b></p> <p>Noting the continued confusion in the terminology of various hook types being used in IOTC fisheries, (e.g. tuna hook vs. J-hook; definition of a circle hook), the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds in the 2014 IOTC Budget to develop an identification guide for fishing hooks and pelagic fishing gears used in IOTC fisheries. The total estimated production and printing costs for the first 1000 sets of the identification cards is around a maximum of US\$16,500 (<a href="#">Table 6</a>). The IOTC Secretariat shall seek funds from potential donors to print additional sets of the identification cards at US\$5,500 per 1000 sets of cards.</p> <p><b>TABLE 6.</b> Estimated production and printing costs for 1000 sets of identification guide for fishing hooks and pelagic fishing gears used in IOTC fisheries.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="264 1177 705 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Purchase images</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>25</td> <td>2,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>US\$350</td> <td>20</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing plates / plate</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>15</td> <td>1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing /1000 sets</td> <td>US\$5500</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>16,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500	Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000	Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500	Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>16,500</b>	<p>SC16.62 (<a href="#">para. 147</a>)</p>	<p><b>Fishing hook identification cards</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> the continued confusion in the terminology of various hook types being used in IOTC fisheries, (e.g. tuna hook vs. J-hook; definition of a circle hook), the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocate funds in the 2014-15 IOTC Budget to develop an identification guide for fishing hooks and pelagic fishing gears used in IOTC fisheries. The total estimated production and printing costs for the first 1000 sets of the identification cards is around a maximum of US\$16,500 (<a href="#">Table 16</a>). The IOTC Secretariat shall seek funds from potential donors to print additional sets of the identification cards at US\$5,500 per 1000 sets of cards.</p> <p><b>TABLE 16.</b> Estimated production and printing costs for 1000 sets of identification guide for fishing hooks and pelagic fishing gears used in IOTC fisheries.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="987 1139 1435 1315"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>Unit price</th> <th>Units required</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Purchase images</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>25</td> <td>2,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract days</td> <td>US\$350</td> <td>20</td> <td>7,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing plates / plate</td> <td>US\$100</td> <td>15</td> <td>1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Printing /1000 sets</td> <td>US\$5500</td> <td>1</td> <td>5,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total estimate (US\$)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>16,500</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Unit price	Units required	Total	Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500	Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000	Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500	Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500	<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>16,500</b>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Commission approved US\$16,500 for this task in 2014 under the IOTC budget.</p> <p><i>Update: IOTC Secretariat considers this a lower priority and deferred the project.</i></p>
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500																																																		
Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000																																																		
Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500																																																		
Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>16,500</b>																																																		
Description	Unit price	Units required	Total																																																		
Purchase images	US\$100	25	2,500																																																		
Contract days	US\$350	20	7,000																																																		
Printing plates / plate	US\$100	15	1,500																																																		
Printing /1000 sets	US\$5500	1	5,500																																																		
<b>Total estimate (US\$)</b>			<b>16,500</b>																																																		
<p>WPEB09.13 (para.123)</p>	<p><b>Ecological Risk Assessment: review of current knowledge and potential management implications</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the list of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to</p>	<p>SC16.19 (<a href="#">para. 43</a>)</p>	<p><b>Ecological Risk Assessment: review of current knowledge and potential management implications</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted. Yet to be incorporated into Res. 13//03</p>																																																



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<p>longline gear (Table 7) and purse seine gear (Table 8) in the Indian Ocean, as determined by a productivity susceptibility analysis, compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded for each gear, contained in Resolution 13/03 on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence. At the next revision to Resolution 13/03, the Commission may wish to add the missing species/groups of sharks and rays.</p>	<p>SC16.20 (para. 46)</p> <p>SC16.21 (para. 47)</p>	<p>list of the 10 most vulnerable shark species to longline gear (Table 7) and purse seine gear (Table 8) in the Indian Ocean, as determined by a productivity susceptibility analysis, compared to the list of shark species/groups required to be recorded for each gear, contained in Resolution 13/03 on the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence. At the next revision to Resolution 13/03, the Commission may wish to add the missing species/groups of sharks and rays.</p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that, in line with Recommendation 12/15 on the best available science, the list of shark species (or groups of species) for longline gear under Resolution 13/03 (Table 7) should be supplemented with the silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>), which was estimated to be at risk in longline fisheries by the ERA conducted in 2012 (ranked as the 4<sup>th</sup> most vulnerable species to longline gear). The SC <b>REQUESTED</b> the Commission to define the most appropriate means of collecting this additional information.</p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that, in line with Recommendation 12/15 on the best available science, the list of shark species (or groups of species) for purse seine gear under Resolution 13/03 (Table 8) should be supplemented with the silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>), mako sharks (<i>Isurus spp.</i>), hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna spp.</i>), pelagic stingray (<i>Pteroplatytrygon violacea</i>), dusky shark (<i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i>), tiger shark (<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>), which were estimated to be at risk in purse seine fisheries by the ERA conducted in 2012. The SC <b>ADVISED</b> the Commission to define the most appropriate means of collecting this additional information.</p>		
WPEB09.14 (para.138)	<p><b>Review of data needs and way forward for the evaluation of shark stocks</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that Resolution 10/02 mandatory statistical requirements for IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPC's), makes provision for data to be reported to the IOTC on "the most commonly caught</p>			Yes	Yet to be incorporated in Res. 10/02



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10																														
	<p><i>shark species and, where possible, to the less common shark species”, without giving any list defining the most common and less common species, and recognising the general lack of shark data being recorded and reported to the IOTC Secretariat, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 10/02 is revised in order to include the list of most commonly caught elasmobranch species (Table 10) for which nominal catch data shall be reported as part of the statistical requirement for IOTC CPCs.</i></p> <p><b>TABLE 10.</b> List of the most commonly elasmobranch species caught.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="219 647 748 916"> <thead> <tr> <th>Common name</th> <th>Species</th> <th>Code</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Manta and devil rays</td> <td>Mobulidae</td> <td>MAN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Whale shark</td> <td><i>Rhincodon typus</i></td> <td>RHN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thresher sharks</td> <td><i>Alopias spp.</i></td> <td>THR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mako sharks</td> <td><i>Isurus spp.</i></td> <td>MAK</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Silky shark</td> <td><i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i></td> <td>FAL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oceanic whitetip shark</td> <td><i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i></td> <td>OCS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blue shark</td> <td><i>Prionace glauca</i></td> <td>BSH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hammerhead shark</td> <td>Sphyrnidae</td> <td>SPY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Sharks and rays</td> <td>–</td> <td>SKH</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Common name	Species	Code	Manta and devil rays	Mobulidae	MAN	Whale shark	<i>Rhincodon typus</i>	RHN	Thresher sharks	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	THR	Mako sharks	<i>Isurus spp.</i>	MAK	Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	FAL	Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	OCS	Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	BSH	Hammerhead shark	Sphyrnidae	SPY	Other Sharks and rays	–	SKH				
Common name	Species	Code																																	
Manta and devil rays	Mobulidae	MAN																																	
Whale shark	<i>Rhincodon typus</i>	RHN																																	
Thresher sharks	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	THR																																	
Mako sharks	<i>Isurus spp.</i>	MAK																																	
Silky shark	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	FAL																																	
Oceanic whitetip shark	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	OCS																																	
Blue shark	<i>Prionace glauca</i>	BSH																																	
Hammerhead shark	Sphyrnidae	SPY																																	
Other Sharks and rays	–	SKH																																	
WPEB09.15 (para.141)	<p><b>Best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> the following <i>Guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks</i>, that should be added as an additional page in the IOTC shark identification guides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The methods listed below depend on the condition of the particular purse seine set, e.g. the size and orientation of the encircled animal, size of fish in the purse seine set and operation style. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cutting the net when the whale shark is at the surface and separated from the tuna and when the operation presents no danger for the crew;</li> <li>○ Standing the animal on the net and rolling it outside the bunt. A rope placed under the animal and attached to the float line could help rolling the whale shark out of the net;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SC16.31 (para. 67)	<p><b>Best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> the following <i>Guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks</i>, that should be added as an additional page in the IOTC shark identification guides:</p> <p>The methods listed below depend on the condition of the particular purse seine set, e.g. the size and orientation of the encircled animal, size of fish in the purse seine set and operation style.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cutting the net when the whale shark is at the surface and separated from the tuna and when the operation presents no danger for the crew;</li> <li>• Standing the animal on the net and rolling it outside the bunt. A rope placed under the animal and attached to the float line could help rolling the whale shark out of the net;</li> <li>• Brailing sharks (only for small individual less than 2–3 meters).</li> </ul>	N/A	–																														



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brailing sharks (only for small individual less than 2–3 meters).</li> <li>• The crew should never:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pull up the shark by its tail;</li> <li>○ Tow the shark by its tail.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	SC16.32 (para. 68)	<p>The crew should never:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pull up the shark by its tail;</li> <li>• Tow the shark by its tail.</li> </ul> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission allocates funds in its 2014 budget, to produce and print the IOTC best practice guidelines for the safe release and handling of encircled whale sharks, and for these to be incorporated into the existing IOTC “<i>Shark and ray identification in Indian Ocean pelagic fisheries</i>”, identification cards.</p>		
WPEB09.16 (para.148)	<p><b>Marine Turtles</b> <b>Review of data available at the Secretariat for marine turtles</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC note that the lack of data from CPCs on interactions and mortalities of marine turtles in the Indian Ocean is a substantial concern, resulting in an inability of the WPEB to estimate levels of marine turtle bycatch. There is an urgent need to quantify the effects of fisheries for tuna and tuna-like species in the Indian Ocean on marine turtle species, and it is clear that little progress on obtaining and reporting data on interactions with marine turtles has been made. This data is necessary to allow the IOTC to respond and manage the adverse effects on marine turtles, and other bycatch species.</p>	–	<b>NOTED</b>	N/A	–
WPEB09.17 (para.166)	<p><b>Ecological Risk Assessment: review of current knowledge and potential management implications</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the ERA for marine turtles be kept under review, and that consideration be given to updating it periodically in light of newly received data and other information.</p>	–	<b>Incorporated into the program of Work</b>	N/A	–
WPEB09.18 (para.168)	<p><b>Review of Resolution 12/04 on the conservation of marine turtles</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that at the next revision of IOTC Resolution 12/04 <i>on the conservation of marine turtles</i>, the measure is strengthened to ensure that where possible, CPCs report annually on the total estimated level of incidental catches of marine turtles, by species, as</p>	SC16.22 ( <a href="#">para. 51</a> )	<p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that at the next revision of IOTC Resolution 12/04 <i>on the conservation of marine turtles</i>, the measure is strengthened to ensure that where possible, CPCs report annually on the total estimated level of incidental catches of marine turtles, by species, as provided at <a href="#">Table 9</a>.</p> <p><b>TABLE 9.</b> Marine turtle species reported as caught in</p>	Yes	Not yet incorporated into Res. 12/04



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10																												
	<p>provided at <a href="#">Table 12</a>.</p> <p><b>TABLE 12.</b> Marine turtle species reported as caught in fisheries within the IOTC area of competence.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="291 438 683 710"> <thead> <tr> <th>Common name</th> <th>Scientific name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flatback turtle</td> <td><i>Natator depressus</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green turtle</td> <td><i>Chelonia mydas</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hawksbill turtle</td> <td><i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leatherback turtle</td> <td><i>Dermochelys coriacea</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loggerhead turtle</td> <td><i>Caretta caretta</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Olive ridley turtle</td> <td><i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Common name	Scientific name	Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>	Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Olive ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>		<p>fisheries within the IOTC area of competence.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1019 375 1400 646"> <thead> <tr> <th>Common name</th> <th>Scientific name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flatback turtle</td> <td><i>Natator depressus</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Green turtle</td> <td><i>Chelonia mydas</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hawksbill turtle</td> <td><i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leatherback turtle</td> <td><i>Dermochelys coriacea</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loggerhead turtle</td> <td><i>Caretta caretta</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Olive ridley turtle</td> <td><i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Common name	Scientific name	Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>	Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Olive ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>		
Common name	Scientific name																																
Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>																																
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>																																
Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>																																
Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>																																
Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>																																
Olive ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>																																
Common name	Scientific name																																
Flatback turtle	<i>Natator depressus</i>																																
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>																																
Hawksbill turtle	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>																																
Leatherback turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>																																
Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>																																
Olive ridley turtle	<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>																																
<p>WPEB09.19 (para.169)</p>	<p><b>Resolution 10/02 Mandatory statistical [reporting] requirements for IOTC Members and Cooperating Non-Contracting Parties (CPCs)</b></p> <p><b>NOTING</b> that Resolution 10/02 does not make provisions for data to be reported to the IOTC on marine turtles, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 10/02 is revised in order to make the reporting requirements coherent with those stated in Resolution 12/04 on the conservation of marine turtles and Resolution 13/03 on On the recording of catch and effort by fishing vessels in the IOTC area of competence.</p>	<p>–</p>	<p>Noted and included in other recommendations</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>–</p>																												
<p>WPEB09.20 (para.171)</p>	<p><b>Requests contained in IOTC Conservation and Management Measures</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECALLED</b> and updated its previous <b>RECOMMENDATION</b> that the SC note the following in regards to the requests to the WPEB outlined in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12/04:</p> <p>a) <i>Develop recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures for gillnet, longline and purse seine fisheries in the IOTC area</i></p> <p><b>Gillnet:</b> The absence of data for marine turtles, fishing effort, spatial deployment and bycatch in the IOTC area of competence makes any recommendation regarding mitigation measures for this gear premature. Improvements in data collection and reporting of marine turtle interactions with gillnets, and research on</p>	<p>SC16.24 (para. 53)</p>	<p><b>Requests contained in IOTC Conservation and Management Measures</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the following in regards to the requests to the SC and WPEB outlined in paragraph 11 of Resolution 12/04:</p> <p>a) <i>Develop recommendations on appropriate mitigation measures for gillnet, longline and purse seine fisheries in the IOTC area</i></p> <p><b>Gillnet:</b> The absence of data for marine turtles, fishing effort, spatial deployment and bycatch in the IOTC area of competence makes it difficult to provide management advice for gillnets. However, possible mitigation measures to avoid marine turtle mortality in gillnets would be possible and, thus, the group</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted.</p>																												



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<p>the effect of gear types (i.e. net construction and colour, mesh size, soak times, light deterrents) are necessary.</p> <p><b>Longline:</b> Current information suggests inconsistent spatial catches (i.e. high catches in few sets) and by gear/fishery. The most important mitigation measures relevant for longline fisheries are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourage the use of circle hooks, whilst developing further research into their effectiveness using a multiple species approach.</li> <li>2. Release live animals after careful dehooking/disentangling/line cutting (See handling guidelines in the <i>Marine turtle identification cards for Indian Ocean fisheries</i>).</li> </ol> <p><b>Purse seine:</b> see c) below</p> <p>b) <i>Develop regional standards covering data collection, data exchange and training</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development of standards using the IOTC guidelines for the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme should be undertaken, as it is considered the best way to collect reliable data related to marine turtle bycatch in the IOTC area of competence.</li> <li>2. The Chair of the WPDCS to work with the IOSEA MoU Secretariat, which has already developed regional standards for data collection, and revise the observer data collection forms and observer reporting template as appropriate, as well are current recording and reporting requirements through IOTC Resolutions, to ensure that the IOTC has the means to collect quantitative and qualitative data on marine turtle bycatch.</li> <li>3. Encourage CPCs to use IOSEA expertise and facilities to train observers and crew to increase post-release survival rates of marine turtles.</li> </ol> <p>c) <i>Develop improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of marine turtles, including the use of biodegradable materials</i></p>		<p>suggested that research in gillnet mitigation measures (e.g. using lights on gillnets) will be considered as a research priority. Moreover, improvements in data collection and reporting of marine turtle interactions with gillnets, and research on the effect of gear types (i.e. net construction and colour, mesh size, soak times, light deterrents) are necessary.</p> <p><b>Longline:</b> Current information suggests inconsistent spatial catches (i.e. high catches in few sets) and by gear/fishery. The most important mitigation measures relevant for longline fisheries are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourage the use of circle hooks, whilst developing further research into their effectiveness using a multiple species approach.</li> <li>2. Release live animals after careful dehooking/disentangling/line cutting (See handling guidelines in the <i>Marine turtle identification cards for Indian Ocean fisheries</i>).</li> </ol> <p><b>Purse seine:</b> see c) below</p> <p>b) <i>Develop regional standards covering data collection, data exchange and training</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development of standards using the IOTC guidelines for the implementation of the Regional Observer Scheme should be undertaken, as it is considered the best way to collect reliable data related to marine turtle bycatch in the IOTC area of competence.</li> <li>2. The Chair of the WPDCS to work with the IOSEA MoU Secretariat, which has already developed regional standards for data collection, and revise the observer data collection forms and observer reporting template as appropriate, as well are current recording and reporting requirements through IOTC Resolutions, to ensure that the IOTC has the means to collect quantitative and qualitative data on marine turtle bycatch.</li> <li>3. Encourage CPCs to use IOSEA expertise and facilities to train observers and crew to increase post-release survival rates of marine turtles.</li> </ol> <p>c) <i>Develop improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of marine turtles, including the use of</i></p>		

WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	All FAD-directed purse seine fisheries should rapidly change to only use ecological FADs <sup>1</sup> based on the principles outlined in Annex III of Resolution 13/08 <i>Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species.</i>		<i>biodegradable materials</i> All FAD-directed purse seine fisheries should rapidly change to only use ecological FADs <sup>2</sup> based on the principles outlined in Annex III of Resolution 13/08 <i>Procedures on a fish aggregating devices (FADs) management plan, including more detailed specification of catch reporting from FAD sets, and the development of improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of non-target species.</i>		
WPEB09.21 (para.207)	<b>Marine mammals</b> <b>Review of Resolution 00/02 On a survey of predation of longline caught fish</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the requirements contained in Resolution 00/02 on a survey of predation of longline caught fish was completed by the WPEB and SC in past years, the WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 00/02 be revoked by the Commission.	SC16.25 (para. 54)	<b>Review of Resolution 00/02 On a survey of predation of longline caught fish</b> <b>NOTING</b> that the requirements contained in Resolution 00/02 on a survey of predation of longline caught fish was completed by the WPEB and SC in past year's, the SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that Resolution 00/02 be revoked by the Commission.	Yes	Revoked. Effective 8 October 2014.
WPEB09.22 (para.213)	<b>Development of technical advice for marine mammals</b> The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that depredation events be incorporated into Resolution 13/03 at its next revision, so that interactions may be quantified at a range of spatial scales. Depredation events should also be quantified by the regional observer scheme.	SC16.26 (para. 55)	<b>Development of technical advice for marine mammals</b> The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that depredation events be incorporated into Resolution 13/03 at its next revision, so that interactions may be quantified at a range of spatial scales. Depredation events should also be quantified by the regional observer scheme.	Yes	Not yet incorporated into Res. 13/03
WPEB09.23 (para.250)	<b>Revision of the WPEB work plan</b> The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that a small working group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat further develop the draft Shark Year Program (SharkYP) and to present the proposal at the next SC meeting to be held in December 2013. The overall objective is to: “The Shark Year Program (SharkYP) represents a further step to align with the work of the WPEB with IOTC Conservation and Management Measures (CMMs), particularly to the recently adopted Resolution 13/06 on a scientific and management framework on the conservation of shark species caught	SC16.33 (para. 74)	<b>Shark Year (multi-year research) Program</b> The SC <b>ENDORSED</b> the Indian Ocean Shark Year Program (multi-year research initiative) provided at Appendix I of paper IOTC-2013-SC16-18 and <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that a detailed multi-year shark research program be prepared (by a small group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat) covering the various aspects raised in paper IOTC-2013-SC16-18. The IOTC budget for 2014 should include funding support to allow the small group of shark experts and the IOTC Secretariat to attend a short ad-hoc meeting (Table 10).	Yes	The Commission budgeted US\$10,000 ofr this project.  <i>Update: workshop held. See paper IOTC-2014-IO-ShYP01-R</i>

<sup>1</sup> This terms means improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of bycatch species, using biodegradable material as much as possible.

<sup>2</sup> This terms means improved FAD designs to reduce the incidence of entanglement of bycatch species, using biodegradable material as much as possible.



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<p><i>in association with IOTC managed fisheries.</i> Moreover, the SharkYP aims to provide guidance to WPEB researchers, by prioritising issues related to data collection and research on species biology/ecology, fisheries and mitigation measures. Finally, by promoting cooperation and coordination among WPEB researchers, the SharkYP aims to improve the quality of the scientific advice on sharks provided to the Commission, and to better assess the impact on these species of the current CMMs.”</p>				
WPEB09.24 (para.252)	<p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC consider and endorse the workplan and assessment schedule for the WPEB for 2014, and tentatively for future years, as provided at <a href="#">Appendix XIX</a> and <a href="#">Appendix XX</a>, respectively.</p>	SC16 (para. 193)	<p><b>Revision of the WPB workplan</b> The SC <b>NOTED</b> the proposed work plans and priorities of each of the Working Parties and <b>AGREED</b> to the revised work plans as outlined in Appendix XXXIV. 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>	N/A	<p><i>Update: To be discussed at WPEB10</i></p>
WPEB09.25 (para.253)	<p><b>Format of future WPEB Sessions</b> The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WPEB <b>DISCUSSED</b> the future format in order to focus the efforts of scientists working on different groups of bycatch species to address more efficiently, the mandate of the group.</li> <li>• The WPEB <b>CONSIDERED</b> a range of options which the SC is asked to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Option 1:</b> The current WPEB be split into two; A dedicated Working Party on Sharks (WPS) and a Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch (WPEB).</li> <li>○ <b>Option 2:</b> Retaining the WPEB in its current form, with alternating focus of sharks in one year, followed by other ecosystem and bycatch issues in the next year.</li> <li>○ <b>Option 3:</b> Maintaining the WPEB with clear guidelines to deal with sharks every year, as well as other issues and bycatch groups in</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	–	<b>NOTED</b> by the SC	N/A	–



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<p>alternate years or as required.</p> <p>The WPEB <b>AGREED</b> that shark issues were important to address on a yearly basis.</p>				
WPEB09.26 (para.257)	<p><b>Development of priorities for an Invited Expert/s at the next Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch meeting</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that two Invited Experts be brought to the WPEB in 2014 so as to further increase the capacity of the WPEB to undertake work on sharks at the next meeting, and for this to be included in the IOTC budget for 2014.</p>	SC16.28 (para. 60)	<p><b>Invited Expert/s at the next Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch meeting</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that two Invited Experts be brought to the WPEB in 2014 so as to further increase the capacity of the WPEB to undertake work on sharks at the next meeting, and for this to be included in the IOTC budget for 2014.</p>	Yes	<p>The Commission budgeted US\$23,500 for Invited Experts to attend WP meetings in 2014, including the costs for 2 experts to attend the WPEB.</p> <p><i>Update: 1 Invited Expert was funded by the IOTC Secretariat.</i></p>
WPEB09.27 (para.263)	<p><b>Election of a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for the next biennium</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the SC note the new Chairperson, Dr. Rui Coelho (EU,Portugal) and Vice-Chairperson, Dr. Evgeny Romanov (La Réunion), of the WPEB for the next biennium.</p>	SC16.73 (para. 210)	<p><b>Election of a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson for the next biennium</b></p> <p>The SC <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Commission note the re-election of Dr Tom Nishida (Japan) as Chairperson, and Mr Jan Robinson (Seychelles) as Vice-Chairperson of the SC for the next biennium, <i>as well as the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of each of the Working Parties</i> as provided in Appendix VII.</p>	Yes	N/A
WPEB09.28 (para.265)	<p><b>Report of the Ninth Session of the Working Party on Ecosystems and Bycatch</b></p> <p>The WPEB <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that the Scientific Committee consider the consolidated set of recommendations arising from WPEB09, provided at <a href="#">Appendix XXI</a>, as well as the management advice provided in the draft resource stock status summary for each of the seven shark species, as well of those for marine turtles and seabirds:</p> <p><b>Sharks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Blue sharks (<i>Prionace glauca</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix X</a></li> <li>○ Oceanic whitetip sharks (<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XI</a></li> <li>○ Scalloped hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XII</a></li> <li>○ Shortfin mako sharks (<i>Isurus oxyrinchus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIII</a></li> <li>○ Silky sharks (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XIV</a></li> <li>○ Bigeye thresher sharks (<i>Alopias superciliosus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XV</a></li> </ul>	–	<b>NOTED</b>	N/A	–



WPEB09 Rec. No.		SC16 Rec. No.	Recommendation adopted by the SC16	Endorsed at S18	Commission response / suggestions for consideration at WPEB10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Pelagic thresher sharks (<i>Alopias pelagicus</i>) – <a href="#">Appendix XVI</a></li></ul> <p><b>Other species/groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Marine turtles – <a href="#">Appendix XVII</a></li><li>○ Seabirds – <a href="#">Appendix XVIII</a></li></ul>				