



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



**PROJECT**  
Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries  
and Biodiversity Conservation in the ABNJ

**TCN**



COMBATTING ILLEGAL FISHING

## Report of the 2nd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

15 – 18 February 2018  
HONIARA, SOLOMON ISLANDS

PROCEEDINGS



***Cover Photograph:***

Picture of skipjack tuna being bulk stored in a carrier in Solomon Islands, kindly provided by Francisco Blaha. This image serves an illustrative purpose and was not taken in the context of any illegal activities.

The views expressed in this report are those of the workshop participants and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO or of the tuna RFMOs.

## **2nd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network**

**15 – 18 February 2018  
Honiara, Solomon Islands**

### WORKSHOP REPORT

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Acronyms

- I. Introduction
- II. Proceedings Workshop 15-17 February
- III. Proceedings TCN Core Group meeting 18 February
- IV. Workshop conclusions and next steps
- V. Annexes
  - Annex 1 - Agenda Workshop
  - Annex 2 - List of Participants

## Executive Summary

With the support of the [Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project](#), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and in cooperation with the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](#) (International MCS Network), the second Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network was convened in Honiara, Solomon Islands, at the headquarters of the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) from 15-18 February 2018.

The Workshop's main objective was to exchange information among the tuna RFMO Secretariats and with other experts on data management and reporting for compliance, and explore the scope for cooperation and rationalizing work processes in this area. In addition, the Workshop provided space for discussion of other topics of relevance to officers responsible for compliance, such as developments in compliance assessment procedures, transshipment, and initiatives to identify best practices in fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS). The last day of the Workshop was reserved for discussions among the TCN's Core Group, which comprises the tuna RFMO officers responsible for compliance.

Participating data and IT experts from the Secretariats of the five tuna RFMOs and from other regional organizations provided the latest information on data management systems, some of which had not been shared among a group of peers before. Officers responsible for compliance of the participating RFMOs provided some considerations on data-management needs, presented current practices in each RFMO and discussed how existing systems could be improved. One session of the Workshop was dedicated to updates and discussion on selected issues of concern to TCN members: compliance assessment procedures; MCS Best practices and transshipment.

After a day and a half of presentations on existing data management systems and opportunities for their strengthening, participants engaged in small-group consultations to identify in more detail: current problems, opportunities for improvement and challenges to achieve such improvements. In their conclusions, participants identified three key problem areas related to data management and reporting: a) complexity of existing reporting requirements due to a high number of requirements; complex deadlines; and redundant requests and duplication of material reported; b) lack of sufficient automated solutions to reduce the burden for Secretariats and for RFMO Members; c) insufficient harmonization amongst RFMOs of compliance assessment procedures, which may make assessments more difficult for each RFMO and compliance more complex for RFMO Members. Participants also identified several possible solutions, which include: streamlining and integrating reporting requirements to reduce the complexity of reporting data and information to RFMOs and the reuse of information provided under different requirements; the generation of automatic reminders on timelines; the adoption by RFMOs of both online data entry and automated data sharing and of automated processes for data validation; and the consideration of the establishment of harmonized compliance assessment categories initially at intra-regional RFMO meetings. Participants emphasized the importance of sharing information within each RFMO and amongst all RFMOs, including information about approaches and tools for supporting data management and reporting for compliance purposes.

The last day of the Workshop was reserved for members of the Core Group of the TCN to discuss matters related to the functioning of the Network and future plans. Core Group members made a positive assessment of the first year of functioning of the Network and expressed their interest in continuing this project and holding another Workshop in early 2019. The Group identified elements for the 2018-19 Workplan.

Both officers responsible for compliance and data managers valued very positively the opportunity to have met in person and learned from each other, and were looking forward to continuing their communication and meeting again in the future. Several of them indicated that they were already taking home a few things they had learned from their colleagues during the Workshop.



Workshop participants outside the meeting venue at FFA headquarters in Honiara, Solomon Islands.

## Acronyms

AIDCP	Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program
AIS	Automated Identification System
CCAMLR	Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CCSBT	Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna
CDS	Catch Documentation Scheme
CLAV	Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFA	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IMCS Network	International Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Network
ISSF	International Seafood Sustainability Foundation
IOTC	Indian Ocean Tuna Commission
IUU Fishing	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
MCS	Monitoring, Control and Surveillance
NPFC	North Pacific Fisheries Commission
PSMA	FAO Port State Measures Agreement
RFMOs	Regional Fisheries Management Organizations
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
tRFMOs	Tuna Regional Fisheries Management Organizations
UVI	Unique Vessel Identifier
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

## **I. Introduction**

With the support of the [Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project](#), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and in cooperation with the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](#) (International MCS Network), the second Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network was convened in Honiara, Solomon Islands, at the headquarters of the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) from 15-18 February 2018. This initiative responds to the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project's Component 2, aimed at strengthening and harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to address Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IUU) in world tuna fisheries through the development of innovative tools and through capacity building.

As determined by the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN) in its Inception Workshop in March 2017, and with the input of the TCN's Core Group in the elaboration of the Workshop's agenda, the meeting placed special emphasis on data management and online reporting. The Workshop's main objective was to exchange information among the tuna RFMO Secretariats and with other experts on this issue and explore the scope for synergy in rationalizing work processes on data management and data reporting. In addition, the Workshop provided space for discussion of other topics of relevance to officers responsible for compliance, such as developments in compliance assessment procedures, transshipment and initiatives to identify best practices in fisheries monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS). The last day of the Workshop was reserved for discussions among the TCN's Core Group, which comprises the tuna RFMO officers responsible for compliance, on the organization of the Network, the TCN's Workplan for 2018-2019, and initiatives to ensure the continuation of its activities in coming years. See the Workshop's agenda in Annex 1.

The Workshop gathered officers responsible for compliance and for data or IT from the following organizations that constitute the Network's Core Group: Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), and the Western and the Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC). In addition, the Workshop also benefited from the participation of other experts in data management and MCS from the following organizations: Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR); North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC); Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC); the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA); and from a wide representation of experts from FFA, the organization hosting the workshop. See list of participants in Annex 2.

## **II. Proceedings Workshop 15-17 February 2018**

### **A. Opening**

Mr. James Movick, Director General of FFA, welcomed participants and opened the Workshop, preceded by introductory remarks by Mr. Gerard Domingue, Chair of the Tuna Compliance Network, who thanked in particular the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) for its hospitality in hosting the Workshop.

## **B. Introduction and purpose of the meeting**

The Workshop commenced with a round of introductions by all project participants, followed by presentations by Mr. Kim Stobberup, MCS Consultant with the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project at FAO and Ms. Adriana Fabra, Coordinator of the TCN. Mr. Stobberup provided background information on the ABNJ project and on activities carried out by the TCN since its establishment in March 2017; the Coordinator described the Workshop objectives, agenda and methodology: the meeting would begin with a day and a half of presentations with ample time for questions and discussions, followed by another day of deliberations in smaller working groups with the objective of extracting some conclusions from information shared at the Workshop and identifying opportunities for improving existing data management and reporting systems. Each work session was to be chaired by a different workshop participant, and each session would have a rapporteur also appointed among the workshop participants.

Presenters at the workshop provided the latest information on data management systems, some of which had not been shared among a group of peers before. This report cannot summarize the rich and substantive presentations made at the Workshop. Power point documents presented at the Workshop are available at:

<https://3.basecamp.com/3709053/buckets/5945791/vaults/915644003>

It was agreed that the meeting would be conducted under Chatham House rules, to facilitate open and informal discussions among participants.

## **C. Overview of each RFMO's current data management system and opportunities for their improvement (Sessions 2 & 3)**

A first set of presentations were provided by all the participating data and IT experts from the secretariats of the five tuna RFMOs. The following speakers provided an overview of the data management systems in their respective organizations: Colin Millar, Database Manager, CCSBT; Nick Vogel, Head of Data Collection and Database Program, IATTC; Carlos Mayor, Database Programmer, ICCAT; Fabio Fiorellato, Data Coordinator, IOTC; and Sam Taufao, IT Manager, WCPFC.

Presentations made indicated that different RFMOs are at different stages of development of their data management systems. WCPFC has made most progress by improving different aspects of data management progressively: with financial support over three years, it has developed centralized databases that integrate various MCS data sources, developed systems for Members to enter their data directly into the online records (i.e. vessel data and annual reporting on implementation of conservation and management measures), and generated an online compliance monitoring report and compliance case file system, among other improvements. WCPFC also has contractual arrangements with SPC for scientific data management services and FFA for VMS services. IOTC is developing a system, e-MARIS, that could be of interest to other RFMOs that are exploring how to improve their systems. ICCAT is also engaged in developing online reporting and other features following an approach similar to e-MARIS. CCSBT is planning on moving towards a fully cloud-hosted and browser-based system, with automated data-quality checking in the back-end and login by Members. The IATTC representative clarified that its system is significantly different from other RFMOs' as most data comes from the onboard observer program and so there is a more limited amount of data to manage.

Officers pointed out to a number of challenges to improve data management systems, including lack of a dedicated budget to these matters in most RFMOs and the existence of a vast amount of data to process, which sits in multiple databases (up to 39 databases in some RFMOs). Data to collect, process and publish includes information on, for example: observer reports, vessel logbooks, vessel movements, transshipment information, at sea and at port inspections, IUU vessel lists and sightings, VMS, catch documentation schemes and information from compliance evaluation processes.

Officers also identified the need to handle some problem areas, such as redundancies in data requirements, complex deadlines, the continued review of forms based on changes made to conservation measures, and errors in data submitted.

Presentations from data managers were followed by presentations by the officers responsible for compliance of the tuna RFMOs: Susie Iball, Compliance Manager, CCSBT; Ricardo Belmontes, Policy Advisor, IATTC; M'Hamed Idrissi, Compliance Officer, ICCAT; and Lara Manarangi-Trott, Compliance Manager, WCPFC, and by Fabio Fiorellato, on behalf of IOTC. They provided some considerations on data-management needs, presented some best practices in each RFMO and discussed how existing systems could be improved. Among the suggested improvements, officers pointed out the advantages of generating automatic reminders to Members to provide information; creating a single reporting template that can be easily updated by the Secretariat and ideally that would be common to all tuna RFMOs to make reporting easier for Members; or converting paper-based systems such as CDS or high seas transshipment reporting into electronic systems.

Lara Manarangi-Trott and Peter Flewwelling, as Chairs of sessions 2 and 3, respectively, and Tim Jones and 'Ana Taholo, as Rapporteurs, extracted the following conclusions from presentations and discussions among participants:

- online solutions are an opportunity to make data management more efficient;
- centralized and integrated databases would ensure best use of received data and correct errors and gaps in information;
- it is important that Members are involved in the development of data management systems and are not just the “consumers of flat reports”;
- it is necessary to have a mandate to develop/improve data management systems, which is supported by Members;
- any system needs to be as efficient as possible given that it is difficult to significantly increase staff numbers or get other resources;
- the TCN can support officers in sharing ideas on how to involve Members and deliver better solutions.

#### **D. Advanced models in data management and reporting for compliance purposes (Session 4)**

In this session, chaired by Susie Iball, experts in data management involved in the development of successful data management models presented key features of systems available in their respective organizations. They acknowledged the problems also identified by previous speakers, including the fact that a lot of data is provided on paper or, if electronically, in different formats (email, spreadsheets, other databases, etc.), which makes information hard to use or time-consuming to introduce into a system. Many countries lack the capacity and

resources to effectively manage data, and due to poor quality of the information or the way in which information is provided data can be manipulated, lost or damaged.

Most presenters emphasized the importance of integrating data in order to have meaningful analysis and the need to standardize information as much as possible to facilitate such integration. Sakaio Manoa, A/IT Manager at FFA, noted the importance of making these systems affordable and scalable as capacities in countries develop, and to make them compatible at a regional level to facilitate greater mutual support among countries within a region. Allan Rahari, Surveillance Operations Officer with FFA, described the flexibility offered by the Niue Treaty Information System, which provides information to participating Members that can be used for the purposes of taking enforcement action. Peter Williams, Principal Fisheries Scientist at SPC, added some practical recommendations such as the usefulness of these systems providing "alerts" instead of "reports," and pushing information out instead of users having to extract the data. He also emphasized the importance of developing standardized data quality control systems to ensure that data is complete and accurate. Ana Taholo, Assistant Compliance Manager at WCPFC, described the online reporting system in support of compliance at WCPFC, where Member countries introduce their reported data directly into the system, with the opportunity of reviewing the information once it has been reflected into the compliance monitoring report. She noted however that a significant amount of information is not provided online but directly to the Secretariat, where staff has to introduce the data manually into the database. Tim Jones, Information Systems and Data Services Manager at CCAMLR, explained how CCAMLR's system is founded on "master data", such as vessels, ports, or geographical areas, which provides the vehicle for effective integration. He also highlighted the importance of a three-phase process to manage data: "extract" (establish a path to get the data); "transform" (provide a mechanism to standardize and validate data) and "load" (determine how to insert/update data). Such system allows the database to change over time without affecting source systems. Peter Flewwelling, Compliance Manager at NPFC, described some of the new systems established in his organization, such as the direct entry of vessel information into the vessel registry, with an automatic double-entry check. As in other organizations, vessel data is at the core of the NPFC data system, but he emphasized the importance of having information on vessel masters and owners in vessel registers. Carlos Mayor, Database programmer at ICCAT, presented ICCAT's Fisheries Online Reporting System (FORS) & Statistical Forms Prototype.

It is interesting to note that technical staff from different participating organizations have been collaborating on a bilateral basis in the development of their data management systems, such as for example WCPFC having contractual arrangements with SPC for scientific data management services, CCAMLR and WCPFC exchanging ideas and approaches for compliance event reporting and vessel records, and WCPFC providing IT advice to NPFC in the development of its new systems. IOTC and ICCAT are developing specifications for data management with the assistance of the same consultant and in parallel. Participants regarded such cooperation fruitful and wished to continue it at bilateral or multilateral levels.

All participants to the workshop benefited from on-site presentations on FFA's surveillance system by military personnel from Australia and New Zealand stationed at FFA's Regional Surveillance and Coordination Centre.

#### **E. Solutions to improved data management systems (Session 5)**

After a day and a half of presentations on existing data management systems and opportunities for their strengthening, participants engaged into small-group consultations to identify in more

detail: current problems, opportunities for improvement and challenges to achieve such improvements. In the first session, two groups were created, one of data and IT managers, and one of officers responsible for compliance.

The working group of data managers, chaired by Peter Williams, provided a number of considerations to improve data management systems for compliance, acknowledging the constraints with each item and offering some suggestions for overcoming those constraints. They are summarized below:

	Considerations/suggestions	Constraints
1	<p>The group noted that there were <u>differences in the compliance data management systems</u> presented at the workshop, but there were several areas of commonality also.</p> <p>For example, the back-end RDBMS used, and the general approach using a document management system.</p>	<p>The respective RFMOs and other agencies have invested in their current systems, which would make it difficult to consider new systems.</p> <p>However, there appear to be opportunities to acquire new information and learn lessons from others to enhance their own systems, for example.</p>
2	<p>Need a mechanism for <u>information sharing/exchange amongst</u> IT/data managers involved in compliance data management systems. The group identified the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establishing a directory to access new skills/people (e.g. consultant developers)</li> <li>- Alerts to relevant, important meetings and/or dissemination of those meeting reports.</li> <li>- A useful outcome of this meeting is understanding how others have approached their solutions.</li> <li>- Some work can proceed on a bilateral level; e.g. CCAMLR and WCPFC exchanging ideas and approaches at a technical level</li> </ul>	<p>Finding ways to share experiences with a consequence of identifying commonalities.</p> <p>Consider whether the IMCSN/TCN could have a role to facilitate such exchange.</p>
3	<p>Establishing potential mechanisms for <u>compliance-related data sharing and data exchange</u>, where relevant, amongst RFMOs and other relevant agencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical aspects. For example, establishing standards/specifications (data formats, mechanism for the exchange, etc.) for data exchange/sharing.</li> <li>2. Legal aspects. For example, agreement and work required in establishing appropriate rules, MOUs/MOCs, etc.; acknowledges existing bilateral MOUs/MOCs as examples for others.</li> </ol>	<p>Lack of time/resources to progress this work.</p> <p>The CLAV is a good example of a global standard initiative. Are others not yet considered? Global record of fishing vessels?</p>

4	<p>Promoting the <u>benefits</u> of having systems in the <u>CLOUD</u> by developing shared strategies to deal with concerns on CLOUD Hosting.</p> <p>Examples,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop FACT SHEETS/'expert' advice to address such concerns.</li> <li>- Use analogies from other domains (e.g. utilities...)</li> <li>- Addresses potential data security and data loss</li> <li>- Cover concerns by having data centres including clauses to indicate that the cloud company is liable.</li> </ul>	<p>Deal with concerns by Members on data security from non-technical stakeholders.</p> <p>Address issues of slow, expensive internet in some developing countries</p>
5	<p><u>Data and Systems Integration</u> and <u>Scalability</u> are critical considerations.</p> <p>There may be differences amongst development approaches to address integration and scalability at the organisational level.</p> <p>For example, recognising the need to get internal systems in order (integration) prior to consideration of outside integration.</p>	<p>Are standards appropriate?</p> <p>(most appropriate place for standards is at the interface between systems)</p> <p>Can the system be hosted on the CLOUD? (see above) (Political will, driven by Members, other constraints?)</p> <p>Resource implications.</p> <p>The need to be flexible to respond to Members' requirements.</p> <p>Development/availability of documentation/metadata</p>
6	<p>The need to consider a mechanism for <u>implementing change management</u>, consequences of implementing new technology to users, the need to recognise and address the impacts of new technology/systems.</p>	<p>New approaches need to be communicated, but who compiles the information and coordinates dissemination?</p> <p>Consider whether the IMCSN/TCN could have a role to compile and facilitate such dissemination</p>
7	<p>Establish and/or adopt <u>Best Practice</u> models and/or <u>minimums standards</u> using commonalities of existing and proposed systems of RFMOs and partner organisations.</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Build systems to ensure data verification as close to the source as possible, so errors are detected early.</li> <li>- Recognise the use of independent sources of data to cross-check primary data.</li> <li>- Ensuring international standards are adopted (where they exist)</li> </ul>	<p>Available resources to undertake this work (e.g. resource implications)?</p> <p>Consider whether the IMCSN/TCN could have a role to facilitate or coordinate the adoption of such minimum standards.</p> <p>Mechanism for sharing DQC rules amongst RFMOs? Differences in definitions/Vocabulary amongst RFMOs will be a constraint.</p>

	- Consideration of having a shared, data quality control (DQC) standard amongst RFMOs and other relevant agencies.	
8	Recognise the benefits and promote the adoption of <u>E-Reporting and online systems</u> to address, for example, the earliest detection of errors (e.g. efficiencies in data entry and DQC).  These systems should be considered Best Practice.	Lack of resources, close working relationship, building trust and addressing potential security concerns with stakeholders (industry through to users).  Ideally in the CLOUD but also recognising the challenges that brings (see item above).

#### F. Priorities and next steps in data management (Session 6)

The working group of officers responsible for compliance discussed three main topics proposed for discussion by the session's Chair, Ricardo Belmontes:

1. Harmonisation in compliance reporting in each RFMO
2. Ways of improving compliance with reporting obligations by Members
3. Identification of common problems and possible solutions

Participants acknowledged that different RFMOs have different needs, especially some RFMOs that receive very little information directly from Members. They also acknowledged that some important hurdles include the difficulties faced by Members trying to comply with reporting obligations, and the difficulties that Secretariats experience in managing and monitoring the receipt of data submissions. Participants agreed that some of the main hurdles are: a) Redundancy in reporting (repeated requests for the same data in different forms); b) Multiple and complex deadlines; c) Heavy workload for both Secretariats and Members.

To facilitate compliance, participants considered that it would be helpful to:

- Move to online reporting (using technology as a capacity building tool)
- Improve standardization of data and automate procedures by creating harmonized or standard templates and reports; issue automatic reminders about deadlines etc; centralize the monitoring of all reporting requirements.
- Distinguish between more and less serious compliance issues, as a way to help prioritize action towards a Member in a situation of non-compliance.
- Try to integrate some requirements of reporting in global national reports to facilitate compliance.

As possible next steps to address some of the identified gaps, participants recommended:

- Reviewing compliance reporting requirements to identify redundancies and determine core data needs (i.e. what data is needed and why is it needed).
- Combine a two-pronged approach that combines capacity building (using available funds and including technological solutions) with structural changes to improve the effectiveness of existing procedures. The review process should consider priorities, rationalising and weighting indices of compliance according to the seriousness of the matter.

- Exchanging information and experiences (such as through the TCN) to create awareness, facilitate communication, and improve compliance assessments.

#### **G. Towards some recommendations for more effective data management (Session 7)**

Session 7, aimed at providing conclusions and identifying opportunities for more effective systems for data management/reporting for compliance was reorganized slightly to allow time for Workshop participants to have some small-group discussions prior to meeting in plenary. Three groups were created, and each group included representatives of RFMO officers responsible for compliance, of data managers and also members of the Workshop's coordinating team.

Conclusions from discussions were reflected in a pre-agreed template, which suggested that each group identify: "problems"; "interim solutions"; "best practice solutions"; "next steps" and "challenges or opportunities for solutions to succeed". Conclusions from each group were presented in a joint session, chaired by Gerard Domingue. Based on summary tables provided by each of the three working groups (available at: <https://3.basecamp.com/3709053/buckets/5945791/vaults/919488188>), all groups identified the following problem areas, and offered a number of possible solutions to address the problems:

##### **1. PROBLEM:**

*Complexity of existing reporting requirements due to a high number of requirements; complex deadlines; and redundant requests and duplication of material reported.*

##### **POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:**

- Members support the review of RFMO conservation measures to make existing requirements clearer and prevent duplications, while examining root causes for poor compliance and identifying data needs.
- Members, before drafting any new conservation measure, make sure that proposed requirements are not already in place, and that they fully understand the implications of any additional requirements to which they are agreeing.
- Secretariats integrate submissions (in time and format) and reuse data (such as vessel information) to make work easier for Secretariats and Members.
- Members consider streamlining and integrating reporting requirements to reduce the complexity of reporting data and information to RFMOs
- Secretariats generate consolidated lists of reporting requirements and provide templates to submit information.
- Secretariats generate automatic reminders on timelines.
- Secretariats improve their internal coordination among different departments such as IT, statistics, or compliance.
- Members create a generic and permanent contact address for each key reporting issue, preventing changes of contact persons when there is a change in government.
- RFMOs adopt the principle whereby the management and ownership of data and reporting rests with each Member.

- Members develop their reporting capacity by, for example, planning ahead for future changes in personnel and ensuring mentoring of new staff; training personnel and training trainers; and organizing internships in other administrations.

## 2. PROBLEM:

*Lack of sufficient automated solutions to reduce the burden for Secretariats and for RFMO Members.*

### POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

- Secretariats explore systems/technical solutions that can represent a feasible alternative considering long-term support, cost and extensibility.
  - Consider current options available: commercial solutions; open-source alternatives; and initiatives such as e-MARIS, currently in development, while acknowledging that some RFMOs already have developed and tailored data management and online reporting tools in response to their Members priorities and needs.
  - While choosing one system, draw inspiration from other systems; RFMOs with established systems share specifications with other RFMOs.
- RFMOs adopt both online data entry and automated data sharing. There is no need to focus on just one system, as each one is fit for different purposes and requirements.
- When establishing automated data sharing arrangements, Secretariats and Commissions ought to adopt common standards.
- When establishing any data management system, Secretariats should minimize human intervention in data management as much as possible to ensure best possible data quality.
- RFMOs develop automated processes for data validation, which ideally would collect requirements from all RFMOs and define a comprehensive data model for all domains. Understand that this can only be done in a phased approach and that still a significant amount of quality assurance must be done manually.

## 3. PROBLEM:

*Insufficient harmonization amongst RFMOs of compliance assessment procedures. This makes assessment more difficult for each RFMO and compliance more complex for Members.*

### POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

- RFMO Members discuss the establishment of harmonized compliance assessment categories initially at intra-regional RFMO meetings.

- RFMO staff and developers of e-MARIS who are currently determining compliance evaluation specifications collect requirements and draft scenarios that might be common to many RFMOs.
- With the help of the TCN, officers responsible for compliance in the tuna RFMOs develop an “RFMO compliance ‘Kobe plot’”.

In addition, all small groups emphasized the importance of sharing information within each RFMO and amongst all RFMOs, including information on data management and reporting for compliance purposes. To make progress on information-exchange, groups suggested:

- RFMOs standardize rules of information exchange between Members according to confidentiality rules.
- RFMOs enter into arrangements with other RFMOs to set standards and data exchange agreements according to confidentiality rules.
- The TCN facilitates information exchanges amongst data/IT managers including through its existing Basecamp platform.

#### **H. Compliance assessment procedures & international initiatives on MCS (Session 8)**

Chaired by M’Hamed Idrissi, the final session of the Workshop was dedicated to addressing selected issues of concern of TCN members: compliance assessment procedures; MCS Best practices and transshipment.

##### *Compliance assessment procedures*

M’Hamed Idrissi introduced the review of new approaches to compliance assessment procedures with a presentation on the ICCAT system, and in particular the CPC-by-CPC review.

To address non-compliance or lack of cooperation with ICCAT conservation and management measures, this RFMO resolved that non-compliance should be addressed in a concrete, transparent, and non-discriminatory way, taking into account the need to remain flexible to address the unique circumstances of individual CPCs. Not all non-compliance is of the same level of severity and impact on the effectiveness of ICCAT’s CMMs. Since 2017, the Guidelines for an ICCAT schedule of actions differentiate between three types of breaches: Conservation and/or Management; Reporting requirements; Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS) measures. The severity of non-compliance is categorized by ICCAT reference guidelines as “minor” or “significant” non-compliance.

During discussions, participants explored the scope for a more harmonized compliance review procedure among tuna RFMOs (also highlighted in the small group discussions earlier that day), and some participants considered that the ICCAT model could be useful for other RFMOs. CCSBT explained that during 2018-19, the Secretariat will be drafting a proposal for a more formalized compliance assessment process for Members to consider. WCPFC indicated that its compliance process was under review, and that subject to the findings of the review there could be changes made to its compliance processes. In the case of IOTC, it was explained that significant work has gone into the development of transparent assessment criteria, while the situation in IATTC is rather different in that compliance is associated with AIDCP and the certification label that has been developed in this context.

### *MCS best practices*

Kim Stobberup, who coordinates the MCS Best Practices project on behalf of the ABNJ Tuna Project, and Hugh Walton, fisheries specialist at FFA, presented work carried out to progress a report on MCS Best Practices and the development of a curriculum for an MCS course.

Kim Stobberup clarified for participants that there are two ongoing initiatives progressing in parallel which tackle MCS best practices: the MCS Best Practices report, under the ABNJ Tuna Project, focused on practices in the framework of tuna RFMOs; and the MCS Toolbox, an FAO initiative with an emphasis on MCS tools available at the national level. On the MCS Best practices, it was explained that a future report on the issue could incorporate analysis on other issues (i.e. port state measures, electronic reporting...) and encouraged TCN members to contribute to the identification of future content for the MCS Best Practices report. One issue that was deemed relevant to consider for future work, was that of “persons of interest”, understood as persons or corporations responsible for fishing operations. The FFA has already commenced some work in this area.

Hugh Walton explained the plans to conduct training in MCS, which would begin with a generic course. This project had come into a halt due to unexpected reasons and it is hoped it will be resumed in the near future.

### *FAO transshipment review*

Harm Koster, Executive Director of the International MCS Network, and one of the commissioned authors to write the report for the FAO transshipment study requested by the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in 2016, presented work carried out so far to progress this FAO study. He explained that a background report on transshipment practices was to be distributed soon and its elements were to be discussed at the upcoming Expert Meeting to be held at the FAO headquarters in late February 2018. This presentation and the issue itself was the subject of much interest among Workshop participants, who were keen on staying apprised on next steps with regard to this study and action by the FAO in preparation for COFI. RFMO officers responsible for compliance considered that they had more up-to-date information and knowledge that could contribute to a more comprehensive assessment of current transshipment practices worldwide. They regretted that no representative from the tuna RFMOs could participate in the Expert Meeting at FAO and hoped to have future opportunities to contribute to the FAO report and provide expert analysis.

### **III. Proceedings meeting Core Group of the Tuna Compliance Network 18 February**

The last day of the Workshop was reserved for members of the Core Group of the TCN to discuss matters related to the functioning of the Network and future plans. The meeting was attended by Ricardo Belmontes, Gerard Domingue, Susie Iball, M’Hamed Idrissi, Lara Manarangi-Trott, as members of the Core Group, and Adriana Fabra and Kim Stobberup, as coordinators of the Network’s activities. Fabio Fiorellato participated in the first session of the meeting, where progress with the CLAV and communications with IHS-Markit were discussed.

Susie Iball, Compliance Manager of CCSBT, was elected the new Chair of the TCN. All participants thanked Gerard Domingue, the Network’s current Chair, for his support during the first year of existence of the Network.

The Core Group reviewed progress with the previous Workplan for 2017-2018, and identified

new objectives for the Workplan 2018-2019, which will be circulated for review and adoption by the Core Group via email. Among areas of interest, the Network wished to continue information exchange and cooperation on data management initiatives and agreed to open a virtual group among data and IT experts from the tuna RFMOs and other organizations. Officers also identified improved compliance review procedures as a common priority. In this context, they considered conducting a comparative assessment of the outcomes of RFMO compliance reviews and of presentation formats developed by Secretariats with the objective of identifying more clearly areas of work that should be prioritized to improve Members' compliance. The Core Group expressed its interest in having a new workshop in February 2019, perhaps to coincide with the 6th Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop (GFETW) organized by the International MCS Network.

On the CLAV, and looking into the future, participants considered that one of the most important aspects for its maintenance would be to retain an expert that would improve the quality of the data. It was identified that the meeting of the Executive Secretaries of the tuna RFMOs in the margins of COFI in July 2018 would be a good opportunity to discuss next steps regarding the CLAV. With regard to communications with IHS-Markit, Core Group members agreed that the best way forward was for each tuna RFMO to determine individually most appropriate engagement with this entity.

Core Group members made a positive assessment of the first year of functioning of the Network and expressed their interest in continuing this project. Considering that funding to support the TCN is due to terminate at the end of 2018, the Core Group considered different options to ensure funding for the coming years and committed to seek opportunities to guarantee the continuity of the TCN. Participants considered exploring opportunities for financial support from the tuna RFMOs and from international projects, and advised that it would be helpful to this end to identify interim funding between the end of the current project and a more continued solution. Core Group Members committed to reach out to their respective RFMO Secretariats to explore avenues for funding, and encouraged the engagement of the ABNJ Tuna Project and the IMCS Network in supporting new fundraising efforts. The Core Group agreed that all partners should enhance the visibility of the Network. As a next step, the Coordinator was to explore the possibility of securing a no-cost extension of the current project with remaining funds, and develop a business case for the TCN.

#### **IV. Workshop conclusions and next steps**

##### **A. Workshop evaluation**

Both officers responsible for compliance and data managers valued very positively the opportunity of having met each other in person and learning from each other, and looked forward to continuing their communication and meeting again in the future. Several personnel indicated they were already taking home a few things they had learned from their colleagues during the Workshop.

According to feedback provided by participants through Evaluation Forms distributed by the Workshop organizers, the Workshop had met their expectations, which included fostering closer collaboration with peers from other tuna RFMOs and learning about work carried out in other RFMOs.

## **B. Conclusions and next steps**

At the end of the Workshop, officers responsible for compliance of the tuna RFMOs agreed, among other issues, to:

- Review conclusions and recommendations on improved data management systems and explore opportunities to act on such recommendations.
- Continue their communication via Basecamp and stay engaged in on-going projects such as the MCS Best practices report and the FAO Transshipment Study.
- Adopt a new Workplan for 2018-2019.
- Explore funding opportunities to ensure the continuation of the Tuna Compliance Network after November 2018.
- Explore opportunities to hold the 3<sup>rd</sup> Workshop of the TCN in February 2019 and to ensure representation of the TCN at COFI in July 2018.
- Inform partners in RFMOs and members of the Extended Group on outcomes of the Workshop and future activities of the TCN.

## V. Annexes

### Annex 1 – Agenda Workshop

**Thursday, 15 February 2018 -- Venue: Conference Center, FFA Headquarters**

---

#### *In plenary*

09.00-9.30	<b>Opening</b> Gerard Domingue, Chair, Tuna Compliance Network James Movick, Director General, Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
<b>09.30-10.30</b>	<b>Session 1: Introductions; meeting objectives; general updates on the TCN</b> Adriana Fabra, Coordinator, Tuna Compliance Network Kim Stobberup, MCS Consultant, Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project
10.30-10.50	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>
<b>10.50-13.00</b>	<b>Session 2: Overview of each RFMO's current data management system as it relates to compliance assessment and reporting.</b>
11.15-11.35	Colin Millar, Database Manager, CCSBT
11.35-11.55	Nick Vogel, Head of Data Collection and Database Program, IATTC
11.55-12.15	Carlos Mayor, Database Programmer, ICCAT
12.15-12.35	Fabio Fiorellato, Data Coordinator, IOTC
12.35-12.55	Sam Taufao, IT Manager, WCPFC
13.00-14.30	<b>LUNCH BREAK – Joint lunch with participants to FFA's Study Tour</b>
<b>14.30-17.00</b>	<b>Session 3: Thinking about the future: Data collection, checking/validation and reporting needs for better compliance assessment</b>
14.30-14.50	Susie Iball, Compliance Manager, CCSBT
14.50-15.10	Ricardo Belmontes, Policy Advisor, IATTC
15.10-15.20	M'Hamed Idrissi, Compliance Officer, ICCAT
15.20-15.40	<b>TEA BREAK</b>
15.40-16.00	Gerard Domingue, Compliance Coordinator, IOTC
16.00-16.20	Lara Manarangi-Trott, Compliance Manager, WCPFC
16.20-17.00	Conclusions from Sessions 2 & 3 (with assistance from Rapporteurs)
19.30	<b>GROUP DINNER, Club Havanah Restaurant, Honiara Hotel</b>

**Friday, 16 February 2018 -- Venue: Conference Center, FFA Headquarters**

---

*In plenary*

<b>09.00-12.30</b>	<b>Session 4: Advanced models in data management and reporting for compliance purposes</b>
09.00-09.25	Mr. Sakaio Manoa - A/IT Manager: Information Management System
09.25-09.50	Mr. Allan Rahari - Surveillance Operations Officer: Niue Treaty Information System
09.50-10.00	Change of venue: walk to FFA's Regional Surveillance and Coordination Centre
10.00-10.30	JJ. Williams - Surveillance Operations Officer: Regional Surveillance Picture
10.30-11.00	COFFEE BREAK
11.00-11.30	Peter Williams, Principal Fisheries Scientist, SPC
11.30-12.00	'Ana Taholo, Assistant Compliance Manager, WCPFC
12.00-12.15	Discussion
12.15-13.15	LUNCH BREAK
13.15-13.45	Tim Jones, Information Systems and Data Services Manager, CCAMLR
13.45-14.15	Peter Flewwelling, Compliance Manager, NPFC
14.15-14.45	Discussion
14.45-15.15	TEA BREAK

*In Working Groups – meeting in parallel*

<b>15.15-17.00</b>	<b>Session 5: Solutions to improved data management systems (Data/IT managers)</b>
	<p>Discussion of issues identified in Session 4 and other topics that merit more detailed follow up &amp; presentation of any demos.</p> <p>Topics to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Office-based servers v. cloud-based servers</li> <li>b) Adaptability of systems</li> <li>c) Data exchange: information-sharing between organizations and innovations in data security</li> </ul> <p>Demos:</p> <p>Carlos Mayor, ICCAT, Fisheries Online Reporting System (FORS) &amp; Statistical Forms Prototype</p>

<b>15.15-17.00</b>	<b>Session 6: Priorities and next steps in data management including opportunities for greater coordination (Officers responsible for compliance)</b>
	Discussion of issues identified in Session 4 that merit more detailed follow up, including identification of best practices and opportunities for greater coordination among tuna RFMOs and beyond

**Saturday, 17 February 2018 -- Venue: Conference Center, FFA Headquarters**

*In plenary*

<b>09.00-12.00</b>	<b>Session 7: Conclusions and opportunities for more effective systems for data management/reporting for compliance</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Data/IT Managers present conclusions from their Working Group</li> <li>b) Compliance officers present conclusions from their Working Group, particularly on needs in terms of data and automated processes and most interesting solutions</li> <li>c) Identification of opportunities for greater coordination in data management among RFMOs/other organizations</li> <li>d) Identification of any related new projects or partnerships in data management for compliance, including capacity building</li> </ul>
10.30-11.00	COFFEE BREAK
	Session continues
12.00-13.30	LUNCH BREAK

\*\*\*\*\* END OF WORKSHOP WITH DATA/IT MANAGERS\*\*\*\*\*

*In plenary*

<b>13.30-17.30</b>	<b>Session 8. Compliance assessment procedures &amp; international initiatives on MCS</b>
13.30-15.00	Comparative review of new approaches to compliance assessment procedures: Roundtable. Kickoff presentation by M'Hamed Idrissi
15.00-15.20	TEA BREAK
15.20-16.20	Kim Stobberup, Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project, MCS Best Practices
16.20-16.45	Hugh Walton, FFA & Kim Stobberup, Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project, Developing a curriculum for an MCS course
16.45-17.30	Harm Koster, International MCS Network, FAO Transshipment Study and input for Expert Meeting

**Sunday, 18 February 2018 -- Venue: Heritage Park Hotel, Honiara**

*Core Group & Coordination team*

<b>08.00-12.30</b>	<b>Session 9: Operation and projects of the Tuna Compliance Network</b>
--------------------	---

08.00-10.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Election of new Chairperson</li> <li>• TCN membership and operation</li> <li>• TCN continuity and funding</li> </ul>
10.30-10.45	COFFEE BREAK
10.45-12.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New projects and activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ materials and publications</li> <li>○ outreach and representation of the TCN at events, such as COFI 2018 and the 2019 International MCS Network's Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop (GFETW)</li> <li>○ next steps regarding the CLAV</li> <li>○ cooperation with IHS Markit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Review TCN WorkPlan</li> </ul>
12.30-13.30	LUNCH BREAK
13.30-16.00	<b>Session 10: Conclusions and next steps</b>

## Annex 2 – List of Participants

### **Steve Bagshaw**

IT Consultant, FFA  
steve@shoreinformatics.com

### **Ricardo Belmontes**

Fishery Management and Policy Officer, IATTC  
rbelmontes@iattc.org

### **Gerard Domingue**

Compliance Coordinator, IOTC  
gerard.domingue@iotc.org

### **Adriana Fabra**

Coordinator, Tuna Compliance Network  
afabra@imcsnet.org

### **Fabio Fiorellato**

Data Coordinator, IOTC  
fabio.fiorellato@fao.org

### **Peter Flewwelling**

Compliance Manager, NPFC  
pflewwelling@npfc.int

### **Peter Graham**

MCS Policy Adviser, FFA  
peter.graham@ffa.int

### **Susie Iball**

Compliance Manager, CCSBT  
Siball@ccsbt.org

### **M'Hamed Idrissi**

Compliance Officer, ICCAT  
mhamed.idrissi@iccat.int

### **Tim Jones**

Information Systems and Data Services  
Manager, CCAMLR  
tim.jones@ccamlr.org

### **John Kelimana**

MSC/IT Officer, Parties to the Nauru Agreement  
(PNA) Office  
john.kelimana@gmail.com

### **Philip Lens**

Observer Program Manager, FFA  
philip.lens@ffa.int

### **Filimoni Lutunaika**

Systems Analyst, FFA  
filimoni.lutunaika@ffa.int

### **Lara Manarangi-Trott**

Compliance Manager, WCPFC  
Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int

### **Sakaio Manoa**

A/IT Manager, FFA  
sakaio.manoa@ffa.int

### **Letitia Masaea**

Data Quality Officer, FFA  
letitia.masaea@ffa.int

### **Carlos Mayor**

Database Programmer, ICCAT  
carlos.mayor@iccat.int

### **Colin Millar**

Database Manager, CCSBT  
cmillar@ccsbt.org

### **Noan Pakop**

Director, Fisheries Operations, FFA  
noan.pakop@ffa.int

### **David Power**

Fisheries Management Adviser, FFA  
david.power@ffa.int

### **Allan Rahari**

Surveillance Operations Officer, FFA  
allan.rahari@ffa.int

### **Kaburoro Ruaia**

US Treaty Manager, FFA  
kaburoro.ruaia@ffa.int

### **Bryan Scott**

Database Administrator, FFA  
bryan.scott@ffa.int

### **Kim Stobberup**

MCS Consultant, ABNJ Tuna Project, FAO  
kim.stobberup@fao.org

**‘Ana Taholo**

Assistant Compliance Manager, WCPFC  
Ana.Taholo@wcpfc.int

**Sam Taufao**

IT Manager, WCPFC  
Samuelu.Taufao@wcpfc.int

**Ano Tisam**

Systems Analyst, FFA  
ano.tisam@ffa.int

**Nick Vogel**

Head of Data Collection and Database  
Program, IATTC  
nvogel@iattc.org

**Hugh Walton**

Fisheries adviser  
Hugh.walton@ffa.int

**JJ. Williams**

Surveillance Operations Officer,  
FFA jj.williams@ffa.int

**Peter Williams**

Principal Fisheries Scientist, SPC  
PeterW@spc.int

**For more information:**

Adriana Fabra  
International MCS Network  
*Tuna Compliance Network Coordinator*  
Email: [afabra@imcsnet.org](mailto:afabra@imcsnet.org)

[www.imcsnet.org](http://www.imcsnet.org)

Alejandro Anganuzzi  
Food and Agriculture Organization  
Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project  
*Global Project Coordinator*  
Email: [alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org](mailto:alejandro.anganuzzi@fao.org)

<http://fao.org/in-action/commonoceans>

 [#CommonOceans](https://twitter.com/CommonOceans)