



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 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22 – 24 February 2019

BANGKOK, THAILAND

PROCEEDINGS



***Cover Photograph:***

Picture of tuna being unloaded from a purse seine vessel at the port in Accra, Ghana, kindly provided by Kyle LaFerriere. 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.

## **3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network**

**22 – 24 February 2019  
Bangkok, Thailand**

### **WORKSHOP REPORT**

#### **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary

Acronyms

- I. Introduction
- II. Proceedings Workshop 22-24 February
- III. Proceedings TCN Core Group meeting 24 February
- IV. Workshop conclusions and next steps
- V. Annexes
  - Annex 1 - Agenda Workshop
  - Annex 2 - List of Participants

## **Executive Summary**

The [Tuna Compliance Network](#) (TCN) convened its Third Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand, from 22-24 February 2019. The Workshop focused on procedures to assess compliance in tuna RFMOs and gathered, among others, the officers responsible for compliance of the five tuna RFMOs and all Chairs of the Compliance Committees of these organizations. It was the first time ever that these experts got together. The Workshop was held back-to-back with the [6<sup>th</sup> Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop \(GFETW\)](#), where some TCN members participated as speakers.

The TCN is an informal network set up to facilitate communication and cooperation between officers responsible for compliance of the tuna RFMOs and experts in Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS). It was established in 2017 as an initiative 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), in cooperation with the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](#) (International MCS Network).

Compliance assessment procedures are a fundamental part of the work of RFMO Secretariats. Considering ongoing efforts to make these procedures more efficient and effective, the Third Workshop of the TCN was convened to exchange best available information on compliance assessment systems and identify opportunities for their strengthening. Participants at the Workshop learned about existing mechanisms and identified some possible actions that could lead to better compliance by RFMO Members. Experts identified as possible solutions: improving the clarity of RFMO measures and resolving potential overlaps with other measures; introducing independent verification of some of the information provided by Members; ranking and prioritizing RFMO obligations that need to be monitored; setting up effective procedures to follow-up on non-compliance situations, including associated and potentially pre-defined sanctions; securing capacity-building for improved compliance; rationalizing information management systems, including online reporting; and ensuring that RFMO procedures are transparent. Participants also considered the benefits of improved coordination among RFMOs, including potential harmonization of some measures or systems.

In addition, the TCN Workshop provided a forum for updates and discussion of other topics reflected in the TCN Workplan for 2018-2019 such as: data management and reporting; port State measures; best practices in MCS; transshipment; IUU vessel lists; catch documentation schemes, and the Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels (CLAV). The last session of the Workshop was reserved for discussions among the TCN's Core Group on the organization of the Network, its Workplan for 2019-2020 and initiatives to ensure the continuation of its activities in coming years.

## **Acronyms**

ABNJ	Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
CMM	Conservation and Management Measure
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
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFETW	Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
International MCS 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
RFMO(s)	Regional Fisheries Management Organization(s)
TCN	Tuna Compliance Network
UN	United Nations
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

## **1 Introduction**

The Third Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network was convened in Bangkok, Thailand, between 22-24 February 2019. It focused in particular on compliance assessment procedures in tuna RFMOs and gathered, among others, the officers responsible for compliance of the tuna RFMOs and all Chairs of the Compliance Committees of the five tuna RFMOs. It was the first time ever that all these experts gathered together.

The Third Workshop took place back-to-back with the [6<sup>th</sup> Global Fisheries Enforcement Training Workshop \(GFETW\)](#), held in Bangkok from 18-22 February. Most participants of the TCN Workshop attended the 6<sup>th</sup> GFETW and some participated as speakers at the GFETW on the issue of “Compliance procedures in RFMOs.” Given that the Workshop was held in coordination with the 6<sup>th</sup> GFETW, it was shorter than in the past two years, comprising two and a half days in total.

The Workshop was convened as part of the activities of the [Tuna Compliance Network](#) (TCN), an informal network set up to facilitate communication and cooperation between officers responsible for compliance of the tuna RFMOs and experts in Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS). It is an initiative carried out 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), in cooperation with the [International Monitoring Control and Surveillance Network](#) (International MCS Network).

During the Workshop, experts shared information about current procedures to assess compliance in tuna RFMOs and identified opportunities for their strengthening. In addition, and as in the previous TCN Workshops, the meeting provided a forum for updates and discussion of other topics reflected in the TCN Workplan for 2018-2019 such as: data management and reporting; port State measures; best practices in MCS; transshipment; IUU vessel lists; catch documentation schemes, and the Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels (CLAV). The last session of the Workshop was reserved for discussions among the TCN’s Core Group on the organization of the Network, its Workplan for 2019-2020 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 the Chairs of Compliance Committees from the following organizations: 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 experts in compliance procedures, who had reviewed compliance assessment systems in several RFMOs; and the compliance officer of the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC). See list of participants in Annex 2.

## **2 Workshop proceedings**

This report only provides a succinct summary of all presentations made at the workshop. All sessions were held in plenary. They were chaired by different workshop participants, and all participants assisted as rapporteurs of the different sessions.

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

### **2.1 Preliminary Sessions**

#### **Opening (Session 1)**

Susie Iball, Chair of the TCN welcomed participants and opened the Workshop. Harm Koster, Executive Director of the International MCS Network, and Alejandro Anganuzzi, Coordinator of the Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project, provided background on their initiatives, which have sponsored the TCN until now, and expressed their satisfaction on progress made by the TCN in the past two years since its establishment.

#### **Guest presentation**

Mark Young, Senior Officer at the Pew Charitable Trusts, made an informative presentation before the beginning of the Workshop on Pew's upcoming work in the sphere of improving compliance in RFMOs, which could be of relevance to the TCN.

#### **Review of Workplan and issues of interest (Session 2)**

The Core Group, together with some of the invited experts, exchanged information on key issues of interest to the TCN members reflected in the TCN Workplan. Gerard Domingue, Compliance Coordinator at IOTC, provided updates on data-management systems developed by IOTC, such as the e-PSM tool, already implemented, or the information-exchange platform e-MARIS, currently in its final stage of conceptualization. Kim Stobberup, consultant with FAO, provided information on the development of a project on successful practices in MCS, one outcome of which will be the production of a set of MCS implementation guidelines. Harm Koster, who was involved in two FAO-led initiatives to develop an MCS Toolbox and on transshipment, explained that the MCS Toolbox report will be published soon and that future work at FAO on transshipment will continue, in compliance with the mandate given by the FAO Committee on Fisheries in 2018. Core Group members expressed their interest in staying apprised on any further developments on these initiatives. On the cross-listing of IUU vessel lists, there were no updates to report and the situation on initiatives related to compliance procedures was discussed as part of the main sessions of the Workshop. Alejandro Anganuzzi provided an update on the CLAV, indicating that the ABNJ Tuna Project will support quality control of the CLAV until the end of September 2019.

### **2.2 Compliance Assessment Procedures in tuna RFMOs**

#### **Guest presentation (Session 3)**

After some introductory words by Adriana Fabra, Coordinator of the TCN, Holly Koehler, Vice-President of Policy and Outreach at ISSF, provided a presentation via Skype on best practice recommendations on compliance procedures in tuna RFMOs. She also introduced preliminary findings from ongoing research, which point to some

weaknesses in current RFMO mechanisms and provided recommendations on how compliance review procedures could be strengthened.

### **Overview of each RFMO procedure to assess Members' compliance (Session 4)**

Initial presentations were provided by each participating RFMO officer responsible for compliance, in partnership with the corresponding Chair of the Compliance Committee of each RFMO. The RFMO representatives provided an overview of their respective compliance assessment procedures. They described institutional arrangements linked to compliance assessment systems, and highlighted their system's particularities, specific challenges, and initiatives (implemented or in progress) that could contribute towards strengthening their respective systems.

### **The purpose and reality of compliance assessment procedures (Session 5)**

Participants discussed what elements contribute towards successful compliance assessment procedures. The group highlighted, among others:

- Consideration of whether the various Committees and Commissions are achieving what the RFMOs want, in terms of meeting not only the objectives and terms of reference established but also in terms of more general positive outcomes, e.g. sustainability of stocks, positive RFMO Member State performance and, overall, good governance.
- Recognition that a distinction can be drawn between results based on process and results based on the quality of input, i.e., the degree to which RFMO compliance committees are receiving the data and are aware of the reality of the state of compliance of Members.
- The level of scrutiny of individual compliance cases that is useful for accomplishing compliance review objectives and balancing the practical functioning of the Committees with the performance objectives for the RFMO Members, individually and collectively.
- The need to balance the amount of time and work necessary to achieve an available level of trust that Members States are operating in adequate fulfillment of their obligations (i.e., not operating in bad faith) and the Committees can, if they choose, focus on macro level patterns and trends.
- The risks of creating or continuing different approaches to different Members or components of the overall fleet, e.g., purse seine vs longline, and the importance of standardizing expectations for reporting, equalizing to the degree possible the level of oversight and ensuring equivalence in treatment and scrutiny by the Committees.
- The importance of integrating cultural and political differences, including in national contexts, communication capacities and inter-personal interactions.

### **What to assess compliance of and how to assess it (Session 6)**

Don MacKay and Kristín von Kistowski provided introductory presentations to frame the ensuing discussions on (1) which are the obligations that compliance assessment mechanisms should focus on, and (2) which systems can assist in their assessment. Don MacKay, Chair of the Independent Panel appointed to Review the Compliance Monitoring Scheme of WCPFC 2017-18, discussed the importance of not becoming too overburdened by looking at compliance or infringements at vessel level and

recommended focusing more generally on the responsibility of the flag State to implement, monitor and enforce its obligations. He emphasized the large amount of detail generated in RFMOs, which can be overwhelming for Compliance Committees and may prevent focus on the real issue, which is that of systemic compliance or non-compliance by States/Parties. He considered that some resources such as the use of a “Friends of the Chair” Group to determine what needs to go to the full Compliance Committee is a helpful resource, although he noted that some Parties may be reluctant to consider this approach. He recognized the desirability of RFMOs prioritizing which obligations to review, given that it is not feasible to assess compliance of all obligations simultaneously. This involves identifying the most important requirements or audit points to assess, particularly those that are essential for the management of the stocks.

Kristín von Kistowski, consultant with FAO and author of the Report “Recommendations for Strengthening the IOTC Compliance Assessment Methodology”, examined aspects related to how to assess compliance and whether it is desirable to rank different levels of non-compliance. She also considered the responses of each organization to bring Members into compliance and the issue of harmonizing reporting requirements across tuna RFMOs.

Regarding issues related to prioritising levels of non-compliance for IOTC, she described a methodology to rank measures by severity of non-compliance based on a risk-based categorization, where non-compliance could be ranked as “A”, “B” or “C” depending on: risks for the status of target species, and of key associated and dependent species; risks for achieving the objectives of the IOTC Agreement, the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea, and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement; risks of damaging the functioning and robustness of the IOTC system of reporting, compliance assessment and decision making; and risks of hampering the effectiveness of IOTC MCS measures with negative effects on monitoring catch and effort limits. With regard to different possible degrees of compliance, she categorized Members as having been: (1) compliant; (2) minor non-compliant; (3) critically non-compliant; (4) serious/persistent non-compliant. In some instances, some requirements would not have been assessed or no compliance status assigned.

In her conclusions, she highlighted that there is no one-size-fits all approach, but that one can find best practices in this area in RFMOs. It is also important to have access to independent data to verify self-reporting and, while it is difficult to quantify non-compliance, this process could help to make the assessment process more transparent and fairer.

Discussions among participants indicated that while it is important to assess compliance at flag State level and not at each individual incident, it is also relevant to look at Members’ performance as port State, coastal State, etc. It was also noted that there is a threshold over which a State, even if found in a situation of non-compliance, could still be considered a responsible State –depending on the type of non-compliance, and eventually considering other factors, such as its level of economic development, so as to ensure a fair result. Members should take compliance assessment processes seriously and they should ideally be linked to a sanctions system.

Participants acknowledged the importance of the quality of the data available to assess compliance. In some instances, there are no data available that can help make an accurate assessment of compliance. In addition, when the information is self-reported by the RFMO members, data should be verified as much as possible.

Participants also discussed how to present the information on compliance by RFMO

Members, and there was special interest in the format used by IOTC to present key compliance-related information at its Compliance Committee.

### **Reporting and compliance assessment (Session 7)**

Participants agreed to remove Session 7 from the agenda to allocate more time to considering all the information exchanged on the first day of the Workshop.

### **The consequences of compliance procedures (Session 8)**

Participants considered that there is a general desire to pre-define responses to non-compliance and that measures have more “teeth”. There was recognition that some measures such as “no data, no fish” in ICCAT have proven to be effective. However, there is a recognition that often Members need to develop confidence in the system and that some responses that are less harsh, such as letters from the Chair, can also be conducive to better compliance. The designation of a Member as non-compliant cannot be devalued.

Some participants considered the advantage of having sanctions clearly associated with a situation of non-compliance. This should be reflected in the drafting of the measures and applied with as much “automaticity” as possible. Participants considered the benefits of establishing responses that reward good compliance and minimize punitive measures. They acknowledged that non-punitive procedures such as the Quality Assurance reviews in CCSBT can be successful particularly for RFMOs with limited membership. They also recognised that there might be a benefit to using targeted Quality Assurance reviews to address specific compliance issues. Participants also considered transparency as a driver to improve compliance, although recognized that there are some limitations as to what type of information can be shared.

### **How to improve existing compliance assessment systems (Session 9)**

Several participants acknowledged the importance of receiving good quality information from members and also complementing the information provided by the members. They emphasized that lack of timely information is a problem and acknowledged that civil society can be a source of additional information.

Regarding the question of whether harmonization of compliance assessment procedures would be advantageous, participants generally favored the importance of sharing information and staying coordinated among RFMOs. In this context, initiatives such as the Tuna Compliance Network can be useful to stay apprised of changes in existing conservation and management measures (CMMs) and other information. It is also useful to be aware of developments in non-tuna RFMOs.

On ways to improve the drafting of CMMs, it was acknowledged that improved compliance can be facilitated at the time of drafting a measure by, for example, not duplicating requirements and making sure that there are no disproportionate burdens for some of the members. Some RFMOs have checklists of items that need to be considered by Members when they are proposing new CMMs. It would be helpful to share these checklists among RFMOs, so Members can consider the same elements. It may also be helpful to harmonize the reporting templates and whenever measures are the same across RFMOs it would be of assistance to use the same format.

## **Conclusions and next steps (Session 10)**

Presenters on the first day emphasized some common challenges and corresponding opportunities around the following themes:

- The need for clarity of the RFMO measure establishing an obligation (and potential overlaps with other measures);
- Availability of information for independent verification;
- Prioritization of obligations that require monitoring of compliance;
- Procedures to follow-up on non-compliance situations, including availability of a sanction system;
- Capacity building for improved compliance;
- Information management systems, including online reporting;
- Transparency of RFMO procedures;
- Need for harmonization of some procedures within the RFMO;
- The role of non-members.

Participants considered the issue of improved coordination among RFMOS, acknowledging that it is not easy to work in isolation and that there are areas where harmonization would be useful. However, close coordination could lead to the lowest common denominator prevailing, which may be disadvantageous in many instances. On issues such as catch documentation schemes, while there are still difficulties to overcome, it would be beneficial to move to electronic systems. Some participants identified benefits in considering a global system.

Participants found it particularly useful to learn about formats on how to present individual compliance-related information; efforts to prioritize compliance information; and reflect upon the nature and legality of the activities to assess. Looking forward, they considered that it could be helpful to keep track of compliance with RFMO obligations through the years, for individual country checks but also globally.

### **2.3 Meeting of the Core Group of the Tuna Compliance Network**

The last session 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, Jenny Cheatle, Gerard Domingue, Susie Iball, Lara Manarangi-Trott, as members of the Core Group, and Alejandro Anganuzzi, Adriana Fabra, Harm Koster and Kim Stobberup, as part of the TCN coordination team.

Lara Manarangi-Trott, Compliance Manager of WCPFC, was elected the new Chair of the TCN. All participants thanked Susie Iball, the Network's current Chair, for her support to the Network.

The Core Group reviewed progress with the Workplan for 2018-2019 and identified new objectives for the 2019-2020 Workplan. Among areas of interest, the TCN wished to continue information exchange and cooperation on data management initiatives and on improved compliance review procedures. In this context, Members wished to carry out a comparative assessment of the outcomes of RFMO Compliance reviews with the objective of identifying more clearly areas of work that should be prioritized to improve members' compliance.

Core Group members made a positive assessment of the second year of functioning of the Network. They welcomed the support of their respective RFMOs for TCN's activities and the RFMOs' commitment to fund travel expenses of each officer to future yearly or biennial TCN Workshops as well as to hosting, in turn, these Workshops in their respective headquarters, as feasible. They also welcomed the International MCS Network's funding of the TCN Coordinator. Members did not identify a particular date or venue for the next meeting but wished to continue their cooperation during the year and hold a fourth Workshop in 2020.



Workshop participants at the meeting venue in Bangkok, Thailand.



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

**3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network**

**22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand**

**Agenda**

**Friday, 22 February 2019 -- Venue: Room Krungthep 2, Centara Grand Hotel, Bangkok**

<b>15:00-15:20</b>	<b>Session 1: Opening of the 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network</b> Chair: Susie Iball
	Susie Iball, Chair, Tuna Compliance Network Harm Koster, Executive Director, International IMCS Network Alejandro Anganuzzi, Coordinator, Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project
<b>15:20-16:15</b>	<b>Guest presentation</b>
	Mark Young, Senior Officer, The Pew Charitable Trusts – <i>Presentation of a new project on compliance in RFMOs</i> Discussion
<b>16:15-16:30</b>	<b>TEA BREAK</b>

*Meeting of the TCN Core Group (open to Chairs of CoC)*

This session is organized as an informal discussion. Suggested speakers are to provide initial updates and/or to kick-off discussions.

<b>16:15-17:45</b>	<b>Session 2: Updates and discussion of TCN Workplan's projects</b> Chair: Adriana Fabra
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data management and reporting &amp; Port State measures - updates on e-MARIS and IOTC's e-PSM tool: Gerard Domingue, IOTC</li> <li>• Best practices in MCS: Kim Stobberup, FAO</li> <li>• FAO MCS Toolbox &amp; FAO Transshipment study: Harry Koster, IMCS Network</li> <li>• Sharing and cross-listing of IUU vessel lists: Ricardo Belmontes, IATTC</li> <li>• CLAV: Alejandro Anganuzzi, FAO</li> <li>• Compliance procedures and compliance assessment &amp; Other issues: Adriana Fabra, TCN</li> </ul>



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

### 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Agenda

**Saturday, 23 February 2019 -- Venue: Room Krungthep 2, Centara Grand Hotel**

---

#### **NOTE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSIONS**

Except for Sessions 1 and 2, sessions are organized as informal discussions, led by a facilitator (a volunteering participant at the workshop) who will prepare some discussion points and guide the discussion. Some sessions will be structured in small groups.

Session 2 will provide an overview of existing compliance procedures, from the perspective of both Chairs of CoC and Officers responsible for compliance. Chairs and officers can organize their presentations as they find most appropriate, but it would be useful that the following aspects are addressed for each RFMO:

- description of the procedures and bodies in place that are relevant to/when assessing compliance, including the interaction between the Compliance Committee and the Secretariat;
- description of procedures and/or bodies that work well;
- description of procedures and/or bodies that do not work well, or identify gaps in the system;
- description of any measurable improvements in Members' Compliance and its relation with existing mechanisms in the RFMO;
- description of initiatives currently under development or trial to improve existing systems.

Under Sessions 3-7, the Agenda provides some suggested topics for discussion. These topics are provided as background and participants can touch upon different or additional topics during discussions.

#### *In plenary*

08:45-09:00	<b>Opening</b> Susie Iball, Chair, Tuna Compliance Network Harm Koster, Executive Director, International MCS Network Alejandro Anganuzzi, Coordinator, Common Oceans ABNJ Tuna Project
09:00-09:15	<b>Session 3: Introductions, meeting objectives and organization</b> Chair: Susie Iball
	Adriana Fabra, Coordinator, TCN – Meeting objectives and organization
09:15-10:00	<b>Guest presentation (via Skype)</b> Holly Koehler, Vice President, Policy and Outreach, ISSF Discussion



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

### 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Agenda

<b>10:00-13:00</b>	<b>Session 4: Overview of procedures to assess Members' compliance in tuna RFMOs</b>  Facilitator: Kim Stobberup Rapporteurs: Peter Flewwelling &
10:00-10:30	Frank Meere, Chair, Compliance Committee, CCSBT Susie Iball, Compliance Manager, CCSBT Questions and clarification points <i>Combined presentation time: 20 mins; Questions and points of clarification: 10 mins</i>
10:30-11:00	David Hogan, Chair, Committee for the Review of Implementation of Measures Adopted by the Commission, IATTC Ricardo Belmontes, Fishery Management and Policy Officer, IATTC Questions and clarification points <i>Combined presentation time: 20 mins; Questions and points of clarification: 10 mins</i>
<b>11:00-11:20</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>
11:20-11:50	Derek Campbell, Chair, Compliance Committee, ICCAT Jenny Cheatle, Head of Compliance, ICCAT Questions and clarification points <i>Combined presentation time: 20 mins; Questions and points of clarification: 10 mins</i>
11:50-12:20	Hosea Gonza, Chair, Compliance Committee, IOTC Gerard Domingue, Compliance Coordinator, IOTC Questions and clarification points <i>Combined presentation time: 20 mins; Questions and points of clarification: 10 mins</i>
12:20-13:00	Lawrence Edwards, Chair, Technical and Compliance Committee, WCPFC Alexa Cole, former Chair, Technical and Compliance Committee, WCPFC Lara Manarangi-Trott, Compliance Manager, WCPFC Questions and clarification points <i>Combined presentation time: 30 mins; Questions and points of clarification: 10 mins</i>
<b>13:00-14:00</b>	<b>LUNCH BREAK</b>
14:00-14:15	Rapporteurs Session 2: Presentation of conclusions from Session 2



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

### 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Agenda

14:15-15:00	<b>Session 5: General questions: purpose and reality of compliance assessment procedures</b> Facilitator: Frank Meere Rapporteur:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What are compliance assessment procedures trying to achieve?</li><li>• Are current procedures contributing towards better compliance/do they make a difference?</li><li>• Are there meaningful actions/consequences when Members don't comply?</li><li>• Are there broader governance issues to be considered? Which are the respective roles of members and Secretariats in ensuring that compliance procedures are effective/ efficient/ successful?</li><li>• What are the main challenges currently?</li></ul>
15:00-15:15	TEA BREAK
15:15-17:30	<b>Session 6 (plenary + working groups): What to assess compliance of and how to assess it</b> Facilitator: Lara Manarangi-Trott Rapporteur:
15:15-15:45	<b>What to assess compliance of</b> <i>Introductory presentation (15 min):</i> Don MacKay, Chair of the Independent Panel to review the Compliance Monitoring Scheme of WCPFC)
15:45-16:15	<b>How to assess it</b> <i>Introductory presentation (15 min):</i> Kristín von Kistowski, FAO – Author of report “Recommendations for strengthening the IOTC Compliance Assessment Methodology”
16:15-17:00	<b>Breakout sessions in Working Groups: What to assess compliance of and how to assess it</b> <i>Each Working Group to appoint a facilitator and a rapporteur</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is it necessary to review compliance with all measures on an annual basis?</li><li>• Could different measures be prioritized in different years so as to make the volume of work more manageable?</li><li>• Which criteria could be used to prioritize issues, e.g. using a risk-based approach?</li></ul>



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

### 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Agenda

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quantitative v. qualitative assessment approaches</li><li>• Do RFMOs have enough independent “ground-truthing” information available to determine whether Members are meeting key compliance obligations?</li><li>• The usefulness of having ratings of compliance, including an index of overall compliance</li></ul>
17:00-17:45	Reporting back to plenary by Working Groups
19:30	GROUP DINNER (All workshop participants)

**Sunday, 24 February 2019 -- Venue: Room Krungthep 2, Centara Grand Hotel**

*In plenary*

08:45-9:00	Review of the agenda based on conclusions from the previous day
09:00-9:45	<b>Session 7: Reporting and compliance assessment</b> Facilitator: Rapporteur: Susie Iball
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members and the Secretariat both have reporting requirements to meet as part of the compliance assessment process. What are current issues in this area (overburden, duplication, overlaps...) and how might they be minimised? Is online reporting part of the solution?</li><li>• Effective ways to summarise and present compliance assessment results</li><li>• Transparency of assessment results</li></ul>
09:45-10:30	<b>Session 8: The consequences of compliance procedures</b> Facilitator: Alexa Cole Rapporteur: Susie Iball
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Which are the consequences/corrective actions associated with not complying in current RFMO regimes? Are they effective?</li><li>• Should the consequences/corrective actions be implemented differently?</li><li>• Responsibility and accountability of members with respect to compliance obligations and procedures</li></ul>
10.15-10:30	COFFEE BREAK



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations

### 3rd Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network

22-24 February 2019, Bangkok, Thailand

#### Agenda

10:30-11:30	<b>Session 9 (Breakout sessions in Working Groups): How to improve existing compliance assessment systems</b> Each Working Group to appoint a facilitator and a rapporteur
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifying “hot-spots” in non-compliance</li><li>• Harmonizing or coordinating procedures among tRFMOs</li><li>• Improving drafting of CMMs</li><li>• Other solutions</li></ul>
11:30-13:00	<b>Session 10: Conclusions and next steps</b> Facilitator: Rapporteur:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reporting back from Session 6 Working Groups</li><li>• Prioritize best possible improvements</li><li>• Identify opportunities for cooperation among tuna RFMOs and other RFMOs</li></ul>
13:00-14:00	LUNCH BREAK

\*\*\*\*\* END OF WORKSHOP \*\*\*\*\*

*Core Group only*

14:00-17.30	<b>Session 11: TCN objectives and operation</b> Facilitator: Adriana Fabra Rapporteur: Kim Stobberup
	Updates and discussion on TCN Workplan projects (continued from Friday session, if necessary)
	Funding and continuity of the TCN: the role of RFMOs and other funders; feedback on letters sent to the tRFMO Executive Secretaries
	Design of Workplan 2019-2020
	Coordination between the TCN and other groups and initiatives, including involvement of NGOs and other stakeholders in the External Group, Projects and/or at TCN Workshops
	Election of the new Chair of the TCN

**Alejandro Anganuzzi**

Coordinator, Common Oceans ABNJ  
Tuna Project  
[Alejandro.Anganuzzi@fao.org](mailto:Alejandro.Anganuzzi@fao.org)

**Ricardo Belmontes**

Fishery Management and Policy Officer,  
IATTC  
[rbelmontes@iattc.org](mailto:rbelmontes@iattc.org)

**Derek Campbell**

Chair, Compliance Committee, ICCAT  
[derek.campbell@noaa.gov](mailto:derek.campbell@noaa.gov)

**Jenny Cheatle**

Head of Compliance, ICCAT  
[jenny.cheatle@iccat.int](mailto:jenny.cheatle@iccat.int)

**Alexa Cole**

Former Chair, Technical and  
Compliance Committee, WCPFC  
[alexa.cole@noaa.gov](mailto:alexa.cole@noaa.gov)

**Gerard Domingue**

Compliance Coordinator, IOTC  
[Gerard.Domingue@fao.org](mailto:Gerard.Domingue@fao.org)

**Lawrence Edwards II**

Chair, Technical and Compliance  
Committee, WCPFC  
[ledwards@mimra.com](mailto:ledwards@mimra.com)

**Adriana Fabra**

Coordinator, Tuna Compliance Network  
[afabra@imcsnet.org](mailto:afabra@imcsnet.org)

**Peter Flewwelling**

Compliance Manager, NPFC  
[pflewwelling@npfc.int](mailto:pflewwelling@npfc.int)

**Hosea Gonza**

Chair, Compliance Committee, IOTC  
[hoseagonza86@gmail.com](mailto:hoseagonza86@gmail.com)

**David Hogan**

Chair, Committee for the Review of  
Implementation of Measures Adopted  
by the Commission  
[HoganDF@state.gov](mailto:HoganDF@state.gov)

**Susie Iball**

Compliance Manager, CCSBT  
[Slball@ccsbt.org](mailto:Slball@ccsbt.org)

**Kristín von Kistowski**

Consultant, FAO  
[Kristin.VonKistowski@fao.org](mailto:Kristin.VonKistowski@fao.org)

**Harry Koster**

Executive Director, International MCS  
Network  
[hkoster@imcsnet.org](mailto:hkoster@imcsnet.org)

**Don MacKay**

Chair of the Independent Panel  
appointed to Review the Compliance  
Monitoring Scheme of WCPFC  
[Don\\_Maria\\_MacKay@msn.com](mailto:Don_Maria_MacKay@msn.com)

**Lara Manarangi-Trott**

Compliance Manager, WCPFC  
[Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int](mailto:Lara.Manarangi-Trott@wcpfc.int)

**Frank Meere**

Chair, Compliance Committee, CCSBT  
[fmeere@aapt.net.au](mailto:fmeere@aapt.net.au)

**Kim Stobberup**

MCS Consultant, ABNJ Tuna Project,  
FAO  
[kim.stobberup@fao.org](mailto:kim.stobberup@fao.org)

**For more information**

Adriana Fabra  
International MCS Network  
Tuna Compliance Network Coordinator  
Email: 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

[www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans](http://www.fao.org/in-action/commonoceans)  
 #CommonOceans