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# Purpose

To provide participants at the 20th Working Party on Data Collection and Statistics (WPDCS20) with data-related requests made by the Scientific Committee and the other Working Parties and Working Groups to the WPDCS.

# Recommendation

That the WPDCS **NOTE** paper IOTC-2024-WPDCS20-12 which details the data-related requests made to the WPDCS that should be addressed during the meeting.

# Appendices

**Appendix A**: Paragraphs of reports from IOTC meetings along with the description of data-related requests made to the WPDCS.

# Appendix A Paragraphs of reports from IOTC meetings along with the description of data-related requests made to the WPDCS

| **Meeting** | **Para.** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **WPDCS19**  **(November 2023)** | **69** | Eventually, the WPDCS **ENDORSED** the use of Form 3-DA from the next data reporting cycle, **REQUESTED** that the SC defines procedures for scientist to get access to more fine-grained data extracted from its submissions, and **AGREED** on publicly disseminating information duly aggregated by grid and month in the meantime. |
|  | **70** | Finally, the WPDCS **REQUESTED** that CPCs with fisheries on DFOBs also report to the Secretariat their historical data through both Form 3-CE (when not done already) and 3-DA. |
|  | **74** | Furthermore, the WPDCS **NOTED** how para.8 of Res. 19/07 establishes that the information on catches from chartered vessels be submitted to the IOTC by 28 February each year, and that this contrasts with the default data reporting deadline of 30 June. |
|  | **75** | For these reasons, the WPDCS **REQUESTED** that the SC clarifies the aspects of Res. 19/07 that deal with the submission of catch statistics to the IOTC, to effectively manage these submissions and assess the compliance level of chartering and flag CPCs in the future. |
|  | **94** | The WPDCS **REQUESTED** all CPCs with fisheries on AFADs to confirm if they can collect (and report) all required data elements, as well as to confirm that the proposed AFAD type and AFAD activity type classifications are fit for the purpose. |
|  | **95** | **ACKNOWLEDGING** that not all CPCs can fulfil these requirements, as their vessels on AFADs are often of artisanal nature and lack proper onboard data collection mechanisms, the WPDCS ENDORSED anyway the proposed Form 3-AA for the reporting of detailed interaction with AFADs and **REQUESTED** that those CPCs that can, also report to the Secretariat historical data for their AFAD fisheries through both Form 3-CE and 3-AA. |
|  | **100** | Nevertheless, the WPDCS **NOTED** that about 25% of the total catch of the Thai small-purse seine fishery may come from AFADs when the rest is taken on free-swimming schools and **REQUESTED** Thailand to consider those as two distinct fisheries in future submissions of catch and effort to the Secretariat, splitting the historical data accordingly where possible. |
|  | **129** | The WPDCS **NOTED** the ***request*** for CPCs and the Secretariat to implement a FAIR data management plan (DMP) and strategies by assigning DOIs to public domain and open data for both past and future resources, **ACKNOWLEDGING** that it might be necessary to seek approval from the SC for the implementation of a DMP. |
|  | **166** | For the recent map (i.e., 2022), the WPDCS **REQUESTED** the Secretariat to liaise with Sri Lanka to cross-check the consistency of the fishing grounds with the catch and effort data reported by Sri Lanka for that year. |
|  | **188** | **NOTING** that the increase in Oman’s official catches – particularly since 2017 – are partly an artifact of improvements in the data collection and monitoring of landings, rather than entirely due to an actual increase in production, the WPDCS **REQUESTED** that Oman consider revising the historical catches not only for yellowfin tuna, but also for all other key tuna and non-tuna species (e.g., longtail tuna, Indian oil sardines, jacks and trevallies, etc.) which account for a significant proportion of total catches, further **REQUESTING** that an update be provided at the next WPDCS meeting. |
|  | **111** | The WPDCS **RECALLED** the paucity of size-frequency data available at the Secretariat, for most coastal fisheries, and for billfish and neritic species in particular, and **URGED** all concerned CPCs to develop and implement sampling and reporting systems to acquire more information on the size composition of the catch of their coastal fisheries. |
|  | **284** | Considering all the above, the WPDCS **RECOMMENDED** that an intersessional working group is organised (by correspondence or through online meetings) to convey interested WPDCS and WGEMS participants and review:  • the scientific need for each ROS data field proposed by the 2018 ROS expert WS report;  • ROS data fields collection and reporting status (e.g., mandatory/optional, etc.);  • potential specific EMS fields to be added to ROS mandatory requirements; and  • summarise the capabilities, and advantages and drawbacks to collect ROS data fields across gears by different alternative methods (e.g., EMS, human onboard observers, self-reporting, port sampling) and a combination of those.  and further **REQUESTED** that this group report to the next sessions of the WGEMS and WPDCS. |
| **SC26**  **(December 2023)** | **30** | The SC **ACKNOWLEDGED** the sudden and steady increase in catches of yellowfin tuna reported for the handline fishery of Oman since 2014, despite constant effort trends and **REQUESTED** further explanations on the matter. The SC QUERIED whether issues with species identification between longtail tuna and yellowfin tuna could be one of the driving factors. |
|  | **146** | **ACKNOWLEDGING** that Res. 23/08 requires the revision of the ROS data fields, the SC **ENDORSED** the request of setting up an intersessional working group (either by correspondence, or remotely) convening interested WPDCS and WGEMS participants to discuss and review:  a) The scientific need for each ROS data field (as proposed by the ROS expert workshop of 2018)  b) The status (mandatory / mandatory when feasible / optional) of each ROS data field  c) The possibility of adding EMS-specific elements to the list of ROS mandatory data fields  d) The inclusion of proper mechanisms / classifications, within the ROS data fields, to better capture details on fins naturally attached to sharks  e) The summary of capabilities, advantages, and drawbacks of collecting ROS data fields through alternative methods such as EMS, human onboard observers, port-sampling, self-reporting, etc. (as well as a combination of these).  and **REQUESTED** that this group reports to the next session of the WGEMS and WPDCS |
|  |  |  |
| **WPNT14**  **(July 2024)** | **11** | 11. The WPNT REITERATED its **REQUEST** for CPCs to report size and weight data for neritic (and all) species, to the Secretariat. The WPNT **NOTED** that the Secretariat has been working to harmonise the code lists for different length types which necessitates each fish to be identified with its corresponding length and weight measurements. This effort aims to streamline the reporting process for these data. |
| **WGEMS03**  **(June 2024)** | **34** | The WGEMS **NOTED** that there was insufficient time to extract information about the coverage of pole and line fisheries from the observer database but further NOTED that the Secretariat intends to complete the work including this fleet as soon as possible. The WGEMS REQUESTED the Secretariat to present an update document including the pole and line at the WPDCS. |
|  | **35** | The WGEMS **NOTED** that this document provides a summary of the data currently available in the ROS database but further **NOTED** that the Secretariat has received more data than is currently available in the ROS database but many of these data have been submitted in formats that cannot easily be input into the database such as in pdf format or aggregated over several trips. The WGEMS **NOTED** that many CPCs have been improving their submissions in recent years, with more using the required formats so these will be input into the database and there is hope that some will resubmit past data in suitable formats so they can also be included in the analysis. |
|  | **36** | The WGEMS **NOTED** the intention of the Secretariat to repeat this exercise routinely in an automated way to better monitor the contents of the ROS database. The WGEMS **REQUESTED** the Secretariat to continue with this work. |
|  | **31** | The WGEMS **NOTED** that geo-referenced catch, effort, and size-frequency data have been collected in Pakistan for the year 2022 but not yet transmitted to the Secretariat due to administrative issues. The WGEMS **URGED** Pakistan to report the data at their earliest convenience. |
| **WPB22**  **(September 2024)** | **42** | **ACKNOWLEDGING** the importance of morphometric relationships in harmonising size-frequency data collected using different measurement types for billfish, due to varying dressing procedures, the WPB **REQUESTED** the Secretariat to develop a new voluntary form for reporting individual morphometric data, to enhance the IOTC reference morphometric relationships. |
| **WPEB20\_DP**  **(April 2024)** | **81** | The WPEB **NOTED** that the level of catches presented do not contain data on discards reported through form 1DI by some CPCs. **NOTING** that Resolution 15/02 currently requires CPCs to report estimates of total catch by species, separated whenever possible into retained catches and discards, the WPEB **NOTED** that discard data are very seldom reported to the Secretariat and are usually not raised to the total catch. Therefore, the WPEB **REQUESTED** CPCs to fully comply with Resolutions 15/01 and 15/02 to ensure reporting of scientific estimates of discards for IOTC species as well as the most commonly caught sharks (as listed in Resolution 15/01 for longline fisheries), and that details on the estimation methods should be provided to the Scientific Committee. |
| **WPEB20\_AS**  **(September 2024)** | **12** | The WPEB **REITERATED** the importance of the recommendation made by the group in 2023: “**ACKNOWLEDGING** that the current ROS data requirements already enable the recording of shark fins attached / non-attached to carcasses, the WPEB **RECOMMENDED** that the SC identifies proper mechanisms to ensure this information is regularly collected and reported to the Secretariat through the ROS.” The WPEB **REQUESTED** that this is discussed by the WPDCS at its meeting later this year as this may be a more appropriate forum for this discussion. |
|  | **20** | The WPEB **RECALLED** that the information on total catch for those CPCs who do not report their catch (e.g., Yemen) is either repeated from the previous years, or recovered from other data sources that include, among others, FAO official catch statistics which are also known to be incomplete and are not available by fishing gear/fishery. The WPEB **REQUESTED** the Secretariat to consult with the relevant CPCs whenever utilising alternative sources of data for fulfilling the non-reported components or modifying the reported catch. |
|  | **51** | The WPEB **REQUESTED** that the WPDCS and WGEMS note the study presented by the authors (IOTC-2024-WPEB20(AS)-14), and **REQUESTED** assistance from the WGEMS for collecting information related to the current status of AI-based species identification. |
|  | **54** | **ACKNOWLEDGING** that this initiative would encompass a broader scope than that addressed by the WPEB, the WPEB **REQUESTED** the WPDCS to explore ways to establish collaboration across t-RFMOs and with other interested organizations. The goal is to compile images for developing these tools, including the formulation of Terms of Reference and a work plan for initial activities |
|  | **152** | The WPEB **NOTED** that mainline material is consistently being submitted by CPCs in their ROS data. The WPEB **NOTED** that the ROS minimum data requirements are currently under revision by the WGEMS/WPDCS and that the current working draft review for longline vessels suggested that collecting detailed branchline configuration information should be “mandatory” at the trip level, however, branchline materials and leader materials for catches of sensitive species should be “mandatory” but this should include the possibility to record this information as “unknown” due to the practical difficulties of collecting this information both by onboard human observers and by EMS. The WPEB further **NOTED** that collecting data on leader material for each fishing set as part of the ROS remains “optional” and includes the possibility of recording this information as “unknown” due to the practical difficulties of collecting this information both by onboard human observers and by EMS. The WPEB **NOTED** that these points will be further discussed at the WPDCS and the WPEB **REQUESTED** that the WPDCS consider these recommendations in their discussions. |
|  | **162** | The WPEB **REQUESTED** the WPDCS to examine the online digital atlas project to receive additional feedback to what has been expressed by the WPEB, in order to design a consolidated project to be presented at SC27. |
| **WPTT26**  **(October 2024)**  **[Report not adopted yet]** | **78** | The WPTT discussed the possibility of imposing a unit of effort for the different fishing gears in order to accurately standardize CPUE. The WPTT QUERIED whether the information on the number of crew or days at sea has been collected to calculate appropriate effort indices. The WPTT NOTED that logbooks contain some information on the number of hooks or crew that could be used to correct for this. The WPTT further NOTED that logbook data also include the number of poles. The WPTT AGREED that consistent reporting of pole and line effort for a long time and the issue of effort units should be further discussed at the WPDCS. |