|  |
| --- |
| **Report** **Coral Triangle Fishers Forum II****Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing and Traceability for Fishing Communities and Industry****18-20 June, 2012****Suva, Fiji****Mary Lack****Shelack Pty. Ltd**  |

# Introduction

On 18 June 2012 approximately 100 participants representing 24 countries, and a broad cross section of fishing related industries and management agencies in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, gathered in Fiji for the second Coral Triangle Fishers Forum (CTFFII). The Forum was sponsored by WWF, the Fiji Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, the Marine Stewardship Council and the Nationale Postcode Loterij - Project Oceans, and with collaborating partner the Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center. Over three days, the participants in the Forum heard from a range of speakers about the nature and extent of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing in the region, about initiatives in place to address the problem and, in particular, about the role of traceability in combating IUU fishing.

The Forum was a response to the growing demand by consumers, retailers and governing bodies for IUU-free and traceable seafood. While this provides an important incentive for the fisheries sector to adopt traceability, implementing traceability and catch documentation programs poses many practical challenges for both large fishing industries and small-scale coastal fisheries.

The Forum was structured around five sessions addressing the following themes:

1. IUU issues and case studies
2. Anti-IUU opportunities and solutions
3. Implementing IUU solutions
4. Ensuring enabling policies and alignment
5. Wrapping up and moving forward

In each session participants heard from a number of presenters addressing the theme of the session followed by plenary and/or break out group discussion addressing key questions related to the theme.

This report highlights the key points raised in each of the five sessions of the Forum. It should be noted that while the report attempts to include the major points raised and discussed at the Forum, this is not meant to imply that there was necessarily consensus on each and every point. The three main outputs from the meeting do, however, represent the consensus of the Forum:

1. a Call to Action to key players in the region;
2. a list of actions providing the basis for development of an Action Plan for the CTFF as an ongoing platform in response to IUU fishing; and
3. commitments made by Forum participants in relation to implementing the outcomes of the Forum and associated measures to combat IUU fishing.

# Objectives

The Forum pursued a number of goals of the Regional Plan of Action for the Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security. Specifically, the CTFF II responded to Target 1 of Goal 2 of the Regional Plan of Action:

**GOAL 2** Ecosystem Approach to Management of Fisheries (EAFM) and other Marine Resources Fully Applied where EAFM is identified as a key approach toward addressing common trans-boundary policy and regulatory concerns, such as (i) over-fishing of shared pelagic fish stocks; (ii) illegal cross-border fishing by small-scale fishers (stimulated by depletion of local coastal fisheries), commercial-scale fishing operations, and trans-shipment; (iii) fishing overcapacity; and (iv) by-catch of protected and endangered species

**TARGET 1**: Strong legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks in place for achieving EAFM including through actions to improve enforcement of IUU fishing through greater collaboration

The specific objectives of CTFFII were to:

1. facilitate awareness-raising on IUU fishing issues as they affect the fishing and seafood sectors – small to large;
2. share experience on improving traceability, including catch documentation, technologies and their anti-IUU fishing characteristics from Coral Triangle and regional fisheries, identifying obstacles, key issues and priorities;
3. promote, and learn from specific examples (success stories, new innovations) on catch documentation and traceability, including under Fisheries Improvement Projects (FIP) and/or with links to buyers and key markets, and how these help address IUU fishing issues and overcome obstacles;
4. develop new pilots/links to collaborate on anti-IUU fishing technologies and fishery best practices;
5. develop a regional “road map” to enable and expand collaborations on traceability and IUU fishing, assessing relevant policies and programmes, how fisher folk and industry players can help influence and implement these and identify what support may be needed;
6. further cultivate the CTFF as a platform for regional dialogue and multi-stakeholder consensus building on sustainable fisheries to contribute towards delivering the goals of the CTI Regional Plan of Action and related Western and Central Pacific initiatives; and
7. introduce key market actors to better fisheries and vice versa to strengthen cooperation to address IUU fishing.

# 3. Outcomes by theme

## 3.1 IUU issues and case studies

The objectives of this session were to:

* Create a shared understanding of the key issues related to IUU fishing
* Share experiences and lessons learned in addressing IUU fishing
* Understand the basic components of traceability, catch documentation and monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) to address IUU fishing

Presentations addressed the following issues:

1. Impacts and key issues of IUU fishing in the Asia-Pacific (Shellack Pty Ltd)
2. IUU lessons learned from the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) regional MCS strategy (FFA)
3. Tuna industry efforts and possible roles in combating IUU fishing (Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association(PITIA))
4. FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme (RFLP): Anti-IUU measures in Timor-Leste (RFLP)
5. From IUU Forwards, Better Fishing Practice in a Mixed Bottomfish Fishery, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia (Sea Delight)
6. Traceability in the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) and global markets (PNA)
7. Traceability as a tool for advancing MSC certification (MSC)
8. Assessment of the Implementation of the European Union IUU Catch Certification Scheme in the Pacific Rim (DEVFish II)

The key points arising from the presentations and subsequent discussion included:

***Nature and extent of IUU fishing***

* IUU fishing in the Asia-Pacific region is a significant, although not well quantified, problem. It was noted that the lack of quantification may not necessarily reflect a lack of data but the need for additional capacity to manage and analyse the data available.
* IUU fishing in coastal States’ waters is carried out by both domestic and foreign fishers.
* Responses to IUU fishing at the national, regional and international level have increasingly focused on market-based approaches to dealing with IUU fishing. These approaches rely heavily on traceability in various forms.

***Monitoring, control and surveillance***

* MCS systems have evolved from reliance on vessel/air patrols to detect IUU fishing to more cost-effective and risk-based approaches.
* The transnational nature of pelagic fisheries for tunas, dictates the need for collaborative regional approaches to MCS in order to combat IUU fishing.
* There remains an ongoing need for support for MCS activities in developing countries.
* There is a need for integrated fisheries management systems underpinned by comprehensive, timely, and quality data, including that available from vessel monitoring systems (VMS), to address IUU fishing on a regional basis. Issues about overcoming fisher resistance to VMS were discussed and concern about confidentiality of data, particularly about location of favoured fishing grounds, was identified as a key issue for fishers. The potential benefits available from a single VMS in the western and central Pacific, as opposed to the two systems run by the FFA and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) were discussed.
* Catch documentation schemes (CDS) were recognised as having the potential to make an important contribution to MCS strategies against IUU fishing.
* The need for more cost-effective MCS approaches that take advantage of technological advancements, particularly in small-scale fisheries, was identified.

***Industry participation in combating IUU fishing***

* It was noted that legitimate fishers have the most to gain from addressing IUU fishing.
* The willingness of the Pacific Island tuna industry to become engaged in MCS was welcomed.
* It was noted that greater access to information on vessels fishing in the region would facilitate industry’s capacity to identify and report IUU activity. In this context, access to data from vessel registers was discussed as a means of facilitating fisher identification of IUU fishing activity and maximising the use of this cost-effective form of surveillance.
* The need for the cooperation and the support of fishers for effective action against IUU fishers was recognised.

***Experiences in combating IUU fishing***

* The experience of Timor Leste confirmed many of the findings of the study of IUU in the broader Asia-Pacific region and demonstrated the need for the development of MCS measures appropriate to the nature of the fisheries and the society in which they operate. It also demonstrated that data collection technology can provide benefits to fishers as well as management agencies and the extent of the benefits that can be obtained from fisher involvement in combating IUU fishing.
* Experience from Central Sulawesi demonstrated that action by an individual company can be extremely effective in addressing IUU fishing. By placing pressure on suppliers to ensure protected species were not sourced, that product offered for sale by the supplier was taken by legal methods and that the source of their product could be verified, the company was able to contribute to combating IUU fishing and, ultimately to drive improved fisheries management.
* The logistical difficulties associated with successful implementation of traceability systems in multi-species fisheries were noted, although it was recognised that technological change was rapidly overcoming these problems.

***Ecolabels and certification***

* The Forum noted that there are significant differences in the rigour/credibility of Ecolabels with respect to sustainability and IUU catch claims and that the recognition of specific ecolabels varies across markets. As a result, the impact of such measures in addressing IUU fishing may vary between products and markets.
* In relation to MSC specifically, it was acknowledged that MSC is not a single solution to sustainability or IUU issues. Those involved in achieving MSC Fishery and Chain of Custody certification noted that this requires commitment and resources.
* In relation to WWF’s FIPs, it was noted that these are not designed to secure MSC certification. However, the need for more market recognition of the steps that fisheries are taking under FIPs to improve their sustainability, including through addressing IUU fishing, was identified.
* The operation of the EU IUU Catch Certification Scheme system was described and deficiencies identified. It was noted that only official certificates guarantee access to the EU and that ecolabels/certification schemes will not guarantee access. Some concerns were raised about whether the EU Scheme was forcing those fisheries with minimal or no IUU fishing problems to implement costly and unnecessary traceability systems. The potential for the development of most cost-effective regional approaches to complying with the requirements was raised, e.g. through regional competent authorities.

## 3.2 Anti-IUU opportunities and solutions

The objectives of this session were to:

* Confirm IUU priorities
* Consider developments in traceability including technological innovation
* Identify the scope for application of traceability

Presentations addressed the following issues:

* Developing a CDS for the Lagonoy Gulf handline fishery (WWF)
* IUU solutions in the Age of Information (Norpac)
* Traceall traceability solutions (Traceall)

The key points arising from discussion included:

* It was noted that electronic traceability systems, rather than paper-based systems minimised the opportunities for the system to be compromised, and the need for data security was paramount. The need for comprehensive accurate, timely and secure Information Management Systems to support traceability systems was noted. Such systems needed to provide linkages between the MCS and management decision making authorities.
* The need, in many countries, for development of human resource capacity to support the development and implementation of traceability systems was identified.
* The urgent need for the WCPFC to develop an effective CDS, that was recognised and implemented by importing countries, was noted.
* Traceability models were presented and explained and their successful operation in various fisheries described. The Forum noted the potential they have to respond to the increasing demand for traceability and to contribute to more productive and efficient business operations.

Break out groups considered a series of questions relating to the role of traceability in addressing priority IUU fishing issues. The key points made in response to these questions are summarised below.

1. *In what fishing situations can traceability systems contribute most to addressing IUU fishing?*
2. *Are there particular forms of IUU fishing that traceability is most relevant to?*
3. *Are there particular types of fisheries to which traceability is most suited?*

It was considered that traceability needs to address all forms of IUU, not just focus on illegal fishing. Issues associated with misreporting or under-reporting, in particular, would suit the application of traceability systems. It was emphasised that, from a business perspective, traceability is a valuable tool for any fishery.

Fisheries well suited for the application of traceability to address IUU fishing were considered to be:

* Industrial scale fisheries
* Fisheries for large pelagic migratory species on the high seas
* High value species
* Those with complex supply chains

However, the role for traceability in small-scale coastal fisheries dedicated to servicing domestic markets and for which there is little market demand for confirmation of the origins, sustainability or legality of product is less clear, even where IUU fishing (e.g. use of destructive fishing practices) is known to be occurring. It was thought that the more immediate need in these fisheries is for the introduction of basic fisheries management measures ( limited entry, MCS etc) and it was noted that in these fisheries the provision of access rights (rights based management) may be a pre-requisite to the application of traceability in the longer term. It was thought that ownership of access rights promotes stewardship and provides an incentive for fishers to support MCS measures. Despite this, experience had shown that appropriately adapted traceability systems also have a role in addressing the unreported and unregulated components of IUU fishing in smaller scale fisheries.

Participants noted that traceability did not have a role to play in ensuring best practices with respect to bycatch species/protected species or sustainability of these species since it applies to species that are landed. However, as a component of a rigorous certification scheme, both legality/sustainability of target species and sustainability of bycatch species across a fishery could be assured. Further, it was considered that traceability has potential for application to monitoring of shark catch sharks through bar-coding of fins and associated carcasses. It was noted, however, that without considerable changes to market awareness of the shark finning problem there was unlikely to be support/demand for traceability from fishers or the market and that such an initiative may need to be management driven.

It was considered that market demand for traceability could drive its application in any fishery, if the economic incentive is strong enough. However the costs and benefits associated with responding to national level requirements for traceability (for example from the EU and US) was questioned. Some participants were of the view that these were, effectively, non-tariff barriers to trade.

A distinction emerged from discussion with respect to the use of traceability systems as a carrot or a stick. Participants identified a difference between situations where consumers were demanding and were prepared to pay more for products where origins/legality could be confirmed through traceability and those where market access (e.g. EU situation) was determined by whether a traceability system is in place. In the former situation it was considered that returns to the investment in traceability were justified. However, in the latter, there was concern that fisheries without significant IUU problems were being penalized as a result of the increased costs associated with meeting the traceability requirements but no guarantee of an extra return to compensate for those costs.

Overall, there was a strong sense that the relevance of, scope for application, and nature of traceability systems varied between:

* artisanal/small-scale and medium-scale/industrial fisheries; and
* fisheries where traceability was market driven and those where it was driven by regulation.
1. *How strong is the market demand for assurances that products are caught and/or caught legally as a driver for adoption of traceability systems? Does this vary across fisheries?*

The role of market demand as a driver of both improved sustainability of both target and non-target species and promoting legal product over IUU product was strongly acknowledged. However, it was noted that:

* the importance of market demand as a driver varies across countries and cultures;
* consumer demand for traceability is probably more evident for higher value species and in western/developed countries as evidenced by the relative higher take up of the MSC label in western economies;
* retailers in export markets are demanding traceability as a way of instilling trust in their product and to protect their brand/corporate image by avoiding any adverse negative campaigns about their products;
* market demand (including access requirements) as a driver for adoption of traceability is stronger for fisheries in the region servicing export markets rather than domestic markets;
* on local markets the focus was more on supply of fish as a source of protein rather than a focus on sustainability or origins; and
* demand for traceability as a contribution to better fisheries management and MCS arrangements was also identified as a driver for adoption of traceability systems.

It was acknowledged that traceability may be driven from the top-down (management, national access requirements) or bottom-up (industry) depending on the reasons for its adoption. The example of a CDS for bigeye tuna in the WCPFC was raised noting that it is more likely to be driven by management rather than industry.

1. *What are the logistical and practical issues that need to be considered in deciding whether traceability should be included in the measures adopted to combat IUU fishing?*

The following logistical and practical issues/constraints associated with adoption of traceability were identified:

* access to the internet and cost-effective and reliable data transfer mechanisms;
* the availability of human and financial resources to support development and implementation of traceability systems;
* need for technology to be appropriate to the fishery and social context of the fishery and for simple and intuitive technological solutions but recognizing that traceability systems need to be sophisticated enough to deal with application to many different product forms and complex transport arrangements in some cases;
* the need for systems to ensure security of data;
* the cost of technology and issues associated with who pays for the equipment/technology associated with traceability systems;
* the need to examine the benefits and costs of traceability in the context of each fishery; and
* the need for incentives for adoption of such systems in some fisheries.

It was considered that traceability systems in fisheries could draw on technologies developed for other industries, rather than reinvent the wheel and that there is a need to be open to technological development to take advantage of more cost-effective options and to be prepared to reconsider traditional approaches to elements of traceability e.g. VMS.

1. *What should be considered in deciding the form of traceability systems that should be adopted***?**

It was considered that there was a need for traceability systems to support fisheries management as well as meet market demands for traceability. The data produced by the system should be accessible to all those in the management supply chain that need it and this will require a single integrated data platform.

Other issues requiring consideration included:

* market requirements, and potential market requirements;
* the cost-effectiveness of the scheme in relation to the commodity;
* the practicality of the systems and the capacity to manage and support the system
* ease of use;
* the need for the system to be scalable; and
* the need for the system to be flexible and responsive to change.

## 3.3 Implementing IUU solutions

The objectives of this session were to:

* Further develop traceability solutions to IUU fishing
* Identify obstacles to implementation

Executive Chef at the Shangri-La Fijian Resort and Spa, Daniel Patterson, addressed the Forum highlighting the rationale and nature of the Shangri-La’s approach to sourcing sustainably caught seafood from legitimate sources. Following the presentation, issues raised with Daniel included:

* The impact of resort style development on turtle nesting sites
* The impact of removal of shark fin from menus and substitutes for that product
	+ The possible use of tilapia fins as a substitute for sharks fin was raised
* The response of other chains to the initiatives of Shangri La
* The level of customer awareness of the need for traceability

Break out groups considered a series of questions relating to implementing traceability systems as a response to IUU fishing and overcoming obstacles to their implementation. These questions built on the earlier findings of the Forum that:

* in the short term, the scope for traceability systems is greatest in large scale industrial fisheries;
* that consumer demand for traceability systems is higher for products from export-oriented fisheries in the region;
* demand for traceability systems arising from market access requirements have the greatest impact on export-oriented fisheries in the region; and
* IUU fishing occurs in small scale fisheries in the region primarily servicing local markets and needs to be addressed.

Groups considered the issues associated with implementation of traceability systems in large scale export industries and smaller-scale, domestic market oriented fisheries. The key points raised in discussion were:

* The need for a comprehensive understanding of the complex supply chain for some seafood products and the market for specific products
* The support for electronic traceability systems over paper-based systems
* The need to raise awareness at all levels about the significance of the IUU fishing problem and the tools available to address it
* The need to demonstrate the effectiveness of traceability through success stories
* The need to change the image of traceability from one of an ‘imposition’ to that of a ‘tool’
* The need for traceability systems to be flexible and responsive to both market demands and changing market access regulations
* The need for rights based management in small scale fisheries as the first step in addressing IUU fishing
* The merit of community based approaches to addressing IUU fishing in small scale fisheries
* The possible merits of CDS in differentiating seafood harvested by local (inshore) communities from fish caught by other fleets (including industrial vessels fishing inshore, often illegally) that wind up in the same markets.
* The support for the Seafood Saver program as a mechanism for driving change at the local level
* The need for the adoption of more innovative technologies to support MCS measures
* The need for bilateral/multilateral government approaches to IUU fishing and traceability
* Within government, the need for integrated actions on IUU fishing across relevant agencies
* The important potential role that regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) and other regional fishery bodies can play in addressing IUU fishing and promoting the adoption of traceability

## 3.4. Ensuring enabling policies and alignment

The objectives of this session were to:

* Identify enabling policies and programs in support of IUU responses
* Develop agreed CTFF responses to IUU fishing as input to an Action Plan
* Identify key messages for inclusion in a Call to Action to government in the region on addressing IUU fishing

Presentations addressed the following issues:

* FFA regional MCS Strategy – status and opportunities (FFA)
* Combating IUU fishing within the United States’ Coral Triangle Initiative (NOAA)
* Implementation of RPOA in Southeast Asia: successes, challenges and needs

The IUU mitigation aspects of the Global Environment Facility Tuna project were also outlined.

Following these presentations the final break-out group session considered the role of these existing programs, gaps in mechanisms to address IUU fishing generally, and traceability in particular, and actions to address these gaps. A range of actions that the CTFF might pursue, in large part in response to the needs identified earlier in the Forum, were identified. These actions related to, communications and awareness raising, advocacy, and analysis and Development of tools. The actions are reported in Table 1.

## 3.5 Wrapping up and Moving Forward

The objectives of this session were to:

1. Consider the outcomes of the meeting and review the actions for inclusion in an Action Plan
2. Agree on a Call to Action
3. Be informed about the Coral Triangle Seafood Savers initiative
4. Provide opportunities for networking, demonstrations and further discussion

### Action Plan

The Forum reviewed the actions identified on Day 2 and requested some amalgamation and refinement of the actions be undertaken following the Forum. The actions listed in Table 1 reflect that refinement. Participants will be given the opportunity to prioritise these actions as part of WWF’s work to develop an Action Plan that identifies priorities, time frames, resources/support required and responsibility for undertaking the action.

**Table 1: CTFF II Action Plan on IUU Fishing and Traceability**

|  |
| --- |
| **Action** |
| **Communication and awareness raising** |
| 1. Develop and widely publicize best practice or successful examples of anti-IUU measures and effective traceability systems, including catch documentation schemes, in both industrial and small-scale fisheries
 |
| 1. Make information on traceability available through social media and networking sites to maximise access and reach
 |
| 1. Develop and maintain information sharing networks housed within CTFF including:
	1. the provision of an online discussion forum for CTFF participants and other interested parties; and
	2. an online compendium of information on traceability systems.
 |
| 1. Nominate a focal point to orchestrate consistent messaging and its distribution.
 |
| 1. Develop clear and standardized messaging about the significant threat that IUU fishing poses to economies in the region and the role of traceability in addressing the issue
 |
| 1. Identify high profile champions of traceability and ‘legally caught seafood’ to influence decision makers and consumer choices
 |
| 1. Utilise local resources to promote awareness of IUU fishing and the role of traceability
 |
| 1. Support extension activities aimed at raising awareness of IUU fishing and the role , potential benefits and the nature of traceability systems, targeted to specific components of the supply chain, from fishers to consumers including:
	1. Presentations to processors/suppliers/retailers/chefs
	2. Development of documentary style programs on IUU fishing
	3. Promote ‘Fish with a story’ concept backed by traceability
	4. Work with governments to raise awareness and understanding of IUU fishing by small scale fishers
	5. Work with like-minded retailers to publicise CTFF efforts to introduce traceability for seafood products.
	6. Using fishing and processing industry associations as a platform for roll out of extension activities
	7. Identification of influential players at each point in the supply chain and enlisting their support as advocates for adoption of seafood traceability schemes.
 |
| **Advocacy** |
| 1. Support development of national and regional information management systems which comprise an integrated collection of application systems and related processes that together support a country’s national fisheries authorities in achieving its business objectives through the provision of comprehensive, timey and quality data
 |
| 1. Promote and support community-based surveillance to combat IUU fishing and the introduction of traceability systems in small-scale fisheries and encourage the consideration of alternative and innovative approaches to encourage community involvement in addressing IUU fishing in these fisheries (e.g. ‘Citizens’ Watch’)
 |
| 1. Support capacity building for traceability and, in particular, ensure support is available for participation of junior staff of fisheries agencies and students to attend regional meetings in order to facilitate human resource development in this area
 |
| 1. Promote the adoption of national measures that dedicate the application of money derived from fines imposed on IUU fishing to the support of measures to combat IUU fishing, including through traceability
 |
| 1. Promote and support the development of regional, subregional and bilateral approaches to IUU fishing and traceability
 |
| 1. Take a stepwise approach to traceability, with initial emphasis on promotion of catch documentation schemes
 |
| 1. Promote the adoption of best practice catch documentation schemes in preference to trade documentation schemes
 |
| **Analysis and Development of tools** |
| 1. Develop a benchmark for best practice monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) as a basis for self-assessment of MCS systems.
 |
| 1. Perform chain of custody type audits of fisheries in Fishery Improvements Projects
 |
| 1. Utilise the potential of RFMOs to adopt region-wide measures by actively seeking to influence outcomes of the WCPFC with regard to catch documentation schemes, in particular, and broader MCS measures against IUU fishing
 |
| 1. Develop a clear understanding of all elements of the increasingly complex supply chain for tuna products from the region to underpin the development of traceability systems for these fisheries
 |
| 1. Conduct an assessment of countries’ capacity to implement and support traceability systems
 |
| 1. Identify priority fisheries/species on which to focus CTFF efforts on adoption of traceability systems
 |
| 1. Develop a data base of companies that provide seafood products with traceability in place
 |
| 1. Work with the various agencies involved in scoping traceability standards, systems, platforms and implementation to promote harmonisation
 |
| 1. Monitor the outcomes of existing traceability initiatives , including the Solomon Islands’ project involving the use of the Nokia Tech system to curb IUU activities in its small scale inshore fisheries
 |

### Call to Action

Forum participants recognized the significance of IUU fishing as a threat to sustainable fisheries and livelihoods in the region and identified the important role that traceability and catch documentation can play in addressing this threat. Participants agreed that addressing the IUU fishing problem, and implementation of traceability systems in particular, would require action by a broad range of stakeholders in the region. Reflecting this, the Coral Triangle Fishers Forumcalled upon:

1. **National Governments** to recognize the significance of IUU as a threat to the region’s food security and livelihoods and to prioritize actions at national and regional levels to address the problem. These actions should include:
	* prioritizing the allocation of funding to monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) and the adoption of more cost-effective monitoring technologies
	* member countries of the WCPFC pursuing the adoption of a catch documentation scheme for species under the Commission’s mandate, and stronger measures to address IUU fishing, as priorities.
	* prioritizing investment in the development of a national catch document scheme that is relevant to both large and small scale fisheries
	* acknowledging the significance of under-reported or misreported catch and using all avenues available to them, nationally and regionally, to penalize the vessels involved
	* recognition of the valuable and challenging role that observers play in the fisheries of the WCPFC and ensuring that remuneration and working conditions of observers reflect this
	* the introduction of rights-based (individual or community) management in small –scale fisheries so as to promote stewardship of the resource. To support this initiative, governments should ensure that fishers have the necessary skills to report effectively on their catch and, recognizing the potential value of catch documentation schemes to local communities through differentiation of their catch, governments should support the development of such schemes.
	* the establishment of regional, sub-regional and bilateral approaches to IUU fishing and traceability
	* reviewing the implementation and progress of National Plans of Action on IUU fishing and making these reviews public.
2. **The WCPFC :**
* to expand the trial of electronic video monitoring and have a mechanism requiring vessels to submit data as a condition of export
* to provide timely implementation of the Commission’s decision to apply the Commission VMS to the national waters of all Commission members that request such application
* to recognize the valuable and challenging role that observers play in the fisheries of the WCPFC and to ensure that this is reflected in the remuneration paid to observers and in the conditions under which they work
* to adopt higher rates of observer coverage in the longline sector and support the introduction of electronic video monitoring to minimize opportunities for non-compliance with management measures for bycatch and protected species
* generate a database on all aspects of IUU fishing, similar to that developed by the Commission on bycatch mitigation information system (BMIS)
1. **WWF** to serve as the central coordinating body for the activities of the CTFF in relation to IUU fishing.
2. **Traceability service providers, fisheries managers, and government agencies** to promulgate standards for electronic traceability systems.
3. Recognizing the interest of **suppliers, retailers, buyers, and restaurateurs** in sustainable and legally-caught seafood, the CTFF calls upon this group to actively support the fishing industry’s attempts to have governments adopt traceability systems as a core component of fisheries management and to directly pressure governments to implement such measures.

### Commitments made at CTFF II

The Forum considered the role of CTFF participants in addressing IUU fishing and in responding to the information provided and issues identified at CTFFII. The following commitments were made.

**Cook Islands Fishing Association** will organise a meeting of the Association to discuss CTFF outcomes, can lobby the government on CTFF recommendations and will meet with Government with a view to revising, updating and implementing the NPOA on IUU fishing.

**FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihood Program,** can, **funds permitting,** sponsor participants from Indonesia, the Philippines and Timor-Leste to attend WWF IUU and traceability workshops and/or training within the region. The RFLP will discuss CTFF outcomes with the Asia-Pacific Fishery Commission (APFIC) Secretary and the national agencies responsible for fisheries in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam, and will highlight the CTFF outcomes and the report on the RFLP website and explore highlighting them on the APFIC website.

**FAO GEF Tuna Project** will be conducting work on traceability in the WCPFC region as part of the GEF project and report progress to CTFF.

**FFA** can, potentially, share resources and expertise and promote the CTFF recommendations through regional meetings.

**Indonesian MMAF** can participate in the development of programs and policies related to “statement of origin” (catch location) for small scale fisheries, support the RPOA on combating IUU fishing, support enabling community-based surveillance groups to combat IUU fishing through information systems such as SMS gateway, support fishing industries that have implemented traceability and support trials of simple traceability systems in small scale fisheries.

**Marine Stewardship Council** will request that MSC share the findings of an investigation into online traceability opportunities and involve fishers. MSC can provide guidance on chain of custody assessments as part of Fisheries Improvement Projects and will report outcomes of CTFF meeting in its regional newsletter.

**Solomons Island Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology** will deliver the outcomes of the CTFF to the National Coordinating Committee of the Solomon Islands for discussion.

**NOAA** will highlight CTFF outcomes within NOAA’s Coral Triangle group.

**Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resource Authority** will promote CTFF initiatives through regional fisheries bodies and work with NGOs to apply pressure on WCPFC members outside the region.

**NORPAC Fisheries Export** can make presentations to industry on the business reasons to embrace traceability and will continue to promote traceability and engage service providers to improve systems and lower costs.

**Philippines Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Regional Office** will inform management of the outcomes of the meetings and develop an action plan on implementation of traceability for consideration by management.

**PITIA w**ill consider the outcomes of the meeting and continue to be involved in pursuit of the outcomes.

**PNA w**ill circulate the outcomes of the CTFF workshop and consider them in its deliberations.

**PNG National Fisheries Authority w**ill include CTFF outcomes in internal discussion for consideration.

**SEA Quest (Fiji) Ltd** will represent the outcomes of CTFF to the industry and lobby government agencies.

**Sea Delight** will participate in regional Seafood Savers Programme and Vietnam FIP, will apply pressure on the Indonesian and Viet Nam governments to initiate traceability and will actively lobby the large retail food chains in the US to support the action plans of the CTFF. It will recruit representatives of the major food chains to sign a Letter of Support or to even send representatives/observers to petition the upcoming WCPFC meeting. Sea Delight is willing to send a representative as well.

**Solomon Islands Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources** will reflect CTFF outcomes in its National Plan of Action and in national policies and ensure active participation of extension officers in CTFF programs.

**Solander Pacific** will provide a vessel for trailing traceability devices and systems.

**Thailand Department of Fisheries** will share expertise on combating IUU fishing in tuna fisheries and share outcomes of the Forum with Departmental officers.

**Tuvalu Fisheries Department** will support the implementation of CTFF goals through the sharing of work and expertise.

**University of the South Pacific** can assist in awareness raising programmes, outreach, research and training.

**Vanuatu Fisheries Department** will seek departmental support for implementation of the recommendations and, if forthcoming, will discuss the CTFF recommendations with industry and other relevant agencies and allocate implementation across these groups. It will inform the CTFF of progress with implementation and seek assistance where required.

**Widegrowth Marine Products** will advise associations of development in CTFF.

### CTFF-III

The Forum considered briefly possible themes for the third CTFF in 2014, noting that it was proposed that the Forum be held in the Philippines. The following themes were proposed:

1. Anchored fish aggregating devices ( FADs) in small scale fisheries, noting that a forthcoming report from the FAO RFLP would help inform such a discussion
2. Food security (including as an overall theme with FADs and/or other issues as sub-themes)
3. Energy optimisation and carbon emissions from fishery products
4. Sharing best practices and shared solutions across a range of issues

The need to encourage greater fisher participation in the next Forum was highlighted.

1. **Next steps for CTFF platform**

Next steps for the platform include:

1. Communicating the results of the CTFF II meeting, including report and Call to Action, to wide spectrum of stakeholders and decision-makers
2. Revamping CTFF website for new communication functions
3. Establishing a communications platform within CTFF for regular email alerts, two-way updates and reporting to CTFF group
4. Prioritizing Action Plan activities, using the CTFF webpage and questionnaire, including roles and timelines
5. Maintaining a monitoring function of progress on the Action Plan as well as identifying and developing opportunities for joint advocacy based on CTFF consensus/outcomes

# 4. Conclusion

The Forum was conducted in a friendly and constructive environment with excellent support from WWF South Pacific. The Forum provided an opportunity to share experiences, highlight practical solutions and for discussion among peers as a basis for improving the effectiveness of responses to addressing issues related to IUU and contributing to sustainable seafood trade and food security.

Feedback from participants was overwhelmingly positive. In particular feedback suggests that the opportunities, both formal and informal, the Forum provided to meet others engaged in addressing IUU fishing and, in developing and applying traceability systems, was highly valued.

The ultimate impact and result of the CTFF-II will hinge strongly on the individual members to follow upon their specific commitments and identified actions, and their efforts to propagate the results and outputs of the meeting. Furthermore, sustainable outcomes will rest heavily on the CTFF platform itself (i.e. webpage and communications platform) to meet its objectives for monitoring and reporting progress, encouraging action, and ensuring advocacy and other key consensus points and recommendations are brought to relevant stakeholders and decision-makers in a timely and effective manner.

**Appendix 1: CTFF-II Agenda**

**CORAL TRIANGLE FISHERS FORUM II**

**Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) Fishing and Traceability for Fishing Communities and Industry**

June 18-20, 2012

Novotel Lami Bay, Suva, Fiji

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***start*** | ***end*** | ***Monday June 18*** |
| 8:00 | 8:30 |  | **Registration** |
| 8:30 | 9:00 | **Welcome and Opening Remarks**  - Col. Timoci Natuva, Acting Minister for Environment* Ms. Kesaia Tabunakawai, Representative, WWF South Pacific Programme Office
* Mr. Bill Holden, Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)
* Dr. Chumnarn Pongsri, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC)
 |
| 9:00 | 9:20 | **CTFF II Background and Meeting Primer*** Keith Symington, WWF Coral Triangle Global Initiative
* Mary Lack, Facilitator
 |
|  | **Session 1 – IUU Issues and Case Studies*****Outcomes:*** *1****.*** *Shared understanding of the key issues related to IUU fishing; 2. Shared experiences and lessons learned in addressing IUU; 3. Understand the basic components of traceability, catch documentation and MCS to address IUU fishing*Chair: Mr. Peniasi Kunatuba |
| 9:20 | 09:50 | * 1. **Keynote: Impacts and key issues of IUU Fishing in the Asia-Pacific**
* Mary Lack, Shellack Pty. Ltd.
 |
|  9:50 | 10:10 | **1.2 IUU Lessons Learned from FFA regional MCS strategy** - Mark Young, Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) |
| 10:10 | 10:30 | **Break** |
| 10:30 | 10:50 | * 1. **Tuna industry efforts and possible roles in combating IUU**
* Naitilima (Tima) Tupou, Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA)
 |
| 10:50 |  11:10 | **1.4 FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihoods Programme: Anti-IUU measures in Timor-Leste*** Mario Pereira, FAO Regional and Fisheries Livelihood Programme
 |
| 11:10 | 11:30 | **1.5 From IUU Forward, Better Fishing Practice in a Mixed Bottomfish Fishery. Central Sulawesi, Indonesia** **-** Stephen Fisher, Sea Delight |
| 11:30 | 12:00 | **1.6 Q&A**  |
| 12:00 | 13:00 | **Lunch** |
| 13:00 | 13:20 | **1.7**  **Traceability in the PNA and global markets** - Maurice Brownjohn (OBE), Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) Office |
| 13:20 | 13:40 | **1.8 Traceability as a tool for advancing MSC certification*** Patrick Caleo, MSC
 |
| 13:40 | 14:00 | * 1. **Assessment of the Implementation of the EU IUU Catch Certification Scheme in the Pacific Rim**
* Francisco Blaha, DEVFish II advisor
 |
| 14:00 | 14:15 | **1.10 Q&A and Wrap up** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Session 2 – Anti-IUU Opportunities and Solutions*****Outcome/Outputs:*** *1. Confirmation of IUU priorities. 2 Consider developments in traceability including technological innovation. 2. Identify scope for application of traceability.*Chair: Bubba Cook |
| 14:15 | 14:35 | **2.1 Developing a Catch Documentation Scheme for CDS for the Lagonoy Gulf handline fishery** - Jose Ingles, WWF |
| 14:35 | 14:55 |  | **2.2 IUU solutions in the Age of Information** **-** Thomas Kraft, Norpac |
| 14:55 | 15:15 |  | **2.3 Traceall traceability solutions** **-** Alan Steele, Traceall |
| 15:15 | 15:30 |  | **Break** |
| 15:30 | 16:15 |  | **2.4 Plenary Discussion – IUU priorities and responses based on lessons learned** Panelists: Mark Young, Tima Tupou, Don Griffiths, Jose Ingles, Thomas Kraft |
| 16:15 | 17:15 |  | **2.5 Breakout Session:** Working group sessions on the role of traceability in addressing priority IUU fishing issues (See handout for Guidance)Group A Chair/RapporteurGroup B Chair/RapporteurGroup C Chair/RapporteurGroup D Chair/Rapporteur |
| 17:15 | 17:30 |  | **2.6 Reporting back -** Working session chairs report back with draft matrix of priority issues, scope for application of traceability and obstacles to adoption |
| 17:30 | 17:45 |  | **2.7 Final comments from the floor** |
| 19:00 | 22:00 |  | **Dinner and Reception Party (WWF host)** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***start*** | ***end*** | ***Tuesday June 19*** |
| 08:30 | 09:00 |  | **Keynote Address:** Chef Daniel Patterson, Shangri-la Fiji Resort |
|  |  | **Session 3 -**  **Implementing IUU Solutions*****Outputs****: Further develop traceability solutions to IUU fishing and identify obstacles to implementation.*  |
| 9:00 | 9:30 |  | **3.1 Recap of Day –** Facilitator recaps main results of Day 1 and reviews Day 2 agenda and objectives:* Summary of issues and priorities for addressing anti-IUU fishing through traceability
* Success stories and lessons learned
* List of innovative ideas and technologies
* Guidance for breakout groups (see Handouts)
 |
| 9:30 | 11:00 | **3.2Breakout group sessions** (tea concurrent) |
|  |  |  | **Breakout Session:** Working group sessions on implementing, and overcoming obstacles in implementation of traceability in addressing priority IUU fishing issues (4 groups). Group A Chair/RapporteurGroup B Chair/RapporteurGroup C Chair/RapporteurGroup D Chair/Rapporteur |
| 11:00 | 11:20 |  | **3.3 Reporting back** - Table chairs report back with solutions matrix for each theme. |
| 11:20 | 12:00 | **3.4 Open discussion on Session 3 outputs** |
| 12:00 | 13:00 | **Lunch** |
|  | **Session 4 -**  **Ensuring enabling policies and alignment***Outcomes/Outputs: 1. Identify enabling policies and programs in support of IUU responses 2. Develop agreed CTFF responses to IUU fishing in the form of an action plan. 3. Identify key messages for inclusion in a Call to Action to governments in the region on addressing IUU fishing.* Chair: Bundit Chokesanguan |
| 13:00 | 13:20 | **4.1**  **FFA Regional MCS Strategy – status and opportunities**  - Hugh Walton, FFA |
| 13:20 | 13:40 | **4.2**  **Combating IUU Fishing within the US Coral Triangle Initiative** - Ann Mooney, NOAA  |
| 13:40 | 14:00 | **4.3**  **Implementation of RPOA in Southeast Asia: successes, challenges and needs** - Somboon Siriraksophon, SEAFDEC |
| 14:00 | 14:45 | **4.4 Plenary Discussion -** Developing a CTFF response to IUU fishing action Panelists: Hugh Walton, Ann Mooney, Somboon Siriraksophon, Michael Cerne (FAO) |
| 14:45 | 15:00 | **Break** |
| 15:00 | 15:15 | **4.5 Breakout group guidance**  |
| 15:15 | 16:30 | **4.6 Breakout group sessions -**  IUU programs and gaps; action plan and Call to Action(see handout) |
|  |  | **Breakout Session:** Working group sessions on identifying: 1. the role of existing programs; 2. gaps in mechanisms to address IUU fishing generally and traceability in particular; 3. identification of an action plan to address these gaps and maximize the impact of existing programs; (4 groups). Group A Chair/RapporteurGroup B Chair/RapporteurGroup C Chair/RapporteurGroup D Chair/Rapporteur |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | **4.7 Reporting back –** Table chairs report back with outputs |
| 16:45 | 17:00 |  | **4.8 Wrap up** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***start*** | ***end*** | ***Wednesday June 20*** |
|  |  | **Session 5 – Wrapping Up and Moving Forward** Chair: Keith Symington |
| 9:00 | 9:15 |  | **5.1**  **Summary of Day 2 –** Facilitator reviews the outcomes/outputs of Day 2 |
| 9:15 | 10:15 | **5.2 Presentation of results –** Facilitator1. Presentation of Action Plan and Call to Action.
2. Comments from floor
 |
| 10.15 | 10.30 | **5.3 S****Coral Triangle Seafood Savers presentation** **-** Geoffrey Muldoon, WWF Coral Triangle Programme |
| 10.30 | 12:30 | **5.4 Networking and Resourcing** (tea provided)* Open networking
* Demonstrations on CDS/traceability systems (booths)
* Program overviews (booths)
* Short training capsule sessions
* Feedback questionnaire
 |
| 12:30 | 13:30 | **Lunch** |
| 13:30 | 14:30 | **5.5**  **Final announcements and closing of meetings**1. Announcements/commitments/recognition
2. Next steps for CTFF
3. Next CTFF meeting
4. Closing of the meeting (Mr. Inoke Wainiqolo - Permanent Secretary for Fisheries and Forests)
 |
| 14:30 | 16:30 |  | * **Side meetings**
* **Press Conference**
 |

**Appendix II: CTFF Feedback - Questionnaire results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CTFF Participant Feedback**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **5 - Strongly Agree** | **4 - Agree** | **3- Neutral / Uncertain** | **2- Disagree** | **1- Strongly Disagree** | **Number of Respondents** |
| **Session 1: IUU Issues and Case Studies** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The session is relevant to my organization | 32 | 14 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| The session is interesting and offered new knowledge | 22 | 24 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| The speakers' style and delivery were effective | 13 | 27 | 10 |   |   | 50 |
| **Session 2: Anti-IUU Opportunities and Solutions** |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The session is relevant to my organization | 34 | 13 | 3 |   |   | 50 |
| The session is interesting and offered new knowledge | 25 | 21 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| The speakers' style and delivery were effective | 18 | 27 | 5 |   |   | 50 |
| **Session 3: Implementing IUU Solutions**  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The session is relevant to my organization | 24 | 22 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| The session is interesting and offered new knowledge | 13 | 30 | 7 |   |   | 50 |
| The speakers' style and delivery were effective | 10 | 29 | 11 |   |   | 50 |
| **Session 4: Ensuring Enabling Policies and Alignment**  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| The session is relevant to my organization | 29 | 17 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| The session is interesting and offered new knowledge | 21 | 26 | 3 |   |   | 50 |
| The speakers' style and delivery were effective | 12 | 34 | 4 |   |   | 50 |
| **TOTAL**  | 253 | 284 | 63 | 0 | 0 |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix 3: Participants List**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title / Position** | **Organisation** | **Country** | **Email** |
| **Mr Bill Holden** | Pacific Fisheries Manager | Marine Stewardship Council(MSC) | Australia | Bill.Holden@msc.org |
| **Mr Patrick Caleo** | Country Manager, ANZ | Marine Stewardship Council(MSC) | Australia | patrick.caleo@msc.org |
| **Ms Mary Lack** | Consultant | Shellack Pty Ltd. | Australia | shellack@webone.com.au |
| **Mr Geoffrey Muldoon** | Strategy Leader  | WWF CTGI | Australia | Geoffery.muldoon@wwf.panda.org |
| **Dr Antony Lewis** |  |  | Australia | al069175@bigpond.net.au |
| **Mr Donald Beer**  | President | Cook Island Fisherman Association | Cook Island | whitesands@whitesands.co.ck |
| **Mr Kelvin Passfield** | Senior Policy Adviser | Ministry of Marine Resources | Cook Islands | Kelvin.passfield@gmail.com |
| **Mr Seremaia Tuqiri** | Fisheries Policy Officer | WWF SPPO | Fiji | stuqiri@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Mr Bob Gillett** | Consultant | Gillett, Preston & Associates | Fiji | gillett@connect.com.fj |
| **Mr Sunia Waqainabete** | Chairperson | Fiji Locally Managed Marine Areas (FLMMA)  | Fiji | swaqainabete@fisheries.gov.fj |
| **Mr Duncan Williams** | Oceans Campaigner | Greenpeace | Fiji | duncan.williams@greenpeace.org |
| **Mr Neita Anselme** | General Manager | Tuvu Fiji | Fiji | tuvu@connect.com.fj |
| **Mr Adrian Chute** | General Manager | Celtrock Holdings Ltd | Fiji | adrian@celtrock.com.fj |
| **Mr Tom Mayo** | Operations Manager | Solander (Pacific) Ltd | Fiji | tom@solander.com.fj  |
| **Mrs Radhika Kumar**  | General Manager  | Solander (Pacific) Ltd. | Fiji | radhika@solander.com.fj |
| **Mr Brett Haywood** |  | Sea Quest (Fiji) Limited | Fiji | blu@connect.com.fj |
| **Mr Soko Loga** | Managing Director | Mannah (Fiji) Ltd | Fiji | sunia@connect.com.fj |
| **Mr Peniasi Kunatuba** | Chairman | Pacific Fishing Company Ltd. | Fiji | pkunatuba@gmail.com |
| **Ms Akisi Bolabola** | CMIF Program Coordinator | WWF SPPO | Fiji | abolabola@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Mr Sanaila Naqali** | Director  | Department of Fisheries | Fiji | naqali@hotmail.com |
| **Ms Kesaia Tabunakawai** | Representative | WWF SPPO | Fiji | ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Mr Du Xue Jun** | Managing Director | Golden Ocean | Fiji | goldhold@connect.com.fj |
| **Ms Theresa Ralogaivau** | Communications Officer | WWF SPPO | Fiji | tralogaivau@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Mr Josua Turaganivalu** |  | WWF SPPO | Fiji | jturaganivalu@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Mr Alfred Bubba Cook Lee** |  | WWF SPPO | Fiji | acook@wwfpacific.org.fj |
| **Ms Seini** |  | USP | Fiji | seini.tawakelevu@gmail.com |
| **Mr Li Chang Hong** | Assistant General Manager | Golden Ocean | Fiji |  |
| **Mr Satalaka Petaia** |  | USP | Fiji | satalaka.petaia@usp.ac.fj |
| **Mr Nari Tuivuniwai** |  | Greenpeace | Fiji |  |
| **Mr Timoci Tavusa** |  | Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry | Fiji |  |
| **Ms Arieta Tunidau** |  | Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry | Fiji |  |
| **Ms Saras Sharma** |  | Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry | Fiji | saras.sharma@fisheries.gov.fj |
| **Mr Daniel Patterson** | Executive Chef | Shangri-la Fijian Resort | Fiji | daniel.patterson@shangri-la.com |
| **Ms Mereoni Mataika** | Service Manager Marine Sanctuary | Shangri-la Fijian Resort | Fiji | mereoni.mataika@shangri-la.com |
| **Ms Lata Yaqona** | Communications Manager | Shangri-la Fijian Resort | Fiji | lata.yaqona@shangri-la.com |
| **Mr Bhan Pratap Singh** | Chief Executive | PAFCO | Fiji | BSingh@pafcofiji.com |
| **Mr Jan Steffen** | Marine Program Coordinator | IUCN Oceania | Fiji | Jan.STEFFEN@iucn.org |
| **Mr Sanivalati Navuku** | Program Manager | SeaWeb | Fiji | snavuku@seaweb.org |
| **Mrs Vina Bedesi** |  | USP | Fiji  | vina.rambidesi@usp.ac.fj |
| **Mr Fabian Nimea**  | Director | Office of Statistics, Budget and Economic Management | FSM | fabiannimea@hotmail.com |
| **Mr Valentin Martin** |  | Marine Resources Unit, Department of Economics Affairs | FSM | fsmmrd@mail.fm |
| **Mr Elvizar Alizar** | Secretary General | Indonesian Longline Tuna Association | Indonesia | elua22000@yahoo.com |
| **Mrs Sere Alina Tampubolon**  | Director of Fisheries Resources Surveillance, MMAF | Directorate of Law Enforcement, MMAF | Indonesia | sere serealinat@yahoo.com |
| **Mr Wawan Ridwan**  | Marine and Marine Species Program Leader | WWF Indonesia | Indonesia | WRidwan@wwf.or.id |
| **Mr Imam Musthofa**  | Fisheries Program Leader | WWF Indonesia | Indonesia | imusthofa@wwf.or.id |
| **Ms Bereti Kaino** | Offshore Licensing Officer | Kiribati Dept of Fisheries | Kiribati | beretik@mfmrd.gov.ki |
| **Mr Gangaram Pursumal**  | Manager, Peninsular Malaysia Seas Programme  | WWF Malaysia | Malaysia | gpursumal@wwf.org.my |
| **Ms Robecca Jumin** | SSME Manager | WWF Malaysia | Malaysia | rjumin@wwf.org.my |
| **Mr Irman Bin Isnain**  | Fisheries Officer | Department of Fisheries, Sabah | Malaysia | irman.isnain@sabah.gov.my |
| **Dr Bah Piyan Tan**  | Senior Fisheries Officer | Dept. of Fisheries | Malaysia | piyan@dof.gov.my |
| **Mr Johnny Wong Sin Fatt** | Secretary | Kudat Fishing Boat Owner Association, Sabah | Malaysia | FOOKSOON@tm.net.jmy |
| **Mr KwekSui Tung** | Director | Widegrowth Marine Products Sdn. Bhd., Sabah | Malaysia | stevenstkwek@yahoo.com |
| **Mr Tan Chean Chooi** | Fishing Industry |  | Malaysia |  |
| **Mr Paolo Mangahas** | Communications Manager | WWF Coral Triangle Programme | Malaysia | pmangahas@wwf.org.my |
| **Mr Maurice Brownjohn (OBE)** | Commercial Manager | Parties to the Nauru Agreement | Marshall Islands | maurice@pnatuna.com |
| **Mr Monte Depaune** | A/CEO | Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Autthority  | Nauru | monstartuna@gmail.com |
| **Ms Carol Phua** | Senior Marine Advisor | WWF Netherlands | Netherlands | CPhua@wwf.nl |
| **Mr Steve Beverly** | Consultant |  | New Caledonia | stevebeverly@hotmail.fr |
| **Mr Ian Bertram** | Coastal Fisheries Management Advisor | SPC | New Caledonia | ianb@spc.int |
| **Mr Francisco Blaha** | Consultant – DevFish |  | New Zealand | franciscoblaha@mac.com |
| **Mr Ley G. Balsamo**  | FARMC Chairman | Mindoro Occidental handline tuna project | Philippines |  |
| **Mr Wilfredo Chavenia** | Fisherfolks Director, Region 5 | Lagonoy Gulf handline tuna project | Philippines |  |
| **Mr Jose Ma. M. Abibuag** | FARMC  | Lagonoy Gulf handline tuna project | Philippines |  |
| **Mr Adon Gaudiano** |  | WWF Philippines | Philippines | agaudiano@wwf.org.ph |
| **Mr Jose Ingles** |  Strategy Leader | WWF CTGI | Philippines | ingles.jose@gmail.com |
| **Ms Marilou Drilon** | Senior Natural Resources Economist | Asian Development Bank | Philippines | mldrilon@adb.org |
| **Mr Leban Gisawa** | Fisheries Manager | NFA | PNG | lgisawa@fisheries.gov.pg |
| **Mr Bruno Boamer** |  | NFA | PNG |  |
| **Miss Rachel Rabi** | Fisheries Management Officer, Inshore Fisheries | NFA | PNG | rrabi@fisheries.gov.pg |
| **Mr Lui Bell** | Marine Species Manager | SPREP | Samoa | luib@sprep.org |
| **Mr Hugh Walton** | Fisheries Development Adviser | Forum Fisheries Agency | Solomon Islands | hugh.walton@ffa.int |
| **Mr Mark Young** | Director, Fisheries Operations | Forum Fisheries Agency | Solomon Islands | Mark.Young@FFA.int |
| **Mr Francis Hoasiuhu** | Sustainable Finance Planner | MECDM | Solomon Islands | franco.badii@gmail.com |
| **Mr Ben Buga** | Chief Fisheries Officer, Marketing | MECDM | Solomon Islands | bbuga@fisheries.gov.sb |
| **Mr Bundit Chokesanguan** | Director, Training Department | Southeast Asia Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) | Thailand | bundit@seafdec.org |
| **Dr Somboon Siriraksophon** | Policy and Program Coordinator | Southeast Asia Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) | Thailand | somboon@seafdec.org |
| **Dr Chumnarn Pongsri** | Secretary General | Southeast Asia Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) | Thailand | sg@seafdec.org |
| **Ms Pattaratjit Kaewnuratchadason** | Program Manager | Southeast Asia Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) | Thailand | Pattaratjit@seafdec.org  |
| **Mr Don Griffiths** | Chief Technical Advisor | FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme | Thailand | don.griffiths@fao.org |
| **Ms Prualai Noochmorn**  | Senior Fisheries Specialist | Department of Fisheries | Thailand |  |
| **Ms Saisunee Chaksuin** | Fisheries Officer | WWF Thailand | Thailand | saisuneec@wwf.panda.org |
| **Mr Mario da Costa Pereira** |  | FAO Regional Fisheries Livelihood Programme | Timor Leste  | Mario.Pereira@fao.org |
| **Ms Tima Tupou** | Secretariat | PITIA | Tonga | secretariat@pacifictunaindustry.com |
| **Ms Moeo Finauga** |  | Tuvalu Dept.of Fisheries | Tuvalu | mfinauga@gov.tv |
| **Mr Alan Steele** |  | Traceall | UK | alan.steele@traceall.co.uk |
| **Mr Justin Henseth** |  | Traceall  | USA | justin.hanseth@gmail.com |
| **Mr Frank Giaretto** | Special Agent | NOAA-CTI | USA | frank.giaretto@noaa.gov |
| **Ms Ann Mooney** |  | NOAA-CTI | USA | ann.mooney@noaa.gov |
| **Mr Michael Cerne** | Technical Advisory | GEF/FAO Electronic Monitoring project | USA | mcerne@alaska.net |
| **Mr Thomas Kraft** | Managing Member | Norpac Fisheries export | USA  | thomaskraft@mac.com |
| **Mr Steve Fisher** |  | Sea Delight | USA/Vietnam | srfqcfish@hotmail.com |
| **Mr Alsen Obed** |  | Vanuatu Dept.of Fisheries | Vanuatu | oalsen@gmail.com |
| **Mr Peter James** | Vanuatu Competent Authority | Department of Fisheries | Vanuatu | jpeterdc@gmail.com |
| **Mr Nguyen Ba Thong** |  | Fisheries Information Center of the Directorate of Fisheries | Vietnam | nguyenbathong@gmail.com |
| **Mr Pham Ngoc Tuan** |  | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development | Vietnam | pnt\_kg@yahoo.com.vn |
| **Mr Nguyễn Văn Việt**  | Commercial Fisherman (longline) | Hoai Huong commune, Hoai Nhon district, Binh Dinh Province | Vietnam |  |
| **Mr Trần Văn Đạt**  | Commercial Fisherman (longline) | Nha Trang, Khanh Hoa Province | Vietnam |  |
| **Mr Vo Ken** | Vessels owner and retired fisherman | Ninh Binh Province | Vietnam |  |
| **Ms Tang Van** |  | Sea Delight | Vietnam | van@sea-delight.com |
| **Mr Keith Symington** |  Strategy Leader | WWF CTGI | Vietnam | keithsymington@yahoo.ca |