



Western and
Central Pacific
Fisheries
Commission

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

Claire van der Geest
WCPFC EREM Chair

Presentation Outline

1. Brief history of EM in WCPFC
2. 2022-23 Workplan
3. Draft Standards, Specifications and Procedures (SSPs)
4. Draft CMM
5. Issues Pending
 1. Objectives and Scope
 2. Capacity and capability of different members
 3. Independence and Impartiality
 4. Compatibility
 5. Giving effect to the precedents set in other CMMs

Brief History of EM in WCPFC

- WCPFC workshop considered the potential for EREM in WCPFC 2014, WCPFC10-2013-16_rev1 supported formal WCPFC dialogue in 2015, including the EREM WG
 - member lead WG
- Four WCPFC EREM Meetings:
 - 8 - 10 July 2015 – focused on ER
 - 1 - 2 August 2016 – focused on ER
 - 6 - 7 August 2018 – focused on EM
 - 14 October 2020 – focused on EM
- ER – agreed and implementing EM SSPs, specifically for e-transshipment, e-observer, e-logs operational level data
- EM – concurrently drafting SSPs and CMM, focused on priority data gaps

2022-23 Workplan

WCPFC 18 endorsed the TCC Workplan 2022-24 including that the EREM WG:

In 2022:

1. Consider and provide advice on outputs from the EREM WG including those related to existing obligations, data gaps and the prioritisation of ER and EM, and
2. Draft minimum standards for electronic monitoring.

In 2023:

1. Consider and provide advice on outputs from the EREM WG, including a draft EM CMM.



Standards, Specifications and Procedures

Describing the minimum requirements of the Electronic Monitoring system. For example:

- Technical Standards and Specifications describing the minimum requirements of the em hardware itself.
- EM Footage Analysis or EM Record Review, the footage storage, transmission of the footage
- National/Subregional EM program specifications, compatibility between the high seas and in zone programs
- Data Standards describing the format of the data generated by the EM footage analysis (review)
- WCPFC accreditation process



Conservation and Management Measure

Describes the overarching requirements for the operation and functioning of the EM Program. for example:

- Objective
- Scope
- Definitions
- Guiding principles
- Links to and with other CMMs and/or WCPFC precedents
 - Independence, Impartiality, Compatibility
 - Data Security, access and dissemination
 - Consider the different starting point of different CCMs

Issues Pending

- Objective and Scope of the EMP
- Accounting for the different starting point, capacity and capability of members
- Ensuring Independence and Impartiality of the EMP
- Compatibility: HS v in zone v other RFMOs
- Giving effect to the precedents in other CMMs
- Integration with the WCPFC Fisheries Management Framework



Objective and Scope of the EMP

WCPFC agreed the following definition for the EMP

“The objective for the WCPFC Electronic Monitoring Program (EMP) shall be to collect and verify catch data, other scientific data, and additional information related to the fishery from the Convention Area and to monitor the implementation of the conservation and management measures adopted by the Commission”

? Overarching consideration the how EM fits within the WCPFC Fisheries Management Framework

? Links to other at-sea monitoring tools, esp. the ROP

? Focused on priority data areas where data is lacking



Different starting point, capacity and capability of members

Different members very different fisheries: small scale vessels very different from large scale industrial fishing vessels

Some members already have 100% observer coverage

Some members already have 100% EM coverage

Fit the EMP into National Fisheries Management Frameworks

Costs of establishing a national EMP

? How to bring it together

? Cost recovery or government funding of national fisheries, implications for appetite

? How to provide flexibility to support these difference, but still meet the at-sea monitoring requirements and WCPFC Convention objectives



Independence and Impartiality

WCPFC strong precedent, existing rules describing the requirements for independence and impartiality of the at sea monitoring – the ROP.

- Most CCMs interpret that at sea observers cannot be from the flag State for high seas trips.

EMP needs to also meet these precedents and principles. Power of EMPs are their independence, the footage is the footage.

? How to give effect to this principle in the EMP?

? How to address vessels moving between in zone and National EMP/Observer programs and the high seas?



Compatibility

Another core principle of UNFSA, of the WCPFC Convention and already precedents in other CMMs.

Compatible measures on the high seas; coastal States must give effect to the decisions of RFMOs

- ? How to build compatible EMPs, when some already exist
- ? How to support the flexibility required by different CCMs while establishing clear and effective program procedures
- ? Links to the data required to be collected from the program



Precedents in other CMMs

EMP linked with existing decisions of the Commission. Clearly identify where existing CMMs, SPPs, etc have ramifications for the EMP. Some include:

- Minimum data requirements, EM SSPs, data security
- ROP
- Transshipment
- VMS
- Data disclosure

? How to take account of this in drafting the EMP



Integration with the WCPFC Fisheries Management Framework

Convention drafted before there was thoughts of electronic monitoring. EMP needs to work in concert with the existing frameworks, esp. the ROP.

- ? At sea monitoring objective supported by both the ROP and the EMP
- ? CCM choice of ROP, EMP or combination
- ? Remain focused on the data required for fisheries decisions inc. Harvest Strategies.

Specific Questions

NB All are works in progress

- **Confidentiality** –

Existing WCPFC data rules and non-disclosure provide the precedent, will depend on the specifics of the system if they remain fit for purpose in EMP

- **Compliance** –

Convention and Observer program precedent, scientific observers, monitor CCMs adopted by the Commission and the data can be used for compliance purposes

- **Tamper Evident/Proof Equipment** –

Yes, precedent set in the VMS CMM that the system needs to be tamper evident, but will also depend on the technology of the EM system itself and the operation of the CMM

- **Coverage and Review Rate** –

Differences need to be clearly defined and well understood by all

AFMA experience: 100% coverage important factor affecting behavioural change, direct correlation with increased confidence in logbook data resulting from EMP



Western and
Central Pacific
Fisheries
Commission

Thank you

Questions?