

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California, USA  
24-30 August 2018

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

AGENDA

	Documents
1. Opening of the agenda	
2. Adoption of the agenda	
3. General presentation of proposals submitted by Members on resolutions and others	
4. a. The fishery in 2017 and status of the tuna and billfish stocks	<a href="#">IATTC-93-01</a>
b. Review of the Commission staff's research	<a href="#">SAC-09-02a</a> <a href="#">SAC-09-14</a>
c. Report and recommendations of the 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee	<a href="#">IATTC-93-03</a>
d. Conservation recommendations by the Commission staff	<a href="#">IATTC-93-04</a>
e. Report of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> joint meeting IATTC-WCPFC NC	
5. Reports of subsidiary bodies and working groups:	
a. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on FADs	
b. 6 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee on Administration and Finance	
c. 9 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee for the Review of Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission	
d. 20 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity	
d.(i) Report by the consultant hired to develop a pragmatic proposal to address the management of capacity in the EPO	
e. 8 <sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Working Group on Bycatch	
6. Observer program for transshipments at sea	<a href="#">CAF-06-03</a>
7. Implementation of Resolution <a href="#">C-14-02</a> (amended) on the establishment of a vessel monitoring system (VMS):	
1. Progress reports by CPCs	
2. Possible development of a stand-alone IATTC VMS scheme	
8. Discussion of resolutions and recommendations	
9. Action Plan for the implementation of the Performance Review recommendations (continued) and Strategic Plan	
10. Election of Chair and Deputy Chair	
11. Election of Chairs of subsidiary bodies and working groups	
12. Other business	
13. Place and date of next meeting	
14. Adjournment	

## APPENDICES

---

1	List of attendees	
<hr/>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>RESOLUTIONS</b>	
2a	Measures for the conservation and management of Pacific bluefin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean (2019 and 2020)	<a href="#">C-18-01</a>
2b	Amendment to Resolution C-16-08 on a long-term management framework for the conservation and management of Pacific bluefin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean	<a href="#">C-18-02</a>
2c	Amendment to Resolution C-13-03 supplementing Resolution C-05-02 on North Pacific albacore	<a href="#">C-18-03</a>
2d	Financing for fiscal year 2019	<a href="#">C-18-04</a>
2c	Amendment of Resolution C-16-01 on the collection and analyses of data on fish-aggregating devices	<a href="#">C-18-05</a>
2e	Resolution (amended) on a Regional Vessel Register	<a href="#">C-18-06</a>
2f	Resolution on improving observer safety at sea: emergency action plan	<a href="#">C-18-07</a>
<hr/>		
<b>3.</b>	<b>PROPOSALS [Not adopted]</b>	
3a	A-1 <b>European Union.</b> Amendment to C-03-05 on data provision	
3b	C-1 <b>European Union.</b> Conservation of sharks in the IATTC convention area	
3c	D-1 <b>European Union.</b> Port State measures	
3d	E-1 <b>European Union.</b> Marine pollution	
3e	F-2 <b>Mexico.</b> Amendment to C-11-08 on observers on longliners	
3f	G-3 <b>Mexico and Colombia.</b> Confidentiality	
3g	H-1A <b>Colombia.</b> Amendment to C-17-02 on conservation measures	
3h	I-1 <b>Colombia.</b> Working Group on juvenile tunas	
3i	K-1A <b>United States.</b> Sea turtles	
3j	A1A <b>United States.</b> Observer safety at sea (equipment) (MOP 37).	
<hr/>		
<b>4</b>	<b>REPORTS</b>	
4a	Report of the 6 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee on Administration and Finance	
4b	Report of the 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission (“Review Committee”)	
4c	Report of the 20 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity	
4d	Report of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on FADs	
4e	Report of the 8 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the Working Group on Bycatch (May 2018)	
<hr/>		
<b>5</b>	<b>OTHERS</b>	
5a	Bolivia statement on its fleet capacity	

The 93<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) was held in San Diego, California, USA, on 24-30 August 2018. The attendees are listed in Appendix 1.

### 1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened by the Chair of the IATTC, Mr. Carlos Marín, of Guatemala. In accordance with rule 10 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure, Mrs. Tania Norori, of Nicaragua, was elected rapporteur.

### 2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted, with the addition of the following items:

- Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> joint meeting IATTC-WCPFC NC (item 4.e)
- Report by the consultant hired to develop a pragmatic proposal to address the management of

capacity in the EPO (item 5.d.i)

- 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Working Group on Bycatch (item 5.e)
- Action Plan for the implementation of the Performance Review recommendations (continued) and Strategic Plan (item 9)
- Election of Chair and Deputy Chair (item 10)

In relation to item 1, "Other business", note was taken of the intention of the following Members to address some specific issues: Mexico: the situation of vessels that fish in the western Pacific and eastern Pacific without allegedly observing a closure; Bolivia: Bolivian fishing capacity in the EPO; Venezuela: the change of the closure period of a Venezuelan vessel.

It was agreed that, subsequent to the adoption of the agenda, the status of payments by Members would be reviewed in order to identify who lose the right to vote, as established in paragraph 4 of Article XV of the Antigua Convention on contributions.

When reviewing this item, the Commission noted that two countries, Colombia and Panama, are two years behind on their contributions.

The European Union recalled that, in accordance with Article XV, paragraph 4, of the Antigua Convention, countries in arrears in the payment of their contributions by an amount equal to or greater than the total of the contributions due for two years automatically lose their right to participate in decision-making, and that this provision should be applied at this IATTC meeting. Ecuador mentioned that the Secretariat should remind the Commission, at the beginning of meetings, about the countries that lose their right to vote according to the aforementioned provision in order to avoid lengthy discussions.

Panama mentioned that agreement had been reached at the previous meeting that it would make annual payments to cover the outstanding balance, including their annual contributions, which they have complied with and should, therefore, be granted equal participation in decision-making. Nicaragua supported this position and pointed out that if this matter were to be raised again at the time of making a decision, it would be reminding said commitment so that Panama could participate in decision-making since the agreement of the previous meeting was not only for one year but for the current and future years. The item was left open since some Members, such as the European Union, recognized the validity of the agreed payment arrangements, but not the participation of Members in arrears in the decision-making process.

### **3. General presentation of proposals submitted by Members on resolutions and others**

Members that had submitted resolution proposals were given the opportunity to present them in a general manner, thus enabling the process of discussion and negotiation of the proposals to commence without delay, before their consideration under item 8 of the agenda. It was recalled that these proposals were uploaded to the IATTC website: [Resolution Proposals 2018](#).

#### **4. a. The fishery in 2017 and status of the tuna and billfish stocks**

The IATTC Director, Dr. Guillermo Compeán, presented Document [IATTC-93-01](#), "*The fishery in 2017 and status of the tuna and billfish stocks*." He mentioned that he would be in charge of describing the status of the fishery in 2017 and that the Coordinator of Scientific Research, Dr. Alexandre Aires-da-Silva, would describe the status of the tuna and billfish stocks.

He reported that, in the EPO, the 2017 yellowfin tuna catches of 212,000 t were lower than the average of the previous five-year period (239,000 t). The preliminary estimate of retained skipjack catch in 2017, 326,000 t, was 28% higher than the 2002-2016 average, and 3% lower than the record catch of 2016. The average annual retained purse-seine catch of bigeye in the EPO was about 5,000 t before the increase in the use of FADs; in 1994, it reached 35,000 t, and in 1996, more than 60,000 t. Since then, it has fluctuated between 44,000 and 95,000 t. The preliminary estimate of retained catch in the EPO in 2017 is 66,000 t.

During 1988-2017, the annual retained catch of bluefin tuna in the EPO by purse-seine vessels averaged 4,800 t; the preliminary estimate for 2017 is 4,100 t.

Mexico commented that it is concerned that the average size of yellowfin and bigeye tunas continues to decline and sets on floating objects have increased exponentially surpassing dolphin sets, thereby increasing the catch of juvenile tunas. Mexico also pointed out that it has already closed the 2018 bluefin tuna fishery and understands that the United States did the same, leaving only sport fishing open. Mexico also noted that it had provided size data that it would like to see presented in the future.

Japan expressed concern about the constantly increasing number of FAD setting in purse seine fishery in the eastern Pacific and noted that this has affected the catch of bigeye, so it should be considered and analyzed. Nicaragua pointed out that there is a marked tendency toward the introduction of new fishing technologies, as was the case with FADs in 1993, which should be reflected upon and included in future presentations in order to make the necessary efforts so that new technologies do not affect resource sustainability.

Dr. Aires-da-Silva presented the status of the tuna and billfish stocks. Regarding tropical tunas, he mentioned that for yellowfin tuna in the EPO, the assessment indicates that the recent fishing mortality ( $F$ ) is slightly below the level corresponding to the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) ( $F$  multiplier = 0.99), and it is estimated that the current spawning biomass ( $S$ ) is below that level. However, the recent biomass ( $B$ ) of fish aged 3 quarters or more is greater than that corresponding to the MSY ( $B_{\text{recent}}/B_{\text{MSY}} = 1.30$ ), due to recent high recruitments.

Historically, both dolphin-associated and unassociated purse-seine fisheries have the greatest impact on the spawning biomass of yellowfin, followed by floating-object fisheries. In more recent years, the impact of floating-object fisheries has been greater than that of unassociated fisheries.

Regarding bigeye tuna in the EPO, the fishery has gone through significant changes in recent decades. Initially, most of the bigeye catch was taken by longline vessels. With the expansion of FAD fisheries since 1993, the purse-seine fishery has been a growing factor in the bigeye catch.

All the indicators, except catch, show strong trends over time, indicating increasing fishing mortality and reduced abundance, and are at, or above, their reference levels. The increasing number of sets and the decreasing mean weight of the fish in the catch suggest that the bigeye stock in the EPO is under increasing fishing pressure, and measures additional to the current seasonal closures, such as limits on the number of floating-object sets, are required. The number of sets on floating objects, per day and per vessel, is increasing, and may be due to the increased efficiency of vessels in finding FADs with tuna, due in turn to both the greater number of FADs deployed and the increased use of satellite-linked buoys equipped with fish-detecting sonar, and further investigation into this phenomenon should be conducted.

Regarding skipjack tuna in the EPO, the data- and model-based indicators have not yet detected any clear adverse impact of fishing. However, the average weight has fallen to levels seen at the beginning of the 1980s and was below its lower reference point in 2015 and 2016 but increased slightly above that level in 2017. This can be a result of overfishing but could also be caused by the fact that recent recruitments have been greater than the previous ones, or by the expansion of the fishery to areas occupied by smaller skipjack. A conventional assessment of skipjack is necessary to determine the status of the stock, but, as noted above, this is not possible without much more extensive tagging data. Implementing the large-scale tagging program in the EPO proposed in the Strategic Science Plan for 2019-2023 is therefore critical.

Nicaragua asked about the percentage of FAD sets made by vessels with DMLs. It also asked what the basis was for the possible recommendation to increase the closure by 35 days, which they could not support this year.

Ecuador emphasized that the assessment model has many uncertainties and criticized the issuance of recommendations to establish limits for fishing on floating objects. Ecuador also stated that the increase in the fishing mortality caused by the purse-seine fleet is not only due to FAD sets but also to dolphin sets and there are no limit recommendations for such fishery. Ecuador also mentioned a study contracted by the

World Bank which indicates that more than 50% of the catch of juveniles comes from dolphin sets and added that, if there were limits of sets on FADs, a race for their use could be encouraged. Likewise, more information from the EPO longline fleet and work with the WCPFC are necessary to have a Pacific-wide bigeye assessment. Ecuador suggested waiting for the results of the implementation of Resolution C-17-02, which involves applying measures until 2020, and then defining, within the framework of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), whether the application of other measures is required.

Mexico mentioned that it is concerned about the increase in floating-object sets and its effect on the MSY, so it is necessary to think about limiting sets on FADs and curbing their growth, which has been increasing exponentially for years. Closures have not proved sufficient to improve the size of tuna stocks. Mexico clarified that it is not a question of reducing the number of sets on FADs, but of avoiding their increase. Regarding the suggestion that there is high mortality of juvenile tunas in dolphin sets, it pointed out that, after decades of data in the IATTC, it is the first time that an argument of this nature has been heard, so the aforementioned study is not trusty and should be subject to a thorough review to concede it some validity.

Dr. Aires-da-Silva mentioned that there are uncertainties in all assessments and that there is a work plan to improve them and reduce those uncertainties. The IATTC scientific staff is working on improving assessment models and the bigeye model is expected to improve with the introduction of spatial elements; an improved model is expected by 2020. He clarified that in the dolphin-associated fishery, according to decade-long data, there has been no evidence of significant catches of small tunas; furthermore, this fishery is associated with yellowfin tuna, not bigeye, as is the case with the FAD fishery.

Venezuela mentioned that, at a previous meeting, it was identified that a small group of vessels catches small juvenile tunas, according to two-year data; therefore, those vessels should be subject to review and specific application of measures to reduce juvenile catches. It is understood that there are uncertainties in the assessment model, but it is clear that juvenile catches have increased and that sets on FADs should be reduced.

Costa Rica asked about the level of uncertainty of the assessment models as well as about the experiences in other RFMOs with limiting sets on FADs. Several delegations noted that there are many interesting precedents, such as the application of a 90-day closure for the use of FADs in the WCPFC, as well as discussions and meetings held specially for reviewing this matter.

Colombia requested that the recommendations from the scientific staff be circulated well in advance of the meeting and also reiterated its position, already presented at the SAC, in terms of limiting the number of FAD sets. Colombia expressed its support for this measure as there is enough information to do so. Additionally it recalled that the precautionary principle is enshrined in the Antigua Convention and, therefore,] it is not necessary to have absolutely all the scientific evidence to take conservation measures. The limits do not necessarily have to be global, but they could be applied by country or by vessel in order to avoid the alleged race to fish, not to mention the possibility of considering other alternatives to address the juvenile issue such as the establishment of an *ad hoc* working group. Colombia added that there are no arguments or information that indicate that sets on dolphins should be limited. Panama pointed out that limiting the number of FADs should not be considered, but rather the quantity of fish that could be caught with that gear since vessel captains target FADs that aggregate a greater volume of fish. Therefore, a limit on the number of sets would only result in a more selective activity that would consist in setting only on the FADs with the most tunas.

Japan voiced its concern about the uncertainties of the assessment models, as well as the increase in sets on floating objects and juvenile catches, because of the repercussions this has on its own longline fishery. Japan recalled that its scientists work with the IATTC staff by providing operational level data on the country's longline fishery; this collaboration will continue in the future to improve stock assessments. Korea and Chinese Taipei also offered their support and the collaboration of their scientists for this purpose.

The European Union agreed that tuna stock assessments should be improved and that, to accomplish this, an appropriate tuna tagging system should be in place. In this regard, it hopes to be able to provide financial

support to conduct the tagging work and that other delegations will be able to support this work since it is a priority for the IATTC.

The European Union referred to the discussion on juvenile catches and recalled that many blame FADs, however, all fisheries contribute in different proportions to the fishing effort by increasing fishing mortality. Also, all purse-seine fleets make sets on FADs, as shown in the information presented by the Secretariat. The European Union emphasized that the way in which the limits are allocated among fleets and countries will require a clear definition, but a combination of number of sets and number of FADs could be considered.

The United States noted that, for the moment, the provisions of Resolution C-17-02 should continue to be complied with and that the SAC should continue working in order to be able to define the possibility of applying limits to any type of set in the future, while keeping in mind that there are difficulties that must be considered, such as how to verify compliance with possible limits, how they would be allocated, and that limiting sets on FADs would imply more DML requests with greater pressure on dolphin populations. Ecuador also stated that the measures adopted in the resolution should be maintained because there is not enough scientific information on the subject to adopt different measures.

Dr. Aires-da-Silva pointed out that it is important to have the best information on the operation of the long-line fleet, particularly regarding mortality and distribution, so he thanked the expressions of support and collaboration. He also stressed the need for financial resources to carry out the tuna tagging. Dr. Alexandre Aires-da-Silva mentioned that, although the relationship between the use of FADs and juvenile catches is not entirely clear, it is evident that such a relationship exists and that this type of fishing has increased. He also clarified that work should be conducted to specify the relationship between sets on floating objects and unassociated sets to protect skipjack stocks.

Dr. Aires-da-Silva then gave a presentation on the status of the stocks of temperate tunas: bluefin and albacore. Regarding Pacific bluefin tuna, he recalled that the Pacific Bluefin Working Group of the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC) carried out an updated stock assessment in 2018. The base-case model results show that: (1) spawning stock biomass (SSB) fluctuated throughout the assessment period, (2) the SSB declined steadily from 1996 to 2010; and (3) the stock has been increasing slowly since 2010. The low recruitment levels estimated in 2010-2014 were a concern in the 2016 assessment. The 2018 assessment estimate of the 2015 recruitment is low, and similar to estimates from previous years, while the 2016 recruitment estimate is higher than the historical average.

Regarding North Pacific albacore, the Albacore Working Group (ALBWG) of the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC), at a workshop held in April 2017, concluded that the stock is likely not overfished, based on several potential reference points. The Working Group concluded that the North Pacific albacore tuna stock is healthy, and that current productivity is sufficient to maintain recent fishing mortality levels, assuming average historical recruitment in both the short and long term.

Mexico commented that, regarding bluefin tuna, after several years of low recruitments a higher one occurred in 2016, which is promising and points toward the accomplishment of the first goal set in the work of both commissions. Mexico's proposal is to maintain the current catch limits for bluefin since they have demonstrated good results in view of the improvement in recruitment levels.

Japan expressed its support for the measures recommended by the IATTC staff for bluefin tuna and announced that a joint meeting of the two organizations will be held in Fukuoka, Japan, in August 2019, to reach agreements on conservation measures for this species and invited all interested IATTC Members to participate.

The United States agreed with the recommendation of maintaining the current management measures; it recalled that its own proposals consider maintaining the current limits established in the previous period. The European Union stressed that the species is decimated, and that the precautionary approach should be applied for its management and current limits should not be increased.

Several delegations recommended that these joint meetings be held alternately, in both the eastern Pacific at the IATTC headquarters and in the western Pacific. The Secretariat also recommended that a representative of the IATTC participate in these meetings. Mexico suggested that Dr. Aires-da-Silva would be the best person to do so.

#### **4b. Review of the Commission staff's research**

Dr. Aires-da-Silva presented Document [SAC-09-02a](#), which was presented during the ninth meeting of the SAC and refers to the Commission staff's activities and research work plan. He recalled that, during the eight SAC meeting, held in May 2017, the Committee recommended that: *"the scientific staff prepare a strategic science plan for the 2018-2022 period, which includes clear objectives, specific priorities, strategies, actions, responsibilities, and resources, including a tentative budget."*

In accordance with the recommendation mentioned above, the scientific staff developed a research plan for 2019-2023, which contains 7 main areas:

1. Data collection
2. Life history studies for scientific support of management
3. Sustainable fisheries
4. Ecological impacts of fisheries: assessment and mitigation
5. Interactions among the environment, the ecosystem, and fisheries
6. Knowledge transfer and capacity building
7. Scientific excellence

Mr. Jon López, of the IATTC scientific staff, presented the work plan on FADs to be carried out in the following months.

The European Union appreciated the presentation of the research plan, the development of which it had requested, and recalled that having this tool allows estimating the necessary financial resources and other types of possible support. It mentioned that the plan can still be polished since, for example, some objectives are not objectives as such, but the means to achieve them. It also mentioned that some strategic objectives must be reformulated and that progress in the implementation of the plan must be quantified. The European Union reported that it allocated €700,000 and €900,000 for next year to support scientific activities. An issue of its particular interest is the protection of sharks, as it has not been possible to prove or know whether the current measures adopted by the Commission have yielded positive results. It is also in the European Union's interest to strengthen bigeye tuna assessments, particularly through the tagging program.

The United States highlighted the need for the activities mentioned in the plan to be classified in order of priority and thanked the offers of financial support made by other CPCs. The United States joined in the interest expressed in bigeye tuna assessments and noted that it would look into the possibility of providing funding for unfunded projects.

Ecuador asked if the Secretariat or the SAC had considered the possibility of reviewing the Strategic Science Plan through a workshop involving all CPCs. It mentioned that the draft plan attached great importance to conducting research on bigeye tuna, but it is also necessary to do so with yellowfin tuna. Ecuador also suggested that work should be carried out in the development of non-entangling FADs and expressed that at least one strategic planning expert could be invited to the proposed workshop.

Colombia noted that the document presented by the Secretariat may remain open to receive comments from the Commission. It stated that it is necessary to prioritize the activities in order to give due consideration to the budget. Colombia recalled that, at the SAC meeting, it had already expressed the need for increasing efforts in terms of research on the floating-object fishery and its effects on the juvenile tuna fishery, as well

as reviewing the issue of fleet capacity in the EPO, particularly the fleets that fish on floating objects. Colombia stressed that it did not consider that a workshop to review the strategic science plan was necessary, which was supported by the European Union.

El Salvador mentioned that it is not possible to deal with a separate strategic science plan, but that a plan for the entire Commission as a whole should be considered, that is, a plan where all activities are included: scientific, operational, procedural, political, etc. As for the goals, El Salvador emphasized that they should be quantifiable.

China stressed the importance of tuna stock assessments and that work should be conducted jointly in peer meetings with the WCPFC, which should be established in the plan. It suggested that southern albacore tuna be also included in the research plan.

Costa Rica highlighted the importance of working with sharks, which implies the need to seek funding sources since the corresponding research activities were marked as "unfunded". Nicaragua, due to the necessity of control and the investments in this fishing gear, insisted that the floating-object fishery should be studied as a priority since experience has shown that closures are not sufficient for the recovery of the resource and additional measures will likely be required for that fishery, in addition to continuing the activities to improve the dialogue between scientists and managers.

Mexico emphasized that the dolphin stock assessment matter was not in the document and that this should be a priority in the Commission's research work, with the need to provide resources for that purpose that do not come exclusively from the AIDCP. Chile, for its part, mentioned the importance and its interest in having assessments carried out on southern swordfish since there are no recent assessments.

The Secretariat recalled that the development process of the Strategic Science Plan was fully inclusive as input was requested from all CPCs and the plan included the suggestions or comments received. However, it is a working document subject to review and inclusion of all relevant inputs.

The representatives of the NGOs Defenders of Wildlife and PEW appreciated the inclusion of silky sharks in the plan and suggested considering the inclusion of other species that are decimated and require conservation measures.

Finally, Dr. Cornelia S. Oedekoven (Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling, University of St Andrews, United Kingdom), who was hired to conduct the design of a survey for eastern tropical Pacific dolphin stocks, presented the progress in the study design described in document [MOP-37-02](#). She mentioned that two distinct objectives are considered for the stock assessment: 1) relative abundance estimates that are comparable with past NMFS surveys, and 2) absolute abundance estimates of priority stocks. The survey would involve the use of drones.

Mexico expressed its great interest in conducting the study, which falls within the principles and rules of the Antigua Convention, and therefore concerns both the IATTC and the AIDCP. Mexico reported that it intended to support the project, possibly through two Mexican research vessels, which would represent a contribution of around five million US dollars from the government and the industry.

In response to a question from Ecuador about whether the proposal is at the same level as the one conducted in 2006 by NMFS and its interest in maintaining the same standard, Dr. Oedekoven stated that the abundance estimation work would be comparable to that carried out in past surveys: there would be six observers per vessel and drones would be used, as well as the same data-collection software and the same procedures. Mexico added that with the use of drones, which travel faster than a vessel, dolphin herds can be sighted, photographed and estimated beyond what can be achieved with observers using binoculars; therefore, it considers that this work will surpass those carried out in the past. Mexico also commented that previous surveys were biased downward since the difficulty of observing school sizes very possibly implied lower estimates of dolphins than the actual quantities.

The United States, in addition to recalling that there are several IATTC Members that are not Parties to the AIDCP, indicated its interest in holding a discussion on the role of both institutions in relation to the budgetary issues raised in the debate. Regarding the survey project, it stated that more than one vessel would be needed to obtain robust information.

The Director reiterated that the project is still not fully funded. He indicated that it had been presented within the framework of this meeting of the IATTC since it provides the Secretariat of the AIDCP as well as the necessary participation of the scientific staff in the design and execution of the project.

#### **4.c Report and recommendations of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee**

The Director reported on the 9<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting held in May 2018 in La Jolla, California. He noted that the SAC endorsed the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on FADs and the Working Group on Bycatch, and adopted a series of recommendations (see Document [IATTC-93-03 Recommendations of the 9<sup>th</sup> Scientific Advisory Committee Meeting](#)).

Nicaragua took the opportunity of the presentation to request the Secretariat to report on the issue of FAD data provision. The Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on FADs presented the corresponding recommendations that were adopted by the Group, which led to an extensive discussion on the provision of high-resolution data. Ecuador expressed its disagreement with this recommendation. El Salvador stated that it did not consider the provision of such data relevant and asked the scientific staff for clarity and guidelines on how they would be used. The scientific staff gave an additional presentation explaining the reasons for the need for the provision of high-resolution data. Colombia, Nicaragua and Mexico stressed the importance of providing this information to the Secretariat for scientific purposes to better manage the fishery and requested the CPCs that have not yet provided the information to do so. Colombia also stated that pursuant to paragraph 12 of Resolution C-17-02, the scientific staff and the Group are responsible for establishing guidance on the notification of FAD data. Therefore, the recommendation to send raw data, which was adopted by the Group and endorsed by the SAC, must be implemented by all Members in a mandatory manner.

Colombia mentioned that, as with previous SAC reports, the reports of the Working Group on FADs and the Working Group on Bycatch should be included in the SAC report.

In response to a question from Ecuador regarding the funding source for the extension of the electronic monitoring pilot project to vessels of all capacity classes, in accordance with recommendation 7 of the SAC, it was clarified that the necessary resources were still being sought and that contributions from Members would be important.

#### **4.d Conservation recommendations by the Commission staff**

Dr. Alexandre Aires-da-Silva presented Document [IATTC-93-04 Conservation Recommendations by the Commission Staff](#). He highlighted the following recommendations:

- Maintain the provisions of the current resolution on tuna conservation (C-17-02).
- For the purse-seine fishery, limit the total annual number of floating-object and unassociated sets combined by Class-6 vessels in 2019 and 2020 to 15,723. Once the limit is reached, only dolphin-associated sets will be allowed during the rest of that year, and all vessels without a Dolphin Mortality Limit must return to port.
- For bluefin tuna, maintain the measures of the current resolution (C-16-08).
- For North Pacific albacore tuna, resolutions C-05-02 and C-13-03 should be continued.
- Establish an observer program for purse-seine vessels of less than 363 t carrying capacity. The recommended level of sampling coverage is 20%.
- Achieve at least 20% observer coverage of longline vessels over 20 m length overall.

Regarding the recommendation of limiting the number of floating-object sets, Ecuador reiterated that there was not enough scientific evidence to support it. Ecuador used its speech to request that the issue of the costs related to the establishment of an IATTC office in Costa Rica be carefully analyzed.

About this last topic, the Secretariat mentioned that the creation of the office in Costa Rica is crucial, particularly for the collection of shark data in Central America. The European Union recalled that the creation and operation of this office had already been approved at a previous meeting and it had been decided to work on a pilot program with the Global Environment Fund (GEF) resources; however, it requested clarification as to the office's functions and costs. Costa Rica, in addition to reaffirming its commitments as host State, highlighted the strategic nature of its location.

Japan, China, Korea, Chinese Taipei and Panama indicated that they could not support the increase in observer coverage on longline vessels to 20% since it is unfeasible due to the costs that such an increase would entail and shortages of observer candidates. For their part, some representatives of observer programs also highlighted safety issues on small vessels as an additional factor that hinders coverage increase. The Secretariat emphasized that the current 5% coverage is very low and not enough for data-collection purposes. Mexico recalled its proposal for a resolution that could solve the cost issue with the gradual use of electronic means of observation. Ecuador shared its experience in this matter by noting that 80% of its longline fleet, vessels under 20 m in length, generate relevant information through its observer program, which faced the difficulties mentioned in the discussion and can serve as an example regarding the implementation of the required percentage. The European Union noted that it could support an increase in the current level of observer coverage of 5%. It took the opportunity to reiterate its particular concern for the conservation of silky sharks which, if not addressed in this IATTC forum, could be addressed in other forums such as CITES with restrictions on international trade, and therefore urged Members to take additional measures for the conservation of this shark species.

In response to a request for clarification by the United States regarding the proposal to collect data on shark species in the observer program for transshipments at sea, it was clarified that the objective is for carrier vessel captains to fill out the transshipment declaration specifying the shark species that are transhipped since currently only overall amounts of sharks are recorded and, in many cases, they do not include catch location. In this regard, it was recalled that, according to the current resolution, captains are responsible for filling out the declaration while observers are responsible for verifying that the data recorded coincide with the information they gather. Therefore, it is required to agree on a mandatory requirement to record shark transshipments by species, which could be easily done by adding a column in the form. The United States proposed that these issues be analyzed by the Working Group on Bycatch.

#### **4e. Report of the 2<sup>nd</sup> joint meeting IATTC-WCPFC NC**

Mr. Gerard DiNardo, former Chair of the ISC and participant in the joint meetings, presented the results of the second joint meeting of the IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group on the Management of Pacific Bluefin Tuna, which was held on 28 August-1 September 2017, in Busan, Korea.

The United States mentioned that it is important for interested CPCs to follow the discussions on the conservation of bluefin tuna in the joint forum and recalled that more information on the results of the Busan meeting can be found on the IATTC website: [IATTC-93 INF B Results of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC working group meeting on the management of Pacific bluefin tuna](#).

Japan mentioned that the stock of this species is recovering since better conditions have been observed since 2010 and that it is feasible for it to be recovered by the target date established. Japan reported that at the meeting in Fukuoka, Japan, in the week following the IATTC meeting, it will present a proposal to increase the current catch limits by 15%.

Mexico indicated that it fully agrees with the holding of joint meetings since it is concerned about the existing discrepancies in the conservation and management measures adopted and applied in both organizations, with those in the central and western Pacific being less rigorous than those in the eastern Pacific. Mexico

mentioned that it will carefully review the proposal that Japan will present at the Fukuoka meeting to increase bluefin catch limits by 15%.

The European Union suggested that these joint meetings be held alternately in the central and western Pacific and in the eastern Pacific, including in La Jolla to allow for greater participation by IATTC Members. The European Union that it would be attending the Fukuoka meeting with the intention of discussing in more detail the assessment and recovery plans for Pacific bluefin tuna.

## **5. Reports of subsidiary bodies and working groups:**

### **a. 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on FADs**

Dr. Josu Santiago, Chair of the Working Group, presented his report (Appendix 4d). He recalled that the second part of the third meeting was held in the previous week, and the first part in May, on the occasion of the SAC meeting. In this meeting, 13 recommendations were identified and sent to the SAC for consideration; they were approved and published on the IATTC website as Document [FAD-03 INF-B Recommendations to the SAC Adopted by the FADs WG](#), May 2018.

Likewise, during the second part of the third meeting of the Working Group, two recommendations were prepared for the Commission, requesting that:

1. Consider the set of terms listed in Annex 1 of Document [FAD-03 Recommendations to the Commission](#) as interim draft definitions related to FAD fishing operations.
2. Assign the following tasks as priority matters for the intersessional period before the 2019 Commission meeting:
  - Capacity-building [C-16-01 and C-17-02]
  - Data gaps – improvement of data collection related to C-16-01 and C-17-02
  - Definitions
  - Indicators of FAD fishing
  - Follow the research activities related to FAD fisheries
  - Participate in the joint t-RFMO FAD working group
  - Develop an appropriate confidentiality framework

Echoing the discussion undertaken during the consideration of the previous item, several delegations highlighted the fact that two Members (Ecuador and El Salvador) rejected the commitment to provide information on FAD data, as stipulated in Recommendation 7 issued at the first part of the third meeting of the Working Group, which states that “*CPCs shall provide to the IATTC staff the same daily raw buoy data received by original users (i.e. vessels, fishing companies) in line with the research needs defined in the Strategic Science Plan to be adopted by the Commission.*” El Salvador clarified that it was necessary to specify the data that must be submitted so that it could support this recommendation.

The Chair of the Working Group recalled that guidelines for the provision of information had been developed and published; however, specifying the requested information would not be a problem.

### **b. 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee on Administration and Finance**

The Chair of the Committee, Mr. Lillo Maniscalchi, of Venezuela, presented his report (Appendix 4a).

The Committee made the following recommendations:

- 1) Approve a 2019 IATTC budget based on the required amount of US\$ 8,133,837, but considering that other activities could be added such as the acquisition and operation of equipment for observer

safety at sea and the holding of an extraordinary IATTC meeting in October 2018.

- 2) Approve the activities planned for 2018 and 2019 related to the special fund for supporting developing countries, which are listed in paragraph 4b) of the Chair's report.
- 3) The Secretariat prepare a proposal on the allocation of funds to developing countries through the special fund for capacity building and that it be reviewed during the intersessional period.
- 4) Approve a budget for the 2019 transshipment program of US\$ 1,300,000.
- 5) Approve an extraordinary contribution to the 2018 transshipment program budget of US\$ 290,000, due in September.

Several delegations thanked the Chair of the Committee, Mr. Lillo Maniscalchi, for his present and past work, as well as for the detail and clarity of his report.

China asked that the information on its contribution to the IATTC budget be updated, considering the payments it made after the SAC meeting. Costa Rica stated that it was in the process of making the necessary arrangements to pay the outstanding debt.

The Commission approved items 2 to 5 of the Committee's recommendations.

Regarding item 1, several delegations stated that they could not approve increases in the budget, nor could they support the funding of new research projects, so they requested a detailed review of the list of new projects classified as "unfunded". The Commission finally approved a budget of US\$ 8,133,837 for 2019, with contributions per Member as indicated in Resolution C-18-04 (Appendix 2d).

This budget does not include the funding of new projects. However, without reaching a concrete agreement, the option of advancing projects 1 to 8 listed in the following table with the current surplus of the IATTC was considered. For project 5, the possibility of using resources from the special fund for developing countries for the first year of implementation was mentioned.

	<b>Project</b>	<b>Budget (US\$)</b>
1.	Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) for tropical tunas in the EPO	162,000
2.	Relationship between vessel operational characteristics and fishing mortality	223,000
3.	Workshop to advance spatial stock assessments of bigeye tuna in the Pacific Ocean	50,000
4.	Analyses of the effects of fisheries targeting on longline CPUE standardization	23,000
5.	Improving data collection and stock assessments for sharks in the EPO	1,012,000
6.	Evaluation of potential reference points for dorado in the EPO	81,000
7.	Electronic monitoring of purse-seine vessel activities and catches	207,000
8.	Testing the potential of sorting grids for reducing the mortality of small tunas and other species in the purse-seine fishery in the EPO	100,000
9.	Tagging program to improve assessments and scientific advice for management, especially for skipjack	7,286,103

**c. 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee for the Review of Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission ("Review Committee")**

The Chair of the Committee, Mr. David Hogan, of the United States, presented his report (Appendix 4b). He noted that the Committee made the following recommendations:

**A. For the Committee/Secretariat:**

1. To better manage the work of the Committee, review the compliance report initially only for corrections or questions, and conduct the substantive discussions and comments within the CPC review portion of the agenda. CPCs should review and record corrections as soon as possible, with an emphasis on doing

so immediately after the initial circulation of the compliance report.

2. In developing and presenting the compliance report, where there are multiple reporting or compliance requirements within resolutions, the Secretariat should separate compliance reporting for each specific requirement, rather than showing compliance with aggregated requirements (*e.g.*, multiple data reporting requirements).
3. The Secretariat should include the table entitled “Possible infractions in the transshipment program and responses from CPCs” (Table 3.13 in Document COR-09-01) in the summary presentations for future meetings.
4. Consider whether the timing of the compliance reporting procedure in Resolution C-11-07 can be improved or should be changed, as appropriate, in particular to minimize, when possible, the period of time for the Secretariat to initially report possible infractions to flag States, recognizing that it is also important for national observer programs to submit their data to the Secretariat in a timely way and make direct reports to their flag authorities.
5. The Committee should explore whether a verification step should be added in the reporting of possible infractions, similar to the function of the IRP under the AIDCP.
6. The Secretariat should not revise or edit the preliminary observer reports directly given the difficulty this presents to flag States relying on the original form for investigative or adjudicative purposes, but instead, following the Commission’s standard editing protocol and procedures, issue supplemental edits and clarifications in a separate document.
7. In future reporting and follow-up to reported cases of possible non-compliance, CPCs should provide detail on the type and, if financial, the amount of sanctions applied to any cases from the current or prior compliance reports, taking advantage of the opportunity to add attachments to the questionnaire.
8. In the event that cases involving investigations or administrative actions are unresolved at the time the responses to the compliance questionnaire and to the letter from the Secretariat on compliance are due, CPCs should follow up to provide the Secretariat with a written updating the results of the investigations.
9. In future compliance reports, include reporting on the status of the implementation of the Commission’s rules of confidentiality.
10. The Secretariat should continue to produce the compendium document for each meeting to help guide the work of the Committee and, with input from CPCs and in collaboration with the Chair, should develop a format for the compendium to input responses from CPCs, and an appendix to the compendium for tracking of the status of cases from year to year.
11. The Secretariat should modify the format of the Compliance Questionnaire to provide a specific space for CPCs to explain “not applicable” responses.
12. Regarding silky sharks, adapt the compliance record format in the silky sharks section to include an additional classification field or comment section for those sharks that fall into the well directly from the brail. For all sharks, ensure observer report formats include all required data for sharks, and make clear the applicability of the shark requirements by gear type.
13. To ask the Commission staff to identify, during the intersessional period but no later than the 2019 meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), data collection formats, handling and release procedures, and any recommended conservation measures for a specific resolution for the conservation and management of whale sharks, taking into account the identified issues of compliance related to sets on this species as well as discussions of the SAC where information gaps regarding this species have been noted.
14. The Committee should continue to highlight areas where compliance and implementation trends continue to improve.

15. Ensure scheduling of at least 2 full days for the meeting of the Committee.
16. Review and assess implementation of prior Committee recommendations.

**B. Recommendations for the Commission**

1. Examine whether the Commission needs to clarify or state that the purse-seine observer IATTC compliance summary form is preliminary and not definitive, and may be supplemented by additional information from the Secretariat or national programs, and that an incomplete or unclear observer compliance form should not prevent effective execution of flag State responsibilities to investigate and adjudicate compliance cases for each CPC's flag vessels.
2. Clarify the scope of the requirement(s) in the Commission's resolutions for reporting of shark trade data (*e.g.*, do they apply only for sharks harvested in the EPO).
3. Revise the notification guidelines for transits without observers, with a view to establishing deadlines for sending these notifications and confirming their receipt. This task could be carried out with special attention from the *Ad Hoc* Working Group to review the legal and operational coherence of IATTC resolutions.
4. Consider clarifying the implementation of paragraph 1 of Resolution C-16-06 on conservation of sharks (silky sharks) regarding the prohibition of retention on board, transshipment, landing or storage, to clarify the scope of applicability of the prohibition.
5. Delete the Fijian vessel *Xin Shi Jih 16* from the IATTC IUU Vessel List.
6. Renew Cooperating Non-Member status for Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Indonesia and Liberia.
7. Communicate to Kiribati its responsibility to participate in the meetings of the Committee and to submit the required compliance questionnaire.
8. Consider adopting a specific resolution to consolidate and strengthen conservation measures and data collection for whale sharks.

**C. Discussions (not resulting in recommendations)**

1. The Committee discussed the usefulness and possible benefit of encouraging the longline fisheries operating in the EPO to consider joining efforts to strengthen implementation of the current requirements for observer coverage, and to consider electronic monitoring to strengthen the Commission's observer coverage objectives.
2. The Committee discussed the cases that illustrated for some CPCs the need to clarify the implementation of the silky shark resolution, *i.e.*, that it only applies when every effort has not been made to avoid retention.
3. The Committee had a significant discussion about the need for improved implementation of Resolution C-16-01.

The Commission took note of these recommendations. Regarding recommendation 12, several delegations warned about the issue that would arise if the observer had to record whether the shark was transferred directly from the brail to the well, since this would imply defining whether or not it is a possible infraction.

One delegation proposed that, in the future, the progress in recommendation compliance be tracked, similar to the practice already in place in the SAC. Colombia insisted that CPCs be urged to comply with the reporting requirements of Resolution C-16-01 regarding the use of FADs in order to advance the management of the purse-seine fishery on floating objects.

Some delegations commented on the possibility of establishing a pattern of infractions after reviewing the type of infraction with the highest recurrence, as well as vessels that are mostly involved in non-compliance

with IATTC regulations. Also, cases of possible infraction under investigation should be followed up in order to ensure that a conclusion is reached and that the results are reported to the Committee.

The Commission agreed to remove the Fijian vessel *Xin Shi Jih 16* from the IUU vessel list, after listening to the country that had initially proposed its inclusion on the list (France), whose representative clarified that the vessel had remained in port for four years and had changed ownership. China requested that the vessel owner be suggested to change the vessel's name to avoid issues already caused by the existence of a vessel with the same name in the Chinese fleet.

Finally, the Commission decided to renew the status of Cooperating Non-Member for Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Indonesia and Liberia.

#### **d. 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity**

The Chair of the Working Group, Mr. Alfonso Miranda, of Peru, presented his report (Appendix 4c). He noted as a possible recommendation of the Group that an extraordinary meeting of the Commission be held in October, in conjunction with the AIDCP meetings, to consider issues related to fleet capacity, both those related to the fleet capacity management plan and the consultant's report, and the pending cases of claims and requests. He noted that the European Union initially expressed reservations due to the expenses in human and financial resources that this extraordinary meeting would imply. However, due to the number of delegations in favor (Ecuador, Guatemala, Colombia, Nicaragua, Peru, United States, Venezuela, Japan), it is possible that the requirements established in the Antigua Convention for convening it will be met.

After the corresponding progress report was presented, several delegations asked what the next step would be about the study carried out by the consultant, Dr. Squires, aimed at developing a plan for capacity management in the EPO. They asked if a second phase was considered, where a concrete practice is proposed to identify the benefits and costs of a specific scheme for capacity management or reduction. Mexico recalled the particular case of vessels that fish in both areas regulated by the WCPFC and the IATTC, stressing that it is not an issue of non-compliance but one of management. Following the objections expressed by the United States, Nicaragua suggested that this be part of the consultant's analysis in his management proposal. The Director reported that the contract established with Dr. Squires was still in force and that he could request him to present a scheme with values to implement a proposal for capacity management.

Regarding the possibility of holding an extraordinary meeting of the IATTC, as proposed by the Chair of the Working Group, after an intense debate on the pros and cons, and in the absence of consensus, it was decided to carry out an indicative vote, which showed that the majority of CPCs present objected to holding an extraordinary meeting in October 2018.

Finally, Dr. Squires reported that he could have the results of the second part of the requested study by the end of January 2019. Taking into account the need to translate the document for circulation and for the Working Group on Fleet Capacity to analyze it before its presentation to the Commission, as noted by some delegations, it was agreed to hold a workshop to review it prior to the SAC meeting.

#### **e. 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Working Group on Bycatch**

In the absence of the co-chairs of the Working Group, the IATTC Director read the recommendations of the Group, which are included in the report, which is published on the Commission website: [8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Working Group on Bycatch](#).

The United States expressed that, as recommended at the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Group, it was required to hold Group meetings for at least two days, taking into account the large number of issues to be addressed that are of interest and relevance to the work of the Commission as a whole.

#### **6. Observer program for transshipments at sea**

Mr. Ricardo Belmontes, of the Commission staff, noted that the report on the progress of the program and its results had already been presented to the Committee on Administration and Finance (CAF). The CAF

approved the budget for 2019 (US\$ 1,300,000) and an extraordinary quota for 2018 (US\$ 290,000), which was confirmed by the Commission. Mr. Belmontes also reported that the Review Committee considered cases of possible infractions on carrier vessels.

He recalled that the SAC had considered a proposal that the transshipment declaration that is filled out by the vessel captain collect information on transshipped shark species. The delegations of Japan and China noted that they could not support such a recommendation because of the difficulties of asking captains to identify transshipped shark species. The European Union, referring to well-identified species such as the silky shark and the oceanic whitetip shark, for which retention or transshipment is prohibited, stressed the need for their identification. Japan mentioned that this could be discussed at the next meeting to resolve this issue, bearing in mind that it already requires the identification of certain species in the logbooks of its vessels.

The representative of the NGO Defenders of Wildlife noted that she could facilitate this task by providing the Commission with shark identification guides and posters created by the organization.

Referring to the matter of observers at sea and the information that transshipment observers have emergency communication equipment in addition to the existence of an emergency protocol or action plan, the United States recalled the resolution proposals it had presented in both the IATTC and the AIDCP to provide equipment and an emergency plan for observers on purse-seine vessels.

Finally, Mr. Belmontes mentioned that there had been cases in which, due to an emergency (e.g., a major failure in the refrigeration system), a transshipment to another longliner, or from one carrier vessel to another, had been necessary. The Commission took note of this information and there was no objection to following this practice as long as, as in the past, the relevant flag States duly inform the Commission through the Director.

## **7. Implementation of Resolution [C-14-02](#) (amended) on the establishment of a vessel monitoring system (VMS):**

### **a. Progress reports by CPCs**

It was recalled that the reports on the use of VMS submitted by individual CPCs had been posted on the IATTC website: [Vessel Monitoring System](#) (VMS) (Resolution [C-14-02](#)). There was no further discussion on this topic.

### **b. Possible development of a stand-alone IATTC VMS scheme**

Mr. Belmontes, of the Commission staff, referred to Document [IATTC-93-05 Possible Development of a Stand-Alone IATTC VMS Scheme](#), which emphasized, among other things, the consistency of such development with the provisions of the Antigua Convention and the mandate given to the Commission to take measures to promote better compliance with IATTC conservation and management measures. As an example, he noted that there is a program in the ICCAT for monitoring the catch of Atlantic bluefin tuna that could be useful as a reference for the development of an IATTC VMS scheme, particularly considering that costs are not too high.

Some Members, such as the European Union, Japan and the United States said that they welcomed the implementation of a centralized VMS system in the IATTC as this would favor compliance with conservation and management measures and facilitate the collection of important data for research. Japan drew attention to the need to be cautious about costs. China once again stated that the Antigua Convention would first have to be amended so that it could join the consensus due to the inconsistency between this system and the provisions of the Antigua Convention and the provisions of its own domestic law.

Ecuador voiced its concern about the fact that constant, permanent work is required 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, to monitor the VMS signal. It also asked if the scheme would be applied to both purse-seine and longline vessels and mentioned that it was not convinced of the need to have a centralized VMS system in the IATTC at this time. Colombia, after referring to its domestic law regarding the use of VMS, stated

that it needed a more concrete and specific proposal in order to analyze the feasibility of approving the development of a centralized system. For its part, Mexico reported on its satellite monitoring system and indicated that it could send a signal to a mirror computer in the IATTC, which, however, needs to be analyzed carefully because of the cost implications as well as the availability of the other Members to take similar measures.

There were no specific conclusions or agreements that would allow further progress on this agenda item during the Commission meeting.

## 8. Discussion of resolutions and recommendations

### a. Resolutions adopted

The following resolutions were adopted:

Resolution	Subject	Appendix
<a href="#">C-18-01</a>	Measures for the conservation and management of Pacific bluefin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean, 2019 and 2020	2a
<a href="#">C-18-02</a>	Amendment to Resolution C-16-08 on a long-term management framework for the conservation and management of Pacific bluefin tuna in the eastern Pacific Ocean	2b
<a href="#">C-18-03</a>	Amendment to Resolution C-13-03 supplementing Resolution C-05-02 on North Pacific albacore	2c
<a href="#">C-18-04</a>	Financing for fiscal year 2019	2d
<a href="#">C-18-05</a>	Amendment of Resolution C-16-01 on the collection and analyses of data on fish-aggregating devices	2e
<a href="#">C-18-06</a>	Resolution (amended) on a Regional Vessel Register	2f
<a href="#">C-18-07</a>	Resolution on improving observer safety at sea: emergency action plan	2g

### b. Proposals submitted but not approved:

The outcomes at the end of the presentation of these proposals were as follows:

Prop.	Subject	
C-1 EU	Conservation of sharks in the IATTC convention area	<p>Several delegations supported this proposal which establishes, among other things, the requirement to not separate the fins from the carcass until landing. Other delegations objected, pointing out that the fins and the carcass of the shark have different destinations, so they must be separated on board. They also noted that the WCPFC did not adopt a similar requirement.</p> <p>The European Union requested that the Review Committee analyze the current IATTC resolutions that address the issue of finning so that they are consistent and not contradictory.</p> <p>The NGO Defenders of Wildlife deplored the absence of consensus to approve the proposal and stated that there is a high probability that this issue will be addressed by organizations like CITES.</p>
D-1 EU	Port State measures	<p>Once again, no consensus was reached on this proposal simply because of reservations expressed by several Members who argued the difficulties of port surveillance and its costs. Other Members stated that they could not support this proposal until the FAO Agreement on the matter is ratified.</p>
E-1 EU	Marine pollution	<p>Despite the support of several Members who referred to the MARPOL Convention, there was no consensus on this proposal due to reservations by other Members who noted that the content of the proposal exceeded the mandate of the Antigua</p>

		Convention, in addition to the need for preliminary studies to determine the magnitude of the problem in the EPO.
F-2 MEX COL	Amendment to C-11-08 on observers on longliners	Several Members supported this proposal which allows for a gradual increase in observer coverage from the current 5% to 20% (this could be coverage by human observers or electronic means) as they consider that the current coverage is insufficient and that the cost problem can be alleviated through the use of electronic monitoring. However, there was no consensus on this proposal due to reservations of other Members about the costs and practical difficulties derived from the placement of a higher percentage of human observers and electronic mechanisms in addition to the need for a preliminary study.
G-3 COL MEX	Confidentiality	The United States and the European Union opposed this proposal to not use the information presented in the Review Committee for unilateral trade purposes, which was supported by several delegations. The EU noted, however, that work could be done to develop additional rules on data confidentiality.
H-1a COL	Amendment to C-17-02 Conservation measures	Withdrawn. Colombia withdrew its proposal due to the absence of consensus in the Working Group on FADs on data submission at the suggested level and frequency.
I-1 COL	Working Group on juvenile tunas	This proposal to create a virtual group to review the issue of the catch of juveniles in fisheries was supported by several delegations, but no consensus was reached since it was considered that this issue concerned the SAC.
K-1a USA	Sea turtles	Despite the support of many delegations, no consensus was reached on this proposal due to concerns expressed about the advisability of using circle hooks.
N-1a USA	Observer safety at sea	There was no consensus on this proposal despite the support of many delegations due to reservations expressed about the costs involved in acquiring the equipment and paying for the communication service.

### 9. Action Plan for the implementation of the Performance Review recommendations (continued) and Strategic Plan

In this regard, Jean-François Pulvenis, of the Commission staff, referred to the memorandum sent a few days before the meeting to all CPCs by the Chair and the Director of the IATTC. As noted in that memorandum, during the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the IATTC and as recorded in the corresponding minutes, *"the Commission could only take note that the Committee on Administration and Finance had initiated the review of the draft plan of action, with the comments and suggestions made by some Members, focusing on the proposed actions that have budgetary implications, but had not been able to conclude its review. The Commission decided that the matter should be considered during its next meeting and given the priority necessary to reach decisions in that regard."*

Considering that similar time constraints would hardly allow the Commission to carry out and finalize a detailed and complete discussion of the plan during its meeting, the memorandum noted two alternative courses of action:

1. The first one, inspired by the proposal presented by Canada the previous year, would consist of the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group to carry out the review of the action plan so that it can then report back to the Commission for a final decision. This group would begin its discussion virtually, without prejudice to the possibility of meeting in person as was done with other groups of this type.
2. The second one, based on the fact that there were generally no objections to the individual

recommendations included in the performance review report, as well as the fact that some of the proposed actions are already being implemented, including through resolution proposals, would be for the Commission to approve in principle the plan of action as a whole, as presented with the revisions or amendments suggested by some Members, without prejudice to the possibility of reviewing and reformulating specific actions in the future. In such a case, it was suggested that a small panel be established, presided by the Chair of the Commission and composed of the Deputy Chair and Chair of the Review Committee and the Chair of the Committee on Administration and Finance. This panel would work in coordination with the Director and present progress reports at Commission meetings.

The Commission welcomed these suggestions and favored the first course of action and the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group. It considered, however, that this does not exclude the possibility for the Commission to pursue actions consistent with some of the recommendations and guidelines contained in the current draft action plan. The election of a Chair of the working group remained pending.

In terms of the Strategic Plan, Amb. Pulvenis also referred to another memorandum sent a few days before the meeting to all CPCs by the Chair and the Director of the Commission. In this memorandum, it was noted that the Commission itself should be responsible for developing, negotiating and adopting this plan based on the inputs provided through the interaction between “*staff, managers and elected representatives*”, as indicated in the report of the IATTC and AIDCP performance review. Therefore, the memorandum proposed the establishment of an open working group, presided by the Chair of the Commission and composed of representatives appointed by Members and, as appropriate, representatives of the fisheries sector, as well as staff Members of the Commission. As with the Working Group on the action plan, this group could start working virtually and then hold one or more face-to-face meetings. The Commission approved the proposed course of action.

**10. Election of Chair and Deputy Chair for the July 2018-July 2019 period**

The Commission reelected Mr. Carlos Marín, of Guatemala, as Chair of the Commission, and Mr. Alfonso Miranda, of Peru, as Deputy Chair.

**11. Election of Chairs of subsidiary bodies and working groups**

The Commission elected or re-elected the following persons:

<b>Working Group or Committee</b>	<b>Chair(s)</b>
Review Committee	David Hogan (USA)
Committee on Administration and Finance	Pending
Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity	Alfonso Miranda (Peru)
Working Group on Bycatch	Yonat Swimmer (USA) Manuel Correia (Venezuela)
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group on Coherence of Resolutions	Bernal Chavarría (Honduras)
<i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Group to review the action plan of the Commission	Pending

The Commission deeply appreciated the services of Mr. Lillo Maniscalchi as Chair of the Committee on Administration and Finance, who stated that he could not continue this work in the future. It was agreed to postpone the election of a new Chair until the next meeting of the Committee.

**12. Other business**

- a. Vessels that fish in the western Pacific and eastern Pacific without allegedly observing a closure**

As it had done during the previous meeting of the Commission, Mexico referred to the situation of vessels that fish in the western Pacific and have the opportunity to make a fishing trip in the EPO in accordance with Resolution C-02-03 and thus take advantage of the closure in the western Pacific to operate in the EPO without joining any conservation effort like the rest of the vessels that operate in either of the two commissions. Also, the flag State of those vessels chose the option of only applying the conservation and management measures of the WCPFC in the overlap area, which also benefits them from not applying the conservation and management measures in force in the EPO. Mexico added that this is an imperfection of the system that should be improved in the future and the IATTC Secretariat should contact the WCPFC Secretariat to collect data and review the issue.

Colombia supported Mexico's statement and noted that this matter should be reviewed. If there are two different management regimes, the IATTC should work together with the WCPFC to adopt harmonized and consistent measures.

The United States pointed out that this is not a compliance issue and that the vessels that come from the western Pacific to fish in the EPO do so in accordance with the established rules, in addition to the fact that there is no scientific evidence that their activity is damaging the tuna resource, for which reason it invited Mexico and Colombia to present the scientific evidence that supports and gives merit to the idea of reviewing the issue. The European Union supported the position expressed by the United States.

Nicaragua suggested that the consultant in charge of reviewing the capacity management plan in the EPO consider the capacity of these vessels that come to operate in the EPO without observing a closure period.

Despite the different positions in this regard, the request made by Mexico for the IATTC Secretariat to communicate with the WCPFC Secretariat to gather data and review the issue was not objected by any Member.

#### **b. Change of the closure period of a Venezuelan vessel**

At the request of Venezuela, the Commission approved the change of the closure period of the Venezuelan purse-seine vessel *Los Roques*, taking into account the unintentional error in the letter sent to the Secretariat and due to the fact that the deadline for the notification of the closure period had expired. The Commission took this opportunity to recall that the dates and deadlines established in IATTC resolutions must be respected.

#### **c. Bolivia statement on its fishing capacity in the EPO**

At the request of Bolivia, a statement that was submitted in writing to the Secretariat for addition in the minutes of the meeting is included as Appendix 5a.

### **13. Place and date of next meeting**

The 94<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Commission will be held in Bilbao, Spain, on dates to be decided, and considering Resolution [C-17-04](#), which modifies the rules of procedure so that the annual meeting is held *preferably* at least three months after the conclusion of the meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee.

### **14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 20:30 on 30 August 2018.

---

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

### ASISTENTES - ATTENDEES

#### MIEMBROS - MEMBERS

##### BELIZE-BELICE

**DELICE PINKARD**

Ministry of Finance  
[sr.fishofficer@bhsfu.gov.bz](mailto:sr.fishofficer@bhsfu.gov.bz)

**ERNIE HOWE**

Belize High Seas Fisheries Unit  
[fisheriesofficer@bhsfu.gov.bz](mailto:fisheriesofficer@bhsfu.gov.bz)

##### CANADA-CANADÁ

**ESTELLE COUTURE\***

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
[estelle.couture@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:estelle.couture@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

**KIRSTEN RUECKER**

Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
[kirsten.ruecker@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:kirsten.ruecker@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)

##### CHINA

**CHEN WAN**

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs  
[bofdwf@agri.gov.cn](mailto:bofdwf@agri.gov.cn)

**XIAOBING LIU**

Chinese Overseas Fisheries Association  
[xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com](mailto:xiaobing.liu@hotmail.com)

**ZIJUN ZHOU**

Chinese Overseas Fisheries Association  
[admin1@tuna.org.cn](mailto:admin1@tuna.org.cn)

**XIAOJIE DAI**

Shanghai Ocean University  
[xjdai@shou.edu.cn](mailto:xjdai@shou.edu.cn)

**CHEN XIAOJUN**

Dalai Ocean Fishing Co. LTD  
[luckych@126.com](mailto:luckych@126.com)

##### COLOMBIA

**ALEJANDRO JARAMILLO\***

Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
[alejandro.jaramillo@cancilleria.gov.co](mailto:alejandro.jaramillo@cancilleria.gov.co)

**ANDRÉS ORTÍZ**

Autoridad Nacional de Acuicultura y Pesca  
[andres.ortiz@aunap.gov.co](mailto:andres.ortiz@aunap.gov.co)

**GUSTAVO LARA**

Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible  
[glara@minambiente.gov.co](mailto:glara@minambiente.gov.co)

**ENRIQUE DE LA VEGA**

Programa Nacional de Observadores  
[edelavega@pescalimpia.org](mailto:edelavega@pescalimpia.org)

**DIEGO CANELOS**

Seatech International, Inc.  
[dcanelos@seatechint.com](mailto:dcanelos@seatechint.com)

**GUILLERMO DAW**

Gralco S.A.  
[guidaw@gralco.co](mailto:guidaw@gralco.co)

**ALEJANDRO LONDOÑO**

ANALDEX  
[alondono@analdex.org](mailto:alondono@analdex.org)

**JORGE RUÍZ**

Atún Tropical  
[rbsociadossas@gmail.com](mailto:rbsociadossas@gmail.com)

**LUIS SENIOR**

Gralco S.A.  
[luis.senior@gralco.co](mailto:luis.senior@gralco.co)

##### COREA - KOREA

**MIN JEONG CHO**

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
[jasmin1210@korea.kr](mailto:jasmin1210@korea.kr)

**ZANG GEUN KIM**

National Institute of Fisheries Science  
[zgkim5676@gmail.com](mailto:zgkim5676@gmail.com)

**HAENA LEE**

Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries  
[hn.lee@kofci.org](mailto:hn.lee@kofci.org)

**HO JEONG**

Korea Overseas Fisheries Association  
[jackiejin@kosfa.org](mailto:jackiejin@kosfa.org)

**DUCKLIM KIM**

SAJO Industries Co. LTD  
[liam@sajo.co.kr](mailto:liam@sajo.co.kr)

**COSTA RICA**

**BERNARDO JAEN\***

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería

[bjan@mag.go.cr](mailto:bjan@mag.go.cr)

**MOISES MUG**

INCOPECA

[mmug@inopesca.go.cr](mailto:mmug@inopesca.go.cr)

**MARCO QUESADA**

Conservación Internacional

[mquesada@conservation.org](mailto:mquesada@conservation.org)

**SHIRLEY ROMERO**

Alimentos Pro-Salud

[sromero@prosalud.com](mailto:sromero@prosalud.com)

**ASDRÚBAL VÁSQUEZ**

CATUN

[Vasqueza1@ice.co.cr](mailto:Vasqueza1@ice.co.cr)

## **ECUADOR**

### **KATUSKA DROUET**

Ministerio de Acuicultura y Pesca  
[katuska.drouet@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec](mailto:katuska.drouet@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec)

### **JORGE COSTAIN**

Ministerio de Acuicultura y Pesca  
[jorge.costain@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec](mailto:jorge.costain@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec)

### **JORGE VILLAVICENCIO**

Ministerio de Acuicultura y Pesca  
[jorge.villavicencio@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec](mailto:jorge.villavicencio@acuaculturaypesca.gob.ec)

### **MANUEL PERALTA**

Instituto Nacional de Pesca  
[mperalta@institutopesca.gob.ec](mailto:mperalta@institutopesca.gob.ec)

### **LUIS TORRES**

PROBECUADOR  
[probecuador@gve.satnet.net](mailto:probecuador@gve.satnet.net)

### **RODRIGO AGUDO**

ATUNEC/Asociación de Atuneros de Ecuador  
[rodrigoao@ideal-manta.com](mailto:rodrigoao@ideal-manta.com)

### **LUIGI BENINCASA AZUA**

ATUNEC/Asociación de Atuneros de Ecuador  
[info@atunec.com.ec](mailto:info@atunec.com.ec)

### **RODRIGO AGUDO**

ATUNEC/Asociación de Atuneros de Ecuador  
[rodrigoao@ideal-manta.com](mailto:rodrigoao@ideal-manta.com)

### **JUAN QUIROZ**

Cámara Nacional de Pesca  
[Juan.quirozespinoza@utas.edu.au](mailto:Juan.quirozespinoza@utas.edu.au)

### **RAFAEL TRUJILLO**

Cámara Nacional de Pesquería  
[direjec@camaradepesqueria.com](mailto:direjec@camaradepesqueria.com)

### **ANTONIO ALVAREZ**

AACH Holding Co.  
[galvarezd@aol.com](mailto:galvarezd@aol.com)

### **OSCAR BECERRA**

DELIPESCA S.A  
[becerraguarderas@hotmail.com](mailto:becerraguarderas@hotmail.com)

### **WILMER BURGOS**

Grupo DEGFER  
[mrivero@degfer.com.ec](mailto:mrivero@degfer.com.ec)

### **JAVIER CARDOSO**

Apolo Abogados  
[jcardoso@apolo.ec](mailto:jcardoso@apolo.ec)

### **IVO CUKA**

Pesdel  
[ivocukajr@marbelize.com](mailto:ivocukajr@marbelize.com)

### **GINO DE GENNA**

Grupo DEGFER  
[mrivero@degfer.com.ec](mailto:mrivero@degfer.com.ec)

### **JORGE DÍAZ**

DROPEMAR  
[jolipi@propemar.com.ec](mailto:jolipi@propemar.com.ec)

### **GUSTAVO PORTILLO\***

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
[gustavo.portillo@mag.gob.sv](mailto:gustavo.portillo@mag.gob.sv)

### **CELINA DE PAZ**

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
[celina.depaz@mag.gob.sv](mailto:celina.depaz@mag.gob.sv)

### **ANDRÉS ENDARA**

Grupo Lider  
[aendara@grupolider.com.ec](mailto:aendara@grupolider.com.ec)

### **IKER GALINDEZ**

Pesquera UGAVI S.A  
[iker.galindez@ugavi.com](mailto:iker.galindez@ugavi.com)

### **PABLO GARCÍA**

Servigrup  
[pgarcia@servigrup.com.ec](mailto:pgarcia@servigrup.com.ec)

### **LUIS GÓMEZ**

Legalsa & Asociados  
[legarcia@legalsa.com.ec](mailto:legarcia@legalsa.com.ec)

### **JAIME HOLGUIN**

Negocios Industriales Real NIRSA S.A  
[presidencia@nirsa.com](mailto:presidencia@nirsa.com)

### **FRANCISCO LEONE**

Servigrup  
[fleone@servigrup.com.ec](mailto:fleone@servigrup.com.ec)

### **DIEGO MILETICH**

Pesquera Jadrán S.A.  
[jadran@gve.satnet.net](mailto:jadran@gve.satnet.net)

### **DIEGO MILETICH**

Pesquera Jadrán S.A.  
[jadran@gve.satnet.net](mailto:jadran@gve.satnet.net)

### **FERNANDO MOLINA**

Idelmar S.A  
[fmolinaf13@hotmail.com](mailto:fmolinaf13@hotmail.com)

### **MIGUEL MOLINA**

Pesquera Jadran  
[jadran@gve.satnet.net](mailto:jadran@gve.satnet.net)

### **MICHAEL MOLINA**

Idelmar S.A  
[michelomb29@hotmail.com](mailto:michelomb29@hotmail.com)

### **GUILLERMO MORÁN**

Tuna Conservation Group  
[gamv6731@gmail.com](mailto:gamv6731@gmail.com)

### **CARLOS NUÑEZ**

Piscantur  
[cnunez@asiservy.com](mailto:cnunez@asiservy.com)

### **FABRIZIO PALADINES**

Grupo Hermanos Paladines  
[delipesca@delipesca.com](mailto:delipesca@delipesca.com)

### **JULIA PALADINES**

INDUATUN  
[juliapaladines@hotmail.com](mailto:juliapaladines@hotmail.com)

### **EVA VILLAR**

Pesquera UGAVI S.A.  
[pilar.haz@ugavi.com](mailto:pilar.haz@ugavi.com)

### **JIMMY VILLAVICENCIO**

Villavicencio & Asociados  
[jvillavicencio@v-a.com.ec](mailto:jvillavicencio@v-a.com.ec)

## **EL SALVADOR**

### **SARA MEJÍA**

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
[sara.mejia@mag.gob.sv](mailto:sara.mejia@mag.gob.sv)

### **MACARENA UBIS**

Grupo Calvo  
[macarena.ubis@calvo.es](mailto:macarena.ubis@calvo.es)

**ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA – UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**RYAN WULFF**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[ryan.wulff@noaa.gov](mailto:ryan.wulff@noaa.gov)

**WILLIAM FOX**

U.S. Commissioner

[bill.fox@wwfus.org](mailto:bill.fox@wwfus.org)

**MICHAEL THOMPSON**

US Commissioner

[mthompson041@cox.net](mailto:mthompson041@cox.net)

**EDWARD WEISSMAN**

US Commissioner

[eweissman@aol.com](mailto:eweissman@aol.com)

**MICHAEL BRAKKE**

U.S. Department of State

[BrakkeMT@state.gov](mailto:BrakkeMT@state.gov)

**DAVID HOGAN**

U.S. Department of State

[hogandf@state.gov](mailto:hogandf@state.gov)

**CELIA BARROSO**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[celia.barroso@noaa.gov](mailto:celia.barroso@noaa.gov)

**DEREK CAMPBELL**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[derek.campbell@noaa.gov](mailto:derek.campbell@noaa.gov)

**TAYLOR DEBEVEC**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[taylor.debevec@noaa.gov](mailto:taylor.debevec@noaa.gov)

**GERARD DINARDO**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[gerard.dinardo@noaa.gov](mailto:gerard.dinardo@noaa.gov)

**JUDSON FEDER**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[judson.feder@noaa.gov](mailto:judson.feder@noaa.gov)

**RINI GHOSH**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[rini.ghosh@noaa.gov](mailto:rini.ghosh@noaa.gov)

**JESSICA KONDEL**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[Jessica.Kondel@noaa.gov](mailto:Jessica.Kondel@noaa.gov)

**PAUL ORTIZ**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[paul.ortiz@noaa.gov](mailto:paul.ortiz@noaa.gov)

**JESSICA REDFERN**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[jessica.redfern@noaa.gov](mailto:jessica.redfern@noaa.gov)

**SARAH SHOFFLER**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[sarah.shoffler@noaa.gov](mailto:sarah.shoffler@noaa.gov)

**DANIEL STUDDT**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[daniel.studdt@noaa.gov](mailto:daniel.studdt@noaa.gov)

**HEIDI TAYLOR**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[heidi.taylor@noaa.gov](mailto:heidi.taylor@noaa.gov)

**MATTHIEU LE-QUENVEN\***

Maritime Affairs in French Polynesia

[matthieu.le-quenven@affaires-maritimes.pf](mailto:matthieu.le-quenven@affaires-maritimes.pf)

**CHARLES MASSA**

Maritime Affairs in French Polynesia

**RACHAEL WADSWORTH**

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service

[rachael.wadsworth@noaa.gov](mailto:rachael.wadsworth@noaa.gov)

**KELLEN STOCK**

USCG Pacific Area

[kellen.a.stock@uscg.mil](mailto:kellen.a.stock@uscg.mil)

**BRETT WIEDOFF**

Pacific Fishery Management Council

[brett.l.wiedoff@noaa.gov](mailto:brett.l.wiedoff@noaa.gov)

**MICHELLE HORECZKO**

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

[michelle.horeczko@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:michelle.horeczko@wildlife.ca.gov)

**KITTY SIMONDS**

Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council

[Kitty.Simonds@noaa.gov](mailto:Kitty.Simonds@noaa.gov)

**PETER FLOURNOY**

American Albacore Fishermen's Association

[phf@international-law-offices.com](mailto:phf@international-law-offices.com)

**SVEIN FOUNGER**

Hawaii Longline Association

[sveinfounger@cox.net](mailto:sveinfounger@cox.net)

**CARY GANN**

StarKist

[cary.gann@starkist.com](mailto:cary.gann@starkist.com)

**BRIAN HALLMAN**

American Tunaboat Association

[bhallmanata@gmail.com](mailto:bhallmanata@gmail.com)

**MICHAEL KRAFT**

Bumble Bee Seafoods

[mike.kraft@bumblebee.com](mailto:mike.kraft@bumblebee.com)

**DREW LAWLER**

AJ Lawler Partners

[drew@ajlawler.com](mailto:drew@ajlawler.com)

**GERALD LEAPE**

The Pew Charitable Trusts

[gleape@pewtrusts.org](mailto:gleape@pewtrusts.org)

**MATTHEW OWENS**

Tri Marine

[mowens@trimarinegroup.com](mailto:mowens@trimarinegroup.com)

**DAVID RUDIE**

Catalina Offshore Products

[dave@catalinaop.com](mailto:dave@catalinaop.com)

**WILLIAM SARDINHA**

Sardinha & Cileu Management

[Bill@sardinhacileu.sdcoxmail.com](mailto:Bill@sardinhacileu.sdcoxmail.com)

**JAMES SOUSA**

Mar Pacifico Fishing N.V.

[jim.sousa@marpacifico.net](mailto:jim.sousa@marpacifico.net)

**JOHN ZUANICH**

Independent Consultant

[jztrading@aol.com](mailto:jztrading@aol.com)

**FRANCIA - FRANCE**

**STEPHEN YEN KAI SUN**

Marine Resources Department

[stephen.yenkaisun@drm.gov.pf](mailto:stephen.yenkaisun@drm.gov.pf)

[charles.massa@affaires-maritimes.pf](mailto:charles.massa@affaires-maritimes.pf)

## GUATEMALA

### **BYRON ACEVEDO\***

Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación  
[byron.acevedo@gmail.com](mailto:byron.acevedo@gmail.com)

### **NANCY SANDOVAL**

Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación  
[direcciondipescagt@gmail.com](mailto:direcciondipescagt@gmail.com)

### **CARLOS MARÍN**

Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación  
[cfmarin1058@gmail.com](mailto:cfmarin1058@gmail.com)

### **FRATERO DÍAZ**

Pesquera Reina de la Paz S.A.  
[diaz.monje@hotmail.com](mailto:diaz.monje@hotmail.com)

### **VASCO FRANCO**

Pesquera Reina de la Paz S.A.  
[vascofrancoduramn@yahoo.com](mailto:vascofrancoduramn@yahoo.com)

### **AUGUSTO HOHAGEN**

The Campomarino Group  
[ahohagen@me.com](mailto:ahohagen@me.com)

## JAPAN- JAPÓN

### **TAKUMI FUKUDA\***

Fisheries Agency of Japan  
[takumi\\_fukuda720@maff.go.jp](mailto:takumi_fukuda720@maff.go.jp)

### **YUICHIRO KIRIKI**

Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
[yuichiro.kiriki@mofa.go.jp](mailto:yuichiro.kiriki@mofa.go.jp)

### **SHINJI HIRUMA**

Fisheries Agency of Japan  
[shinji\\_hiruma150@maff.go.jp](mailto:shinji_hiruma150@maff.go.jp)

### **TAKESHI MIWA**

Fisheries Agency of Japan  
[takeshi\\_miwa090@maff.go.jp](mailto:takeshi_miwa090@maff.go.jp)

### **EIICHI ARISATO**

Overseas Fishery Cooperation Foundation of Japan  
[arisato@ofcf.or.jp](mailto:arisato@ofcf.or.jp)

### **HIROSHI MINAMI**

National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries  
[hminami@affrc.go.jp](mailto:hminami@affrc.go.jp)

### **SATORU SHIMIZU**

National Ocean Tuna Fishery Association  
[mic-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp](mailto:mic-shimizu@zengyoren.jf-net.ne.jp)

### **YUJI UOZUMI**

Japan Tuna Fisheries Corporation  
[uozumi@japantuna.or.jp](mailto:uozumi@japantuna.or.jp)

### **NAOHISA KANDA**

JAPAN NUS Co., Ltd.  
[kanda-n@janus.co.jp](mailto:kanda-n@janus.co.jp)

## MÉXICO – MEXICO

### **MARIO AGUILAR\***

CONAPESCA/Comisión Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca  
[mario.aguilar@conapesca.gob.mx](mailto:mario.aguilar@conapesca.gob.mx)

### **MICHEL DREYFUS**

Instituto Nacional de Pesca  
[dreyfus@cicese.mx](mailto:dreyfus@cicese.mx)

### **LUIS FLEISCHER**

Instituto Nacional de Pesca  
[lfleischer21@hotmail.com](mailto:lfleischer21@hotmail.com)

### **MARTHA ESTRADA**

CONAPESCA/Comisión Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca  
[mestrada@conapesca.gob.mx](mailto:mestrada@conapesca.gob.mx)

### **JUAN PERDOMO**

CONAPESCA/Comisión Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca  
[juan.perdomo@conapesca.gob.mx](mailto:juan.perdomo@conapesca.gob.mx)

### **ARMANDO DÍAZ**

PNAAPD – FIDEMAR  
[adiaz@cicese.mx](mailto:adiaz@cicese.mx)

### **TED DUNN**

Consultor  
[bluefint@san.rr.com](mailto:bluefint@san.rr.com)

### **NORISSA GIANGOLA**

Alianza del Pacífico por el Atún Sustentable  
[ng@coquimarketing.com](mailto:ng@coquimarketing.com)

### **ARMANDO GONZÁLEZ**

MARPESCA S.A. de C.V.  
[control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx](mailto:control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx)

### **VILHELM GUDMUNDSSON**

Baja Aqua Farms  
[vilhelm.gudmundsson@gmail.com](mailto:vilhelm.gudmundsson@gmail.com)

### **SANTIAGO MATUS**

MARPESCA S.A. de C.V.  
[control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx](mailto:control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx)

### **MARIANA RAMOS**

Alianza del Pacífico por el Atún Sustentable  
[mariana@pacifictunaalliance.org](mailto:mariana@pacifictunaalliance.org)

### **ALFONSO ROSIÑOL**

Grupomar  
[arosinol@oceanaindustrial.com](mailto:arosinol@oceanaindustrial.com)

### **BENITO SARMIENTO**

MARPESCA S.A. de C.V.  
[control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx](mailto:control.documentos@bajaaquafarms.mx)

### **ALVIN SUÁREZ**

Alianza del Pacífico por el Atún Sustentable  
[sargassumgc@gmail.com](mailto:sargassumgc@gmail.com)

### **EVARISTO VILLA**

Herdez  
[evm@herdez.com](mailto:evm@herdez.com)

## NICARAGUA

### **RENALDY BARNUTTY**

Instituto Nicaragüense de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[rbarnutti@inpesca.gob.ni](mailto:rbarnutti@inpesca.gob.ni)

### **JULIO GUEVARA**

Industrial Atunera de Nicaragua

### **ARMANDO SEGURA**

Cámara de la Pesca de Nicaragua

[juliocgp@hotmail.com](mailto:juliocgp@hotmail.com)

**TANIA NORORI**

Instituto Nicaragüense de Pesca y Acuicultura

[tnorori@inpesca.gob.ni](mailto:tnorori@inpesca.gob.ni)

**ZULEIKA PINZÓN\***

Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá

[zpinzon@arap.gob.pa](mailto:zpinzon@arap.gob.pa)

**RAÚL DELGADO**

Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá

[rdelgado@arap.gob.pa](mailto:rdelgado@arap.gob.pa)

**LUCAS PACHECO**

Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá

[lpacheco@arap.gob.pa](mailto:lpacheco@arap.gob.pa)

**ARNULFO FRANCO**

FIPESCA

[arnulfofranco@fipesca.com](mailto:arnulfofranco@fipesca.com)

**JAVIER ATKINS\***

Ministerio de la Producción

[jatkins@produce.gob.pe](mailto:jatkins@produce.gob.pe)

**GLADYS CÁRDENAS**

Instituto del Mar del Perú

[gcardenas@imarpe.gob.pe](mailto:gcardenas@imarpe.gob.pe)

**JESÚS PONCE**

Ministerio de la Producción

[jponce@rree.gob.pe](mailto:jponce@rree.gob.pe)

**OMAR RÍOS**

Ministerio de la Producción

[orios@produce.gob.pe](mailto:orios@produce.gob.pe)

**RICARDO BERNALES**

Sociedad Nacional de Pesquería

[snpnet@snp.org.pe](mailto:snpnet@snp.org.pe)

**MARÍA JOSÉ BOLUARTE**

Sociedad Nacional de Pesquería

[snpnet@snp.org.pe](mailto:snpnet@snp.org.pe)

**CHI-CHAO LIU\***

Fisheries Agency/Council of Agriculture

[chichao@msl.f.a.gov.tw](mailto:chichao@msl.f.a.gov.tw)

**YU CHEN**

Fisheries Agency/Council of Agriculture

[chenyu@msl.f.a.gov.tw](mailto:chenyu@msl.f.a.gov.tw)

**CHIEH HAN YANG**

Dept. of International Organizations

[chyang03@mofa.gov.tw](mailto:chyang03@mofa.gov.tw)

**ANGELA MARTINI\***

European Commission

[angela.martini@ec.europa.eu](mailto:angela.martini@ec.europa.eu)

**LUIS MOLLEDO**

European Commission

[luis.molledo@ec.europa.eu](mailto:luis.molledo@ec.europa.eu)

**ANTONIO LIZCANO**

Secretaría General de Pesca

[alizcano@mapama.es](mailto:alizcano@mapama.es)

**DANIEL CALVO**

OPAGAC

[daniel.calvo@isabel.net](mailto:daniel.calvo@isabel.net)

**MIGUEL HERRERA**

[capenic@ibw.com.ni](mailto:capenic@ibw.com.ni)

**MIGUEL MARENCO**

NICATUN S.A.

[lobodemar59@gmail.com](mailto:lobodemar59@gmail.com)

## PANAMÁ-PANAMA

**MA. PATRICIA DÍAZ**

FIPESCA

[mpdiaz@fipesca.com](mailto:mpdiaz@fipesca.com)

**EDDIE CHAN**

Grupo Rocmar

[eddie@gruporocmar.com](mailto:eddie@gruporocmar.com)

**LUIS DORATI**

Grupo Rocmar

[ldorati@trimarinegroup.com](mailto:ldorati@trimarinegroup.com)

## PERÚ - PERU

**EDUARDO CARCOVICH**

Dolmar Representaciones SAC

[ecarcovich@dolmar.pe](mailto:ecarcovich@dolmar.pe)

**OMAR CARCOVICH**

Dolmar Representaciones SAC

[ocarcovich@dolmar.pe](mailto:ocarcovich@dolmar.pe)

**ALFONSO MIRANDA**

Pez de Exportación S.A.C.

[Alfonso.miranda@pezex.pe](mailto:Alfonso.miranda@pezex.pe)

**PABLO NIETO**

Sociedad Nacional de Pesquería

[snpnet@snp.org.pe](mailto:snpnet@snp.org.pe)

**JORGE RISI**

Sociedad Nacional de Pesquería

[snpnet@snp.org.pe](mailto:snpnet@snp.org.pe)

## TAIPEI CHINO – CHINESE TAIPEI

**HUI-SHAN MA**

Overseas Fisheries Development Council

[sandrama7@gmail.com](mailto:sandrama7@gmail.com)

**LIN HAN YU**

Taiwan Tuna Association

[tony@tuna.org.tw](mailto:tony@tuna.org.tw)

**LIANG-CHUN WANG**

Taiwan Tuna Association

[duo\\_w@livemail.tw](mailto:duo_w@livemail.tw)

## UNIÓN EUROPEA – EUROPEAN UNION

**GREG HAMMANN**

OPAGAC

[ghammann@marineinstruments.es](mailto:ghammann@marineinstruments.es)

**JUAN LARREA**

SATLINK

[jcl@satlink.es](mailto:jcl@satlink.es)

**JUAN MARTIN**

Asociación de Armadores Buques de Pesca de Marín

[feder.puerto.marin@opromar.com](mailto:feder.puerto.marin@opromar.com)

**AMAIA ORMAECHEA**

Zunibal

[amaia.ormaechea@zunibal.com](mailto:amaia.ormaechea@zunibal.com)

**JOSU SANTIAGO**

OPAGAC  
[Miguel.Herrera@opagac.org](mailto:Miguel.Herrera@opagac.org)  
**RAÚL BRUÑA**  
Zunibal  
[raul.bruna@zunibal.com](mailto:raul.bruna@zunibal.com)  
**JOAQUÍN CADILLA**  
OR.PA.GU.  
[direccion@orpagu.com](mailto:direccion@orpagu.com)

AZTI Tecnalia  
[jsantiago@azti.es](mailto:jsantiago@azti.es)  
**CHRIS WILSON**  
SATLINK  
[clw@satlink.es](mailto:clw@satlink.es)

#### VANUATU

**WAYNE TALEO\***  
Vanuatu Fisheries Department  
[ttaleo@gmail.com](mailto:ttaleo@gmail.com)

**KEVIN LIN**  
Ming Dar Fishery Vanuatu  
[Kevin.mdfc@msa.hinet.net](mailto:Kevin.mdfc@msa.hinet.net)

#### VENEZUELA

**ALVIN DELGADO\***  
FUNDATUN  
[fundatunpnov@gmail.com](mailto:fundatunpnov@gmail.com)

**LILLO MANISCALCHI**  
AVATUN/Asociación Venezolana de Armadores  
Atunero  
[lillomaniscalchi@yahoo.com](mailto:lillomaniscalchi@yahoo.com)

#### NO MIEMBROS COOPERANTES – COOPERATING NON-MEMBERS

##### BOLIVIA

**IVÁN HONOR\***  
Ministerio de Defensa  
[intermar@mindef.gob.bo](mailto:intermar@mindef.gob.bo)  
**JUAN HUCHANI**  
Ministerio de Defensa  
[pescamar@mindef.gob.bo](mailto:pescamar@mindef.gob.bo)

**HUGO ALSINA**  
The Campamarino Group  
[halsina@campomarino.ws](mailto:halsina@campomarino.ws)

##### CHILE

**KARIN MUNDNICH\***  
Subsecretaría de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[kmundnich@subpesca.cl](mailto:kmundnich@subpesca.cl)

##### HONDURAS

**JOSÉ OSORIO\***  
Dirección General de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[jlosorio.sag.hn@gmail.com](mailto:jlosorio.sag.hn@gmail.com)  
**BERNAL CHAVARRÍA**  
Dirección General de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[bchavarria@lsg-cr.com](mailto:bchavarria@lsg-cr.com)  
**LORENA HERNÁNDEZ**  
Dirección General de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[lorena.h.aguilar2010@hotmail.com](mailto:lorena.h.aguilar2010@hotmail.com)

**IVONNE HERNÁNDEZ**  
Dirección General de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[ivonneh@dongjyu.com](mailto:ivonneh@dongjyu.com)  
**WILLIS YANG**  
Dirección General de Pesca y Acuicultura  
[willis.yang@dongjyu.com](mailto:willis.yang@dongjyu.com)

##### INDONESIA

**TRIAN YUNANDA\***  
Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries  
[sdi.djpt@yahoo.com](mailto:sdi.djpt@yahoo.com)

##### LIBERIA

**RUPHENE SIDIFALL\***  
Liberia International Shipping & Corporate Registry  
[rsidifall@liscr.com](mailto:rsidifall@liscr.com)

#### ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES – INTERNACIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

**ALEJANDRO ANGANUZZI**  
FAO  
[Alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org](mailto:Alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org)  
**VERÓNICA CÁCERES**  
IAC  
[secretario@iacturtle.org](mailto:secretario@iacturtle.org)

**FELETI TEO**  
WCPFC  
[feleti.teo@wcpfc.int](mailto:feleti.teo@wcpfc.int)  
**BRYAN WALLACE**  
IAC  
[bryan@csp-inc.org](mailto:bryan@csp-inc.org)

#### ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES – NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

**NICOLE BEETLE**  
World Wildlife Fund  
[nicole.beetle@wwf.org](mailto:nicole.beetle@wwf.org)  
**CHRIS DORSETT**  
Ocean Conservancy  
[cdorsett@oceanconservancy.org](mailto:cdorsett@oceanconservancy.org)  
**JAMES GIBBON**  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
[jgibbon@pewtrusts.org](mailto:jgibbon@pewtrusts.org)  
**ALEJANDRA GOYENECHEA**  
Defenders of Wildlife  
[agoyenechea@defenders.org](mailto:agoyenechea@defenders.org)  
**PABLO GUERRERO**  
World Wildlife Fund  
[pablo.guerrero@wwf.org.ec](mailto:pablo.guerrero@wwf.org.ec)  
**JIM HUMPHREYS**  
Marine Stewardship Council  
[Jim.Humphreys@msc.org](mailto:Jim.Humphreys@msc.org)

**JOSÉ BELOSO**  
Satlink  
[afm@satlink.es](mailto:afm@satlink.es)  
**JINYOL CHO**  
Servax Bleu S de RL de CV  
[hlee@grupoaltex.com](mailto:hlee@grupoaltex.com)  
**HAROLD COOKLIN**  
Thai Union Group  
[harold.cooklin@thaiunion.com](mailto:harold.cooklin@thaiunion.com)  
**RICARDO DA ROSA**  
Pacific Princess Partnership LTD  
[RicardodaRosa01@gmail.com](mailto:RicardodaRosa01@gmail.com)  
**JOSÉ C. GONZÁLEZ**  
Altex  
[jgonzalez@grupoaltex.com](mailto:jgonzalez@grupoaltex.com)

**MANUEL CORREIA**  
Universidad Autonoma de Sinaloa  
[manuelcorreia.a@gmail.com](mailto:manuelcorreia.a@gmail.com)  
**CORNELIA OEDEKOVEN**  
University of St Andrews  
[csod2@st-andrews.ac.uk](mailto:csod2@st-andrews.ac.uk)

**GUILLERMO COMPEÁN, Director**  
[gcompean@iattc.org](mailto:gcompean@iattc.org)  
**MARISOL AGUILAR**  
[maguilar@iattc.org](mailto:maguilar@iattc.org)  
**ERNESTO ALTAMIRANO**  
[ealtamirano@iattc.org](mailto:ealtamirano@iattc.org)  
**RICARDO BELMONTES**  
[rbelmontes@iattc.org](mailto:rbelmontes@iattc.org)  
**LAURA BOWLING**  
[lbowling@iattc.org](mailto:lbowling@iattc.org)  
**ALEXANDRE DA SILVA**  
[adasilva@iattc.org](mailto:adasilva@iattc.org)  
**MONICA GALVÁN**  
[mgalvan@iattc.org](mailto:mgalvan@iattc.org)

**HOLLY KOEHLER**  
International Seafood Sustainability Foundation  
[hkoehler@iss-foundation.org](mailto:hkoehler@iss-foundation.org)  
**VISHWANIE MAHARAJ**  
World Wildlife Fund  
[vishwanie.maharaj@wwf.org](mailto:vishwanie.maharaj@wwf.org)  
**EDWIN MONCAYO**  
World Wildlife Fund  
[edwinmoncayo@gmail.com](mailto:edwinmoncayo@gmail.com)  
**GALA MORENO**  
International Seafood Sustainability Foundation  
[gmoreno@iss-foundation.org](mailto:gmoreno@iss-foundation.org)  
**RYAN ORGERA**  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
[rorgera@pewtrusts.org](mailto:rorgera@pewtrusts.org)  
**ESTHER WOZNAK**  
The Pew Charitable Trusts  
[ewozniak@pewtrusts.org](mailto:ewozniak@pewtrusts.org)

#### **OTROS OBSERVADORES - OTHER OBSERVERS**

**HAK SONG LEE**  
Pesquera Chichimecas S. R.L de C.V  
[hlee@grupoaltex.com](mailto:hlee@grupoaltex.com)  
**JOSH MADEIRA**  
Monterey Bay Aquarium  
[jmadeira@mbayaq.org](mailto:jmadeira@mbayaq.org)  
**PEDRO VIGIL**  
Satlink  
[afm@satlink.es](mailto:afm@satlink.es)  
**GUADALUPE VILLAMIL**  
Pesquera Chichimecas S. R.L de C.V  
[hlee@grupoaltex.com](mailto:hlee@grupoaltex.com)

#### **UNIVERSIDAD-UNIVERSITY**

**DALE SQUIRES**  
UCSD  
[dsquires@ucsd.edu](mailto:dsquires@ucsd.edu)

#### **SECRETARÍA – SECRETARIAT**

**JEFF MORGAN**  
[jmorgan@iattc.org](mailto:jmorgan@iattc.org)  
**TERESA MUSANO**  
[tmusano@iattc.org](mailto:tmusano@iattc.org)  
**JORGE PARRAGA**  
[jparraga@iattc.org](mailto:jparraga@iattc.org)  
**CHRISTINE PATNODE**  
[cpatnode@iattc.org](mailto:cpatnode@iattc.org)  
**JEAN-FRANCOIS PULVENIS**  
[jpulvenis@iattc.org](mailto:jpulvenis@iattc.org)  
**NORA ROA**  
[nroa@iattc.org](mailto:nroa@iattc.org)  
**MARLON ROMAN**  
[mroman@iattc.org](mailto:mroman@iattc.org)  
**ROBERT SARAZEN**  
[rsarazen@iattc.org](mailto:rsarazen@iattc.org)  
**KURT SCHAEFER**  
[kschaefer@iattc.org](mailto:kschaefer@iattc.org)

**MARTIN HALL**  
[mhall@iattc.org](mailto:mhall@iattc.org)  
**CLERIDY LENNERT**  
[clennert@iattc.org](mailto:clennert@iattc.org)  
**NEREA LEZAMA**  
[nlezama@iattc.org](mailto:nlezama@iattc.org)  
**PAULINA LLANO**  
[pllano@iattc.org](mailto:pllano@iattc.org)  
**JON LOPEZ**  
[jlopez@iattc.org](mailto:jlopez@iattc.org)  
**DAN MARGULIES**  
[dmargulies@iattc.org](mailto:dmargulies@iattc.org)  
**JOYDELEE MARROW**  
[jmarrow@iattc.org](mailto:jmarrow@iattc.org)  
**MARK MAUNDER**  
[mmaunder@iattc.org](mailto:mmaunder@iattc.org)  
**CAROLINA MINTE VERA**  
[cminte@iattc.org](mailto:cminte@iattc.org)

**MICHAEL SCOTT**  
[mscott@iattc.org](mailto:mscott@iattc.org)  
**ENRIQUE UREÑA**  
[eurena@iattc.org](mailto:eurena@iattc.org)  
**NICHOLAS WEBB**  
[nwebb@iattc.org](mailto:nwebb@iattc.org)  
**SOFIA WEBBER**  
[swebber@iattc.org](mailto:swebber@iattc.org)  
**BRAD WILEY**  
[bwiley@iattc.org](mailto:bwiley@iattc.org)  
**HAIKUN XU**  
[hkxu@iattc.org](mailto:hkxu@iattc.org)

\*Head of Delegation-Jefe de Delegación

NOTE: IF YOUR INFORMATION IS INCORRECT, PLEASE LET US KNOW. THANKS.

NOTA: SI SU INFORMACIÓN ES INCORRECTA, POR FAVOR DEJENOS SABER. GRACIAS.

## Appendix 2a

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)  
24, 27-30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-01

## MEASURES FOR THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA IN THE EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN, 2019 AND 2020

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) gathered in San Diego, California (USA), on the occasion of its 93rd Meeting:*

*Taking into account* that the stock of Pacific bluefin tuna is caught in both the western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Recognizing with concern* that the 2018 stock assessment of Pacific bluefin tuna by the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC) shows the following:

- Although the spawning stock biomass (SSB) appears to have grown slightly in the last few years, SSB remains near the historic low point (ratio of SSB in 2016 relative to the theoretical unfished SSB ( $SSB_{2016}/SSB_{F=0}$ , the depletion ratio) estimated in this assessment is 3.3%);
- The stock is overfished relative to  $20\%SSB_{F=0}$ , which is the second rebuilding target recommended by the Joint IATTC-Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) Northern Committee (NC) Working Group, and is subject to overfishing relative to most of the common fishing intensity-based reference points;
- The projection results are strongly influenced by the inclusion of the relatively high, but uncertain recruitment estimate for 2016; and,

*Taking* into consideration that IATTC Members, through resolutions and voluntary actions, have, since 2012, effected 40% reductions in the catch of Pacific bluefin tuna across the entire range of age classes available in the EPO;

*Noting* that in 2018 the IATTC Scientific Staff did not recommend additional measures because the measures established in Resolution C-16-08 are adequate to meet the rebuilding targets recommended by the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group;

*Recognizing* the recommendation of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) from its ninth meeting in May 2018, in which the SAC recommended that the Commission take note of the current status of Pacific bluefin tuna, the different impacts of harvesting small and large Pacific bluefin tuna, and of the increased risks of not achieving the rebuilding targets if the Resolution (C-16-08) is modified to increase catch limits;

*Recalling* that Article VII, paragraph 1(c) of the Antigua Convention provides that the Commission shall “adopt measures that are based on the best scientific evidence available to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the fish stocks covered by this Convention and to maintain or re-store the populations of harvested species at levels of abundance which can produce the maximum sustainable yield...”;

*Urging* all IATTC Members and Cooperating Non-Members (CPCs) involved in this fishery to participate in a fair and equitable manner, and without exceptions, in the discussion and adoption of conservation measures applicable to the stock throughout its entire range;

*Mindful* that these measures are intended as an interim step towards assuring sustainability of the Pacific bluefin tuna resource, consistent with the precautionary approach, and the objectives of the long-term management framework for the conservation and management of Pacific bluefin tuna in the EPO;

*Noting* that the IATTC has adopted mandatory conservation and management measures for Pacific bluefin tuna for 2012-2018, and that the measures resulted in reducing catches in the EPO; and,

*Desirous* that combined conservation and management measures by the WCPFC and the IATTC, together with other voluntary measures aimed at controlling fishing mortality, should be implemented to better the condition of the Pacific bluefin tuna stock.

*Resolves as follows:*

1. The Commission shall implement this Resolution in accordance with the long-term management objectives of Pacific bluefin tuna in paragraph 1 of Resolution C-18-02 [Amendment to Resolution C-16-08].
2. Each CPC shall report sport fishery catches of Pacific bluefin tuna semi-annually to the Director. Each CPC shall continue to ensure that catches of Pacific bluefin tuna by sportfishing vessels operating under its jurisdiction are reduced in a manner commensurate with reductions in commercial catches.
3. During 2019 and 2020, in the IATTC Convention Area, combined total commercial catches of Pacific bluefin tuna by all CPCs shall not exceed the catch limit of 6,200 metric tons<sup>1</sup>. No CPC shall exceed 3,500 metric tons in 2019.
4. Any CPC other than Mexico with historical commercial catches of Pacific bluefin tuna in the Convention Area may catch 600 metric tons of Pacific bluefin tuna in commercial fisheries in 2019 and 2020, combined, but not exceeding 425 metric tons in any year. The 600 metric ton catch limit for each CPC under this paragraph will be subtracted and reserved from the total catch limit in paragraph 3 for the exclusive use of that CPC.
5. Any over-harvest shall be deducted from catch in the following year in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Resolution C-18-02 [Amendment to Resolution C-16-08]. Over-harvest of the biennial catch limits established in Resolution C-16-08 shall be deducted from catch limits applicable to this Resolution.
6. Under-harvest of biennial catch limits established in Resolution C-16-08 shall be added to catch limits applicable to this Resolution in accordance with Paragraph 4 of Resolution C-18-02.
7. CPCs should endeavor to manage catches by vessels under their respective national jurisdictions in such a manner and through such mechanisms as might be applied, with the objective of reducing the proportion of fish of less than 30 kg in the catch toward 50% of total catch, taking into consideration the scientific advice of the ISC and the IATTC staff. At the annual meeting of the IATTC in 2020, the Scientific Staff shall present the results of the 2019 fishing season in this regard for the Commission's review. CPCs shall take the necessary measures to ensure that the catch limits specified in

---

<sup>1</sup> The catch limit for 2019-2020 is subject to final data on commercial catches of Pacific bluefin tuna in 2018 and does not prejudice the outcome of relevant domestic legal issues in affected CPCs, the consideration of which does not create a precedent for compliance with catch limits in this or future resolutions. Pursuant to Paragraph 10, the Director will notify the possible change to the catch limit for approval by the Commission subject to the Commission's rules for intersessional decision-making (Rules of Procedure, Section VIII). The catch limit for 2019-2020 shall not exceed 6,600 metric tons, consistent with IATTC Scientific Staff recommendations

paragraphs 3 and 4 are not exceeded in 2019 and 2020, without prejudging the adoption by the CPCs of additional management and conservation measures within their national jurisdiction.

8. In 2019 and 2020, each CPC shall report its catches to the Director weekly after 50% of its annual catch limit in each year is reached.
9. The Director will send out notices to all CPCs when 75% and 90% of the limits in Paragraphs 3 or 4 have been reached. The Director will send out a notice to all CPCs when the limits in Paragraphs 3 or 4 have been reached. CPCs shall take the necessary internal measures to avoid exceeding the limits established in Paragraphs 3 or 4.
10. By January 31 in 2019 and 2020, the Director shall notify all CPCs of the catch limit for 2019 and 2020 in accordance with Paragraphs 3 and 4 of this resolution and considering any over-harvest or under-harvest in accordance with Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Resolution C-18-02 [Amendment to Resolution C-16-08].
11. In 2019 and 2020, the IATTC Scientific Staff shall present an assessment to the Scientific Advisory Committee of the effectiveness of this resolution also taking into consideration the results of the ISC's latest Pacific bluefin tuna stock assessment, harvest scenario projections performed by the ISC, and conservation and management measures for Pacific bluefin tuna adopted by the WCPFC. The Commission shall consider new management measures to apply beyond 2020 based on the results of the assessment.
12. Taking into consideration the outcomes of the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group on Pacific bluefin tuna and meetings of the WCPFC, the Commission shall review this Resolution and consider revising the catch limits established in this resolution, taking into account the need for an equitable distribution of catch, during the 2019 Annual Meeting of the IATTC.

## Anexo 2b

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### RESOLUCION C-18-02

## AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION C-16-08 ON A LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF PACIFIC BLUEFIN TUNA IN THE EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in San Diego, California (USA), on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:*

*Taking into account* that the stock of Pacific bluefin tuna is caught in both the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) and the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Recalling* the outcomes of the first Joint IATTC-WCPFC Northern Committee (NC) Working Group meeting held August 29 – September 2, 2016, in Fukuoka, Japan, and the second Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group meeting that convened in August 28 – September 1, 2017, in Busan, Korea (see Document SAC-09 INF H);

*Recognizing with concern* that the latest stock assessments by the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC) [2014, 2016 and 2018] show that, although the spawning stock biomass (SSB) appears to have grown slightly in the last few years, SSB remains near the historic low point.

*Taking into consideration* that IATTC Members, through resolutions and voluntary actions, have since 2012 effected 40% reductions in the catch of Pacific bluefin tuna across the entire range of age classes available in the EPO with the objective of urging comparable conservation actions in the WCPO fishery, but, in the view of IATTC Members, without the actions sought by the IATTC having been taken by the WCPFC.

*Recalling* that Article VII, paragraph 1(c) of the Antigua Convention provides that the Commission shall “adopt measures that are based on the best scientific evidence available to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the fish stocks covered by this Convention and to maintain or restore the populations of harvested species at levels of abundance which can produce the maximum sustainable yield...”;

*Affirming* that it is necessary to adopt compatible and effective management measures in both Commissions (IATTC and WCPFC), which have the responsibility and competence over this resource in order to reduce fishing mortality throughout the range of the Pacific bluefin tuna resource to contribute to the rebuilding of the stock;

*Putting on record again* that greater than 80% of the fisheries impacts on the spawning stock biomass of Pacific bluefin tuna results from WCPO fisheries, and urging joint action with the WCPFC to discuss an equitable distribution of catch between EPO and WCPO fisheries;

*Noting* a request by IATTC Members, consistent with IATTC-90-04d, *Recommendations by the Staff for Conservation Measures in the Eastern Pacific Ocean, 2016*, requiring greater reductions in juvenile

catches in the western Pacific by WCPO fisheries and additional measures to reduce the catch of adults to in order to reduce the immediate risk of low spawner abundance on recruitment;

*Noting also* that other IATTC Members did not support the above request, while still believing that further reduction of catch should be implemented by both Commissions;

*Highlighting concerns* that measures adopted in the EPO alone will not fulfill the objective of this resolution if effective and substantial measures are not taken for all fisheries involved by both Commissions;

*Recognizing* the need for a basin-wide rebuilding plan for Pacific bluefin tuna and a precautionary long-term management framework for the stock and associated fisheries;

*Urging* all IATTC Members and Cooperating non-Members (CPCs) involved in this fishery to participate in a fair and equitable manner, and without exceptions, in the discussion and adoption of a harvest strategy applicable to the stock throughout its entire range;

*Mindful* that these measures are intended as an interim step towards assuring sustainability of the Pacific bluefin tuna resource, consistent with the precautionary approach, and that future conservation measures should be based not only on these interim measures, but also on the development of future scientific information and advice of the ISC the IATTC scientific staff, and the Scientific Advisory Committee, which may include outcomes of a management strategy evaluation (MSE);

*Recalling* that the IATTC Scientific Staff in 2014 recommended the adoption of  $B_{MSY}$  and  $F_{MSY}$  as interim target reference points for Pacific bluefin tuna (Document IATTC-87-03d);

*Noting* that the WCPFC has adopted a harvest strategy for Pacific bluefin tuna, including: (1) rebuilding targets as recommended by the Joint IATTC-NC Working Group in 2017; (2) development of reference points through the MSE process, which includes a workplan to develop candidate reference points and harvest control rules; and (3) decision rules at the initial and second rebuilding periods;

*Also noting* that the initial rebuilding target adopted by WCPFC, the historical median of SSB calculated in the ISC's 2018 stock assessment, is equivalent to a depletion ratio of 6.7% , which is below the interim limit reference point adopted for other tunas in the EPO and below the interim limit reference point for Pacific bluefin tuna recommended by the IATTC scientific staff;

*Further noting* that WCPFC also adopted the second rebuilding target, which is  $20\%SSB_{F=0}$ , to be reached by 2034, or 10 years after reaching the initial rebuilding target, whichever is earlier, with at least 60% probability; and,

*Considering* the recommendations made by the Seventh Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee, which recommended strengthening scientific cooperation with the WCPFC and promotion of the adoption of harmonized conservation measures for bluefin and bigeye tunas in both organizations;

*Resolves as follows:*

#### Rebuilding targets

1. The Commission recognizes that the management objective of the IATTC is to maintain or restore fish stocks at levels capable of producing MSY, and shall implement a provisional rebuilding plan in part by adopting: (1) an initial (first) rebuilding target of  $SSB_{med,1952-2014}$  (the median point estimate for 1952-2014) to be achieved by 2024 with at least 60% probability; and (2) a second rebuilding target of  $20\%SSB_{F=0}$ <sup>2</sup> to be achieved within 10 years of reaching the initial rebuilding target or by

---

<sup>2</sup> 20% of the expected spawning stock biomass under average recruitment conditions without fishing. If  $20\%SSB_{F=0}$  is considered inappropriate as the second rebuilding target, taking into account consideration from WCPFC, scientific advice from ISC, IATTC SAC or WCPFC SC, and the IATTC Scientific Staff, and socioeconomic factors, another objective may be established.

2034, whichever is earlier, with at least 60% probability.<sup>3</sup>

2. The Commission shall do so by adopting catch limits and other necessary management measures that, based on information provided by the IATTC Scientific Staff, the SAC recommendations and the ISC, are expected to achieve the rebuilding target, while also recognizing the need for compatible and comparable measures and goals in both the IATTC and WCPFC. If the SSB projection performed by the ISC indicates that the probability of achieving the historical median by 2024 is less than 60% probability, management measures shall be modified to increase it to at least 60%. If the SSB projection performed by the ISC indicates that the probability of achieving the initial (first) rebuilding target is at least 75%, catch limits may be increased provided the probability is maintained at 70% or larger, and the probability of reaching the second rebuilding target by the agreed deadline remains at least 60%.<sup>4</sup>
3. Over-harvest of catch limits established in Resolutions on conservation and management of Pacific Bluefin tuna shall be deducted from the applicable catch limits for the following year. In years when a resolution establishing catch limits expires, the over-harvest shall be deducted from catch limits established in the next resolution.
4. An under-harvest of catch limits established in Resolutions on conservation and management of Pacific Bluefin tuna may be added to the applicable catch limit in the following year and shall not exceed 5% of the initial catch limit.
5. Implementation and progress of this plan shall be reviewed based, in part, on updates of stock assessments and SSB projections to be conducted by ISC and IATTC Scientific Staff advice; management measures shall be modified, if necessary, based on the review.
6. No later than the IATTC meeting in 2020, taking into account the outcomes of the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group, the Commission shall consider and develop candidate reference points and harvest control rules. These candidate reference points and harvest control rules will be forwarded to the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group and ISC for consideration and potential inclusion in a management strategy evaluation to be completed by the ISC.
7. The decisions made in respect to Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 shall be designed so as to conserve and recover the Pacific bluefin tuna stock and be comparable or preferably the same to those made by the WCPFC. This cooperative process should be informed by the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group. Additionally, the effectiveness of the decisions made with respect to Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 shall be evaluated by the ISC, IATTC Scientific Staff, and SAC when new stock assessment or management strategy evaluation results become available.
8. To enhance the effectiveness of this resolution and Pacific-wide progress towards rebuilding the

---

<sup>3</sup> However, if: (1) the SSB reaches the initial rebuilding target earlier than 2024; (2) ISC recommends a recruitment scenario lower than the average recruitment scenario; and (3) the SSB projections indicate that the second rebuilding target will not be achieved on this schedule, the deadline for rebuilding may be extended to 2034 at the latest.

<sup>4</sup> Recruitment scenario used in Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) projection: (i) The low recruitment scenario (resampling from the relatively low recruitment period (1980-1989)) or the recent recruitment scenario (resampling from the last 10 years), whichever is lower, should be used for the ISC's SSB projections until 2024 or the SSB reaches the historical median (the median point estimate for 1952-2014 as specified by ISC), whichever is earlier. (ii) The recruitment scenario to be used for the SSB projections after 2024 or the SSB has reached the historical median should be tentatively the average recruitment scenario (resampling from the entire recruitment period). (iii) ISC will be requested to periodically evaluate whether the scenarios in paragraph (1) and (2) are reasonable given current conditions and make recommendation on whether a different scenario should be used. If ISC recommends a different scenario, this should be considered.

Pacific bluefin tuna stock, CPCs are encouraged to communicate with and, if appropriate, work with the concerned WCPFC members bilaterally, including through the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group.

9. CPCs shall, wherever possible and to the extent practicable, work bilaterally and/or multilaterally towards ensuring the objectives and timelines in this resolution are successfully achieved.
10. CPCs shall continue to cooperate to develop a catch documentation scheme (CDS) for Pacific bluefin tuna that is, if possible, electronic. The decisions related to a CDS for Pacific bluefin tuna, specifically, should be informed, in part, by the Joint IATTC-WCPFC NC Working Group.

## Appendix 2c

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)  
24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-03

### AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION C-13-03 SUPPLEMENTING RESOLUTION C-05-02 ON NORTH PACIFIC ALBACORE

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC):*

*Recalling* Resolution C-05-02 on Northern Pacific albacore tuna;

*Recalling further* its responsibility for the conservation and management of tunas and tuna-like species in the Convention Area, and for the formulation of recommendations to its Members and Cooperating non-Members (CPCs) with regard to the conservation and management of these resources;

*Observing* that the 2017 stock assessment of North Pacific albacore from the International Scientific Committee for Tuna and Tuna-like Species in the North Pacific Ocean (ISC) indicates that North Pacific albacore tuna is neither being overfished nor is it in an overfished state;

*Mindful* that the effectiveness of Resolution C-05-02 is unknown and considering that the ISC is expected to complete a new stock assessment in 2020;

*Acknowledging* that the ISC relies on catch data provided by CPCs for stock assessments;

*Recognizing* the importance of working with the WCPFC, as provided for in Article XXIV of the Antigua Convention, in order to manage North Pacific albacore tuna throughout its migratory range;

*Noting* the work of the WCPFC's Northern Committee in determining the extent their Commission Members, Cooperating Non-Members, and participating Territories (CCMs) are working to implement the WCPFC's Conservation and Management Measure (CMM) 2005-03 on North Pacific albacore;

*Recalling further* Article 22(4) of the WCPFC Convention that provides for cooperation with the IATTC regarding fish stocks that occur in the convention areas of both organizations;

*Taking into account* Article IV of the Antigua Convention calling upon members of the Commission to apply the precautionary approach, as described in the relevant provisions of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, as well as the 1995 United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement, for the conservation, management and sustainable use of fish stocks covered by the Convention;

*Considering* the ongoing management strategy evaluation work within the ISC which may inform the further development of the WCPFC harvest strategy for North Pacific albacore and which may include target, threshold and limit reference points, as well as pre-agreed decision rules should those reference points be breached; and,

*Recalling* that Resolution C-13-03 required submission of North Pacific albacore catch data only through 2012, and that since 2014 the IATTC Scientific staff has recommended Resolution C-13-03 be continued.

*The IATTC therefore resolves that:*

1. All CPCs shall report to the Director by December 1, 2018, using the template in Annex A, a list of all

their specific fisheries or fleets that had any catch of North Pacific albacore in the Convention Area from 2013 through 2017; whether or not those fisheries or fleets were targeting North Pacific albacore; and the annual catch by fishery or fleet. Thereafter, all CPCs shall report for each year such information annually to the Director by the following June 30. If estimated catch has changed in any of the previous five years, CPCs shall also report updates to catch, as necessary. In the case that a CPC cannot distinguish whether or not its catch of North Pacific albacore occurred in the Convention Area, it shall report its catch of North Pacific albacore in the entire North Pacific.

2. All CPCs shall report to the Director by December 1, 2018, using the template in Annex B, annual fishing effort for fisheries targeting North Pacific albacore from 2013 through 2017, as well as the average effort for the period 2002-2004. Fishing effort shall be reported in fishing days and number of vessels fishing for (i.e., targeting) North Pacific albacore. Thereafter, all CPCs shall report for each year such information annually to the Director by the following June 30. If estimated effort has changed in any of the previous five years, CPCs shall also report updates to effort, as necessary.
3. The Director shall direct the IATTC scientific staff to review the data template for its completeness.
4. The Director and the IATTC scientific staff shall, in coordination with the ISC, monitor the status of North Pacific albacore tuna and report on the status of the stock at annual meetings taking place after each assessment completed by the ISC.
5. The IATTC scientific staff shall review the management strategy evaluation work undertaken within the ISC and the WCPFC towards the development of a harvest strategy for North Pacific albacore that includes identification and adoption of a limit and a target reference point, as well as harvest control rules for the IATTC. The IATTC Scientific Staff shall make recommendations in respect of such a framework for consideration by the Commission.
6. The Commission shall continue efforts to promote compatibility between the conservation and management measures adopted by the IATTC and the WCPFC with respect to North Pacific albacore.
7. Upon the entry into force of this resolution, paragraph 3 of Resolution C-05-02 shall no longer be in effect.
8. The Director shall communicate this Resolution to the WCPFC Secretariat.

Annual catches of North Pacific albacore in the EPO by fishery. List separately all fisheries that had any catch of North Pacific albacore and indicate whether they were fisheries that fished for (i.e., targeted) North Pacific albacore.

## CPC:

<b>Year (e.g., 2018)</b>	Data pertain to IATTC Area only or entire North Pacific?	Fisheries with ANY catch of NP albacore	"Fishing for" (i.e., targeting) NP albacore? (Y/N)	Annual catches
<b>Year (e.g., 2017)</b>				
Total catches:				
Catches in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
% of total catch in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
<b>Year (e.g., 2016)</b>				
Total catches:				
Catches in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
% of total catch in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
<b>Year (e.g., 2015)</b>				
Total catches:				
Catches in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
% of total catch in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
<b>Year (e.g., 2014)</b>				
Total catches:				
Catches in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
% of total catch in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
<b>Year (e.g., 2013)</b>				
Total catches:				
Catches in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				
% of total catch in fisheries "fishing for" NP albacore:				

Average fishing effort (in number of vessels and fishing days) for 2002-2004 and annual fishing effort (in number of vessels and fishing days) for the previous five years for fisheries for (i.e., targeting) North Pacific albacore in the EPO.

CPC	Area <sup>5</sup>	Fishery <sup>6</sup> / Gear type	Averageo 2002–2004		Year		Year		Año		Año		Año	
			No. of vessels	Fishing days	No. of vessels	Fishing days	No. of vessels	Fishing days	No. of vessels	Fishing days	No. Of vessels	Fishing days	No. of vessels	Fishing days

<sup>5</sup> Indicate if data pertain to IATTC Convention Area (fill in with “EPO”) only or entire North Pacific (fill in with “NPO”).

<sup>6</sup>.Fisheries “fishing for” (i.e., targeting) NP albacore

## Appendix 2d

# INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California, USA  
24, 27 - 30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-04

#### FINANCING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in San Diego, California, USA, on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:*

*Understanding* the importance of ensuring sufficient funding for the Commission in a timely manner, so that it may continue to effectively develop and implement the agreed conservation and management program for the living marine resources of the IATTC Convention Area, and conduct the associated data collection and research;

*Noting* that non-payment of the agreed contributions may impair the Commission's ability to continue its operations;

*Aware* that the allocation of the costs of supporting the Commission among Members should be transparent, fair and equitable, stable, and predictable, but also should allow for redistribution of costs as new Members join;

*Taking into account* Resolution C-15-05, whereby the Commission, at its 89<sup>th</sup> Meeting, agreed on a formula for calculating the contributions of the Members to the Commission's budget for the years 2013-2017 and beyond;

*Taking into account* the relevant provisions of the Antigua Convention;

*Noting* that several non-Members derive benefits from catching or utilizing fish covered by the Convention, but do not make contributions to the Commission's budget;

*Taking note* of the Commission staff's proposals regarding the budget presented in Document CAF-06-01; and

*Recognizing* the need to seek economies in the operation of the Commission, in order to reduce costs;

*Agrees:*

1. To adopt a budget of US\$ 8,133,836 for fiscal year (FY) 2019.
2. That the Members shall contribute to the Commission's budget for FY 2019 in accordance with the following schedule:

	<b>FY 2019 (US\$)</b>
Belize	45,825
Canada	150,239
China	230,081
Colombia	242,637
Korea	255,425
Costa Rica	127,305

	<b>FY 2019 (US\$)</b>
Ecuador	1,661,762
El Salvador	89,785
United States	1,746,553
France	135,989
Guatemala	51,206
Japan	404,764
Kiribati	45,133
Mexico	1,049,109
Nicaragua	76,578
Panama	720,048
Peru	122,778
Chinese Taipei	241,395
European Union	473,734
Vanuatu	57,432
Venezuela	206,058
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,133,836</b>

## Appendix 2e

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-05

#### AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION C-16-01 ON THE COLLECTION AND ANALYSES OF DATA ON FISH-AGGREGATING DEVICES

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC):*

*Taking into account* the best available scientific information on the status of the bigeye, yellowfin and skipjack stocks;

*Committed* to the long-term conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Understanding* that all fishing gears, including fish-aggregating devices (FADs), have an effect on the stocks and the pelagic ecosystem in the EPO, and that such effects should be fully understood by the Members of the Commission;

*Attentive* to the provisions of IATTC Resolution C-99-07 on measures related to the regulation of FADs;

*Agreeing* that, to accurately provide the scientific advice necessary to effectively manage tuna fisheries in the EPO, it is necessary for the scientific staff of the IATTC to have access to, and analyze, the relevant data regarding such fisheries and gears, and for Commission Members to put in place measures as needed to collect such information in their fisheries;

*Acknowledging* that observers currently collect data on FADs in the EPO that have been examined by the IATTC staff (Document SAC-02-13) and that the Commission has adopted measures for further research on FADs; the significant effect that FADs may have on bigeye tuna spawning biomass, according to IATTC estimates (Document SAC-03-06); that skipjack tuna is captured on FADs and in unassociated schools in the EPO (Document SAC-03-03), and according to IATTC estimates, its exploitation rate has been increasing in recent years (Document SAC-03-07);

*Recognizing* that these measures need to be expanded and improved upon to ensure that the effects of the use of FADs on highly migratory fish stocks along with non-target, associated and dependent species, are fully understood and that the Commission can receive the best available scientific advice concerning mitigation of any negative effects;

*Committed* to ensuring that such scientific advice is taken into account in the development of the Commission's conservation and management measures concerning fishing for tunas;

*Noting* that the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) has recommended that the Commission should strengthen the work on FADs by holding a meeting involving managers, scientists, and other stakeholders;

*Noting* that, based on recent scientific analysis, the development of improved FAD designs, in particular non-entangling FADs, both drifting and anchored, helps reduce the incidence of entanglement of sharks, sea turtles and other species;

*Further noting* that whale sharks are particularly vulnerable to exploitation, including from fishing, and noting the ecological and economic value these species can bring to the EPO; and

*Concerned* about the potential effects of purse-seine operations on the status of whale sharks when deliberately or accidentally set upon;

*AGREES:*

1. For the purposes of this Resolution, the term “Fish-Aggregating Device” (FAD) means anchored, drifting, floating or submerged objects deployed and/or tracked by vessels, including through the use of radio and/or satellite buoys, for the purpose of aggregating target tuna species for purse-seine fishing operations.

**SECTION 1. FAD DATA COLLECTION**

2. Beginning 1 January 2017, CPCs shall require the owners and operators of all purse-seine vessels flying their flag, when fishing on FADs in the IATTC Convention Area, to collect and report the information contained in Annex I. The data may be collected through a dedicated logbook, modifications to regional logsheets, or other domestic reporting procedures.
3. CPCs shall provide the data collected for the previous calendar year, pursuant to Paragraph 2, which are available at the time of submission, to the Director. CPCs shall submit the data to the Director no later than 60 days prior to each regular meeting of the SAC.
4. No later than the IATTC annual meeting in 2018, the scientific staff of the IATTC, in coordination with the SAC, shall present to the Commission the preliminary results of its analyses of the information collected pursuant to Paragraph 2, and shall identify additional elements for data collection, as well as specific reporting formats, necessary to evaluate the effects of the use of FADs on the ecosystem of the EPO fishery. The analyses shall also incorporate information from data on FADs collected by observers through the *Flotsam Information Record*.
5. In addition, no later than the IATTC annual meeting in 2018, the scientific staff of the IATTC, in coordination with the SAC and taking into account the outcomes of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on FADs, shall present to the Commission initial recommendations based on information collected, based on this resolution and through other mechanisms, for the management of FADs, including possible effects of FADs in the tuna fishery in the EPO. The Commission shall consider adopting management measures based on those recommendations, including a region-wide FAD management plan, and which may include, *inter alia*, recommendations regarding FAD deployments and FAD sets, the use of biodegradable materials in new and improved FADs and the gradual phasing out of FAD designs that do not mitigate the entanglement of sharks, sea turtles, and other species.
6. The scientific staff of the IATTC, in coordination with the SAC, shall also formulate recommendations for regulating the management of the affected stocks for presentation to the Commission, on the basis of the results of its analyses of the collected FAD information. Such recommendations shall include methods for limiting the capture of small bigeye and yellowfin tuna associated with fishing on FADs.
7. In 2018, compliance with the FAD reporting requirements of this Resolution will be comprehensively reviewed by the *Committee for the Review of the Implementation of Measures adopted by the Commission* and presented to the Commission.
8. Data collected pursuant to this resolution shall be treated under the rules established in the IATTC Resolution on Confidentiality.

**SECTION 2. FAD IDENTIFICATION**

9. No later than 1 January 2017, CPCs shall require the owners and operators of their applicable flagged purse-seine fishing vessels to identify all FADs deployed or modified by such vessels in accordance with a Commission identification scheme detailed in footnote 1 of Annex 1.

**SECTION 3. NON-ENTANGLING FADS**

10. To reduce the entanglement of sharks, sea turtles or any other species, as of 1 January 2019 CPCs shall ensure that the design and deployment of FADs are based on the principles set out in Annex II.

11. Annex II is consistent with the 2015 recommendations of the scientific staff of the IATTC. The scientific staff of the IATTC, in coordination with the SAC, shall continue to review research results on the use of non-entangling material and biodegradable material on FADs, and shall provide specific recommendations no later than the 2018 IATTC annual meeting, consistent with Paragraph 5.

#### **SECTION 4. WHALE SHARKS**

12. CPCs shall prohibit their flag vessels from setting a purse-seine net on a school of tuna associated with a live whale shark, if the animal is sighted prior to the commencement of the set.
13. CPCs shall require that, in the event that a whale shark is not deliberately encircled in the purse-seine net, the master of the vessel shall:
  - a. ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to ensure its safe release; and
  - b. report the incident to the relevant authority of the flag CPC, including the number of individuals, details of how and why the encirclement happened, where it occurred, steps taken to ensure safe release, and an assessment of the life status of the whale shark on release (including whether the animal was released alive but subsequently died).

#### **SECTION 5. *AD HOC* PERMANENT WORKING GROUP ON FADS**

14. An *ad hoc* Permanent Working Group on FADs (Working Group) is established.
15. This Working Group shall be multi-sectorial, involving various stakeholders such as scientists, fishery managers, fishing industry representatives, administrators, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and fishers. Expressions of interest to participate in the Working Group shall be provided to the Director, who shall inform CPCs and the Chair of the FADs Working Group.
16. To the highest degree possible, the Working Group shall conduct its work electronically or, if convenient and cost-effective, in targeted face-to-face meetings that take place in conjunction with other Commission meetings.
17. The Working Group shall report on a regular basis to the Commission and present an initial report of its findings at the 2017 meeting of the SAC.
18. The Terms of Reference of the Working Group are those indicated in Annex III.
19. The Working Group shall liaise, as far as possible, with other similar working groups on FAD management established in other tuna regional fisheries management organizations (tuna RFMOs), in particular the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC).
20. During its 2019 meeting(s), the IATTC FAD Working group will evaluate materials and designs to further reduce entanglements in FADs and for biodegradable FADs and make recommendations to revise Annex II.
21. This Resolution replaces Resolution C-16-01.

## Annex I

CPCs are required to ensure their vessel owners and operators record and report to the appropriate national authorities any interaction with FADs, using a standard format to be developed by the Commission staff.

For each interaction with a FAD, the following information shall be recorded:

- i. Position;
- ii. Date;
- iii. Hour;
- iv. FAD identification<sup>7</sup>;
- v. FAD type (*e.g.*, drifting natural FAD, drifting artificial FAD);
- vi. FAD design characteristics (dimension and material of the floating part and of the underwater hanging structure);
- vii. Type of the activity (set, deployment, hauling, retrieving, loss, intervention on electronic equipment, other (specify));
- viii. If the activity is a set, the results of the set in terms of catch and bycatch; and
- ix. Characteristics of any attached buoy or positioning equipment (positioning system, whether equipped with sonar, *etc.*).

## Annex II

### Principles for design and deployment of FADs

The floating or raft part (flat or rolled structure) of the FAD can be covered or not. If it is covered with mesh net, it must have a stretched mesh size less than 7 cm and the mesh net must be well wrapped around the whole raft so that there is no loose netting hanging below the FAD when it is deployed.

The design of the underwater or hanging part (tail) of the FAD should avoid the use of mesh net. If mesh net is used, it must be tied as tightly as practicable in the form of sausages or have a stretched mesh size less than 7 cm in a panel with weight at the end.

To reduce the amount of synthetic marine debris, the use of natural or biodegradable materials (such as hessian canvas, hemp ropes, *etc.*) for drifting FADs should be promoted.

---

<sup>7</sup> CPCs shall obtain unique alphanumeric codes from the IATTC staff on a periodic basis and distribute those numbers to the vessels in their fleets for FADs that may be deployed or modified, or in the alternative, if there is already a unique FAD identifier associated with the FAD (*e.g.*, the manufacturer identification code for the attached buoy), the vessel owner or operator may instead use that identifier as the unique code for each FAD that may be deployed or modified.

The alphanumeric code shall be clearly painted in characters at least 5 cm in height. The characters shall be painted on the upper portion of the attached radio or satellite buoy in a location that does not cover the solar cells used to power the equipment. For FADs without attached radio or satellite buoys, the characters shall be painted on the uppermost or emergent top portion of the FAD. The vessel owner or operator shall ensure the marking is durable (for example, use epoxy-based paint or an equivalent in terms of lasting ability) and visible at all times during daylight. In circumstances where the observer is unable to view the code, the captain or crew shall assist the observer (*e.g.* by providing the FAD identification code to the observer).

### **Annex III**

The objectives of the Working Group are the following:

1. Collect and compile information on FADs in the EPO, including but not limited to data collected by the IATTC and reports prepared by the scientific staff of the IATTC;
2. Review the FAD data collection requirements established in this Resolution to assess the need for revision;
3. Develop data reporting formats and definitions of terms related to FAD fishing (*e.g.* biodegradable FADs, non-entangling FADs, *etc.*), to implement obligations under this Resolution, in cooperation with the scientific staff, to be submitted to the Commission for consideration;
4. Compile information regarding developments on FADs in other tuna RFMOs;
5. Compile information regarding developments on the latest scientific information on FADs, including information on non-entangling FADs, and identify priority areas for research;
6. Prepare annual reports for the SAC, including specific recommendations, as appropriate; and
7. Identify and review possible FAD management measures, in coordination with the scientific staff and the SAC, and make recommendations to the Commission, as appropriate.

## Appendix 2f

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-06

## RESOLUTION (AMENDED) ON A REGIONAL VESSEL REGISTER

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in San Diego, California on its 93rd Meeting:

*Affirming* the importance of ensuring that all vessels fishing in the Antigua Convention Area comply with the conservation and management measures agreed by the Commission;

*Reaffirming* the need to have pertinent information relative to the operations of vessels fishing in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Recalling* that Article XII, paragraph 2 (k), of the Antigua Convention stipulates that the Director shall maintain the record of vessels fishing in the Convention Area based, *inter alia*, on the information provided pursuant to Annex 1 of the Convention;

*Concerned* that the current IATTC Regional Vessel Register includes fishing vessels not from Members and Co-operating Non-Members of the Commission (CPCs) and the Commission cannot confirm whether these vessels are complying with relevant IATTC resolutions;

*Further recalling* that the Commission has been taking various measures to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the Convention Area,

*Noting* that large-scale fishing vessels are highly mobile and easily change fishing grounds from one ocean to another, and have high potential of operating in the Convention area without timely registration with the Commission,

*Recalling* that the FAO Council adopted on June 23, 2001, an International Plan of Action (IPOA) aiming to prevent, to deter and to eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, that this plan stipulates that the regional fisheries management organization should take action to strengthen and develop innovative ways, in conformity with international law, to prevent, deter and eliminate IUU fishing and in particular to establish records of vessels authorized and records of vessels engaged in IUU fishing,

*Further noting* that the International Maritime Organization, at its 30th Assembly meeting in December 2017, adopted Resolution A.1117(30), which amends the IMO Ship Identification Number Scheme to expand fishing vessels' eligibility for IMO numbers from such vessels 100 GT and above to include motorized inboard fishing vessels below 100 GT down to 12 meters in length overall authorized to operate outside waters under national jurisdiction of the flag State,

*Recognizing* the utility and practicality of using IMO numbers as a unique vessel identifier (UVI) for fishing vessels, and

*Aware* of the need to amend its Resolution C-14-01 on a Regional Vessel Register:

Agrees that:

1. The Director shall establish and maintain a record of vessels that have been authorized to fish in the Antigua Convention Area for species covered by the Convention, on the basis of the information detailed in paragraph 2. The record shall contain only vessels that fly the flags of CPCs.

2. Each CPC shall supply to the Director the following information with respect to each vessel under its jurisdiction to be included in the record established pursuant to paragraph 1:
  - a. name of vessel, registration number, previous names (if known), and port of registry;
  - b. a photograph of the vessel showing its registration number;
  - c. previous flag (if known and if any);
  - d. International Radio Call Sign (if any);
  - e. name and address of owner or owners;
  - f. where and when built;
  - g. length, beam, and moulded depth;
  - h. freezer type and freezer capacity, in cubic meters;
  - i. number and capacity of fish holds, in cubic meters and, in the case of purse-seine vessels, capacity breakdown by fish hold if possible;
  - j. name and address of operator(s) and/or manager(s)(if any);
  - k. type of vessel;
  - l. type of fishing method or methods;
  - m. gross tonnage;
  - n. power of main engine or engines;
  - o. the nature of the authorization to fish granted by the flag CPC (such as main target species); and
  - p. International Maritime Organization (IMO) or Lloyd's Register (LR) number, if issued.<sup>8</sup>
3. Each CPC shall promptly notify the Director of any modifications to the information listed in paragraph 2.
4. Each CPC shall also promptly notify the Director of:
  - a. any additions to the record;
  - b. any deletions from the record by reason of:
    - i. the voluntary relinquishment or non-renewal of the fishing authorization by the owner or operator of the vessel;
    - ii. the withdrawal of the fishing authorization issued to the vessel in accordance with Article

---

<sup>8</sup> Effective 1 January 2016, flag CPC's shall ensure that all their fishing vessels (except for recreational fishing vessels) authorized to fish in the Convention Area that are at least 100 gross tons (GT) or 100 gross registered tons (GRT) in size have an IMO or LR number issued. Effective 1 January 2020, flag CPCs shall ensure that all their motorized inboard fishing vessels (except for recreational fishing vessels) of less than 100 GT or 100 GRT down to a size limit of 12 meters in length overall (LOA) or registered length, authorized to fish in the high seas of the Convention Area have an IMO or LR number issued. In assessing compliance with this requirement, the Commission shall take into account extraordinary circumstances in which a vessel owner is not able to obtain an IMO or LR number despite following the appropriate procedures. Flag CPCs shall report any such extraordinary situations in their annual reports.

XX, paragraph 2, of the Convention;

iii. the fact that the vessel is no longer entitled to fly its flag;

iv. the scrapping, decommissioning or loss of the vessel; and

v. any other reason, specifying which of the reasons listed above are applicable.

5. CPCs shall notify the Director by 30 June each year of their vessels<sup>9</sup> on the Regional Vessel Register flying their flag that were actively fishing in the IATTC Convention Area for species covered by the Convention from 1 January to 31 December of the previous year.
6. The Director shall request each CPC to provide complete data for its vessels in accordance with paragraph 2 if the CPC does not provide all the required information.
7. The Commission shall review this resolution in 2022 and consider revisions to improve its effectiveness, including revisions to the vessel information required in paragraph 2 of this resolution.
8. This resolution replaces Resolution C-14-01.

---

<sup>9</sup> Excluding recreational fishing vessels.

## Appendix 2g

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### RESOLUTION C-18-07

## RESOLUTION ON IMPROVING OBSERVER SAFETY AT SEA: EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) gathered in San Diego, California, on the occasion of its 93rd Meeting:*

*Taking into account* that observers collect data that is essential to the functions of the Commission and that the safety of observers is critical to their ability to perform their duties;

*Recognizing* that certain IATTC resolutions require longline, purse-seine, and carrier vessels to carry observers, and that consistent safety requirements should apply to all observers operating within the legal and institutional framework of the IATTC;

*Concerned* that the Commission needs a plan to respond to emergency situations to ensure the safety of observers operating within the legal and institutional framework of the IATTC; and

*Noting* the commitments in international law, including the provisions of the [International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue](#), with regard to the development of an international maritime search and rescue plan for the rescue of persons in distress at sea;

*Agrees that:*

1. This Resolution applies to all IATTC observer programs, including the Regional Observer Program for transshipment, the national observer programs for longline vessels that implement IATTC observer requirements, and any future observer program established by the IATTC.
2. Nothing in this Resolution shall prejudice the rights of CPCs to enforce their laws or implement additional measures with respect to the safety of observers or crew members consistent with international law.
3. In the event that an observer dies, is missing or presumed fallen overboard, the CPCs to which the fishing vessel is flagged shall ensure that the fishing vessel:
  - a. immediately ceases all fishing operations;
  - b. immediately commences search and rescue if the observer is missing or presumed fallen overboard, and searches for at least 72 hours, unless the observer is found sooner, or unless instructed by the flag CPC to continue searching;<sup>10</sup>
  - c. immediately notifies the flag CPC and the observer provider;
  - d. immediately alerts other vessels in the vicinity by using all available means of communication;
  - e. cooperates fully in any search and rescue operation whether or not the search is successful and after such search and rescue operation has been terminated, orders the vessel to the nearest port for further investigation, as agreed by the flag CPC and the observer provider;

---

<sup>10</sup> In the event of *force majeure*, flag CPCs may allow their vessels to cease search and rescue operations before 72 hours have elapsed.

- f. provides the report to the observer provider and appropriate authorities on the incident; and
  - g. cooperates fully in any and all official investigations, and preserves any potential evidence and the personal effects and quarters of the deceased or missing observer.
4. In the event that an observer dies, the flag CPC shall require that the fishing vessel ensure that, to the extent practicable, the body is well-preserved for the purposes of an autopsy and investigation.
  5. In the event that an observer suffers from a serious illness or injury that threatens his or her life and/or long-term health or safety, the CPC to which the fishing vessel is flagged shall ensure that the fishing vessel:
    - a. immediately ceases fishing operations;
    - b. immediately notifies the flag CPC and the observer provider;
    - c. takes all reasonable actions to care for the observer and provide any medical treatment available and possible on board the vessel, and where appropriate seek external medical advice;
    - d. where directed by the observer provider, if not already directed by the flag CPC, facilitates the disembarkation and transport of the observer to a medical facility equipped to provide the required care, as soon as practicable; and
    - e. cooperates fully in any and all official investigations into the cause of the illness or injury.
  6. For the purposes of paragraphs 3 through 5, the flag CPC shall ensure that the appropriate Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre (<http://sarcontacts.info>), observer provider, and Director are immediately notified and provided a report on actions undertaken.
  7. In the event that there are reasonable grounds to believe an observer has been assaulted, intimidated, threatened, or harassed such that their health or safety is endangered and the observer or the observer provider indicates to the CPC to which the fishing vessel is flagged that they wish for the observer to be removed from the fishing vessel, the CPC to which the fishing vessel is flagged shall ensure that the fishing vessel:
    - a. immediately takes action to preserve the safety of the observer and mitigate and resolve the situation on board;
    - b. notifies the flag CPC and the observer provider of the situation, including the status and location of the observer, as soon as possible;
    - c. facilitates the safe disembarkation of the observer in a manner and place, as agreed by the flag CPC and the observer provider, that facilitates access to any needed medical treatment; and
    - d. cooperates fully in any and all official investigations into the incident.
  8. In the event that there are reasonable grounds to believe that an observer has been assaulted, intimidated, threatened, or harassed but neither the observer nor the observer provider requests that the observer be removed from the fishing vessel, the CPC to which the fishing vessel is flagged shall ensure that the fishing vessel:
    - a. takes action to preserve the safety of the observer and mitigate and resolve the situation on board as soon as possible;
    - b. notifies the flag CPC and the observer provider of the situation as soon as possible; and
    - c. cooperates fully in all official investigations into the incident.
  9. If any of the events in paragraphs 3 through 7 occur, port CPCs shall facilitate entry of the fishing vessel to allow disembarkation of the observer and, to the extent possible, assist in any investigations if so requested by the flag CPC.
  10. In the event that, after disembarkation from a fishing vessel of an observer, an observer provider identifies—such as during the course of debriefing the observer—a possible violation involving assault or harassment of the observer while on board the fishing vessel, the observer provider shall notify, in

writing, the flag CPC and the Director, and the flag CPC shall:

- a. investigate the event based on the information provided by the observer provider and take any appropriate action in response to the results of the investigation;
  - b. cooperate fully in any investigation conducted by the observer provider, including providing the report to the observer provider and appropriate authorities of the incident; and
  - c. notify the observer provider and the Director of the results of its investigation and any actions taken.
11. CPCs shall ensure that their national observer providers:
- a. immediately notify the flag CPC in the event that an observer dies, is missing or presumed fallen overboard in the course of observer duties;
  - b. cooperate fully in any search and rescue operation;
  - c. cooperate fully in any and all official investigations into any incident involving an observer;
  - d. facilitate the disembarkation and replacement of an observer in a situation involving the serious illness or injury of that observer as soon as possible;
  - e. facilitate the disembarkation of an observer in any situation involving the assault, intimidation, threats to, or harassment of that observer to such an extent that the observer wishes to be removed from the vessel, as soon as possible; and
  - f. provide the flag CPC with a copy of the observer report on alleged violations involving that provider's observer upon request.
12. Where requested, relevant observer providers and CPCs shall cooperate in each other's investigations, including providing their incident reports for any incidents indicated in paragraphs 3 through 8 to facilitate any investigations as appropriate.
13. This Resolution shall enter into force on 1 January 2020.

## Appendix 3a

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 A-1

### SUBMITTED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

### EU PROPOSAL TO AMEND RESOLUTION C-03-05 ON DATA PROVISION

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Comprehensive data collection on the fish stocks covered by the Antigua Convention is key to carrying out the objective of the Antigua Convention laid down in its Article II of ensuring the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the stocks under its purview, as well as an essential element for the provision of sound scientific advice by the Commission Scientific Staff and the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC).

The need to increase the Level 2 and 1 catch and effort data and length frequency data available for scientific purposes has been regularly highlighted by the SAC in its discussions. This will improve not only the quality of the stock assessment exercises but also the ecosystem analysis.

The current EU proposal makes the provision of that data compulsory for all vessels with some exceptions allowed for artisanal vessels.

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION  
COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA DEL ATÚN TROPICAL

### 70<sup>a</sup> REUNION - 70<sup>th</sup> MEETING

ANTIGUA (GUATEMALA)

24-27 JUN 2003

### RESOLUTION C-03-05

#### RESOLUTION ON DATA PROVISION

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC):*

*Emphasizing* the importance of obtaining comprehensive information on the catches, and related information, by all vessels fishing for species under the purview of the Commission;

*Understanding* that all member nations of the Commission are obliged to provide information on catches by all of their vessels fishing for any species under the purview of the Commission;

*Aware* of the long-standing and well-established practice of vessels fishing in the EPO providing catch information to the Director;

*Noting* that nations not members of the Commission which are fishing in the region are obliged under international law to cooperate with the Commission, and that the provision of catch data is one aspect of such cooperation;

Concerned that the Director is not receiving all pertinent catch information;

Therefore recommends to the High Contracting Parties that:

1. Through the appropriate government authorities and in collaboration with those authorities, they take the necessary steps to ensure that all pertinent catch information is provided to the Director on an annual basis, for all of their vessels fishing for species under the purview of the Commission.
2. The data be provided, by species and fishing gear, where practical, via vessel logbooks and unloading records, and otherwise in aggregated form as in the following table, with Level 3 catch and effort data as a minimum requirement, and Levels 2 and 1 catch and effort data and length- frequency data.

Category	Level	Resolution	Data
Catch and effort	1	Set-by-set, logbook data with information on gear configuration and target species	Total catch in numbers, and weight if available; fishing effort
	2	1°x1°-month, with information on gear configuration and target species	
	3	5°x5°-month, with information on gear configuration and target species	
Length frequency	1	Set position, start or end of set	Length or weight of individual fish
	2	Grid position, best possible spatial- temporal resolution of area of capture	

3. The aggregated data referred to in paragraph 2 for each year shall be provided by 30 June of the following year.
4. The technical aspects of the data to be supplied shall be established by the Director in collaboration with scientists of the members.
5. The following exceptions shall apply to the immediate entry into force of this resolution:
  - a. For vessels of less than 24 meters in length overall, the requirements of this resolution shall not enter into force until 1 January 2007. However, each member shall make its best efforts to provide as much data as possible for these vessels.
  - b. Catch data from artisanal vessels may be reported as total annual catches, without data on fishing effort. Levels 2 and 1 catch and effort data and length- frequency data of paragraph 2 shall only be provided where practicable.
  - c. Catch data from recreational fishing vessels may be reported as total annual catches, without data on fishing effort.
6. The Director communicate with the governments of states not party the Commission whose flag vessels may be fishing in the region, to comply with the terms of this resolution.
7. The Director ensure that the catch information provided to the Commission is maintained in strict accordance with the Commission's confidentiality rules and procedures.

## Appendix 3b

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24 – 30 August 2018

### 1. PROPOSAL IATTC-93 C-1

### 2. SUBMITTED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

## RESOLUTION C-18-XX ON THE CONSERVATION OF SHARKS CAUGHT IN ASSOCIATION WITH FISHERIES IN THE IATTC CONVENTION AREA

### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

The Antigua Convention requires IATTC to adopt conservation measures for species associated with the main targeted stocks.

The European Union is proposing a new Resolution which aims at eliminating the loopholes that prevent the effective enforcement and control of the implementation of the finning ban in the Convention area introduced through IATTC Resolution C-05-03.

This management measure aims to respond to concerns about the threats to shark populations from the practice of shark finning, in fact:

- The current fins to carcass weight ratio requirement has no solid scientific basis underpinning its appropriateness reliable and robust method for the implementation of the finning ban;
- Current scientific evidence clearly indicates that fins to carcass weight ratio varies widely among species, fin types used in calculations, the type of carcass weight used (whole or dressed), and the method of processing used to remove the fins (fin cutting technique);
- The use of the fins to carcass weight ratios undermines the collection of essential information on species level interactions with fishing fleets, crucial for accurate stock assessments for sharks;
- The use of the ratio measure is not possible to control at sea;
- The only way to guarantee that sharks are not finned is to require that the carcasses be landed with the fins attached.

**RESOLUTION C-18-XX ON THE CONSERVATION OF SHARKS  
CAUGHT  
IN ASSOCIATION WITH FISHERIES IN THE IATTC CONVENTION  
AREA**

The Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC),

CONSIDERING that many sharks are part of the pelagic ecosystems in the IATTC area, and that tunas and tuna-like species are captured in fisheries targeting sharks;

RECOGNISING the need to improve the collection of species specific data on catch, discards and trade as a basis for improving the conservation and management of shark stocks and aware that identifying sharks by species is rarely possible when fins have been removed from the carcass;

RECALLING that United Nations General Assembly Resolution on Sustainable Fisheries, adopted annually by consensus, since 2007 (62/177, 63/112, 64/72, 65/38, 66/68, 67/79, 68/71 and A/RES/69/109) calls upon States to take immediate and concerted action to improve the implementation of and compliance with existing regional fisheries management organization or arrangement measures that regulate shark fisheries and incidental catch of sharks, in particular those measures which prohibit or restrict fisheries conducted solely for the purpose of harvesting shark fins, and, where necessary, to consider taking other measures, as appropriate, such as requiring that all sharks be landed with each fin naturally attached;

FURTHER RECALLING that the FAO International Plan of Action for Sharks calls on States to encourage full use of dead sharks, to facilitate improved species-specific catch and landings data and monitoring of shark catches and the identification and reporting of species-specific biological and trade data;

AWARE that despite regional agreements on the prohibition of shark finning, sharks' fins continue to be removed on board and the rest of the shark carcass discarded into the sea;

EMPHASISING the recent recommendations of IOTC and WCPFC Scientific Committees and WCPFC Technical and Compliance Committee that the use of fins-to-carcass weight ratios is not a verifiable means of ensuring the eradication shark finning and that it has proven ineffective in terms of implementation, enforcement and monitoring;

NOTING the recent adoption of Recommendation 2015:10 on Conservation of Sharks Caught in Association with Fisheries Managed by the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission (NEAFC), which establishes the fins attached policy as exclusive option for ensuring the shark finning ban in the NEAFC Convention area;

*FURTHER NOTING* the recent adoption of the fins naturally attached policy by NAFO at its 2016 Annual Meeting;

Agrees as follows:

- a. Members and Cooperating non-Members (CPCs) should establish and implement a national plan of action for conservation and management of sharks, in accordance with the *FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks*.
- b. CPCs shall take the necessary measures to require that their fishermen fully utilise their entire catches of sharks, with the exception of those species for which a retention ban has been adopted by the IATTC. Full utilization is defined as retention by the fishing vessel of all parts of the shark excepting head, guts and skins, to the point of first landing.

- c. CPCs shall prohibit the removal of shark fins on board vessels. CPCs shall prohibit the retention on-board, transshipment, carrying and landing of shark fins which are not naturally attached to the shark carcass until the first point of landing.
- d. Without prejudice to paragraph 3, in order to facilitate on-board storage, shark fins may be partially sliced through and folded against the shark carcass, but shall not be removed from the carcass until the first point of landing.
- e. CPCs shall prohibit the purchase, offer for sale and sale of shark fins which have been removed on-board, retained on-board, transhipped or landed, in contravention to this Resolution.
- f. In fisheries in which sharks are unwanted species, CPCs shall, to the extent possible, encourage the release of live sharks, especially juveniles and pregnant sharks that are caught incidentally and are not used for food and/or subsistence. CPCs shall require that fishers are aware of and use identification guides and handling practices.
- g. CPCs shall report data for catches of sharks, in accordance with IATTC data reporting requirements and procedures, including all available historical data, estimates & life status of discards (dead or alive) and size frequencies. CPCs shall send to the IATTC Secretariat, by May 1, at the latest, a comprehensive annual report of the implementation of this Resolution during the previous year.
- h. CPCs shall, where possible, in cooperation with the IATTC scientific staff, undertake research to:
  - a) identify ways to make fishing gears more selective;
  - b) improve knowledge on key biological/ecological parameters, life-history and behavioural traits, migration patterns of key shark species;
  - c) identify key shark mating, pupping and nursery areas; and
  - d) improve handling practices for live sharks to maximise post-release survival.
- i. The Scientific Advisory Committee shall annually review the information reported by CPCs and will, as necessary, provide recommendations to the Commission on ways to strengthen the conservation and management of sharks within IATTC fisheries.
- j. The Commission shall consider appropriate assistance to developing CPCs for the identification of shark species/ groups and the collection of data on their shark catches.
- k. Resolution C-05-03 is replaced by this measure.

## Appendix 3c

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 D-1

### SUBMITTED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

## IATTC RESOLUTION FOR AN IATTC SCHEME FOR MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR INSPECTION IN PORT

### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

The current EU proposal aims to fight against IUU fishing and contribute to the long-term conservation and sustainable use of living marine resources in the IATTC Convention Area through minimum standards for port inspections. Port inspection closes an important loophole against IUU fishing.

The central elements of the EU proposal are the establishment of a minimum percentage of inspection for foreign vessels (5%), the designation of ports by port States, a compulsory prior notification for port access and the reporting of possible infringements detected in the inspection.

In addition to that, it will be the first ever port inspection measure adopted by IATTC. Therefore it will ensure consistency with management measures taken in other RFMOs and improve the results of the measures aimed towards conservation of tuna and tuna-like species in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. This will contribute to a more responsible and effective management of the stocks covered by the Antigua Convention.

This proposal incorporates comments made by Delegations during the 90<sup>th</sup>, 91<sup>st</sup> and 92<sup>nd</sup> IATTC Meetings. It takes into consideration comments received from developing coastal CPC, including a number of simplified provisions in order to facilitate consensus at the IATTC. The track changes in the text show the amendments made to last year's proposal following suggestions received at the 92<sup>nd</sup> IATTC Meeting.

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)*

*DEEPLY CONCERNED* that illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing has a detrimental effect upon fish stocks, marine ecosystems and the livelihoods of legitimate fishers in particular in developing States,

*CONSCIOUS* of the role of the port State in the adoption of effective measures to promote the sustainable use and the long-term conservation of living marine resources,

*RECALLING* that under the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, the right to fish carries with it the obligation to do so in a responsible manner so as to ensure effective conservation and management of living aquatic resources,

*RECOGNIZING* that measures to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing should build on the primary responsibility of flag States and use all available jurisdiction in accordance with international law, including minimum standards for inspection in port, coastal State measures, and measures to ensure that nationals do not support or engage in illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing,

*RECOGNIZING* that the definition of minimum standards for inspections in port provide a powerful and cost-effective means of preventing, deterring and eliminating illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing,

*AWARE* of the need for increasing coordination at the regional and interregional levels to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing through minimum standards for inspection in port, and

*RECALLING* the relevant provisions of the Agreement to Promote Compliance with International

Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas of 24 November 1993, the 1995 FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and other relevant international law,

*Agrees as follows:*

#### **Assessment in Anticipation of Implementation**

1. Following the adoption of this Resolution, the IATTC Secretariat will identify the needs of developing CPCs related to the implementation of this Resolution; to present options and facilities for capacity building for those CPCs that might require and desire such assistance; to identify and assess any other barriers to effective full implementation; and to develop solutions to any such barriers.
2. This assessment will be accomplished through consultations, through questionnaires sent to all developing CPCs as set forth in Annex 2, and through any other available information.
3. Within 60 days following the deadline for receipt of the completed questionnaires, the Secretariat shall provide all CPCs with a report summarizing the responses, identifying any developing CPCs that may not have responded, and providing a detailed description of identified barriers to implementation.
4. The Commission, at its annual meeting in 2018, shall review the assessment report of the Secretariat and any individual reports from developing CPCs, as provided in paragraph 32.

#### **Scope**

5. Nothing in this Resolution shall prejudice the rights, jurisdiction and duties of Members and Cooperating Non-Members of the Commission (hereinafter referred to as "CPCs") under international law. In particular, nothing in this Resolution shall be construed to affect the exercise by CPCs of their authority over their ports in accordance with international law, including their right to deny entry thereto as well as to adopt more stringent measures than those provided for in this Resolution.

This Resolution shall be interpreted and applied in conformity with international law, taking into account applicable international rules and standards, including those established through the International Maritime Organization, as well as other international instruments.

CPCs shall fulfill in good faith any obligations ultimately assumed pursuant to this Resolution and shall exercise the rights recognized herein in a manner that would not constitute an abuse of right.

6. With a view to monitoring compliance with IATTC Resolutions, each CPC, in its capacity as a port CPC, shall apply this Resolution for an effective scheme of port inspections in respect of foreign fishing vessels carrying IATTC-managed species caught in the IATTC Convention Area (Convention Area) and/or fish products originating from such species caught in the Convention Area that have not been previously landed or transhipped at port, hereinafter referred to as "foreign fishing vessels".
7. A CPC may, in its capacity as a port CPC, decide not to apply this Resolution to foreign fishing vessels chartered by its nationals operating under its authority and returning to its ports. Such chartered fishing vessels shall be subject to measures by the CPC which are as effective as measures applied in relation to vessels entitled to fly its flag.
8. Without prejudice to specifically applicable provisions of other IATTC Resolutions, and except as otherwise provided in this Resolution, this Resolution shall apply to all transhipments undertaken by foreign fishing vessels and to foreign fishing vessels equal to or greater than 20 meters in length overall.
9. Each CPC shall gradually subject foreign fishing vessels below 20 meters length overall, foreign fishing vessels operating under charter as referred to under paragraph 7, and fishing vessels entitled to fly its flag to measures that are at least as effective in combating Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU)<sup>11</sup> fishing as measures applied to vessels referred to in paragraph 8. In the application of these measures

---

<sup>11</sup> IUU fishing refers to illegal, unreported or unregulated fishing activities as defined in Annex 1.

CPCs may take into consideration the characteristics of the different fleets. CPCs shall inform the IATTC Director of the application and scope of the measures set out in this paragraph.

10. CPCs shall take necessary action to inform vessel owners, operators and vessel masters of fishing vessels entitled to fly their flag of this and other relevant IATTC Resolutions as well as the representatives of foreign fishing vessels seeking access to their ports.

#### **Points of Contact**

11. Each CPC wishing to grant access to its ports to foreign fishing vessels shall designate a point of contact for the purposes of receiving notifications pursuant to paragraph 17. Each CPC shall designate a point of contact for the purpose of receiving inspection reports pursuant to paragraph 28(b) of this Resolution. It shall transmit the name and contact information for its points of contact to the IATTC Director no later than 30 days following the entry into force of this Resolution. Any subsequent changes shall be immediately notified to the IATTC Director and at least 7 days before such changes take effect. The IATTC Director shall promptly notify CPCs of any such change.
12. The IATTC Director shall establish and maintain a register of points of contact based on the lists submitted by the CPCs. The register and any subsequent changes shall be published promptly on the IATTC website.

#### **Designated ports**

13. Each CPC wishing to grant access to its ports to foreign fishing vessels shall designate its ports to which foreign fishing vessels may request entry pursuant to this Resolution.
14. Each CPC wishing to grant access to its ports to foreign fishing vessels shall ensure that it has sufficient capacity to conduct inspections in every designated port pursuant to this Resolution to the greatest extent possible.
15. Each CPC wishing to grant access to its ports to foreign fishing vessels shall provide to the IATTC Director within 30 days from the date of entry into force of this Resolution a list of designated ports. Any subsequent changes to this list shall be notified to the IATTC Director at least 14 days before the change takes effect.
16. The IATTC Director shall establish and maintain a register of designated ports based on the lists submitted by the port CPCs. The register and any subsequent change shall be published promptly on the IATTC website.

#### **Prior notification**

17. Each port CPC wishing to grant access to its ports to foreign fishing vessels shall, except as provided under paragraph 18 of this Resolution, require foreign fishing vessels seeking to use its ports for the purpose of landing and/or transshipment to provide, at least 48 hours before the estimated time of arrival at the port, the following information:
  - a) Vessel identification (External identification, Name, Flag CPC, IMO No, if any, and IRCS);
  - b) Name of the designated port, as referred to in the IATTC register, to which it seeks entry and the purpose of the port call (landing and/or transshipment);
  - c) Fishing authorization or, where appropriate, any other authorization held by the vessel to support fishing operations on IATTC-managed species and/or fish products originating from such species, or to transship related fishery products;
  - d) Estimated date and time of arrival in port;
  - e) The estimated quantities in kilograms of each IATTC-managed species and/or fish products originating from such species held on board, with associated catch areas. If no IATTC species and/or

fish products originating from such species are held on board, a 'nil' report shall be transmitted;;

- f) The estimated quantities for each IATTC-managed species and/or fish products originating from such species in kilograms to be landed or transshipped, with associated catch areas.

The port CPC may also request other information as it may require to determine whether the vessel has engaged in IUU fishing, or related activities.

- 18. The port CPC may prescribe a longer or shorter notification period than specified in paragraph 17, taking into account, inter alia, the type of fishery product, the distance between the fishing grounds and its ports. In such a case, the port CPC shall inform the IATTC Director, who shall publish the information promptly on the IATTC website.
- 19. After receiving the relevant information pursuant to paragraph 17, as well as such other information as it may require to determine whether the foreign fishing vessel requesting entry into its port has engaged in IUU fishing, the port CPC shall decide whether to authorize or deny the entry of the vessel into its port. In case the port CPC decides to authorize the entry of the vessel into its port, the following provisions on port inspection shall apply.

### **Port inspections**

- 20. Inspections shall be carried out by the competent authority of the port CPC.
- 21. Each year CPCs shall inspect at least 5% of landing and transshipment operations in their designated ports as are made by foreign fishing vessels.
- 22. The Port CPC shall, in accordance with its domestic law, take the following, inter alia, into account when determining which foreign vessels to inspect:
  - a) Whether a vessel has failed to provide complete information as required in paragraph 17;
  - b) Requests from other CPCs or relevant regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) that a particular vessel be inspected, particularly where such requests are supported by evidence of IUU fishing by the vessel in question;
  - c) Whether clear grounds exist for suspecting that a vessel has engaged in IUU fishing, including information derived from RFMOs.

### **Inspection procedure**

- 23. Each inspector shall carry a document of identity issued by the port CPC. In accordance with domestic laws, port CPC inspectors may examine all relevant areas, decks and rooms of the fishing vessel, catches processed or otherwise, nets or other fishing gears, equipment both technical and electronic, records of transmissions and any relevant documents, including fishing logbooks, Cargo Manifests and Mates Receipts and landing declarations in case of transshipment, which they deem necessary to ensure compliance with the IATTC Resolutions. They may take copies of any documents considered relevant, and they may also question the Master and any other person on the vessel being inspected.
- 24. Inspections shall involve the monitoring of the landing or transshipment and include a cross-check between the quantities by species notified in the prior notification message in paragraph 17 and the quantities which are landed, transhipped or held on board by the vessels. Inspections shall be carried out in such a way that the fishing vessel suffers the minimum interference and inconvenience, and that degradation of the quality of the catch is avoided to the extent practicable.
- 25. On completion of the inspection, the port CPC inspector shall provide the Master of the foreign fishing vessel with the inspection report containing the findings of the inspection, including possible subsequent measures that could be taken by the competent authority of the CPC. The inspector shall sign the report. The Master shall be given the opportunity to add any comments or objection to the report, to

contact the competent authority of the flag CPC. A copy of the report shall be provided to the Master.

26. The port CPC shall transmit a copy of the inspection report electronically or by other means to the flag CPC point of contact and the IATTC Director no later than 14 days following the date of completion of the inspection. If the inspection report cannot be transmitted within 14 days, the port CPC should notify the IATTC Director within the 14 day time period the reasons for the delay and when the report will be submitted.
27. Flag CPCs shall take necessary action to ensure that Masters facilitate safe access to the fishing vessel, cooperate with the competent authority of the port CPC, facilitate the inspection and communication and not obstruct, intimidate or interfere, or cause other persons to obstruct, intimidate or interfere with port CPC inspectors in the execution of their duties.

#### **Procedure in the event of infringements**

28. If the information collected during the inspection provides evidence that a foreign fishing vessel has committed an infringement of the IATTC Resolutions, the inspector shall:
  - a) record the infringement in the inspection report;
  - b) transmit the inspection report to the port CPC competent authority, which shall promptly forward a copy to the IATTC Director and to the flag CPC point of contact;
  - c) to the extent practicable, ensure safekeeping of the evidence pertaining to such alleged infringement.
29. If the infringement falls within the legal jurisdiction of the port CPC, the port CPC may take action in accordance with its domestic laws. The port CPC shall promptly notify the action taken to the competent authority of the flag CPC and to the IATTC Director, who shall promptly publish this information in a secured part of the IATTC website.
30. Infringements that do not fall within the jurisdiction of the port CPC, and infringements referred to in paragraph 29 for which the port CPC has not taken action, shall be referred to the flag State and, as appropriate, the relevant coastal State.. Upon receiving the copy of the inspection report, the flag CPC shall promptly investigate the alleged infringement and notify the IATTC Director of the status of the investigation and of any enforcement action that may have been taken within 6 months of such receipt. If the flag CPC cannot provide the IATTC Director this status report within 6 months of such receipt, the flag CPC should notify the IATTC within the 6 month time period the reasons for the delay and when the status report will be submitted. The IATTC Director shall promptly publish this information in a secured part of the IATTC website. CPCs shall include in their Compliance questionnaire information regarding the status of such investigations.
31. Should the inspection provide evidence that the inspected vessel has engaged in IUU activities as referred to in Resolution C-05-07, the port CPC shall promptly report the case to the flag CPC and notify as soon as possible the IATTC Director, along with its supporting evidence.

#### **Requirements of developing CPCs**

32. On the basis of the outcome of the assessment exercise set forth in Annex 2 and in paragraphs 1 to 3, developing CPCs requiring assistance shall submit a plan of action for the implementation of this Resolution. CPCs shall give full recognition to the special requirements of developing CPCs in relation to a port inspection scheme consistent with this Resolution. As of 1 January 2019, and following the result of the assessment of needs, the Special Sustainable Development Fund established by Resolution C-14-03, either directly or through supplementary voluntary contributions from CPCs, shall provide assistance to developing CPCs in order to, *inter alia*:
  - a) Develop their capacity including by providing technical assistance and establishing an appropriate

funding mechanism to support and strengthen the development and implementation of an effective system of port inspection at national, regional or international levels and to ensure that a disproportionate burden resulting from the implementation of this Resolution is not unnecessarily transferred to them and

- b) Facilitate their participation in meetings and/or training programmes of relevant regional and international organizations that promote the effective development and implementation of a system of port inspection, including monitoring, control and surveillance, enforcement and legal proceedings for infractions and dispute settlements pursuant to this Resolution.

### **General provisions**

33. CPCs are encouraged to enter into bilateral agreements/arrangements that allow for an inspector exchange program designed to promote cooperation, share information, and educate each party's inspectors on inspection strategies and methodologies which promote compliance with IATTC Resolutions. A description of such programs should be provided to the IATTC Director which should publish it on the IATTC website.
34. Without prejudice to the domestic laws of the port CPC, the flag CPC may, in the case of appropriate bilateral agreements or arrangements with the port CPC or at the invitation of that CPC, send its own officials to accompany the inspectors of the port CPC and observe or take part in the inspection of its vessel.
35. Flag CPCs shall consider and act on reports of infringements from inspectors of a port CPC on a similar basis as the reports from their own inspectors, in accordance with their domestic laws. CPCs shall cooperate, in accordance with their domestic laws, in order to facilitate judicial or other proceedings arising from inspection reports as set out in this Resolution.
36. The IATTC Director shall develop model formats for prior notification reports and inspection reports required under this Resolution, taking into account forms adopted in other relevant instruments, such as international organisations and other RFMOs, for consideration at the 2018 Annual Meeting of the Commission.
37. The Commission shall review this Resolution no later than its 2020 Annual Meeting and, if appropriate, taking into account developments in other RFMOs and/or international for a and consider revisions to improve its effectiveness. The Secretariat will report annually on the implementation of this measure.
38. This Resolution shall enter into force on January 1, 2020.

## ANNEX 1

As defined by FAO in the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, IUU fishing means:

**Illegal fishing** refers to fishing activities:

- (1) conducted by national or foreign vessels in waters under the jurisdiction of a State, without the permission of that State, or in contravention of its laws and regulations;
- (2) conducted by vessels flying the flag of States that are parties to a relevant regional fisheries management organization but operate in contravention of the conservation and management measures adopted by that organization and by which the States are bound, or relevant provisions of the applicable international law; or
- (3) in violation of national laws or international obligations, including those undertaken by cooperating States to a relevant regional fisheries management organization.

**Unreported fishing** refers to fishing activities:

- (1) which have not been reported, or have been misreported, to the relevant national authority, in contravention of national laws and regulations; or
- (2) undertaken in the area of competence of a relevant regional fisheries management organization which have not been reported or have been misreported, in contravention of the reporting procedures of that organization.

**Unregulated fishing** refers to fishing activities:

- (1) in the area of application of a relevant regional fisheries management organization that are conducted by vessels without nationality, or by those flying the flag of a State not party to that organization, or by a fishing entity, in a manner that is not consistent with or contravenes the conservation and management measures of that organization; or
- (2) in areas or for fish stocks in relation to which there are no applicable conservation or management measures and where such fishing activities are conducted in a manner inconsistent with State responsibilities for the conservation of living marine resources under international law.

## ANNEX 2

### Assessment of Capacity to Implement

The Secretariat shall, within 30 days following adoption of this Resolution, transmit to all developing CPCs an assessment questionnaire designed to assess, for each obligation anticipated under this resolution, the extent to which each CPC:

1. Is already applying a particular obligation within laws and/or regulations;
2. For each obligation not already applied, the capacity of each CPC to implement it and the approximate time that will be required to do so;
3. For each obligation that a CPC deems inapplicable or unimplementable, request that the CPC provide the reasons for that determination.

The assessment questionnaire shall include the following obligations envisioned in this Resolution, *inter alia*:

1. The ability of the CPC to designate specific port(s) which foreign vessels may enter;
2. The capacity of the CPC to inspect at least 5% of foreign vessels entering the designated ports;
3. The capacity of the CPC to designate and empower a competent national authority to receive and process “Prior Notification” information as required in paragraph 18 from inbound foreign vessels;
4. The capacity under national laws of a CPC to empower inspectors to execute the “Inspection Procedures” in paragraphs 23 to 27;
5. The capacity of the CPC to implement the “Procedure in the event of infringement” set forth in paragraphs 28 to 31;
6. The specific needs identified by the CPC for assistance in the areas of capacity building;
7. Any other areas where capacity building needs have been identified in order to ensure the effective implementation of this Resolution.

Developing CPCs shall respond in full to the Assessment Questionnaire to the Secretariat within 90 days of receipt.

Within 60 days following the deadline for receipt of the completed questionnaires, the Secretariat shall provide all CPCs with a report summarizing the responses, identifying any developing CPCs that may not have responded, and providing a detailed description of identified barriers to implementation.

## Appendix 3d

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 E-1

### SUBMITTED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

### ON MARINE POLLUTION

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Every year very large quantities of plastic waste leak into the environment from sources both on land and at sea, generating significant economic and environmental damage. Globally, 5 to 13 million tonnes of plastics — 1.5 to 4 % of global plastics production — end up in the oceans yearly. It is estimated that plastic accounts for over 80 % of marine litter.

Plastic debris is then transported by marine currents, sometimes over very long distances. It can be washed up on land, degrade into microplastics or form dense areas of marine litter trapped in ocean gyres. UNEP estimates that damage to marine environments is at least USD 8 billion per year globally.

The current EU proposal establishes a regulatory framework on the marking of fishing gear and the discharge of plastics from fishing vessels in the IATTC Convention Area in order to limit the negative effects of plastic residues in the ocean affecting marine life on shore and off shore.

Marine litter from sea-based sources is significant. While MARPOL bans the discharge of garbage from all ships, including fishing vessels, it provides no mechanism for monitoring the effective implementation of this obligation. RFMOs are then called to play an essential role in ensuring the application of the MARPOL obligations.

Fishing gear abandoned at sea can have particularly harmful impacts through entanglement of marine life. The implementation of the relevant provisions of the of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Marking of Fishing Gear by the IATTC would help in ensuring that all fishing gear is marked, and, if lost or discarded, could be traced back to its original owner.

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC)*

*RECALLING* the mandate of the Commission under Article VII of the Antigua Convention to adopt, as necessary, conservation and management measures and recommendations for species belonging to the same ecosystem and that are affected by fishing for, or dependent on or associated with, the fish stocks covered by this Convention, with a view to maintaining or restoring populations of such species above levels at which their reproduction may become seriously threatened;

*CONCERNED* of the impact of Abandoned, Lost or Otherwise Discarded Fishing Gear (ALDFG) and plastic residues in the ocean greatly affecting marine life and the need to facilitate the identification and recovery of such gear;

*AWARE* of Article 18(3)(d) of the United Nations Fish Stock Agreement (UNFSA) in relation to the marking of fishing vessels and fishing gear for identification in accordance with uniform and internationally recognizable vessel and gear marking systems, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Standard Specifications for the Marking and Identification of Fishing Vessels and the Voluntary Guidelines on the Marking of Fishing Gear;

*RECALLING* that the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) seeks to eliminate and reduce the amount of garbage being discharged into the sea from ships and that its Annex V applies to all vessels but there is no monitoring mechanism provided for by MARPOL to ensure its effective implementation,

*Agrees as follows:*

#### **Marking of fishing gear**

1. Members and Cooperating Non-Members (CPCs) shall ensure that all fishing gear used by vessels flying their flag are clearly marked.
2. The Director shall develop a marking scheme for consideration and adoption by the Commission in 2019, in coordination with CPCs and taking into account the FAO voluntary guidelines on the marking of fishing gear.
3. The Director should consider, at a minimum, including the following elements in the marking scheme:
  - a. The marking should provide a simple, pragmatic, affordable and verifiable means of identifying ownership and position of fishing gear and its link with the vessel(s) or operator (s) undertaking the fishing operation;
  - b. To the extent possible, be compatible with related traceability and certification systems;
  - c. When applicable, the marking should match the vessel's registration details (e.g. the vessel's port letters and numbers or International Radio Call Sign or IMO number, if issued);
  - d. Marker buoys and similar objects floating on the surface and intended to indicate the location and/or origin of fixed fishing gear shall be clearly marked at all times;
  - e. The identification should be easy to apply to the fishing gear and should be applied in such a manner that it will permit its identification or electronic recognition taking into consideration confidentiality safeguards and should not become unreadable or disassociated from the fishing gear.

#### **Retrieval of abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear**

4. CPCs shall ensure that:
  - (a) vessels flying their flag operating with any gear on board shall make every reasonable attempt to have equipment on board to retrieve abandoned, lost or otherwise discarded fishing gear (ALDFG) and training available to facilitate the recovery of ALDFG ;
  - (b) vessels flying their flag that have lost gear shall not abandon it without making every reasonable

attempt to retrieve it as soon as possible;

- (c) no vessels flying their flag shall deliberately abandon fishing gear, except for safety reasons, notably in case of vessels in distress and/or life in danger;
- (d) if gear cannot be retrieved, a vessel flying its flag shall promptly notify its competent authority of the following information:
  - i. the name, IMO number and call sign of the vessel;
  - ii. the type of lost gear;
  - iii. the quantity of gear lost;
  - iv. the time when the gear was lost;
  - v. the position (longitude/latitude) where the gear was lost;
  - vi. measures taken by the vessel to retrieve lost gear, and
  - vii. report, if known, the circumstances that led to the gear being lost, or abandoned for safety reasons;
- (e) following retrieval of any ALDFG, a vessel flying its flag shall notify its competent authority of the following:
  - i. the name, IMO number and call sign of the vessel that has retrieved the gear;
  - ii. the name, IMO number and call sign of the vessel that lost the gear (if known);
  - iii. the type of gear retrieved;
  - iv. the quantity of gear retrieved;
  - v. the time when the gear was retrieved;
  - vi. the position (longitude/latitude) where the gear was retrieved;
  - and
  - vii. if possible, photographs of the gear retrieved; and
- (f) its competent authority shall without delay notify the Secretariat of the information referred to in paragraphs 4 (d) and (e).

5. Recovered ALDFG and fishing gear no longer in use should be recycled or disposed of responsibly on land. CPC should ensure the provision of adequate port reception facilities for the disposal of such fishing gear in accordance with MARPOL Annex V.

#### **Special provisions**

6. This Resolution is without prejudice to Resolution C-16-01 on Fish Aggregating Devices.

#### **Discharge of plastics**

7. Except as provided in paragraph 7 of this Resolution, CPCs shall prohibit vessels flying their flag

from discharging into the sea any plastics<sup>12</sup>, including but not limited to synthetic ropes, synthetic fishing nets, plastic garbage bags and incinerator ashes from plastic products. All plastics on-board shall be stored on-board the vessel until an on land location is reached where it can be safely disposed.

8. Paragraph 6 shall not apply to:

- (a) The discharge of all plastics from a vessel necessary for the purpose of securing the safety of a ship and those on board or saving life at sea; or
- (b) The accidental loss of plastics resulting from damage to a vessel or its equipment, provided that all reasonable precautions have been taken before and after the occurrence of the damage, to prevent or minimize the accidental loss; or
- (c) The accidental loss of fishing gear from a vessel provided that all reasonable precautions have been taken to prevent such loss.

---

<sup>12</sup> Plastic means a solid material which contains as an essential ingredient one or more high molecular mass polymers and which is formed (shaped) during either manufacture of the polymer or the fabrication into a finished product by heat and /or pressure.

## Appendix 3e

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

## 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 F-2

### SUBMITTED BY COLOMBIA AND MEXICO

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION C-11-08 ON OBSERVERS ON LONGLINE VESSELS

### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

The current resolution C-11-08 on observers on longline vessels makes it mandatory to have a coverage of 5% of the fishing effort made by its longline fishing vessels greater than 20 metres length overall.

Taking into account that the staff recommendation on management and data collection, 2018, the longline fishery, states the following:

*“Resolution C-11-08 requires that at least 5% of the fishing effort by longline vessels greater than 20 m length overall (LOA) carry a scientific observer. However, 5% coverage is too low for calculating accurate estimates of the catches of species caught infrequently in those fisheries, such as some sharks of conservation concern; 20% coverage is considered the minimum level required for such estimates. Both the staff and the SAC have recommended that this level of coverage be adopted for longline vessels over 20 m LOA.*

*RECOMMENDATION: The staff maintains its recommendation of at least 20% observer coverage of longline vessels over 20 m length overall..”*

In addition, the recommendations of the ninth meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (CCA), held from May 14 to 18, 2018 in La Jolla, California, state the following:

*“ (...) the SAC recommends that CPCs with large scale longline fleets: 1) share the operational-level data with the IATTC through an appropriate way; and/or 2) collaborate with IATTC staff and other CPCs with large-scale longline fleets to develop improved abundance indices.”*

In In this context, it is considered essential that the current resolution be modified to accommodate a necessary coverage, in a gradual manner that will allow it to reach the proposed level of 20%, through two alternatives. One is the gradual increase in the number of observers on board or alternatively, the use of electronic methods of remote monitoring and the use of conventional video cameras.

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in San Diego, California (USA), on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> meeting:*

*Recognizing the need to improve the scientific information from the longline fishery on target species as well as comprehensive data on interactions with non-target species as required by the Antigua Convention, in particular, sea turtles, sharks and seabirds;*

*Noting the considerations of the Parties with extensive longline fishing and the need to ensure a uniform and equitable treatment of all tuna fishing vessels and fisheries that operate in the Antigua Convention Area;*

*Noting* that large purse-seine vessels operating in the Antigua Convention Area have been operating for many years and comply with carrying 100% scientific observers aboard, in accordance with the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program;

*Taking into account* and reaffirming the recommendation by the Ninth Meeting of the Commission's Scientific Advisory Committee that within a period of no more than five years, the coverage by observers on longline fishing vessels greater than 20 metres length overall be increased until the scientifically adequate coverage of 20% is reached,

*Agrees that:*

1. A gradual increase in observer coverage will be implemented in order to ensure a 20% coverage and for this:
2. Each Member and Cooperating non-Member (CPC) shall ensure a gradual increase in the coverage by scientific observers on longline fishing vessels greater than 20 meters length overall so that:
  - a. from 1 January 2020, coverage shall be at least 10%.
  - b. from 1 January 2022, coverage shall be at least 15%.
  - c. from 1 January 2024, coverage shall be at least 20%.
  - d. Or alternatively, starting in 2020, the coverage will be gradually incremented in the same percentages using electronic methods of remote monitoring and the additional use of conventional video cameras to carry out the controls provided in this Resolution and, through the electronic monitoring option, achieve that the country be enabled to control in a timely manner and from land the management of fishing on board of its vessels;
3. The main task of the on-board observers or the remote electronic monitoring systems shall be to record catches of target species, species composition by species, as well as any interactions with non-target species, such as sea turtles, seabirds and sharks and, where appropriate, the precise and timely application of mitigation measures agreed by the Commission
4. When the results of the remote electronic monitoring program are communicated, the margin of error inherent in the technical specifications of the system will also be reported, which will not exceed a range of +/- 5%
5. With this information the State / CPC authorities will provide a report of the vessel having made the catches, including the following documents: a) Technical report of the remote monitoring system used, b) General information on: date, place (length and latitude), species, statistical information on size distribution, average size and weight, size. The effort shall be determined by the number of fishing days, type of catch, discards, among others.
6. Each CPC shall ensure that the coverage by observers and/or remote electronic systems be representative of the activities of its fleet and shall report to the IATTC staff the duration of the fishing operations.
7. The aforementioned video recordings shall also be available for analysis by the IATTC and each CPC shall adopt the necessary measures to avoid any substitution, editing or manipulation.
8. Each CPC shall update the list of its vessels, indicating specifically which vessels are active, and of them the percentage of on-board observers and / or remote monitoring systems, in addition to the inactive, and/or sunk vessels.
9. The Director, in cooperation with the Scientific Staff and the Scientific Advisory Committee, shall review the reporting format detailing the required data to be collected directly by scientific observers or through remote electronic monitoring systems on longline vessels and will communicate it to the Commission.

10. Scientific observers shall submit to the authorities of their flag CPC a report on these observations at the latest 30 days after the end of each fishing trip.
11. Every year, CPCs shall submit to the Scientific Advisory Committee, through the Director, by 31 March, the scientific observers' information on the previous year's fishery, in a format established by the Scientific Advisory Committee.
12. The large scale longline fleets shall: 1) share the operational-level data with the IATTC through an appropriate way; and/or 2) collaborate with IATTC staff and other CPCs with large-scale longline fleets to develop improved abundance indices.
13. The use of remote electronic monitoring systems be evaluated in order to establish minimum standards and observer coverage in longline fisheries in the EPO be extended through these two options.

## Appendix 3f

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 G-3

### SUBMITTED BY COLOMBIA, MEXICO, AND NICARAGUA

#### PROPOSAL FOR A RESOLUTION ON CONFIDENTIALITY IN THE USE OF INFORMATION ON COMPLIANCE

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) gathered in the city of San Diego, California, on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:*

*Recalling* that information related to compliance with the resolutions or recommendations of the Commission by a CPC, that is collected or compiled by the IATTC, or provided by any CPC, has the purpose of evaluating and improving the level of performance and effectiveness of the joint work of the Commission;

*Recalling* that the “Antigua Convention”, in its Article XXII establishes that the Commission shall determine rules of confidentiality for access, use and disclosure of information pursuant to the Convention;

*Recognizing* that information related to compliance with the resolutions and recommendations of the Commission by a CPC is of a strictly confidential character, limited exclusively to the purposes described in the corresponding resolution or recommendation;

*Taking into consideration* that Article XVIII of the “Antigua Convention” on implementation, compliance and enforcement by Parties provides that each Party shall authorize the use and release, subject to any applicable rules of confidentiality, of pertinent information recorded by on-board observers of the Commission or a national program.

*Recognizing* that reports derived from this information do not prejudice the responsibility of CPCs, its fleets or operators and in any case do not replace the decision mechanisms which in the framework of international law might ensue under the guarantee of due process;

*The Commission agrees:*

1. The use of information related to compliance with the resolutions or recommendations of the Commission by a CPC, that is collected or compiled by the IATTC, or provided by any CPC, for purposes other than those established in the respective resolution or recommendation, shall require the express authorization by the respective CPC for that information;
2. CPCs, observers or any attendee at the meetings of the Commission or its Working Groups shall abstain from using information described in the first paragraph in unilateral processes for identifying or certifying sanctions that are not expressly authorized by the Commission;
3. Excluded from this obligation is the use that a CPC may make of that information, as evidence in accordance with its domestic laws, or for judging alleged infractions that occur in its Exclusive Economic Zone or regarding its flag vessels;

4. No provision of this resolution may be interpreted in a way that limits the duty of States to administer their fisheries effectively, imposing the appropriate and relevant sanctions that will dissuade non-compliance with the resolutions and recommendations of the Commission.

## Appendix 3g

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 H-1A

### SUBMITTED BY COLOMBIA

#### AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION C-17-02

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in La Jolla, California (USA) on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:

*Taking into account* that Resolution C-17-02 empowers the scientific staff of the IATTC and to provide guidance to the Commission on the manner in which the FAD data referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 of this resolution should be presented, including the format and specific data to be reported;

*Considering* that Resolution C-17-02 establishes that the Scientific Advisory Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Permanent Working Group on FADs shall review the progress and results of the implementation of the FAD provisions contained in this Resolution and make recommendations to the Commission, as appropriate;

Bearing in mind that the *Ad Hoc* Permanent Working Group on FADs at its third meeting recommended that CPCs provide to the IATTC staff the same daily raw buoy data received by original users (i.e. vessels, fishing companies) in line with the research needs defined in the Strategic Science Plan to be adopted by the Commission, a recommendation that was also endorsed by the Scientific Advisory Committee at its 9th meeting.

*Agrees that:*

1. Resolution C-17-02 is amended as follows:

Replace paragraph 11 with the following paragraph:

“ 11. In order to support the monitoring of compliance with the limitation established in Paragraph 8, and the work of the IATTC scientific staff in analyzing the impact of FAD fisheries, while protecting business confidential data, CPCs shall report,; or require their vessels [to authorize data buoy companies] to report daily information on all active FADs to the Secretariat, in accordance with guidance developed under Paragraph 12, with reports at monthly intervals submitted with a time delay of at least 60 days, but no longer than 90 days. These data shall be reported to the Secretariat in raw form, as received by the original users (i.e. vessels, fishing companies). [The IATTC scientific staff shall present a preliminary analysis of the raw data to the meeting of the SAC in 2019, and advise the SAC if raw data is useful for analyzing the impact of FAD fisheries and if the raw data should continue to be reported].”

## Appendix 3 h

INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)  
24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 I-1

### SUBMITTED BY COLOMBIA

## ESTABLISHMENT OF AN *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP FOR THE STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF THE FISHERIES ON THE JUVENILE TROPICAL TUNA STOCKS

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), gathered in La Jolla, California (USA) on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:

*Committed* to the long-term conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Bearing in mind* that all fishing gear has an impact on stocks and the pelagic eco-system in the EPO, and that the Members of the Commission should fully understand these effects;

*Noting* that the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) at its 8th Meeting recommended to assess the impact of the fishing mortality of juveniles on future spawning biomass of yellowfin and bigeye tunas;

*Recognizing* the concern expressed by several Members regarding the possible negative impact resulting from the increased capture of juveniles of yellowfin and bigeye;

*Agrees:*

1. To establish the *Ad Hoc* Virtual Working Group to study the impact of the catch of juveniles on the long-term sustainability fishery (Working Group on Juvenile Tunas);
2. The functions of the Working Group referred to in paragraph 1 shall be the following:
  - a. To clearly define the concept of juveniles for tropical tuna species;
  - b. To analyze the impact of the purse-seine fishery on the catch of juvenile tropical tunas;
  - c. To analyze the effect of the catch of juveniles on the maximum sustainable yield and F multiplier of yellowfin tuna and bigeye tuna;
  - d. If necessary, to develop management proposals focused on minimizing the impact of the catch of juveniles on the sustainability of the tropical tuna fishery;
  - e. To submit a progress report to the Scientific Advisory Committee at its annual meeting in 2019 and a final report at the annual meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in 2020.
3. The Working Group will be chaired by the person chosen by the Commission.
4. The Working Group will be multisectoral, with the participation of various stakeholders, such as

scientists, fisheries managers, representatives of the fishing industry, administrators, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and fishermen. Expressions of interest in participating in the group will be communicated to the Director, who will inform the CPCs and the Chair of the Working Group on Juvenile Tunas.

5. The Chair of the Working Group, with the support of the Secretariat and considering the contributions provided by the Members, will establish the format, periodicity and content of the virtual meetings required for the performance of its functions, which will be carried out during the intersessional periods in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020.
6. The Commission may review, at its annual meetings in 2019 or 2020, the need or not to extend and/or broaden the mandate of the Group.

## Appendix 3i

### INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION

### 93<sup>RD</sup> MEETING

San Diego, California (USA)

24, 27 – 30 August 2018

### PROPOSAL IATTC-93 K-1A

### SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES

## RESOLUTION TO MITIGATE THE IMPACT ON SEA TURTLES BY VESSELS FISHING FOR TUNA AND TUNA-LIKE SPECIES IN THE EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN

*The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) gathered in San Diego, California (USA), on the occasion of its 93<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:*

*Considering* the adverse effects of fishing for tunas and tuna-like species on the populations of sea turtles in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO);

*Deeply concerned* about the marked decline in the number of nesting female Eastern Pacific leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the EPO, and that the sub-population is considered by the IUCN to be Critically Endangered;

*Considering* that sea turtle catch is incidental and according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Code of Conduct, States should minimize the catch of non-target species;

*Guided* by recent work that has led to advancements in best practices and technologies to avoid interactions and/or to reduce mortality of sea turtles interacting with fishing gear, including:

- the FAO *Guidelines to Reduce Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations* (2005 Guidelines) and their recommended implementation by regional fisheries bodies and management organizations,
- FAO Common Oceans workshops (2016) on the Joint Analysis of Sea Turtle Mitigation Effectiveness, which identified the need to address sea turtle bycatch in longline fisheries, and
- international scientific studies on the use of circle hooks and whole finfish bait that demonstrate statistically significant reductions in the both the rate of interaction and mortality of sea turtles incidentally caught in longline gear.

*Recognizing* that the IATTC has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC), which can contribute to collaboration in furtherance of the reduction of sea turtle bycatch and the implementation of this measure;

*Acknowledging* that nearly every IATTC Member has undertaken circle hook trials in their longline fisheries in the last decade;

*Recalling* the discussions at the 7th and 8th Bycatch Working Group and resulting recommendations (BYC-07 and BYC-08);

*Noting* that increasing observer coverage and quality of data on longline vessels would allow for more refined and targeted measures to address sea turtle bycatch; and

*Affirming* that additional measures should be undertaken to reduce sea turtle bycatch and mortality in

IATTC fisheries;

*Has agreed as follows:*

1. IATTC Members and Cooperating Non-Members (“CPCs”) shall:
  - a. Require fishermen or vessel operators of longline, purse seine, and other gear types that fish for species covered by the IATTC to:
    - i. Follow sea turtle handling and release guidelines consistent with the FAO "Best practices for sea turtle handling and release" of the 2005 Guidelines when any sea turtle interaction occurs.
    - ii. Carry safe-handling tools on board (e.g. de-hookers, line cutters, and dip nets), and when sea turtle interactions occur, employ them for the prompt and safe release of incidentally-caught sea turtles.
  - b. Implement or enhance observer programs for fisheries under the purview of the Commission that may have impacts on sea turtle populations, taking into consideration economic and practical feasibility.
  - c. Continue to participate in and promote research to identify techniques to further reduce sea turtle bycatch in all gear types used in the EPO.
  - d. Investigate the use of temporary fishing closures adjacent to nesting beaches or known foraging hotspots to reduce impacts of fishing on sea turtles.
2. CPCs with purse-seine vessels fishing in the Convention Area shall:
  - a. Require fishermen to avoid encirclement of sea turtles.
  - b. Require fishermen to safely release all sea turtles observed entangled in FADs and report any such release to the Commission as an interaction under paragraph 4.a.ii.
3. CPCs with longline vessels fishing in the Convention Area shall require longline vessels to employ at least one of the following mitigation measures:
  - a. Use only circle hooks<sup>13</sup>,
  - b. Use only finfish for bait (whole or cut),
  - c. Gear must be deployed such that the deepest point of the main longline between any two floats, i.e., the deepest point in each sag of the main line, is at a depth greater than 100 meters below the sea surface, OR
  - d. Another mitigation measure to reduce sea turtle bycatch that has been reviewed by the IATTC scientific staff and approved by the Commission. A proposal for such a measure must be submitted to the Bycatch Working Group for review in their meeting the year prior to desired implementation, the first being the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting in 2019, for measures to be implemented in 2020.
4. Monitoring and Evaluation
  - a. CPCs must report to the Director annually, by June 30 (beginning in 2021), in a standardized format to be developed by the Commission staff and circulated for CPC approval no later than six months after the adoption of this resolution, the information identified here:
    - i. Laws, regulations, and other measures in place to implement the FAO *Guidelines to Reduce*

---

<sup>13</sup> “Circle hooks” are defined as a hook with the point turned perpendicularly back to the shank to form a generally circular or oval shape, with no more than 10 degrees offset.

*Sea Turtle Mortality in Fishing Operations*<sup>14</sup> (2005) and this Resolution.

- ii. For vessels with observers, or when information is otherwise available from the vessel, the following information on all observed sea turtle interactions in all gear types:
    - a. date
    - b. location (latitude, longitude)
    - c. fishing gear type
    - d. species identification
    - e. size (curved carapace length)
    - f. capture and release condition (e.g., live/dead)
    - g. hooking location, if applicable (e.g., flipper, mouth/jaw, swallowed)
    - h. amount of gear left on the animal, if applicable, prior to release (e.g., estimated amount of line)
  - iii. a declaration of the mitigation measure(s) employed by a CPC's longline vessels for the previous year pursuant to paragraph 3.
  - iv. implementation status of each paragraph/subparagraph requirements: "yes"; "no"; or "not applicable" (explanations required for all "no" and "not applicable" responses; "not applicable" is not a permitted response for paragraph 1 requirements)
- b. All standardized CPC reports described under 4.a shall be made available through a controlled-access portal on the IATTC website for review by other CPCs, taking into consideration not posting confidential information.
  - c. Based on these reports, the Commission staff shall, in conjunction with the Bycatch Working Group, report to the SAC and the Committee for the Review of Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission (Implementation Review Committee) every three years (beginning in 2023) on the extent of implementation, areas needing improvement, the level of bycatch reduction that has been achieved since adoption, and recommendations for improvement including amendments to this measure.
  - d. The SAC shall consider these 3-year reviews and make recommendations for improvements of the measure.
5. Compliance
- a. The Implementation Review Committee shall undertake a comprehensive review of compliance with the requirements of this resolution every three years (beginning in 2023).
  - b. The Review Committee shall report to the Commission on that review and make recommendations of needed actions including areas to strengthen compliance with the resolution.
6. Considering the particular situation of coastal developing countries, the special fund established in Resolution C-14-03 should be strengthened through the allocation of funds, from voluntary contributions of CPCs and inclusion of specific budget lines, to facilitate the implementation of this Resolution, including for training fishermen on safe handling and release and to provide related equipment.
7. The Bycatch Working Group shall discuss, at its 9th meeting in 2019, and recommend to the Commission an optimum circle hook size for consideration and potential modification to this resolution.
8. This Resolution shall enter into force on 1 January 2020, and replaces Resolution C-07-03 to Mitigate the Impact of Tuna Fishing Vessels on Sea Turtles.

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0725e/i0725e.pdf>

## Appendix 3j

# AGREEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL DOLPHIN CONSERVATION PROGRAM

## 37<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE PARTIES

San Diego, California (USA)  
17 August 2018

### PROPOSAL MOP-37 A-1A

### SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES

#### RESOLUTION ON IMPROVING OBSERVER SAFETY AT SEA: SAFETY EQUIPMENT

*The Parties to the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (AIDCP):*

*Taking into account* that observers play a critical role in supporting effective management outcomes, and therefore, it is critical that measures are in place to ensure their safety while undertaking their duties;

*Concerned* that observers participating in the AIDCP On-Board Observer Program are not provided critical life-saving equipment;

*Recognizing* that consistent safety requirements should apply to all observers operating within the legal and institutional framework of the AIDCP; and

*Considering* that the Secretariat has conducted a cost analysis of providing an independent two-way satellite communication device (such as an *inReach* device), and (2) a personal life-saving beacon (such as a *ResQLink*) to observers in the On-Board Observer Program (see Annex I, and [MOP-36 INF-A](#)).

*Resolve as follows:*

1. Observer safety equipment
  - a. The AIDCP On-Board Observer Program, which includes the IATTC observer program and the Parties' respective national observer programs, shall ensure that, when observers embark on a vessel for a trip, they are provided with (1) an independent two-way satellite communication device, and (2) a waterproof personal life-saving beacon. The devices shall be included on a list of approved devices maintained by the AIDCP observer program, to ensure the reliability of the devices.
  - b. Parties with national observer programs that would like the AIDCP to cover the cost of the equipment and the associated operating costs under this paragraph shall submit to the Secretariat an estimate of the number of devices required for their observers.
  - c. The IATTC observer program and each Party's national observer program shall appoint a designated person or persons whom observers can contact at all times in cases of emergency.
2. The equipment requirements of paragraph 1(a) are approved in principle, pending the confirmation of available funds.

## Appendix 4a.

<p><b>INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION</b> <b>COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE</b> <b>6<sup>TH</sup> MEETING</b> <b>San Diego, California, USA</b> <b>20 August 2018</b></p>
--

### CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

#### AGENDA

	Documents
1. Opening of the meeting	
2. Adoption of the agenda	
3. Review of the financial audit report	
4. Review of budgets for 2019 and 2020	CAF-06-01
5. Financial contributions of Members:	
a) Regular budget (Resolution <a href="#">C-15-06</a> )	
b) Special Fund for promoting institutional capacity-building (Resolution <a href="#">C-</a>	CAF-06-02
c) Program to monitor transshipments at sea (Resolution <a href="#">C-12-07</a> )	CAF-06-03
d) Other	
6. Other business	
7. Recommendations to the Commission	
8. Adjournment	

#### APPENDICES

##### 1. List of attendees

The sixth meeting of the Committee on Administration and Finance was held in San Diego, California (USA) on 20 August 2018. The list of attendees can be found as Appendix 1.

##### **Opening of the meeting**

The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Lillo Maniscalchi, from Venezuela, opened the meeting.

##### **Adoption of the agenda**

The provisional agenda was adopted without changes.

##### **Review of the financial audit report**

It was reported that the financial audit report was provided to the Commissioners and heads of delegations 6 weeks before the meeting. No comments were made.

##### **Review of budgets for 2019 and 2020**

Mrs. Nora G. Roa, from the IATTC staff, presented [Document CAF-06-01](#). She explained the financial activity in 2017, the status of the contributions for 2018 and the requested and projected budgets for 2019 and 2020, respectively.

During her presentation, she pointed out that the budget needs to keep pace with inflation, which affects all

expenditures related to the activities of the Commission, both at headquarters and abroad. Several increases to the budget are needed to add a scientist and a translator, provide COLA and merit increases for the staff, and cover a possible increase in audit costs as a result of changing the Commission's auditors. It is therefore essential that the Commission adopt the requested budget for 2019 of US\$ 8,133,837 so that the Commission and its staff fulfill their functions in compliance with the Antigua Convention.

Some Members pointed out that Document [CAF-06-01](#) included the necessary elements that had been repeatedly requested in previous meetings; therefore, there were no objections to the approval of the requested budget. However, it remained open so that the Commission could consider a series of matters including the allocation of resources for the purchase and operation of equipment for the safety of observers at sea, the financing of proposed scientific projects, and the organization of an extraordinary meeting of the Commission in October 2018.

### **Financial contributions of Members:**

#### **a. Regular budget (Resolution [C-16-07](#))**

The Secretariat presented information on the Members' pending arrears, emphasizing that they currently add up to US\$ 6,316,699—which represents approximately 80% of the approved budget for 2018—and that two Members, Colombia and Panama, are two or more years behind on their contributions. It was reiterated that Members must pay their contributions on time and that the pending payments situation should be resolved without further delay.

Panama explained that it was in the process of making a payment in accordance with the agreement established at a previous IATTC meeting, and that the payment will be received in the Commission's account in the following days.

Colombia mentioned that its pending contributions for 2017 and 2018 are mainly due to changes in the government administration and a monetary reversion. As for Venezuela, it was mentioned that Venezuelan shipowners will help the government to make the necessary payments and that more information would be provided at the IATTC meeting when the representatives of the Venezuelan government were present.

China recalled that its three-year budget has been unfortunately reduced by nearly half, but efforts are under way to make the pending payments soon. China asked that the US\$ 20,000 appearing in Document [CAF-06-01](#) as a voluntary contribution be changed to a partial payment of its contribution to the 2018 regular budget.

Guatemala noted that it would be able to report on the payment of its outstanding contributions during the IATTC meeting.

Belize mentioned that, in the future, its contributions should be significantly different than the current ones since the country does not have a fishing fleet in the EPO anymore; therefore, according to the formula used to calculate contributions, the tuna catch factor would no longer exist.

Ecuador pointed out that it will soon be up to date with its pending contributions and that, during the IATTC meeting, it would provide further details in terms of the date they will be paid.

As of the date of presentation to the plenary, the Commission received payments of US\$ 621,202 from Panama and China's 2018 contribution, reducing the total outstanding contributions to US\$ 5,592,696.

At the request of several delegations, a table detailing the pending contributions for 2019 was prepared, which would allow them to make estimates and/or approve the budget.

#### **b. Special Fund for promoting institutional capacity-building (Resolution [C-14-03](#))**

Mr. Ricardo Belmontes, from the Commission staff, presented Document [CAF-06-02](#) on the special fund for promoting institutional capacity-building in developing Members, established by Resolution C-14-03.

The current balance is US\$ 143,720.

In 2017, the activities developed with resources from the fund were focused on supporting the participation of developing Members in meetings of the IATTC and the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), as well as the organization of a capacity-building seminar/workshop on duties and responsibilities of Members and Parties to the IATTC and AIDCP and a technical meeting on sharks.

For 2018 and the first months of 2019, the following activities were expected to be carried out with resources from the fund:

1. Training of port samplers for collecting shark fisheries data in Central America and entering them into the OSPESCA/IATTC database.
2. Continue supporting the processing and archiving of historical data for the shark fishery in Central America obtained through the FAO-GEF Common Oceans project.
3. Management Strategies Evaluation (MSE) workshop (August 2018).
4. Capacity-building seminar/workshop for decision makers from developing CPCs on subjects such as scientific advice concepts, the Commission's strategic work plan, research needs, etc. (Possibly in October 2018)
5. Annual IATTC scholarship for developing scientific capacity in developing CPCs (2019).

The Committee approved these activities, emphasizing the need of using the fund mainly for building capacity in developing Members and not only for supporting attendance to meetings of the IATTC and its subsidiary bodies.

Additionally, the need to develop criteria—such as application deadlines and performance reports—for the allocation of resources from the fund was stressed. The Secretariat was asked to draft proposals on this regard to be analyzed and reviewed during the intersessional period.

The annual scholarship for developing scientific capacity attracted great interest. It was pointed out that it is important for scholarship holders to be committed to working in support of their country after the scholarship period, although some Members pointed out that this should be the responsibility of each CPC.

**c. Program to monitor transshipments at sea (Resolution [C-12-07](#))**

Mr. Belmontes presented Document [CAF-06-03](#), covering both the operational and financial aspects of the program, in order to save time at the plenary meeting since this item is also included in the IATTC agenda.

For 2019, a budget of US\$ 1,300,000 is required. Moreover, the higher costs of the program for the current year require an additional contribution of US\$ 290,000 in September 2018, divided as follows:

Participant	Additional contribution
China	98,600
Japan	31,900
Korea	34,800
Panama	17,400
Chinese Taipei	63,800
Vanuatu	43,500
Total	<b>290,000</b>

The Committee approved these budget items and decided to endorse them to the Commission.

The Committee also approved the proposal to include, in the transshipment declaration, a column to record the species of transshipped sharks for the benefit of scientific research. It was acknowledged that the Committee should not discuss this type of issues in the future and should be limited to financial matters.

### **Other business**

No other business was discussed.

### **Recommendations to the Commission**

The Committee agreed to submit the following recommendations to the Commission:

1. Approve a budget of US\$ 8,133,837 for 2019 but taking into consideration that other elements could be added, such as the purchase and operation of equipment for the safety of observers at sea and the organization of an extraordinary IATTC meeting in October 2018.
2. Approve the activities planned for 2018 and 2019 related to the special fund for supporting developing Members mentioned in section 5b of this report.
3. That the Secretariat draft a proposal on the allocation of financial support through the special fund, to be reviewed during the intersessional period.
4. Approve a budget of US\$ 1,300,000 for the program of transshipments at sea in 2019.
5. Approve an extraordinary contribution of US\$ 290,000 for the program of transshipments at sea in 2018.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 14:10 p.m. on 20 August.

## Appendix 4b

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF**  
**MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION**  
**9<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**  
**San Diego, California (USA)**  
**21-22 August 2018**

**CHAIR'S REPORT**  
**AGENDA**

	Documents
1 Opening of the meeting	
2 Adoption of the agenda	
3 Compliance with IATTC measures in 2017:	
a. Report by the staff on compliance	COR-09-01
b. Review of the questionnaires submitted by CPCs in compliance with Resolution <a href="#">C-11-07</a>	
4 Identification of Members whose implementation of IATTC measures is inadequate, and mechanisms to improve compliance	
5 Consideration of the provisional IUU Vessel List	<a href="#">COR-09-02</a>
6 Cooperating non-Members	<a href="#">COR-09-03</a>
7 Other business	
8 Recommendations for the Commission	
9 Adjournment	

The 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee for the Review of Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission (Review Committee) was held in San Diego, California (USA), on 21-28 August 2018.

### **Opening of the meeting**

The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Committee, Mr. David Hogan, of the United States.

### **Adoption of the agenda**

The Committee adopted the provisional agenda with no changes.

### **Compliance with IATTC measures in 2017**

#### **a. Report by the staff on compliance**

Mr. Ricardo Belmontes, of the Commission staff, presented Document COR-09-01, which summarizes

compliance with IATTC resolutions in 2017. A number of Members asked questions, sought clarifications, and identified errors to be corrected. Overall, trends in compliance are improving: infractions of most measures show decreases over time. Implementation of more recent measures is still incomplete, and a number of CPCs pointed out the need for improvement regarding measures addressing sharks, observer coverage, and FAD data reporting, including Resolution C-16-01. Members also requested that the compendium of possible compliance cases, which had been available for previous Committee meetings, be available for future meetings. .

#### **b. Presentations by CPCs**

The Committee heard presentations by each CPC present at the meeting, including explanations of certain responses to the compliance questionnaire, explanations and clarifications of certain cases that appeared in the compliance report, and follow-up to prior cases. The Committee used the compendium of compliance matters to also help guide the discussion, and after each presentation other CPCs were provided the opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

#### **Identification of Members whose implementation of IATTC regulations is inadequate, and mechanisms to improve compliance**

The Committee discussed institutional and systemic implementation issues, and offered suggestions for improving procedures, engagement, and reporting by CPCs, and related matters. No individual CPCs were identified.

#### **Consideration of the provisional IUU Vessel List**

The Committee reviewed Document COR-09-02, including Fiji's reiterated request to remove the vessel *Xin Shi Ji 16* from the IUU List, and Peru's proposal to add five Ecuadorian vessels to the list. No recommendation on Peru's proposal was agreed. The Committee made a recommendation to implement Fiji's request.

#### **Cooperating non-Members**

The Committee reviewed Document COR-09-03, and recommended that the status of all five Cooperating Non-Members (Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Indonesia, and Liberia) be renewed by the Commission.

#### **Other business**

No other business was discussed.

#### **Recommendations**

##### **a. Recommendations for the Committee/Secretariat**

1. To better manage the work of the Committee, review the compliance report initially only for corrections or questions, and conduct the substantive discussions and comments within the CPC review portion of the agenda. CPCs should review and record corrections as soon as possible, with an emphasis on doing so immediately after the initial circulation of the compliance report.
2. In developing and presenting the compliance report, where there are multiple reporting or compliance requirements within resolutions, the Secretariat should separate compliance reporting for each specific requirement, rather than showing compliance with aggregated requirements (*e.g.*, multiple data reporting requirements).
3. The Secretariat should include the table entitled "Possible infractions in the transshipment program and responses from CPCs" (Table 3.13 in Document COR-09-01) in the summary presentations for future meetings.
4. Consider whether the timing of the compliance reporting procedure in Resolution C-11-07 can be improved or should be changed, as appropriate, in particular to minimize, when possible, the period of

time for the Secretariat to initially report possible infractions to flag States, recognizing that it is also important for national observer programs to submit their data to the Secretariat in a timely way and make direct reports to their flag authorities.

5. The Committee should explore whether a verification step should be added in the reporting of possible infractions, similar to the function of the IRP under the AIDCP.
6. The Secretariat should not revise or edit the preliminary observer reports directly given the difficulty this presents to flag States relying on the original form for investigative or adjudicative purposes, but instead, following the Commission's standard editing protocol and procedures, issue supplemental edits and clarifications in a separate document.
7. In future reporting and follow-up to reported cases of possible non-compliance, CPCs should provide detail on the type and, if financial, the amount of sanctions applied to any cases from the current or prior compliance reports, taking advantage of the opportunity to add attachments to the questionnaire.
8. In the event that cases involving investigations or administrative actions are unresolved at the time the responses to the compliance questionnaire and to the letter from the Secretariat on compliance are due, CPCs should follow up to provide the Secretariat with a written updating the results of the investigations.
9. In future compliance reports, include reporting on the status of the implementation of the Commission's rules of confidentiality.
10. The Secretariat should continue to produce the compendium document for each meeting to help guide the work of the Committee and, with input from CPCs and in collaboration with the Chair, should develop a format for the compendium to input responses from CPCs, and an appendix to the compendium for tracking of the status of cases from year to year.
11. The Secretariat modify the format of the Compliance Questionnaire to provide a specific space for CPCs to explain "not applicable" responses.
12. Regarding silky sharks, adapt the compliance record format in the silky sharks section to include an additional classification field or comment section for those sharks that fall into the well directly from the brail. For all sharks, ensure observer report formats include all required data for sharks, and make clear the applicability of the shark requirements by gear type.
13. To ask the Commission staff to identify, no later than the 2019 meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), data collection formats, handling and release procedures, and any recommended conservation measures for a specific resolution for the conservation and management of whale sharks, taking into account the identified issues of compliance related to sets on this species as well as discussions of the SAC where information gaps regarding this species have been noted.
14. The Committee should continue to highlight areas where compliance and implementation trends continue to improve.
15. Ensure scheduling of at least 2 full days for the meeting of the Committee.
16. Review and assess implementation of prior Committee recommendations.

**b. Recommendations for the Commission**

1. Examine whether the Commission needs to clarify or state that the purse-seine observer IATTC compliance summary form is preliminary and not definitive and may be supplemented by additional information from the Secretariat or national programs, and that an incomplete or unclear observer compliance form should not prevent effective execution of flag State responsibilities to investigate and

adjudicate compliance cases for each CPC's flag vessels.

2. Clarify the scope of the requirement(s) in the Commission's resolutions for reporting of shark trade data (*e.g.*, do they apply only for sharks harvested in the EPO).
3. Revise the notification guidelines for transits without observers, with a view to establishing deadlines for sending these notifications and confirming their receipt. This task could be carried out with special attention from the *Ad Hoc* Working Group to review the legal and operational coherence of IATTC resolutions.
4. Consider clarifying the implementation of paragraph 1 of Resolution C-16-06 on conservation of sharks (silky sharks) regarding the prohibition of retention on board, transshipment, landing or storage, to clarify the scope of applicability of the prohibition.
5. Delete the Fijian vessel *Xin Shi Jih 16* from the IATTC IUU Vessel List.
6. Renew Cooperating Non-Member status for Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Indonesia and Liberia.
7. Communicate to Kiribati to remind its responsibility to participate in the meetings of the Commission and subsidiary bodies and to submit the required compliance questionnaire.
8. Consider adopting a specific resolution to consolidate and strengthen conservation measures and data collection for whale sharks.

**c. Discussions (not resulting in recommendations)**

1. The Committee discussed the usefulness and possible benefit of encouraging the longline fisheries operating in the EPO to consider joining efforts to strengthen implementation of the current requirements for observer coverage, and to consider electronic monitoring to strengthen the Commission's observer coverage objectives.
2. The Committee discussed the cases that illustrated for some CPCs the need to clarify the implementation of the silky shark resolution C-16-06, *i.e.*, that it only applies when every effort has not been made to avoid retention.
3. The Committee had a significant discussion about the need for improved implementation of Resolution C-16-01.

**Adjournment**

The initial Committee session was left open to continue working through the agenda and to await the participation of Costa Rica and Kiribati if those delegations attended the Commission plenary meeting. A session was convened on the afternoon of 23 August, and was left open to await the participation of all CPCs in the discussion of agenda items 3(b) and 5. The Committee reconvened on 28 August, and adjourned that same day.

## Appendix 4c

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**PERMANENT WORKING GROUP ON FLEET CAPACITY**  
**20<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**  
**San Diego, California, USA**  
**23 August 2018**

### CHAIR'S REPORT

#### AGENDA

	Documents
1 Opening of the meeting	
2 Adoption of the agenda	
3 Review of changes in the utilization of fleet capacity in the EPO	<a href="#">CAP-20-01</a>
4 Progress in the implementation of a Fleet Capacity Management Plan in the EPO	
a. Report by the consultant hired to develop a pragmatic proposal to address the management of capacity in the EPO: presentation and discussion of the proposal	
5 Review of pending capacity claims, disputes, adjustments, and requests on the list presented at the 89 <sup>th</sup> meeting of the IATTC and referred to in Document <a href="#">CAP-17 INF-A REV</a> (14 May 2016)	
6 Recommendations to the Commission	
7 Other business	
8 Adjournment	

#### APPENDIX

##### 1. List of attendees

The 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity was held in San Diego, California (USA) on 23 August 2018.

#### **Opening of the meeting**

The Chair of the Working Group, Mr. Alfonso Miranda from Peru, opened the meeting.

#### **Adoption of the agenda**

The provisional agenda was adopted without changes

#### **Review of changes in the utilization of fleet capacity in the EPO**

Dr. Guillermo Compeán, Director of the IATTC, presented Document [CAP-20-01](#). As of 30 June 2018, the active purse-seine capacity on the Regional Register was 285,474 m<sup>3</sup>, the capacity of inactive or sunk

vessels, 5,532 m<sup>3</sup> and the capacity available as a result of movements of vessels on the Regional Register, 11,355 m<sup>3</sup>, for a potential total of 302,361 m<sup>3</sup>. In June 2002, when [Resolution C-02-03](#) entered into force, the active capacity was 218,482 m<sup>3</sup>, while the total sum of the active and inactive capacity, plus the special allocations included in paragraph 10 of the resolution, was 273,467 m<sup>3</sup>; this represents an increase of 28,894 m<sup>3</sup> in the potential total capacity.

Japan and the European Union expressed their concern over the increase in capacity over several years, with a level that is still far too high relative to tuna stocks. The European Union highlighted that the capacity level has never decreased, it has always increased due to various reasons; therefore, a more global approach is needed. In response to a question from Japan regarding the reason why the level of active capacity during the first closure period of the year (summer) does not seem to decrease, Dr. Compeán replied that there was a tendency toward choosing the second closure period, in winter, when a significant reduction is observed. Mexico expressed that this demonstrates that the two-closure period per year system has not had the expected benefit and asked Dr. Compeán about the future of this option within the framework of a plan to reduce capacity that would allow the decrease of competition between vessels and, therefore, the reduction of pressure on resources. Dr. Compeán pointed out that, at the plenary meeting, there would be a presentation on the state of resources and the evolution of catches, and management options would be presented for consideration by the Commission. Colombia stressed that, while the level of fleet capacity is very alarming, an additional concern is the high number of sets on FADs, which has worsened the situation. In this respect, Nicaragua asked the Secretariat to inform the Commission about the evolution of FAD technology since the 1990s that had led to a significant increase in their efficiency, contrary to the technology for sets on dolphins, which had remained more stable.

### **Progress in the implementation of a Fleet Capacity Management Plan in the EPO**

#### **a. Report by the consultant hired to develop a pragmatic proposal to address the management of capacity in the EPO: presentation and discussion of the proposal**

Dr. Dale Squires gave a summarized presentation on the work conducted within the framework of the consultancy, on the understanding that a summary would soon be circulated prior to its publication in its entirety—just as expressly requested by Mexico—and in the two languages of the Commission, as specified by Nicaragua. After the presentation, there was a question and answer session in which the following matters were discussed, among others:

- In response to a question from the United States, Dr. Squires recognized that the reduction in the number of vessels with a well volume that has altogether remained relatively stable, probably represents an increase in their efficiency.
- Noticing that the presentation identified several areas in which more work is required, the United States asked on which ones this effort should be focused and where to go from this point. After Dr. Squires replied that he preferred to hand this to the members of the Working Group and the Commission, Dr. Compeán expressed that he believed the most feasible option and goal was to develop a fishing days scheme, which should be explored and that could be implemented once all legitimate capacity claim cases—as defined by the Working Group and the Commission—are resolved and taking into account the issue of the situation of the new Members. Dr. Squires pointed out that the study did include a reference to this type of scheme with ideas taken from a paper written by Dr. Compeán and with a proposal taken from the current scheme of the WCPFC.
- The European Union expressed its surprise at the fact that the presentation was described as a starting point because something more concrete in terms of proposals was expected. Without denying the great value of the study and the presentation, and the fact that it gathered matters and ideas that had already been discussed previously (e.g., at the Cartagena workshop or regarding the study conducted by Northern Economics), it was indeed preparatory work rather than a presentation of specific alternatives with a quantification of their effects, impacts and costs on the Members. For example, why keep talking

about buybacks when previous studies and discussions clearly show that they are not a viable option? In the future, within the framework of the current contract, this matter could be further explored with the aim of having something more concrete that could become a resolution for consideration and adoption by the Commission. Regarding this same topic, Nicaragua stressed that the study on effects, impacts and costs should not be limited to the countries with the largest fleets—particularly Ecuador and Mexico—but cover all CPCs, mentioning as an example the evolution of prices as a consequence of capacity management and their impact on canneries. In response to Nicaragua’s comments, Dr. Squires pointed out that the study had considered prices and the impact of measures related to capacity on demand. Similarly, the United States, highlighting the range of individual interests and situations in the group and the Commission, stressed the need to discuss the pros and cons of each option before identifying the next step to take. In this context, the economic benefits for the fishery as a whole should also be considered, not only for one of its components. The United States warned that, in terms of trends, that said search for options was headed toward legitimizing the current capacity level.

- Colombia mentioned two particular concerns: first, the effect of fulfilling the pending requests, which could limit the scope of the capacity solutions that would be adopted; second, the issue of the dissemination of certain data that could be sensitive for the industries.
- Taking into account the lack of sufficient decision-making capacity and time in this meeting, Ecuador, supported by Guatemala, suggested that an extraordinary meeting be held in October,—on the occasion of the AIDCP meetings—in order to further analyze this issue, and to which each Member could attend with a clear position on this matter, after having made the appropriate internal enquiries (as Ecuador must do with its private sector).

**Review of pending capacity claims, disputes, adjustments, and requests on the list presented at the 89<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IATTC and referred to in Document [CAP-17 INF-A REV](#) (14 May 2016)**

Before starting the presentation on claims and requests, Nicaragua stated that it could not support any of them and no increase with capacity adjustments unless its own request was taken into account. The United States recalled that, in the past, there had been an attempt to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate requests and that it had proved impossible to do so. It would have preferred to avoid a long discussion and limit it to stating the pending cases and consider them later within the framework of the capacity management plan as a whole. The United States warned that, if it was decided to consider them case by case, it would reiterate its position expressed previously that all cases should be considered and resolved within the framework of an agreement on a capacity management plan together with tuna conservation measures. The European Union also expressed its willingness to listen to a presentation on claims and requests once again but warned that this discussion would not reach any solution since, as confirmed by Nicaragua’s statement, a particular case cannot be chosen to resolve it without resolving every case without giving preference to any of them.

Then, Peru presented its request again, particularly highlighting its different nature, namely that the claimed capacity would only be used in Peruvian jurisdictional waters, which would therefore have a lower impact on resources. Peru asked the Secretariat to conduct an analysis of the impact differences that would prove it. On this basis, Peru would submit a concrete proposal.

Without going into substantive considerations in this regard, Colombia and the United States emphasized the need to respect the rules of procedure in terms of deadlines for submitting proposals and stressed that, according with said rules, Peru’s proposal should be presented at the extraordinary meeting in October. Furthermore, both delegations reiterated that, in order to make progress on the consideration of these individual cases, more progress is necessary on the management and solution of the more general issue of overcapacity in the EPO and the adoption of conservation and management measures that take this capacity increase into account. Nicaragua agreed with the statement from Colombia and the United States and mentioned again that it could not support Peru’s request if all requests were not resolved as a package. Taking the floor again, Colombia also recalled that it had its own request and invited Peru to avoid presenting its

proposal individually.

Ecuador was then given the floor to present three specific cases. Ecuador highlighted the difference in nature between these requests and the others since they involve three vessels that fished or are still fishing in the EPO, but whose capacity is not recognized, partially or totally, through their registration in the IATTC Regional Vessel Register. Ecuador then proceeded to present the details of the cases of vessels *Monteneme*, *María del Mar* and *Ricky A* (associated with the case of the sunken vessel *Victoria A*). Ecuador stated that it was available to provide any further information needed to other delegations, which could also be requested to the Secretariat.

Colombia mentioned that it could not consider Ecuador's request due to the same rules of procedure referred to in Peru's case, since the documents were only submitted the previous day. The European Union expressed that, in fact, those same cases and others had already been reviewed on many occasions, including those it encouraged to be considered at the bilateral level or through the establishment of a panel that was rejected. The European Union made comments on the three cases, one by one. As for the *Monteneme* case, it had previously stated that the European Union cannot accept it and ratified that its position would not change. The *Ricky A* case is a matter of a sunk capacity. Besides doubting the validity of the request, it is unacceptable that the CPC unilaterally authorized this capacity and that, after doing so, asked the Commission to endorse this authorization. This unilateral action is a failure to comply with the applicable rules and that is why it was considered by the Review Committee. As for the third case, the one of the vessel *María del Mar*, the European Union recalled that it is a sunken vessel whose capacity was never included in the Regional Register because the flag State did not request it before 2005. Nicaragua agreed with the European Union regarding the *Monteneme* and the *Ricky A*, but added that it could support Ecuador's request concerning the vessel *María del Mar*, provided that all the other requests were taken into account. The United States referred to the fact that the group was unable to reach consensus on the unique nature of a case compared to all the other cases. Furthermore, the United States expressed, as it had done previously in similar situations, that an option would be to accept every request and claim—which would mean the inclusion of more capacity in the Register—as long as this was done in conjunction with the adoption of the necessary conservation and management measures. In conclusion, for these reasons, the United States declared that it could not consider Ecuador's requests.

Subsequently, Bolivia took the floor to recall its request for a capacity of 5,830 m<sup>3</sup>, from which, similarly to Venezuela, only a fraction would be activated together with the adoption of the appropriate conservation and management measures. Colombia, as in previous meetings, stressed that this was not an issue for the consideration by this Working Group and requested that its verbatim statement be attached to the report of the meeting (see Annex).

### **Recommendations to the Commission**

The Chair of the Working Group suggested as a possible recommendation to hold an extraordinary meeting of the Commission in October, along with the AIDCP meetings, to consider, among others, capacity issues, both those related to the management plan and the report of the consultant, as well as claim and request cases. While the European Union initially expressed reservations due to the financial and human resources expenses such meeting would imply, it became clear by the number of delegations that were in favor (Ecuador, Guatemala, Colombia, Nicaragua, Peru, United States, Venezuela, Japan) that it would not be an issue to fulfill the requirements established in the Antigua Convention for convening the meeting, as recalled by the Director (proposed by two Members and supported by a majority). The United States stressed that the Working Group should meet before the extraordinary meeting and that the rules of procedure must be taken into account for the submission of proposals. It recalled that the Committee on Administration and Finance had not been adjourned yet and that this opportunity should be used to include the financial resources needed for the meeting in the budget.

The European Union expressed that all recommendations should be adopted by consensus and that it could not accept this as a recommendation of the Working Group and requested that the rules of procedure be followed: proposed by two Members and supported by a majority.

**Other business**

No other business was discussed.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 13:00 p.m. on 23 August 2018.

**Appendix .****Statement by Colombia**

For the Government of Colombia, and according to what was stated at the Meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Fleet Capacity and the Meeting of the Parties to the IATTC, this is not the appropriate place to discuss the request from the Plurinational State of Bolivia.

For the Government of Colombia, as head of Colombia's maritime authority—the General Maritime Directorate (DIMAR)—the registration process of the referenced vessels that granted them the Colombian flag was carried out in accordance with the proceedings established in the Colombian legislation in force for that date and in good faith. Additionally, the certificates of cessation of flag are authentic since they are duly legalized by the Bolivian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Finally, it is important to point out that the carrying capacity transferred from Bolivia is not part of the capacity reserve authorized for Colombia in the footnote of Resolution C-02-03 and it must be understood as an additional capacity that the country acquired through transfer, which has not been duplicated.

## Anexo 4d

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**WORKING GROUP ON BYCATCH**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**

**La Jolla, California (USA)**  
**10-11 May 2018**

### **CO-CHAIRS' REPORT**

#### **AGENDA**

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Adoption of agenda
3. Review recommendations from 2017 Bycatch Working Group
4. Brief overview on species of concern and bycatch from purse seine and longline fisheries in the EPO (Chairs)
  - a. Presentations by Members on recent bycatch activities
5. Seabirds
  - a. Seabird distribution and fisheries bycatch in the EPO (NOAA/Lisa Ballance)
  - b. Update on conservation status and foraging distribution of ACAP species in the EPO and bycatch mitigation best practices (ACAP-BirdLife/ Igor Debski)
  - c. Discussion of potential recommendations
6. Sea turtles
  - a. Leatherback turtles and fisheries overlap in the EPO (IAC/ Bryan Wallace)
  - b. Update on sea turtle bycatch in the EPO/ Update on implementation of resolution C-07003 (IATTC/ Martin Hall)
  - c. Discussion of potential recommendations
7. Sharks and rays
  - a. Update on post-release mortality sharks in purse seine and longline fisheries, including mitigation (NOAA/Melanie Hutchinson)
  - b. Update on interaction with whale sharks in the EPO (IATTC/Marlon Román)
  - c. Report on fisheries bycatch of Mobulid rays in the EPO (IATTC)
  - d. Discussion of potential recommendations

8. Monitoring
a. Update on electronic monitoring from a WCPO tuna fishery (Observer/ Craig Heberer) and others (NOAA/ John Wang)
9. Perspectives for future actions, including research
a. Replacing unintended cross-taxa conflicts with intentional tradeoffs by moving from piece-meal to integrated fisheries bycatch management (Observer/ Eric Gilman)
10. Recommendations to the Scientific Advisory Committee
11. Adjournment

## APPENDICES

### Recommendations for the Scientific Advisory Committee

The 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Bycatch Working Group was held in La Jolla, California, USA, on May 10 and 11, 2018. The attendees are listed in Appendix 1.

#### **1. Opening of the meeting.**

The meeting was opened by Dr. Alexandre Aires-da-Silva of the IATTC, who introduced the co-chairs of the meeting, Dr. Yonat Swimmer of the United States and Manuel Correia of Venezuela. Colombia, Korea, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, United States, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Chinese Taipei, European Union, and Venezuela were present. Observers present included the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP), the Inter-American Convention for the Protection of Sea Turtles (IAC), Defenders of Wildlife, and Humane Society International.

#### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

The Committee adopted its agenda with minimal changes, whereby it was suggested by Venezuela to consider bycatch of juvenile tunas if time permits<sup>15</sup>.

#### **3. Review recommendations from 2017 Bycatch Working Group**

Review of 2017 recommendations, summarized by Co-chair, Yonat Swimmer.

#### **4. Brief overview on species of concern and bycatch from purse seine and longline fisheries in the EPO (Chairs)**

Presentation on various definitions of bycatch and bycatch-associated resolutions on conservation measures within IATTC from Co-chair Manuel Correia.

##### **a. Presentations by Members on recent bycatch activities**

The Committee heard presentations by Panama, Colombia, European Union, Ecuador, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Peru, Japan, United States, Mexico, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. Each of the countries provided updates on key research. For instance, Panama provided information on implementing a new framework for hook size and shape in its longline fleets. Colombia noted its national action plan for the conservation of marine mammals. Costa Rica mentioned its fishery improvement project for dorado and swordfish. Further,

<sup>15</sup>Venezuela expressed concern that the Commission's latest conservation resolutions, with the obligatory retention of yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye tunas, achieved a reduction of discards, but in the last year there has been a significant increase in catches of juveniles of yellowfin and bigeye, which should be considered as bycatches, and thought that this Group should analyze this.

Costa Rica will eliminate all shrimp trawling by 2019. Throughout this session, countries exchanged their views on the various topics.

## **5. Seabirds<sup>2</sup>**

Dr. Lisa Ballance presented on seabird biology, including hot spots of species of most concern, particularly the waved and antipodean albatrosses. Then Dr. Igor Debski presented on the ACAP best practices to reduce interactions and mortality of seabirds in fisheries. After the presentation, Dr. Martin Hall suggested the idea of hook-shielding devices opening at greater depths, perhaps at 20 m, if there are gains for other species. Dr. Debski noted that target catch was a key criterion in their studies, and they have not seen a reduction in target catch. The European Union asked whether the implementation of these bycatch mitigation measures has produced a tangible effect. Dr. Debski said that has been difficult to evaluate as reporting by CPCs has not always been complete. He said that with the Common Oceans project they are now starting to look at this issue.

The session then concluded with a discussion of possible recommendations. Co-chair Manuel Correia suggested that the ACAP recommendations could serve as a starting point for the IATTC Bycatch Working Group recommendations. Co-chair Yonat Swimmer requested that Dr. Debski provide a table comparing the ACAP best practices with the existing IATTC seabird resolution (C-11-02)

## **6. Sea turtles<sup>3</sup>**

Dr. Bryan Wallace, IAC Leatherback Task Force chair, presented on leatherback sea turtle population declines and bycatch within the EPO. He emphasized migratory movements within the EPO and threats from different gear types. He noted that the movements of inter-nesting females and males off the major nesting beaches of Mexico and Costa Rica from October to March increased the likelihood of interactions with fisheries. Dr. Martin Hall then discussed sea turtle bycatch mitigation measures in longline fisheries with regards to efficacy for sea turtles as well as potential impacts to other taxonomic groups. Participants were provided the opportunity to ask questions and make comments. Co-chair Yonat Swimmer then summarized the possible recommendations discussed, which included improved or standardized data report format, increased observer coverage, and the use of circle hooks. Japan added that the use of fish bait should be considered a mitigation option as well.

## **7. Sharks and rays**

Dr. Melanie Hutchinson of the United States National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) gave a presentation on post-release mortality of sharks. She was followed by a presentation from Marlon Román (IATTC) on whale shark interactions in the EPO. After his presentation, there was discussion on the existing resolutions related to whale sharks. Venezuela asked that whale sharks be taken out the FADs resolution and a specific resolution on whale sharks be developed. It was noted that this could be proposed at the annual meeting of the IATTC. Dr. Martin Hall, Dr. Josh Stewart and Dr. Nerea Lezama Ochoa presented the knowledge of mobulid rays in the EPO. Additionally, basic biology and distribution of mobulid was discussed, as well as safe handling to increase post-release survival. Participants were provided the opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

## **8. Monitoring**

Craig Heberer, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and Dr. John Wang (NMFS) each presented on electronic monitoring, one from a tuna fishery in the WCPO as well as from a small-scale fishery in the EPO. Advances and limitations in electronic monitoring systems were discussed. Participants were provided the opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

## **9. Perspectives for future actions, including research**

Dr. Eric Gilman (TNC) made a presentation on the trade-offs involved in single-taxa focused management efforts given the potential for unintended negative consequences for other taxa. He provided examples where bycatch management was undertaken for one species, but had consequences for other species. He advocated for taking an ecosystem-based approach to bycatch management. Participants were provided the

opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

#### **10. Other business proposed by Chairs**

Venezuela requested that whale sharks be taken out the FADs resolution.

#### **11. Recommendations to the Scientific Advisory Committee**

After a robust discussion, the Working Group decided to present the recommendations in Appendix 2, based on the presentations and discussions at the meeting and the scientific references in Appendix 3, to the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee for consideration.

#### **12. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.

## Appendix .

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### GENERAL

1. Request the scientific staff to provide, three weeks in advance of every meeting of the Working Group, an updated overview of bycatch data (by species, gears, areas, *etc.*) available to the Commission, outstanding data gaps, progress in the implementation and results of relevant projects, updates on ongoing collaborations with relevant organizations, and suggestions for future work.
2. Prioritize work to assess the conservation status of key bycatch species.
3. Prioritize work to assess the effectiveness of adopted and alternative bycatch mitigation methods, taking into account the potential effects on other affected species (including target species), and the relative impact of the various fisheries on mortality and the conservation status of these species.

#### OBSERVERS

4. Per IATTC recommendation, increase on-board observer coverage for longline vessels greater than 20 m length overall from 5% to 20%, and apply an appropriate level of coverage for all other longline vessels, as determined by the SAC. This could be supplemented or partially achieved by electronic monitoring, in order to meet the staff's data needs.
5. Request the Commission to establish a draft minimum standard protocol for electronic monitoring.
6. Submit summarized national observer data in a standardized form that provides information useful for generating fleet-wide bycatch estimates.

#### SEA BIRDS<sup>2</sup>

7. Based on an assessment of Resolution C-11-02 against the latest review of seabird mitigation measures, consider the following revisions to improve C-11-02:
  - a. Adding hook-shielding devices as a mitigation option;
  - b. Updating the specifications for side-setting in the North Pacific to require that the branchline weighting used meets minimum requirements;
  - c. Updating the minimum *specifications (request info from ACAP)* for branchline weighting and tori lines;
  - d. Removing blue-dyed bait, deep-setting line shooters, and underwater setting chutes from the list of mitigation options;
  - e. Making management of offal discharge a required additional measure;
  - f. Allowing mitigation measures whose effectiveness for seabird bycatch mitigation is proven to be added in the future.

#### SEA TURTLES<sup>3</sup>

8. Organize a regional workshop on sea turtle bycatch and mitigation methods, in order to determine the level of interaction with, and the mortality caused by, different fishing gears relative to factors other than fishing, analyze existing scientific information on mitigation (including *inter alia*, gear depth, soak time, hook type, bait type, *etc.*) for the most endangered sea turtle species that are likely to interact with tuna fisheries, while considering spatial and seasonal factors and the potential effects on other species (including target species).
9. Consider the following options for the protection of leatherback turtles:
  - a. Time-area management measures in areas adjacent to leatherback inter-nesting habitats for a reasonable period and distance from nesting beaches during the nesting season, that will provide adequate protection, per scientific evidence. This may involve temporary moratoria on fishing and an

exploration of options for fishers affected by closures.

- b. Modifying longline fishing methods to mitigate bycatch in pelagic areas, where it is difficult to determine periods and areas where leatherback turtles aggregate, such as requiring the use of circle hooks, deeper setting, or finfish bait as alternative requirements for fishers who cannot implement other mitigation measures.
10. Continue to participate and promote research to improve techniques to further reduce sea turtle bycatch in all gear types used in the EPO.

#### **SHARKS AND RAYS**

11. Review the ban on finning sharks (Resolution C-05-03).
12. Develop and implement guidelines for the safe release of sharks and rays for different gear types.

## Appendix 4e

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON FADs**  
**SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**  
**August 2017**

**GROUP CHAIRMAN REPORT**  
**DURING THE 63<sup>RD</sup> ANNUAL MEETING OF THE IATTC**

The group held its second meeting in two parts during 2018. The first part was held on May 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018 in La Jolla, California, and the second one, on July 22<sup>nd</sup> in San Diego, California. It was recalled that resolution [C-16-01](#) extended the mandate of the Working Group and gave the possibility to inform and make recommendations to the Scientific Advisory Committee and also to the Commission, as well as to "*identify and review possible FAD management measures, in coordination with the scientific staff and the Scientific Committee Adviser (SAC)*".

It was informed that in the first part of the meeting held in May 2018, 13 recommendations were issued to the SAC, which were reviewed by the Committee and endorsed for consideration and approval by the Commission (Annex 1). The Commission, after reviewing them, decided to approve them.

Also, during the second part of the third meeting of the Working Group, two recommendations were prepared for the Commission, asking that:

1. consider the set of terms listed in Annex 1 as interim draft definitions related to FAD fishing operations. Some of these terms reflect the IATTC staff's definitions used for data analysis, such as those for floating objects, and none of the terms are intended to prejudge interpretations of existing resolutions or domestic regulations.
2. assign the following tasks as priority matters for the intersessional period before the 2019 Commission meeting.
  - Capacity building (C-16-01 and C-17-02)
  - Data gaps – improvement of data collection related to C-16-01 and C-17-02.
  - Definitions
  - Common indicators
  - Follow the research activities related to FAD fisheries
  - Participate in the j-tRFMO FAD WG and the small technical j-tRFMO FAD WG
  - Develop appropriate framework of confidentiality

It was recalled that in the next year the same scheme would be followed to bring the group together on two occasions, one in May and the other together with the meetings that take place with the annual meeting of the Commission. On this occasion, the meeting of the joint working group on tuna RFMOs should be considered in 2019.

Regarding the 2018-2019 work plan, it was commented that the Working Group would have as reference the tasks identified as priorities for the intersessional period and listed above.

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**PERMANENT AD-HOC WORKING GROUP ON FADS**  
**THIRD MEETING**

La Jolla, California (USA)  
11-12 May 2018

**DOCUMENT FAD-03 INF-B**

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SAC ADOPTED BY THE FADS  
WORKING GROUP**

1. FAD data collection form 9/2016 and its instructions, established pursuant to Resolution C-16-01, and the observer program's *Flotsam Information Record* will be modified to include new fields that will enable FADs to be tracked over time, incorporating options such as interaction with natural objects that are being tracked and buoy changes. The new form will be presented to SAC-09 for adoption. Once this new form is adopted, an electronic version will be developed as an alternative to the paper version.
2. The new form for FAD data collection related to the requirements of Resolution C-16-01 will be the default form to be used by the purse-seine fleet operating in the EPO. Fleets that also operate in other convention areas may use their own form, provided that it includes all the data fields required by Resolution C-16-01.
3. Coordination with the working groups on FADs of other tuna RFMOs to propose the new FAD data form, with a view to developing a possible harmonized form to be used by captains or operators for FAD inventory and activity data collection in all t-RFMOs, while keeping in mind that the definition of a FAD can vary among RFMOs, and that the form may need to be modified based on the needs of each RFMO.
4. CPCs, the IATTC staff, and the staff of national observer programs shall strive to organize training workshops that will train vessel captains, crew and government authorities to properly fill out FAD data forms related to the requirements of Resolution C-16-01.
5. Following the decision of the Commission, the IATTC staff will finalize, before the Commission meeting in August 2018, the development of a common database to be used by the IATTC staff for the management of FAD data collected pursuant to Resolution C-16-01. All data included in the database will be handled in a manner consistent with the Commission's confidentiality standards.
6. CPCs should report, or ask their vessels to report, FAD data from fishing trips required by Resolution C-16-01 to the IATTC staff as soon as possible, and at most with a 4-month delay, to facilitate the processing of the data in advance to the annual SAC meeting.
7. CPCs shall provide to the IATTC staff the same daily raw buoy data received by original users (*i.e.* vessels, fishing companies) in line with the research needs defined in the Strategic Science Plan to be adopted by the Commission.
8. The guidelines for submission of FAD data pursuant to Resolution C-17-02 (Annex 1) will be the reference for complying with the provisions of paragraph 11 of the resolution on a provisional basis during 2018. The guidelines should be modified to clarify that the latest transmission date is 1 May for January data, 1 June for February data, and so on.

9. The staff shall provide two email addresses to centralize the submission of FAD data required by Resolutions C-16-01 and C-17-02.
10. Incorporate experts from buoy providers as members of the *ad hoc* Permanent Working Group on FADs, to participate in the intersessional work of the group on the Basecamp platform.
11. Organize a workshop on buoy technology and use on the margins of the Commission meeting in August 2018, with the active participation of experts from buoy provider companies.
12. The Working Group, with the collaboration of the IATTC staff, should continue developing definitions intersessionally for a set of terms related to FAD fishing operations. The terms recommended for definition include those related to the utilization of buoys and other relevant terms. This task should be finalized by the annual meeting of the Commission in August 2018.
13. Continue the project on the implementation of biodegradable FADs in the EPO that has been initiated by the IATTC scientific staff. The Working Group also recommends that the IATTC staff develop a robust experimental design and ensure an effective coordination of the project, including with other relevant initiatives. The commitment and active involvement of CPCs in promoting the participation of the industry are critical for the success of the project.
14. The following research initiatives should be undertaken as an absolute priority. They are ranked in descending order of importance:
  - a. Review and prioritize data collection/ FAD marking
  - b. FAD impacts on catch rates of juvenile bigeye and yellowfin tunas
  - c. Influence of vessel, captain, technology used and FAD/gear attributes on catches of bigeye and yellowfin tunas
  - d. Science-based limit on FAD numbers/FAD sets
  - e. FAD-based index of abundance
  - f. Impact of FAD density on the associative behavior of tunas
  - g. Tests of biodegradable FADs (design and implementation of biodegradable materials)
  - h. Bycatch release practices, with special focus on sharks and manta rays
  - i. Pilot project on recovery of FADs
  - j. Estimates of bycatch and discard rates, by species, and identification of hot spots

## Appendix 5a

### **Declaration of the Plurinational State of Bolivia to the Ninety-third Meeting of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, San Diego, California, United States of America**

**August 24 to August 30, 2010**

The Plurinational State of Bolivia has maintained since 2,004, in reiterated and permanent form, a claim for a volume of capacity for five thousand eight hundred and thirty cubic meters (5,830 m<sup>3</sup>). For constitutional reasons and based on the right of all States to equitable access to living marine resources, recognized by International Law, especially on the high seas, can't renounce to such claim. The methodology used to date, with statements and accusations, has not produced a favorable result for Bolivia, except to keep the claim alive and it has not served for Bolivia to replace its wale volume of capacity. Consequently, it's time to move forward and seek solutions that emulate outputs that have proved effective in the recent past, especially that of the sister Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Bolivia is a developing State without coast, which only has two hundred and twenty-two cubic meters (222 m<sup>3</sup>) of the wale volume of capacity wineries registered in the Regional Vessel Register of the Commission. This tiny amount is not enough to develop a purse seine fishing fleet. The Bolivian State, as a natural part of the basin of the Eastern Pacific Ocean, needs to develop its fishery, in a way that allows to exercise its maritime vocation and legitimate right to take advantage of the resources and opportunities that are found there, in full compliance with the regulations of the International Law in general and the IATTC in particular, as it has always done.

For these reasons, Bolivia requests the distinguished Members of the Commission to recognize their right to replace, with new wale volume of capacity, the amount indicated above, and to authorize immediately the amount of two thousand four hundred and thirty-nine cubic meters (2,439 m<sup>3</sup>), which is less than 42% of the total claimed, adopting the management measures that compensate this additional effort. Bolivia joins the spirit of cooperation that must prevail in this organization, leaving pending the activation of the difference for a later time, when the state of the resource and the management measures in force at that time allow it.

In the city of San Diego, California, United States of America, on the 30<sup>th</sup> of August 2018.