

**INTER-AMERICAN TROPICAL TUNA COMMISSION**  
**COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF**  
**MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION**

**11<sup>TH</sup> MEETING**

By video conference  
 29 – 30 March 2021

**DOCUMENT COR-11-03**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED**  
**DURING THE PREVIOUS MEETING (10<sup>TH</sup>) OF THE REVIEW**  
**COMMITTEE: PROGRESS AND OUTCOMES**

At its annual meetings, the Review Committee (COR) makes recommendations to the Commission, many of which involve action by the staff. This document lists the recommendations currently requiring action by the staff and/or the Commission, and their current status: **green**: completed; **yellow**: in progress, incomplete; **orange**: pending of discussion in the Commission; **red**: no action.

	Recommendation, COR-10	Status (February, 2021)
<b>Recommendations to the Committee / Staff</b>		
1.	Continue the retrospective progress review represented by COR-10-01	In the final part of this table, another table is added on the recommendations of the 9 <sup>th</sup> meeting, the implementation of which is still in progress.
2.	Reintroduce the breakout for the status of released bycatch – disaggregate “Affected” back to more specific categories such as injured or killed	The status of the bycatch is always one of the information the on-board observer is asked to collect. The categories used to characterize this status change by species group due to elements such as observer and crew safety and the ability to obtain the relevant information. For example, turtles are easier to handle than sharks, and their status at the time of release can be better assessed. On the other hand, it is important that CPCs in their responses to communications sent to them about possible infractions also make sure to indicate the status of the bycatch when it is released.
3.	Continue to track cases of discrepancies between transshipment observer estimates of transshipped fish and reported landings and other available information, and to examine other models for monitoring transshipment in other RFMOs or fora, to consider the utility of recommending the development of a threshold for determining whether any differences may be a compliance matter.	After analyzing this issue, it was decided to adopt and apply a threshold of a 10% difference above which the CPCs involved are informed of the existence of a possible infraction and are requested to respond.
4.	In order to address cases of wrapping large sharks by the tail to remove them from the net, ask the Secretariat to examine from a scientific perspective any available information on handling of large sharks based on threats to human safety, and determine at the Commission whether the existing protocols in force in the shark	The Secretariat has recently signed a collaboration agreement with AZTI to research technologies to improve the handling and release of megafauna, including sharks. One of the procedures being explored is the use of devices that allow sharks to be manipulated around the tail, but in such a way that the weight of the

	<b>Recommendation, COR-10</b>	<b>Status (February, 2021)</b>
	<p>resolution may need to be revised. The Committee recognized and reiterated that the shark handling requirements remain in force.</p>	<p>animal is distributed throughout its body, thus without causing harmful effects on its physical condition. In addition, the project will tag the sharks to monitor them in order to evaluate their post-release survival according to the devices and procedures tested.</p> <p>The Secretariat has just signed a collaboration agreement with AZTI to research technologies that improve the management and release of megafauna, including sharks. One of the devices / technologies to be explored directly manipulates the sharks around the tail, but in a way where the weight is distributed throughout the animal in a harmless way (it will be scientifically proven though). The project will tag animals to assess post-release survival of different technologies and approaches. Somehow this will bring light on this issue.</p>
5.	<p>Members that continue to experience challenges with reporting operational level data under Resolution C-11-08 should be prepared to present to the Committee with a description of those challenges and any steps they are taking to improve.</p>	<p>A Memorandum was sent to the CPCs to remind them of this recommendation and that they should be prepared to make the referred to presentation at next meeting of the Compliance Committee.</p>
6.	<p>The Secretariat should seek to ensure coherence and reduction of discrepancies between and among the responses to the questionnaire, the issues reported in the Compliance Report, and the Compendium</p>	<p>The Secretariat has been working to review these documents more thoroughly to ensure their consistency and coherence with each other.</p>
7.	<p>The Secretariat should examine what types of data or monitoring would be needed to report on compliance with FAD requirements, including rules on activation/deactivation</p>	<p>The Secretariat has defined and communicated to the CPCs what data and monitoring are needed to accomplish this task: first, access to high-resolution buoy data (and not summarized, as provided by most CPCs) and, second, access to VMS data. On the other hand, failure to send information on buoys that were deactivated should be considered as a possible problem of non-compliance with the established FAD monitoring scheme.</p>
8.	<p>Recognizing that the requirements to retrieve FADS in the period before a closure remains in force and consider the implications of this requirement for vessels setting opportunistically on FADs with satellite buoys they do not own.</p>	<p>A memorandum was sent to the CPCs reminding them of their obligation to comply with this requirement in an effective manner and clarifying that they must do so even in the case of FADs that had been deployed by vessels of another flag.</p>
9.	<p>The Members recommend that the Secretariat should endeavor to send all available evidentiary and documentary information when reporting any cases to Members, in particular for any possible violations that were not included on the compliance record for a trip.</p>	<p>The Secretariat has continued to send to each CPC all the information available to document the identified cases of possible non-compliance that have been reported to them, clarifying that, in some circumstances, this information cannot be found in the Compliance Report (RDC) filed by the observers, nor in the other reports such as the shark and manta rays records, daily reports, etc.</p>
<b>Recommendations for the Commission</b>		

	<b>Recommendation, COR-10</b>	<b>Status (February, 2021)</b>	
10	Renew Cooperating Non-Member status for Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Liberia and Indonesia	The Commission renewed this status to all five countries.	
11	No changes were recommended for the IUU Vessel List.	The Commission adopted the list without changes, and subsequently shared it with other regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs).	
12	Communicate to the CPCs that were absent from the CPC-by-CPC review of their responsibility to attend and participate in the work of the Committee.	Communications were sent to these CPCs to remind them of their obligation to participate in the meetings of the Compliance Committee.	
13	Reiterate the recommendations arising from the 9th meeting which are still pending discussion and consideration by the Commission and note that some actions may benefit from a Member exercising their prerogative to submit a proposal to facilitate action by the Commission.	The discussion and consideration of these recommendations is still pending because the Commission was unable to address them at its last regular meeting, which was held by videoconference with a reduced agenda, focusing only on the matters considered most essential and urgent. It is expected that the Commission will do so at its next 98th regular meeting.	
14	In order to reduce redundant reporting, consider revising the FAO Sea Turtle Guidelines implementation reporting requirement to change it from annual to only when any changes occur, IATTC-94 – July 2019 – Minutes 127 possibly taking into account a model used in ICCAT or other RFMOs.	Consistent with this recommendation, the CPCs were asked to indicate whether or not there is any change in the previous report. If there is no change, the pending report is considered as having been submitted and fulfilled the obligation established in the corresponding resolution.	
15	Reiterate obligation to retrieve FADs within 15 days of closure regardless of whether the set is opportunistic	A memorandum was sent to the CPCs reminding them of their obligation to comply with this requirement in an effective manner and clarifying that they must do so even in the case of FADs that had been deployed by vessels of another flag.	
16	Reiterate the Secretariat's memo to Members of 11/20/18 regarding implementation of C-17-02.  (It is related to FADs data)	CPCs have been reminded of their obligation to provide the Commission with information on FADs as established in the resolutions in force and ways to promote and facilitate compliance with this obligation have been sought, including by holding training seminars for fishing captains of the fleet.	

## Pending recommendations of the 9<sup>a</sup> COR meeting

**All the pending recommendations from the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the COR must be discussed within the Commission to advance in their application.**

	Recomendation , COR-09	Status (May 2019)
<b>Recomendaciones al Comité / Personal de la Secretaría</b>		
17.	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	The Secretariat has expressed the need for these deadlines to be revised, but the Committee still needs to analyze this matter in more detail and formulate specific recommendations for subsequent consideration and eventual adoption by the Commission..
18.	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..	This is an issue that the Committee and the Commission still need to address, in particular analyzing which cases should be notified to the CPCs in a manner analogous to what the Review Panel (IRP) does in the framework of the AIDCP, since adding that step would mean more time and work before the Committee could review the cases of possible infractions.
<b>Recomendaciones a la Comisión</b>		
19.	. Revise the notification on guidelines for transits without observers, with a view to establishing deadlines for sending these notifications and confirming their receipt. This task can be carried out with special attention from the Ad Hoc Working Group to review the legal and operational coherence of IATTC resolutions.	This matter would appear to be sufficiently clarified and defined, since the current guidelines on transit without an observer on board indicate, among other things, that the Secretariat must be notified of the exemption prior to the vessel's departure. However, the guidelines do not specify how far in advance the flag State must send the notification, so in practice there have been many cases of excessive delay in which the Secretariat received the notification after the vessel's departure, in addition to cases of non-compliance with the guidelines when the notification was sent after that date.
20.	Consider to clarify 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.	The Commission should still consider and discuss this matter, since it was unable to do so during its last meeting. It could even, as in the case of the previous recommendation, instruct the Working Group on the Legal Consistency of Resolutions to undertake this task and subsequently submit relevant recommendations to it. As background, it should be recalled that while there is a total prohibition of retention on board, transshipment, landing or storage for purse seiners, in the case of longliners there is only a limit of 20% of the bycatch, but it is not defined whether it is legal to retain on board, land or transship that 20%.