|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 09**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | CCMs shall ensure that the effectiveness of these measures for the purse seine fishery are not undermined by a transfer of effort in days fished into areas within the Convention Area south of 20ºS. In order to not undermine the effectiveness of these measures, CCMs shall not transfer fishing effort in days fished in the purse seine fishery to areas within the Convention Area north of 20ºN |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Limit = do not shift purse seine fishing effort in days fished north of 20N or south of 20S |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 2013 (pg 11): In 2012, there were no active purse-seine vessels in the Eastern Skipjack Fishery.   CMM 2009-01 09 (received on 18 March 2013): Australia reported to WCPFC in 2012 that the seven purse seine vessels registered in WCPFC RFV during 2012 did not fish beyond Australia’s national jurisdiction during 2012. | | |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | | |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  | | |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | PS vessels, which do operate in the tropical waters of the western and central Pacific, are greater than 200 GRT (most of them 249 GRT) and 50-200 GRT class vessels operate in the coastal and offshore waters of Japan north of 20 N.  The number of vessels of 50-200GRT that engaged in tuna fishery ranged from 33 to 40 without apparent trend during the 2008-2012 period.  Note that the number of distant water purse seiners which are allowed to operate in tropical waters by government regulation was 35 and has been stabilized since 1995 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.2) | | |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | NO (not implemented) | There is no Korean-flagged purse seiner operating in the high seas Area. | | |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | NZ vessels do not fish north of 20 degrees north   NZ has 4 Class-6 purse seiners fishing offshore in EEZs of Pacific Island States and in high seas areas of the equatorial WCPO. Number of smaller capacity domestic-based purse seiners had declined to 5 vessels by 2009 and has remained at that level  (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.3 & 5 also Table 4) | | |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | No PH flag vessels fishing within the Convention Area south of 20ºS | | |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | | | Our tuna purse seiners are only allowed to fish in the area between 20ºN and 20ºS in the Convention area. |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | | | None.   2012 PS preliminary catch = 259,760 t and updated 2011 data = 203,746 t.  No. of license PS = 39 vessels.  The fishery operated mainly in areas between 10 degree N and 15 degree S latitude and 140 E and 160 W longitude in 2011 (AR Pt 1, pg.20)   Note:  Fig 1 (pg 16 AR Pt1) shows spatial distribution of reported logbook fishing effort (vessel days fished) for 2011 |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | | | AR Pt 1, 2013 Fig.2 shows distribution of purse seine effort, in fishing days, by area (5 x 5) and quarter in 2012. |  |
| Ecuador | Limit Type = Days Limit Value = 0 Limit Comment = Limit is as agreed at WCPFC8: 0 days in high seas of Convention Area (except in the overlap area) |  | YES (fully implemented) | | Ecuador's  purse seine effort in 2012 is between the area 20 N and 20 S  *SPC advise as at 17 July 2013, purse seine days fished in high seas of WCPFC-CA in 2012 was 125 days (In personal communication with SPC, SPC confirmed that all these days fished were east of 150W (Overlap area))* | |  |
| El Salvador | Limit Type = Not Specified Limit Comment = Limit is as agreed at WCPFC8: 29 days in high seas of Convention Area (except in the overlap area). |  | YES (fully implemented) | Yes, we verify the days, no fishing south of 20°S   AR Pt 1, 2013, Table 4:  Fishing days: HS except overlap area = 24 days Kiribati EEZ = 186 days Tuvalu EEZ = 23 fishing days Tokelau EEZ = 48 fishing days | | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 10**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | CCMs shall take necessary measures to ensure that the level of purse seine fishing effort in days fished2 by their vessels in areas of the high seas does not exceed 2004 levels or the average of 2001-2004. In accordance with paragraph 6 this Measure, this paragraph shall not apply to small developing state members and participating territories.  Footnote 2: In the case of small developing fleets, of four vessels or less, that legitimately entered the fishery after 2000 but before 2004, the baseline level of effort shall be a year in the period 2001-2004 in which its full vessel complement was active in the fishery. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 2013 (pg 11): In 2012, there were no active purse-seine vessels in the Eastern Skipjack Fishery.   CMM 2009-01 09 (received on 18 March 2013): Australia reported to WCPFC in 2012 that the seven purse seine vessels registered in WCPFC RFV during 2012 did not fish beyond Australias national jurisdiction during 2012.   *SPC estimates of days fished by CCM flagged vessels in high seas during 2012. = 0 (SPC, 17 Jul 2013)* |  |
| China | Type = Days Limit Value = 420 source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 26 days |  |
| Ecuador | Type = Days Limit Value = 0 Limit Comment = Limit is as agreed at WCPFC8: 0 days in high seas of Convention Area (except in the overlap area) | 2008-01 para 10: High Seas: limit purse seine effort in days fished to 2004 or average of 2001-2004 Potential implementation or compliance issues. • Overlap area SPC is checking for fishing on HS outside of overlap | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): 125 days   *(In personal communication with SPC, SPC confirmed that all these days fished were east of 150W (Overlap area))* |  |
| Indonesia | type = Days Limit Value = 500 Limit Comment = Limit is as agreed at WCPFC8: 500 days in high seas of the Convention Area |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 500 days |  |
| Japan | Type = Days Limit Value = 1859 source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 110 days |  |
| Korea (Republic of) | Type = Days Limit Value = 1249 source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 24 days |  |
| New Zealand | Type = Days Limit Value = 346 source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 88 days |  |
| Philippines | High Seas Purse seine fishery 20N to 20S Limit Type = Days Limit Value = 4659  source: estimate of high seas days fished provided by SPC as at 17 July 2013 |  | YES (fully implemented) | No PH flag vessels fishing within the Convention Area south of 20ºS   SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 3 days |  |
| El Salvador | Type = Days Limit Value = 29 Limit Comment = Limit is as agreed at WCPFC8: 29 days in high seas of Convention Area (except in the overlap area) | 2008-01 Bigeye and Yellowfin: para 10: High seas – limit purse seine effort in days fished to 2004 or average of 2001-2004. Potential implementation or compliance issue, additional information or clarification is required: In Pt 1 2012 report ES refers to a high seas days limit for ES purse seine vessels in 2011 which is greater than what was specified as participatory rights for El Salvador during 2011 in WCPFC7 Report.   *El Salvador analyzed and reviewed every fisheries logbook of 2011 and we calculated nineteen days in WCPO and nineteen days in overlap area.* | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013, Table 4:  Fishing days: High seas except overlap area = 24 days Kiribati EEZ = 186 days Tuvalu EEZ = 23 fishing days Tokelau EEZ = 48 fishing days |  |
| Chinese Taipei | Type Type = Days Limit Value = 1913 |  | YES (fully implemented) | The fishing activities of our tuna purse seiners are monitored through VMS and weekly catch report. The fishing days fished by our vessels in areas of the high seas does not exceed 2004 levels or the average of 2001-2004.   SPC advice (as at 17 Jul 2013): 26 days |  |
| United States of America | Type = Days Limit Value = 1036 source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012. |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations the U.S. has implemented to meet the purse seine requirements of CMM 2008-01 is an Interim Final Rule, published in 2011, which continued the pertinent elements of regulations established in 2009 to implement CMM 2008-01. The regulations established an annual limit on fishing days in accordance with the specified baseline. All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov.     *As noted in CMR 2012, the United States had previously indicated that the level of days fished in 2004 should be 1066 days.   SPC estimates of days fished by CCM flagged vessels in high seas during 2012. = 1278 (SPC, 17 Jul 2013)*  *The US provisional estimate is that in 2012 its purse seine vessels fished 1,274 days on the high seas which is in accordance with applicable CMMs and US domestic regulations.* |  |
| European Union | Type = Days Limit Value = 103 | Potential implementation or compliance issue, provisional purse seine days fished estimate for 2011 appears to exceed the limit  • PS licenses limited to the number permitted under bilateral fisheries agreements with coastal States inthe Convention Area. • The EU applies limits on catches as per paragraph 7, and Schedule 7 of 2008-01. The number of licenses has been limited by internal legislation. The presence has not been increased over the years.  *EU responded “YES” and state “The flag State was reminded of this obligation* | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 Fig.2 shows distribution of purse seine effort, in fishing days, by area (5 x 5) and quarter in 2012 but no actual numer of days fished   SPC advice of 2012 level (as at 17 July 2013): 425 days |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 17**  **(iii) Spatial and temporal closures and restrictions on the use of FADs** | For the members of the FFA who are members of the PNA, this measure will be implemented through their domestic processes and legislation, including:  b. the Third Arrangement Implementing the Nauru Agreement of May 2008 which comprises a 3 month FAD closure period in the EEZs of the PNA member countries from 0000 hours on 1 July each year until 2400 hours on 30 September  each year; full catch retention and other conditions for the purse seine fleet in national waters. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federated States of Micronesia | Coastal CCM requirement = apply the PNA 3IA which comprises a 1 July - 30 Sept FAD closure, as well as other measures |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Nauru |  | YES (fully implemented) | PNA Member |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Palau |  | YES (fully implemented) | palau has implemented through national policy the Vessel Day Scheme and the third implementing arrangement requirements. |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Solomon Islands is party to PNA. Solomon Islands flagged vessels comply with PNA VDS and 3IA Regulation |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  | *Tuvalu has incorporated the 3IA measure as a condition of access agreement and a regulation since 2009. There are also major amendments made to the Marine Resources Act 2006 to accommodate Tuvalu obligations under this 3IA measure and other measures...* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 18**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | Waters under the jurisdiction of non-PNA members  18. Other non-PNA CCMs shall implement compatible measures to reduce purse seine fishing mortality on bigeye tuna in their EEZs. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 2013 (pg 11): In 2012, there were no active purse-seine vessels in the Eastern Skipjack Fishery. Australia has implemented a ban on the use of FADs north of 20°S, (paragraph 12 of Eastern Skipjack Tuna general permit conditions - attachment 1 of AR Pt 2).    CMM 2009-01 09 (received on 18 March 2013): Australia reported to WCPFC in 2012 that the seven purse seine vessels registered in WCPFC RFV during 2012 did not fish beyond Australias national jurisdiction during 2012.    SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 0 day |  |
| Cook Islands |  |  | N/A | No Purse seine vessels were licenced to fish in Cook Islands waters for this period, other than through the US Treaty.   SPC advised (17 July 2013) that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 500 days |  |
| Fiji |  |  | N/A | Fiji does not have any purse seine vessels.  However, AR Pt 1, 2013 reports (Table 6) 4 US Treaty purse seine fishing vessels made a total of 16 sets in Fiji's waters and caught a total of 505 mt of tuna (AR Pt 1 2013, pg.11)   SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 29 days |  |
| Indonesia | Limit Type = Days Limit Value = 4415  Limit Comment = source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 17 July 2013 | 2008-01 para 18: Non-PNA EEZs Implement compatible measures to reduce PS fishing mortality on BET in EEZs • Please provide further detail about how Indonesia’s regulations are a compatible measure to reduce purse seine fishing mortality on BET in Indonesia’s EEZ. • Limitation number and deployment area of FAD in purse-seine fisheries. Revision of the minister regulation on FAD is being promoted and discussed. \*The SWG could not conclude that the measure taken by Indonesia sis compatible  Indonesia is still in process to revise the Ministerial Decree on Deployment and Utilization of Fish Aggregating Device by fishing gears that is allowed, including purse seine. | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised (17 July 2013) purse seine days fished in waters under Indonesia's national jurisdiction in 2012 was 3,076 days   SPC also advised that historical estimates of days fished by Indonesia during 2001 - 2004 has been revised, and suggested limit based on number days fished in 2004 was 4,415 days |  |
| Niue |  |  | N/A | There was no fishing in Niue EEZ in 2012.  Niue is not a flag State (AR Pt 1, 2013)   SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 0 days |  |
| New Caledonia |  |  | N/A | Only longliners in the New Caledonian fleet     SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 0 days |  |
| French Polynesia |  |  | N/A | French Polynesia only have longliner fleet which operate exclusively in her EEZ (AR Pt 1, 2013)  SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 0 days |  |
| Philippines | Limit Type = Days Limit Value = 5601  Limit Comment = source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 17 July 2013 |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippines adopted and implemented FAO 236-1   SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 1971 days   SPC also advised that historical estimates of days fished by Philippines during 2001 - 2004 has been revised, and suggested limit based on number days fished in 2004 was 5,601 days |  |
| Tokelau |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Tokelau implemented a 3 month FAD closure in early 20103   SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 747 days |  |
| Tonga |  |  | N/A | Tonga has no purse seine fishery   SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 0 days |  |
| United States of America | Limit Type = Days Limit Value = 343  Limit Comment = source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 17 July 2013 |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations the U.S. has implemented to meet the purse seine requirements of CMM 2008-01 is an Interim Final Rule, published in 2011, which continued the pertinent elements of regulations established in 2009 to implement CMM 2008-01. The regulations established an annual limit on fishing days in accordance with the specified baseline. All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov.    SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 203 days |  |
| Vanuatu |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 5 days |  |
| Wallis and Futuna |  |  |  | SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 1 day |  |
| Samoa |  |  | N/A | Samoa's purse seine of BET and YFT are subject to multilateral access agreement between US and certain pacific island countries |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 18**  **(iii) Spatial and temporal closures and restrictions on the use of FADs** | Waters under the jurisdiction of non-PNA members  18. Other non-PNA CCMs shall implement compatible measures to reduce purse seine fishing mortality on bigeye tuna in their EEZs. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Australia has implemented a ban on the use of FADs north of 20°S. (paragraph 12 of Eastern Skipjack Tuna general permit conditions - attachment 1 to AR Pt 2 2013).    AR Pt 1 2013 (pg 11): In 2012, there were no active purse-seine vessels in the Eastern Skipjack Fishery.   CMM 2009-01 09 (received on 18 March 2013): Australia reported to WCPFC in 2012 that the seven purse seine vessels registered in WCPFC RFV during 2012 did not fish beyond Australias national jurisdiction during 2012. |  |
| Cook Islands |  |  | N/A | No Purse seine vessels were licenced to fish in Cook Islands waters for this period, other than through the US Treaty. |  |
| Fiji |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Indonesia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia has implemented this resolution. a. Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Number: Per.05/Men/2008 as amended by Minister of Marine Affair and Fisheries Regulation Number: Per.12/Men/2009 as amended by Minister of Marine Affair and Fisheries Regulation Number: Per.14/Men/2011 regarding Capture Fisheries Business b. Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Number: 03 year 2009 regarding Fishing and Fish Transporting on the High Seas c. Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries No. 02/2011 concerning fishing rute and placement of fishing gear d. Regulation of the Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries No. 18/2010 concerning Fishing Log Book Limitation number and deployment area ofFAD in purse-seine fisheries. Revision of the minister regulationin on FAD is being promoted and discussed. (2011 CMR) |  |
| New Caledonia |  |  | N/A | Only longliners in the New Caledonian fleet |  |
| Niue |  |  | N/A | There was no fishing in Niue EEZ in 2012.  Niue is not a flag State (AR Pt 1, 2013) |  |
| French Polynesia |  |  | N/A |  |  |
| Philippines |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippines adopted and implemented FAO 236-1 |  |
| Tokelau |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Tokelau implemented a 3 month FAD closure in early 20103 |  |
| Tonga |  |  | N/A | Tonga has no purse seine fishery |  |
| United States of America |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations the U.S. has implemented to meet the purse seine requirements of CMM 2008-01 is an Interim Final Rule, published in 2011, which continued the pertinent elements of regulations established in 2009 to implement CMM 2008-01. The regulations established an annual limit on fishing days in accordance with the specified baseline. All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov. |  |
| Vanuatu |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | All Vanuatu Purse seiners operate within the PNA required limits, these vessels are based out of PNG and operate under the FSM arrangement. |  |
| Wallis and Futuna |  |  |  | SPC advised (17 July 2013)  that estimated purse seine days fished in this CCMs waters during 2012 was = 1 day |  |
| Samoa |  |  | N/A | No purse seine fishery |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 19**  **(iii) Spatial and temporal closures and restrictions on the use of FADs** | The purse seine fishery on the high seas in the area bounded by 20ºN and 20ºS shall be closed to fishing on FADs between 0000 hours on 1 July and 2400 hours on 30 September. During this period all purse seine vessels without an observer from the Regional Observer Program on board will cease fishing and return directly to port. During this period, a vessel may only engage in fishing operations if the vessel carries on board an observer from the Regional Observer Program to monitor that at no time does the vessel deploy or service any FAD or associated electronic devices or fish on schools in association with FADs. |

| **Applicable CCM** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement = FAD closure in Purse seine Fisheries in high seas areas from 1 July - 30 Sept between 20 N and 20S |  | YES (fully implemented) | Australia has implemented a ban on the use of FADs north of 20°S. (paragraph 12 of Eastern Skipjack Tuna general permit conditions - attachment 1 to AR Pt 2 2013).   AR Pt 1 2013 (pg 11): In 2012, there were no active purse-seine vessels in the Eastern Skipjack Fishery.   CMM 2009-01 09 (received on 18 March 2013): Australia reported to WCPFC in 2012 that the seven purse seine vessels registered in WCPFC RFV during 2012 did not fish beyond Australias national jurisdiction during 2012. |  |
| China |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Purse vessels are not allowed to operate on highseas as stipulated in the fishing condition by PNA members |  |
| Ecuador |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Will law character was issued in august 2012, the Regulation No. 287, establishing the FADs closure period, to the purse seine fishery in EEz and high seas in the area bounded by 20º N and 20º S to fishing on FADs between 00:00 hours on 1 July and 24:00 hours on 30 September 2012. |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | As for PNA 3IA |  |
| Indonesia |  | 2008-01 para 19: During the FAD closure period, vessels engaging in fishing operations must carry on board an observer from the ROP or cease fishing and return directly to port • Please provide additional information about how thisprovision is applied inIndonesia’s EEZ • “Indonesia has not applied this CMM in the IEEZ. It plans to adopt it if there is a recommendation from research activity. “  *2008-01 para 19: Indonesia already issued Ministerial regulation No. 1 year 2013 on Observer of Fishing Vessel and Fish Carrier. The national observer program has been running this year. One of the activities is to deploy the observer on the fishing vessels that operate in the Sulawesi Sea and Pacific Ocean* | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia already regulate by Ministry Regulation No.12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Seas and in process to revise Ministry Decree No.30 year 2004 on Utilization and Deployment of Fish Aggregating Device |  |
| Japan |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | 2010 CMR: Domestic regulation underlines the FADs closure as adopted by the WCPFC |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  |  | N/A | There is no Korean-flagged purse seiner operating in the high seas Area. |  |
| Marshall Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| New Zealand |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | All NZ vessels carry an observer sourced from the RoP 100% of the time |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Philippines |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippines adopted and implemented FAO 245 |  |
| Solomon Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Solomon Islands flagged vessels are not permitted to fish outside SI EEZ. Solomon Islands is party to PNA. Solomon Islands flagged vessels comply with 3-month FAD closure and 100% observer courage under regulation 3IA |  |
| El Salvador |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | El Salvador is not a coastal country of the WCPFC area therefore does not have any survey program in order to control the fleets operating in the Western, nevertheless is controlled by the IATTC Observer Program and Kiribati Observer Program (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.7) |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | We stipulated regulation to require tuna purse seiners to carry observers and to implement the 3-month FAD closure. |  |
| United States of America |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations the U.S. has implemented to meet the purse seine requirements of CMM 2008-01 is an Interim Final Rule, published in 2011, which continued the pertinent elements of regulations established in 2009 to implement CMM 2008-01. The regulations established a FAD closure and observer requirements specific to the FAD closure. All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov.    Starting on January 1, 2010, the observer coverage rate in the US PS fishery in the CA has been 100%.  Through an agreement with the FFA, the 100% observer coverage rate was maintained throughout 2010, 2011 and 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.26) |  |
| Vanuatu |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Vanuatu Flagged Purse seiners have a 100% observer coverage in compliance with PNA requirements |  |
| European Union |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | All vessels that operated during FAD closure had an observer on board (PNA/Kiribati) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 23 (iii) Spatial and temporal closures and restrictions on the use of FADs** | By 1 July 2009, CCMs fishing on the high seas shall submit to the Commission Management Plans for the use of FADs by their vessels on the high seas. These Plans shall include strategies to limit the capture of small bigeye and yellowfin tuna associated with fishing on FADs, including implementation of the FAD closure pursuant to paragraphs 13 and 19 above. The Plans shall at a minimum meet the Suggested Guidelines for Preparation for FAD Management Plans for each CCM (Attachment E). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| Australia | Flag CCM Requirement = CCMs fishing in high seas to submit Plan for use of FADs by their vessels on the high seas |  | YES (fully implemented) | FAD Management Plan received:  5 Dec 2007 |  |
| China |  | NO (not implemented) | Purse vessels are not allowed to operate on highseas as stipulated in the fishing condition by PNA members   *FAD Management Plan received: 30 June 2013* |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) | *FAD Management Plan received: 25 July 2013* |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | FAD Management Plan received:  1 July 2009 |  |
| Indonesia | 2008-01 para 23: Submit FAD management plan • Indonesia has not submitted FAD management plan • FAD Management Plan is being prepared in line with the revision of Minister Regulation on the FAD.  *2008-01 para 23: Indonesia is still in process to revise the Ministerial Decree on Deployment and Utilization of Fish Aggregating Device* | NO (not implemented) |  |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | FAD Management Plan received:  25 January 2008 |  |
| Kiribati | 2008-01 para 23: Submit FAD management Plan • Potential compliance or implementation issue • Kiribati is in the progress of developing its FAD management plan |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | N/A | Korea subimitted its FAD management plan for 2011. However, there has been no fishing on high seas.  *FAD Management Plan received:  11 Nov 2011* |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | NO (not implemented) | Management plan adopted in 2010 but yet to be formally submitted to WCPFC. |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | FAD management plan has been submitted 25 Sept 2008 |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | N/A | PNG flagged vessels do not fish in the high seas areas.   FAD Management Plan received:  5 Nov 2007 |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippines adopted and implemented FAO 244 and 245   *Philippines submitted a high seas FAD Management Plan as part of dCMR response* |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | FAD Management Plan received:  27 Mar 2012 |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have submitted our FAD management plan which could be found on the Commission’s website.  *FAD Management Plan received:  1 July 2009* |  |
| United States of America | 2008-01 Bigeye and Yellowfin para 23: Submit FAD management Plan • US has not submitted a FAD management plan but has provided explanation regarding work underway to develop such a plan  *WCPFC NOTE: this was received 20 Aug 2013* | NO (not implemented) | FAD management plan expected to be submitted in advance of  the 2013 TCC.   *United States submitted a FAD Management Plan which was received by WCPFC on August 20 2013* |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | Vanuatu has developed and submitted a FAD management plan.  *FAD Management Plan received:  30 Mar 2012* |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | Submitted to ED 22/10/2010 and circulated to CCMs on 28/10/2010 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 26 (iii) Spatial and temporal closures and restrictions on the use of FADs** | CCMs, working independently or collaboratively with industry, and reporting through the Scientific Committee and the Technical and Compliance Committee at each regular session, shall explore and evaluate mitigation measures for juvenile bigeye and yellowfin taken around FADs and present the results annually to the Commission. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Requirement: CCMs, independently or collaboratively, shall explore and evaluate mitigation measures for juvenile bigeye and yellowfin tuna taken around FADs, and present results annually to Commission reporting through SC and TCC. |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) | sorting grids in use from 2009 |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Indonesia |  | NO (not implemented) |  |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | NO (not implemented) | Further consultation with industry on an ongoing basis. |  |
| New Zealand |  | NO (not implemented) | No new research was undertaken in the 2012 year |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | N/A | No work on mitigation measures carried out independently or collaboratively with industry in 2012. |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Palau |  | N/A | palau is not a flag state and has no flagged vessels fishing fishing around FADs. |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Tokelau |  | YES (fully implemented) | Tokelau participated in the ISSF research cruise in 2012. Tokelau is not a flag state. |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | Our tuna purse seiners carried cadre observers to implement Project 60 of the Commission for 3 trips. In addition, the scientific data of our tuna purse seiners have been submitted to scientific provider of the Commission for evaluating mitigation measures. |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | None. |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | EU fleet has the intention to replace all FADs with new ones with less incidental by-catch. All this work is being done in the framework of the FADs National Plan. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 28**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | Purse seine vessels fishing within the area bounded by 200N and 200S exclusively on the high seas, on the high seas and in waters under the jurisdiction of one or more coastal States, or vessels fishing in waters under the jurisdiction of two or more coastal States, shall carry effective 1 January 2010, an observer from the Commission’s Regional Observer Programme. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| China | Requirement = PS fishing vessels fishing betw. 20N and 20S exclusively on the HS, on the HS and in waters under the jurisdiction of one or more coastal States, or vessels fishing in waters under the jurisdiction of two or more coastal States, shall carry an observer from the ROP |  | YES (fully implemented) | Purse seine vessels will not leave port for fishing without an observer from ROP. Purse vessels are not allowed to operate on highseas as stipulated in the fishing condition by PNA members |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Indonesia |  | N/A | Fish/Did not fish report for 2012 received: 1 July 2013  In 2012 432 vessels were on the WCPFC RFV flagged to this CCM: 70 vessels were reported to have fished within the Convention Area beyond this CCMs area under national jurisdiction.  161 Purse seine: 17 fished  182 Longline: 44 fished  23 pole and line vessels: 9 fished  65 Other gears: 0 vessels fished   During 2012, 10 longline vessels and 1 support vessel were detected within the WCPF Convention Area on the WCPFC VMS during 2012 (these numbers should be the same or less than the number of vessels that were reported to have fished but may also include vessels transiting) |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | All PNG licensed vessels that fish inside or outside the waters under PNG jurisdiction require observers to be placed on-board as a condition of their license. |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippines adopted/implemented FAO 245 |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | The vessels carry 100% onboard observers on all the trips.  They carry one observer from IATTC and WCPFC (KIRIBATI) program |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have submitted monthly observer deployment report to the Secretariat. Our purse seiners have met the requirement of 100% coverage of observer in accordance with this measure. |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations (50 CFR Part 300) the U.S. has implemented to meet the purse seine requirements of CMM 2008-01 is an Interim Final Rule, published in 2011, which continued the pertinent elements of regulations established in 2009 to implement CMM 2008-01. The regulations established specific observer coverage requirements. All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov.    The US PS fleet in 2012 operated under 100% observer coverage (from above) |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | Vanuatu flagged purse seiners have 100% observer coverage in compliance with PNA requirements |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | observer on board from PNA/Kiribati |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 31**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | The total catch of bigeye tuna by longline fishing gear will be subject to a phased reduction such that by 1 January 2012 the longline catch of bigeye tuna is 70% of the average annual catch in 2001-2004 or 2004 (Attachment F).3 The catch of yellowfin tuna is not to be increased in the longline fishery from the 2001-2004 levels.  Footnote 3: The year 2004 shall apply only to China, the United States and Indonesia. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 3097Mt Source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 / CMR 2012 |  | N/A | AR Pt 1 2013, Table 1: Annual yellowfin catch estimates (whole weight) for the Australian longline fleet: 1100.7 Mt (Note, this figure includes small catches from other commercial methods (minor line component including trolling, rod-and-reel and handline) to address issues of confidently)   *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013):  CCM LL catch of YFT in 2012 was 1,150 mt* |  |
| Belize | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000 Mt Specified participatory rights as agreed at WCPFC8 for high seas (excluding the overlap area) |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Canada | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000 Mt |  | N/A | Canada has no directed fishery for bigeye or yellowfin tuna in the WCPO.  AR Pt 1 2013 shows Canada only has an albacore troll fishery |  |
| China | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2792 Mt source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012.    But from CMR 2012: China interpretation of para 31, is that for YFT they should be able to pick the year 2004, but not limited to the average 2001-2004  The limit, as reported by SPC  in 2004 is 4048mt. | Potential compliance issue or implementation issue.  • China interpretation of para 31, for YFT they should be able to pick the year 2004, but not limited to the average 2001-2004 The limit, as reported by SPC is 4048mt. • Request SPC to work with China on the revision of the historical catch estimates to cover overlap area for YFT. | YES (fully implemented) | Bigeye catch by China-flagged longliners are restricted below 2004 level.   AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 2 (pg.7) report nominal catch of YFT by Chinese LL vessel in WCPFC Convention Area: 6004 mt   *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): YFT = 6,004 mt.  YFT catch reported by China in AR Pt 1, 2013 also is 6004mt.*  *The catch of yellowfin tuna by longline fishery in 2012 did exceed the figure of a given year from 2001 to 2004. However, China reported the catch data to IATTC for those years. China will pay back the overfished catch should the Commission adopts similar measures.* |  |
| Indonesia | Limit Type = Catch Limit = no relevant participatory rights from WCPFC8 decisions in high seas, but fishing activities in Indonesias EEZ would be outside the limit. | 2008-01para 31: Longline catch of YFT not to be increased from 2001-2004 levels • Potential compliance and implementation issue, which may be dependent on clarification of Indonesia’s participatory rights in the longline fishery for yellowfin. • Longline catch of YFT on 2011 as much as 13,750 mt shall be presumed harvested from high seas, IEEZ and territorial waters and only 141,258 Kgs harvested by five (5) longliner on the high seas which was landed outsite of Indonesia. | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 reports: Nominal LL YFT catches in Fisheries Management Area 716 (IEEZ Sulawesi Sea) and 717 (IEEZ Pacific Ocean) = 16.729 mt   SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): YFT = 11,656 mt  *SPC advised that as at 17 July 2013: the ave catch 2001-2004 was 7,192Mt.   SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): YFT longline catch estimate = 11,656 mt .* |  |
| Japan | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 16480 Mt source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | In recent five years, yellowfin catch fluctuated with no apparent trend, was 6,915 mt in 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.3)   SPC advised (as at 17 July 2013), Japan's LL catch of YFT= 9,231mt |  |
| Korea (Republic of) | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 12864 Mt source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | NO (not implemented) | Korea exceeded its bigeye allocation by around 280 tonnes in 2011, but this excess happened due to the double counting of catches in the WCPFC-IATTC overlap Area. To prevent this from happening again, the Korean government is requiring  the vessel operators to report their bigeye catches to the authorities on a monthly basis from 2013 and is closely monitoring the catch trends. The Korean government notified the Secretariat that the bigeye catches by Korean-flagged in the overlap Area would be counted as those in the IATTC Area.  *SPC advised (as at 17 July 2013), Korea's LL catch of YFT= 7,832 mt* |  |
| New Zealand | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | Yellowfin caught in 2012:  1008 t |  |
| Philippines | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | 2012 BET & YFT Philippine LL catches does not exceed the 2004 annual catch or the 2,000 tonnes catch limit   YFT catch by 2 PH LL vessels in Kiribati waters = 60.63mt (AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 6).  PH fish/did not fish report states only 2 tuna LL vessels were fishing in 2012 |  |
| Chinese Taipei | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 22361Mt source: SPC CMM 08-01 tables 2012 |  | YES (fully implemented) | Our bigeye and yellowfin tuna catches are lower than the catch limits respectively. Please refer to our scientific data submitted to the Secretariat on April 30, 2013. Domestic regulations were adopted to limit the catch of LL fisheries.   From Table 2-4 in AR Pt 1, 2013,  2012 YFT preliminary est.: LTLL fishery = 2059mt DWPS fishery = 25,750mt STLL fishery = 14,889mt   SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): YFT = 16,958 mt |  |
| United States of America | Yellowfin longline fishery Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000 Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | Domestic regulations the U.S. has implemented to meet the longline requirements of CMM 2008-01 is a Final Rule: Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries in 2009, 2010, and 2011 (50 CFR Part 300). The U.S. published an Interim Final Rule, Bigeye Tuna Catch Limit in Longline Fisheries for 2012 on 27 August 2012 that established a catch limit for bigeye catch for the U.S. longline fleet in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (50 CFR Part 300). All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov. The catch of yellowfin tuna did not increase in the longline fishery from the 2001-2004 levels as reported in the Annual Report Part I.    AR Pt 1, Table 1a & 1f reports LL YFT estimated weight of landings by vessels of US & its participating territory at 1,184mt  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): USA LL catch of YFT in 2012 was 575 mt* |  |
| European Union | Yellowfin longline fishery Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000 Mt |  | N/A | EU longliners have not been targeting BET / YFT   AR Pt 1, 2013 (EU-Portugal flagged longliners) Annex 2 shows one LL FV "Artico" active in 2012 - main species caught were blue marlin and blue shark.  No catches of YFT is recorded in this annex. Yet to receive data for EU-Spanish flagged longliner  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): EU LL catch of YFT in 2012 was 2 mt* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 32**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | Paragraph 31 does not apply to members and participating territories that caught less than  2,000 tonnes in 2004. Each member that caught less than 2,000 tonnes of bigeye in 2004 shall ensure that their catch does not exceed 2,000 tonnes in each of the next 3 years (2009, 2010 and 2011). Consistent with paragraph 3 opportunities for non members will be decided by the Commission on a case by case basis. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt Source: CMR 2012 |  | N/A | Australia’s bigeye catch for 2012 was below 2,000 tonnes.                 AR Pt 1: Annual bigeye catch estimates (whole weight) for the Australian longline fleet: 473.0 Mt (Note, this figure includes small catches from other commercial methods (minor line component including trolling, rod-and-reel and handline) to address issues of confidently)  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): CCM LL catch of BET in 2012 was 482 mt* |  |
| Belize | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 803.25Mt Specified participatory rights as agreed at WCPFC8 for high seas (excluding overlap area) |  | YES (fully implemented) | SPC advised that Belize reported annual longline catch of bigeye tuna for 2012 in the WCPFC Convention Area was 132mt (as at 17 July 2013)       As at 19 July 2013: Annual Report Part 1 covering 2012 activities had not been received by the WCPFC Secretariat  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): Belize LL BET catch in 2012 was 132 mt* |  |
| Canada | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | N/A | Canada has no directed fishery for bigeye or yellowfin tuna in the WCPO.  AR Pt 1 2013 shows Canada only has an albacore troll fishery |  |
| New Zealand | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | BET = 240 t    SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): CCM LL catch of BET in 2012 was 154 mt |  |
| Philippines | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | PH – flag LL vessels fishing in the Convention area, does not exceed 2,000 tonnes level.   BET catch by 2 PH LL vessels in Kiribati waters = 247.83 mt (AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 6).  PH fish/did not fish report states only 2 tuna LL vessels were fishing in 2012.   SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): CCM LL catch of BET in 2012 was 0 mt |  |
| European Union | Bigeye longline fishery Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 2000Mt |  | YES (fully implemented) | EU longliners have not been targeting BET / YFT   AR Pt 1, 2013 (EU-Portugal flagged longliners) Annex 2 shows one LL FV "Artico" active in 2012 - main species caught were blue marlin and blue shark.  No catches of BET is recorded in this annex.  Yet to receive data for EU-Spanish flagged longliner  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): CCM LL catch of BET in 2012 was 23 mt* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 33**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | Each member or cooperating non-Member that caught an average of more than 2,000 tonnes of bigeye shall be subject to the following catch limits for bigeye tuna for the years 2009 to 2011  inclusive:  2009: 10% reduction of the catch specified in Attachment F;  2010: 20% reduction of the catch specified in Attachment F;  2011: 30% reduction of the catch specified in Attachment F.  35. Further to paragraph 34, the reductions specified in paragraph 33 for 2010 and 2011 shall not apply to fleets of members with a total longline bigeye tuna catch limit as stipulated in Attachment F of less than 5,000 tonnes and landing exclusively fresh fish, provided that the details of such fleets and their operational characteristics are registered with the Commission by 31 December 2008 and that the number of licenses authorized in such fisheries does not increase from current levels. In such cases, catch limits specified in Attachment F shall continue to be applied. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indonesia | limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 5589Mt Limit Comment =  is as agreed by WCPFC8 as participatory rights, for high seas |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 reports: Nominal LL BET catches in Fisheries Management Area 716 (IEEZ Sulawesi Sea) and 717 (IEEZ Pacific Ocean) = 3.266 mt   *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): CCM LL catch of BET in 2012 was 3,681 mt* |  |
| Japan | limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 19670Mt Limit Comment = Bigeye longline catch limit: Attachment K to CMM 2008-01 less 30% |  | YES (fully implemented) | Bigeye catch showed decreasing trend, was 7,854 mt in 2012 AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.3)   SPC advised (as at 17 July 2013), Japan's LL catch of BET= 12,259mt |  |
| Korea (Republic of) | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 15014Mt Limit Comment = Bigeye longline catch limit: Attachment K to CMM 2008-01 less 30% | Potential implementation or compliance issue: 2011 bigeye longline catch estimate appears to exceed the limit for 2011. • The catch data submitted to SPC was the preliminary estimated data based on raised data but will be updated when log sheet data coverage increases. Accurate statistics will be submitted after complement the data collection rate.  • Korea advised that its scientific data exceeded the catch limit for bigeye but its official statistics does not, and that it will cross check those two data in the future.  *Korea exceeded its bigeye allocation by around 280 tonnes in 2011, but this excess happened due to the double counting of catches in the WCPFC-IATTC overlap Area. To prevent this from happening again, Korean government notified the Secretariat that the bigeye catches by Korean-flagged in the overlap Area would be counted as those in the IATTC Area. Also, the government revised the “Regulations on the Reporting of Fishing* *Operations in the Korean EEZ and Distant Waters” on March 24th, 2013 to improve the reporting and monitoring of the catches of major species, including the bigeye, under the pruview of RFMOs. Under the revised Regulations, vessels operators are required to report the catches of these species to the authorities on a monthly basis and the authorities closely monitor the catch trends to ensure the catches are kept within allocated opportunitie*s. | NO (not implemented) | This has been addressed in field number 68.  Korea exceeded its bigeye allocation by around 280 tonnes in 2011, but this excess happened due to the double counting of catches in the WCPFC-IATTC overlap Area. To prevent this from happening again, the Korean government is requiring  the vessel operators to report their bigeye catches to the authorities on a monthly basis from 2013 and is closely monitoring the catch trends. The Korean government notified the Secretariat that the bigeye catches by Korean-flagged in the overlap Area would be counted as those in the IATTC Area.  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): BET = 18,823 mt.*  *From 2013, the Korean government is allocating each vessel with individual vessel quota to make it easier for the government to control the catches and keep them within the national allocation. Also, reporting requirements have been strengthened in terms of reporting frequency. With the recent amendment to the Distant Water Fisheries Development Act of Korea, the Korean government now has more stringent sanction schemes in place, including those against who exceeded their allocations.* |  |
| Chinese Taipei | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 11098 Mt Limit Comment = Bigeye longline catch limit: Attachment K to CMM 2008-01 less 30% |  | YES (fully implemented) | BET catch of Taiwan’s tuna longliners from 2009 to 2011 does not exceed catch limit stipulated in CMM 2008-01. Please refer to our catch data and WCPC9/IP09 rev3.   SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): BET = 10,994 mt |  |
| United States of America | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 3763Mt Limit Comment = based on para 35 of this CMM, 2004 level is the lim |  | N/A | Excluding landings by the US Participating Territories (ie A/Samoa), LL landings of BET increased slightly to 3,654mt in 2012.  these bigeye tuna landings by the US LL fishery were below the limit of 3,763 t established in US Fishery regulations (50 CFR Part 200, 2009) pursuant to the provisions of the WCPFC CMM 2008-01 (AR Pt 1, pg.3)  *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013): USA LL BET catch in 2012 was 3,654 mtt* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 39**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | Beginning in 2009, CCMs shall take necessary measures to ensure that the total capacity of their respective other commercial tuna fisheries for bigeye and yellowfin tuna, including purse seining that occurs north of 20ºN or south of 20ºS, but excluding artisanal fisheries and those fisheries taking less than 2,000 tonnes of bigeye and yellowfin, shall not exceed the average level for the period 2001-2004 or 2004. CCMs shall provide the SC with estimates of fishing effort for these other fisheries or proposals for the provision of effort data for these fisheries for 2009 and future years. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indonesia | Limit Type = Not Specified Limit Comment = no relevant participatory rights from WCPFC8 decisions in high seas, but activities in Indonesias EEZ appear to be outside the limit |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 reports: Nominal catches in Fisheries Management Area 716 (IEEZ Sulawesi Sea) and 717 (IEEZ Pacific Ocean) for Pole and Hand Line:  YFT = 1.864, BET = 2.237 Handline: YFT=2.051, BET=177 Others:  YFT=15.338, BET=1.658 |  |
| Japan | Limit= Cap capacity of other fisheries at 2004 or average 2001-2004 levels (excludes artisanal and <2000T fisheries) |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 reports in the Japanese tuna and billfish fisheries eg. longline, pole-and-line, purse seine and other miscellaneous coastal fisheries in the WCPFC-CA.  Japanese catches (mt) for tropical tuna species by gear in the WCPFC Convention Area is reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 6 (pg.14). |  |
| Philippines | Limit= Cap capacity of other fisheries at 2004 or average 2001-2004 levels (excludes artisanal and <2000T fisheries) | 2008-01 Bigeye and Yellowfinpara 39: Report effort data for other commercial fisheries. “It has been recognized by the Commission that Philippines and other members and cooperating non-members of the Commission may have difficulties complying with this information. Although Philippines have provided someinformation and continues to improve data on relation to this fisheries. Handlining – catch data is provided but not yet for effort data.  *Handline fishery in the PH is not considered under the commercial sector and should not be covered by this CMM. Although catch data for this fishery has been provided, PH recognize difficulty in providing effort data for this fishery. But PH have been trying to improve data gathering to include effort data monitoring for this fishery but on a limited scale (e.g. for General Santos City based handline fishery).* | YES (fully implemented) | PH have not increased the number of active vessels operating on WCPO  *Hook-and-line which includes the handline fishery are not considered under the commercial sector in the Philippines and should be excluded in this limit or compliance issues. It should also be noted that eventhough catches for YFT for handline fishery have increased and may have exceed the 2004 levels [around 1,030MT], PH YFT catches in other fisheries have decreased significantly [22,000MT less than the 2004 level]. Philippines has difficulty in providing catch and effort data and this has been recognized by the Commisson but Philippines tried to make improvements on its data provision particularly on the catch and effort data for the municipal hook-and-line fishery to include handline fishery through the WPEA-OFMP. This improvements have been in progress through our port sampling activities (e.g. General Santos City Fishport area)* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 08-01 43**  **(ii) Catch and effort reporting for target species** | Monitoring shall be conducted at landing and transshipping ports to assess the amount of catch by species. The outcomes shall be reported annually to the Commission. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Reporting requirement = outcome of monitoring landing and transshipping ports shall be reported to the Commission. |  | YES (fully implemented) | Australia’s bigeye catch for 2012 was below 2,000 tonnes.   Port sampling programme in place and AU Annual Report Pt 1 reports AU catches for 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013)     pg 27: Catch disposal records are the formal method for monitoring unloads, and were implemented in the ETBF in January 2006 (Table 12). Catch disposal records are completed by both the fisher and licensed fish receiver at the point of unload to obtain accurate data on fish numbers and verified weight by species. Skippers tend to under-estimate the weights reported in logbooks for most species, so the catch disposal record data have been reported in domestic official statistics since 2007. Compliance checks are conducted on unloads as part of a risk based compliance program. Weight estimates are also derived from the size-monitoring program, and are likely to be more accurate than logbook data for that part of the time series. There was no transhipment in the ETBF in 2012. |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | Belize does not carry out transhipment at port but at sea in the overlap area and which are reported and monitored by IATTC observers. For your guidance, Belize has imposed a Moratorium on transhipment at sea with the exception of those vessels regulated by an ROP managed by an RFMO. |  |
| Canada |  | N/A | Canada does not have a port sampling program to measure albacore fork lengths during domestic off-loads. Historically some vessels unloading in US ports had portions of their catch sampled by US port samplers and these data were made available to Canada. The record of port sampled length frequency data is discontinuous from 1984 to 2008. At-sea transshipment or in-port transshipment activities were not reported by the Canadian albacore troll fleet in 2012 (AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.5).  Catch and effort statistics and summary of size (fork length) sampling program is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Transhipment and unloading data available and will be sent to the Commission. Catch and effort estimates is also reported for CK LL fleet in the WCPFC-CA (Table 1a&1b) as well as annual un-raised catch estimates for all Cook Island licensed longline vessels (AR Pt 1,2 013) |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | Bureau of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture of China, is leading and supervising thedata collection of Chinese tuna fisheries. National-wide meeting on tuna data quality have been organized at least once a year in recent years. Participants are managers of tuna fishing companies and tuna-related fishery enterprises. Each vessel of every company engaged in tuna fishing is required to report fishery data (such as catch and effort by species, month, gear, area etc.) to China Overseas Fisheries Association (COFA). Data coverage of catch and effort is 100%. COFA and Shanghai Ocean University (SHOU) host and maintain the fishery and observer database for tuna fishery of China Since 2008, each LL vessel is obliged by the Bureau of Fisheries to use uniformed logbook and return it back to SHOU before the end of March next year. The data contained in the logbook is evaluated to further promote data collection quality of China (AR Pt 1, 2013).  Catch data is also reported in AR Pt 1 |  |
| Ecuador |  | N/A | Full inspection in Naitonal Ports of all types of fishing vessels including artisinal boats in every trip (from AR Pt 2, CMM 2010-07p.12) |  |
| Fiji |  | N/A | Fiji's 2013 Part 1 Report indicates the landings and trans-shipment by Fiji fishing vessels in other ports. Fiji understands there is a need to verify such port activities and is therefore working towards mandating its vessels to trans-ship or land all catch in Fiji designated fishing ports. Catch statistics is reported in Fiji's AR Pt1 |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | In 1974, Government started established and developed of statistical system. In 1976, Government implemented the survey method on national-wide, also developed survey frame based on the 1973 Agriculture Census. In 1974, government started data collection based on the Potential Village. During 1984-1989 Government has been improved data collection method. 1990 – Now, Government has been strengthening data collection method, data collection form, data processing, species breakdown, fisheries management area, etc. (AR Pt 1, 2013).  Total tuna catch for all gears is fisheries management areas were also reported in AR Pt 1 |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Some information provided in AR Pt 1 on unloadings and port sampling programme |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | CCM reports catch and fishing effort statistics in AR Pt 1, 2013.  Informatin is also provided on status of tuna fishery data collection systems through logbooks, observer programs as well as port sampling program. |  |
| Kiribati |  |  | AR Pt 1: some information on transshipment activities in Kiribati Port.,a nd its port sampling programme |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | some information in AR Pt 1 on disposal of catch, unloadings and national port sampling and data collection programmes |  |
| Nauru |  | N/A | No Port landings or tranship done in 2012 |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Data provided to the SPC - OFP |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | All fish caught in the Convention Area are subjected to a monitored unload by an observer from a certified RoP observer program |  |
| French Polynesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Most of the licensed LL boats have an obligation to unload their catches within the fishing port of Papeete.  The port manager has to monitor the amount of fish unloaded in order to collect unloading fees.  Coverage rate for the overall landings is estimated around 95% of the commercial catches.      There has been regular but low coverage sampling in Papeete for several years and very limited in recent year due to logistical difficulties. However, these difficulties were partly overcome by the completion of a centralised unloading facility in Papeete and since 2005 a team of two port samplers carried out port-sampling operations (reported in Table 8) (AR Pt 1, 2013).  Catch estimates is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | PNG port sampling program on purse seine catches is still being conducted in the main unloading and transhipment ports around the county.   However the port sampling covers mostly vessels fishing in PNG waters and unloading or transhipping through PNG ports Data collection in PNG is comprehensive with above 80% catch & effort data coverage for all fleets. For size and species composition data (AR Pt 1, 2013) Catch and effort data is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | PH issues catch certificates for catches that comes from legal/legitimate fishing activities only (e.g. FAO 238); there is only 1 transhipment port in the PH that is located in Davao City, all catches transhipped in this port are monitored and documented. |  |
| Palau |  | YES (fully implemented) | palau collects all tuna landed and are reported.   Dedicated personnel of fisheries port samplers are present at all times during offloading at fisheries port to collect data and information (AR Pt 1,2 013) Catch data is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | N/A | The Solomon Islands domestic flagged vessels fish only within Solomon Islands EEZ and land catches to the processing plant in Noro, Solomon Islands. There is a high level of observer coverage on domestic purse seine vessels.   AR Pt 1: provides information on port sampling, unloadings and ip port transshipment monitoring information |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | El Salvador is not a coastal country of the WCPFC area therefore does not have any survey program in order to control the fleets operating in the Western, nevertheless is controlled by the IATTC Observer Program and Kiribati Observer program. During disembarkation in El Salvador CENDEPESCA make inspection and all controls accord with the national law.  Legislation provides of controls regarding: 1. Discharged fish and 2. RFMO management measures resolutions (AR Pt 1, 2013).  Catch estimates is also reported in AR Pt 1 |  |
| Thailand |  | N/A | Data from canneries were submitted to WCPFC for scientific purposes. |  |
| Tonga |  | YES (fully implemented) | All landings and transshipments of fish in port are inspected by officials.  100% of catch logbooks collected within 45days of end of trip/  Transshipment is not allowed.  Port sampling programme is in place (AR Pt 2, 2013) Catch and effort statistics is reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  | Tuvalu flag vessels offload their catches at ports outside Tuvalu. There was an increasing in the number of transshipment occurred in domestic ports in 2012 from which by-catch and discards remain a challenging issue (AR Pt 1, 2013) Fishing catch and effort data by species is reported in the AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | 1. Foreign tuna fishing vessels not listed in RFVs of RFMOs are not allowe dto enter our ports, and are prohibited from landing and transhipping at domestic ports.  2. For our tuna fishing vessels, landing at domestic ports is monitored through the fish market by maintaining records on landing and sale of catches.  In addition, the Fisheries Agency dispatches inspectors randomly to monitor the landing.  3. In case that our tuna vessels land their catches in foreign ports, the owners are required to submit copies of invoices on sale of catches to the FA after custom clearance (AR Pt 2, 2013) |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | None. |  |
| Vietnam |  | N/A | The national catch statistical system is unreliable and thus from 2010 under the framework of West Pacific East Asia Oceanic Fisheries Management (WPEA OFM) project granted by GEF throughout WCPFC, Vietnam has been gradually improving its tuna fisheries data collection system based on standards of WCPFC.  In 2012, tuna data have still been collecting for longline, purse seine and gillnet fisheries with data types of logsheet, port sampling and landing at Binh Dinh, Phu Yen anh Khanh Hoa.  Collected data of the project partly addressed data gaps and importantly contributed for catch estimates of Vietnam’s domestic tuna fishing fleets in 2012. Size composition data were indicated in the Appendix 1 (Figure 2 and 3). There is an intention agreed by WCPFC that the project will be expanded to collect tuna fisheries data in other provinces where skipjack tuna are being landed. This expansion will be a significant improvement to further address data gaps on tuna fisheries at the national and regional levels (AR Pt 1, 2013).  Catch data by species is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | There is 100% observer coverage on all transhippments and offloadings in domestic ports. Catch and effort data is also reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 |  |
| Samoa |  | YES (fully implemented) | Reported in AR Pt 1, 2013 section 3.2 |  |
| Wallis and Futuna |  |  |  |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | Observers carry out this task on board. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 11-01 02**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | The PNA members intend to implement VDS which limit total days fished in their EEZs to no greater than 2010 level. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federated States of Micronesia | Coastal CCM limit = days fished in PNA EEZs. It should be noted that this provision specifies a collective responsibility for CCM implementation (which is shared among the eight PNA countries).   PNA have previously advised WCPFC, that CMM 2008-01 limits effort in PNA EEZs to 2004 levels taking into account existing rights granted under Agreements registered with the Commission in accordance with para 7 of CMM 2008-01. The CMM 2008-01 in-zone purse seine effort limits do not apply to domestic vessels, but domestic vessels are covered by the VDS limits. The VDS does not apply to US vessels which operate within the limits of vessel numbers established in the Treaty between the United States and Pacific Island Parties. (from PNA report to WCPFC8 (March 2012)) |  | YES (fully implemented) | No details provided in AR Pt 1 to support implementation of this requirement.  (AR Pt 1 was received shortly before dCMR completion)   *In response to a request from WCPFC for information on the purse seine days limit in CMM 2011-01, and level of purse seine days fished in 2012, the PNA Office advised WCPFC on 23 July 2013 of the following: 1. PNA understands that CMM 2011-01 paragraph 2 applies a non-binding effort in PNA EEZs of the 2010 effort level which was reported by SPC at the time to be 43,257 days. 2. PNA formally implemented a limit of 44,703 days through the VDS in 2012, which is based on the 43,257 days plus an adjustment factor which takes into account the length adjustment factors in the VDS. 3. Based on the VDS records, the estimated days fished in PNA EEZs collectively for 2012 is 43,986 days but we have not seen any data from SPC for 2012, based on the logsheets.    SPC advice on estimated purse seine days fished in PNA EEZs: Limit 2010 level = 43,580 days (was advised to WCPFC8, which adopted CMM 2011-01 – (from WCPFC8-2011/21 Rev3 (8 May 2012) ) Updated limit 2010 level = 43,823 days (Source: SPC as at 17 July 2013) 2012 level = 40,929 days. (Source: SPC as at 17 July 2013) SPC notes: These figures do not take into account paragraph 6 and 7, and footnote 2 of CMM 2008-01, and the definition of days effort may differ from the definition of days used in the PNA VDS.* |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | Figure 3a provides an illustration of distribution of purse seine days effort in RMI EEZ. |  |
| Nauru |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 2: PNA Member implemented PNA VDS FIMS   AR Pt 1 2013: reported 3100 was the average purse seine days (fishing and searching) during 2010 - 2012. |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 2013: (pg14) In 2012, a total of 186 purse seiners spent a total of 14,498 days fishing and searching inside the PNG EEZ.   (pg 5): A total of 13 PNG flag vessels (three more vessel than 2011) were actively fishing in PNG waters in 2012. The total number of days spent by these vessels fishing and searching in 2012 was estimated at 1241, only a slight increase 2011 (1202 days)   (pg 7): The number of active Chartered vessels fishing both inside and outside of PNG waters in 2012 was 38 which is less by one vessel than 2010 with 39 purse seiners. An estimated overall of 4,835 fishing days was spent fishing and searching in the WCPO by these vessels in 2012. Most effort was spent in PNG waters (over 71% on average) than waters in other countries in the past 5 years. In 2012 3137 fishing days were spent in PNG waters while 1698 days was distributed in other EEZs of PNA member countries (Figure 2). |  |
| Palau |  | YES (fully implemented) | palau fully implements the Vessel Day Scheme.   No information was reported on purse seine days fished in its EEZ during 2012 in AR Pt 1 2013 (only catch levels) |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR PT 2 2013: Solomon Islands complies with PNA VDS. Solomon Islands is party to PNA |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  | AR Pt 1 2013: reported in 2012 there were 1800 purse seine days (fishing and seraching) in this CCMs EEZ |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 11-01 03**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | Philippines shall restrict their purse seine fishing in the western High Sea Pocket No.1 (Attachment 1) as provided in Attachment 2 and shall not fish in the High Sea Pocket No.2. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Philippines | Limit Type = Vessels Limit Value = 36 Limit Comment = 36 fishing vessels (described by the Philippines as catcher fishing vessels) in the HSP-1 SMA, and total catches shall not exceed equivalent to validated vessel days fished in the high seas |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 2: Philippine implementation of FAO 245: fishing days in the HSP1 does not exceed the limit, same with the number of catcher vessels allowed.   AR Pt 1: In 2012, Philippines was given limited access to High Seas Pocket 1 as Special Management Area (SMA) allowing only 36 traditional fresh/ice chilled fishing vessels operating as a group. Philippine-flagged vessels operating in HSP1 are managed under the DA-BFAR Fisheries Administrative Order 245 (FAO 245). Out of 36 catcher vessels there were only eleven (11) vessels which started to operate in October 2012. The total catch of these vessels operating in HSP1 for the period of October to December 2012 is around 2,066MT equivalent to 209 fishing sets.     SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013), purse seine day fished in the high seas of the WCPFC-CA betw. 20 N and 20 S by PH flag vessels = 3 days    WCPFC detected 9 "catcher vessels" in HSP1 during 1 Oct - 31 Dec 2012 (and 15 carrier vessels), and no catcher vessels provided Manual VMS position reports to WCPFC during this period (only support vesssels: carrier and light boats).     There were a further 9 purse seine vessels that were detected on WCPFC VMS in HSP1 during 1 Sept - 31 Dec 2012, but the frequency of VMS the reporting while in this area suggests transit activities, rather than fishing activities. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CMM 11-01 03**  **(ii) Catch and effort reporting for target species** | | Philippines shall restrict their purse seine fishing in the western High Sea Pocket No.1 (Attachment 1) as provided in Attachment 2 and shall not fish in the High Sea Pocket No.2. | | | | |
| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** | |
| Philippines | Reporting requirement = HSP-1 SMA entry/exit report, submitted to the Commission <= 24hrs prior to entry and < 6hrs prior to exiting | |  |  | 66 HSP-1 SMA entry/exit report received from PH flagged vessels in 2012   AR Pt 1: In 2012, Philippines was given limited access to High Seas Pocket 1 as Special Management Area (SMA) allowing only 36 traditional fresh/ice chilled fishing vessels operating as a group. Philippine-flagged vessels operating in HSP1 are managed under the DA-BFAR Fisheries Administrative Order 245 (FAO 245). Out of 36 catcher vessels there were only eleven (11) vessels which started to operate in October 2012. The total catch of these vessels operating in HSP1 for the period of October to December 2012 is around 2,066MT equivalent to 209 fishing sets. |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 11-01 04**  **(iv) Observer and VMS coverage** | CCMs shall require all their purse seine vessels fishing in the area between 20N to 20S to carry an observer on board. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| China | Requirement= CCMs shall require their PS vessels fishing betw. 20N to 20S to carry an observer |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Ecuador |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Under the PNA 3IA on 100% observer coverage, FSM had ratified and implemented as a license condition |  |
| Indonesia |  |  | N/A | Fish/Did not fish report for 2012 received: 1 July 2013  In 2012 432 vessels were on the WCPFC RFV flagged to this CCM: 70 vessels were reported to have fished within the Convention Area beyond this CCMs area under national jurisdiction.  161 Purse seine: 17 fished  182 Longline: 44 fished  23 pole and line vessels: 9 fished  65 Other gears: 0 vessels fished   During 2012, 10 longline vessels and 1 support vessel were detected within the WCPF Convention Area on the WCPFC VMS during 2012 (these numbers should be the same or less than the number of vessels that were reported to have fished but may also include vessels transiting) |  |
| Japan |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Marshall Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| New Zealand |  |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | All PNG licensed vessels that fish inside or outside the waters under PNG jurisdiction require observers to be placed on-board as a condition of their license. (from 2007-01 p.7) |  |
| Philippines |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | All PH vessels fishing in HSP1 have observers on board as stipulated in FAO 245 |  |
| Solomon Islands |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Solomon Islands implemented 100% observer courage on PS vessels. Solomon Islands complies with PNA 3IA Regulations |  |
| El Salvador |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | The vessels carry 100% onboard observers on all the trips.  They carry one observer from IATTC and WCPFC (KIRIBATI) program |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | We have submitted monthly observer deployment report to the Secretariat. Our tuna purse seiners should source observer from observer providers authorized by the Secretariat as per our domestic regulation. |  |
| United States of America |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | The U.S. has implemented an Interim Final Rule published 30 December 2011 requiring observer coverage for purse seine vessels (50 CFR Part 300). All U.S. regulations can be found at www.ecfr.gov.    The US PS fleet in 2012 operated under 100% observer coverage (from ans. to above questions) |  |
| Vanuatu |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Vanuatu flagged purse seiners have 100% observer coverage in compliance with PNA requirements |  |
| European Union |  |  | YES (fully implemented) | Observers from Kiribati/PNA |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 11-01 05**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | For China, the bigeye catch limit including the WCPFC-IATTC overlapping area for longline vessels shall be 11,748mt for 2012. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** |  | **2012 Implementation** | **TCC Assessment** |
| China | Limit Type = Catch Limit Value = 11478Mt Limit Comment = Bigeye longline catch limit |  | YES (fully implemented) | 1.catch data are collected from each longliner on monthly basis. 2.observer from Shanghai Ocean University (SHOU) are sent on board to collect and verify data 3. logbook are used, and the data are collected verified by scientific team in SHOU to ensure data quality. 4. Port sampling made by scientific team in SHOU. 5. Transhipment Prior Notification and Declaration are made and collect, the data on trashipment are used to verify the quality of catch data, with an aim to ensure no overfishing against the catch limit. 6.vessels are closely monitored by VMS since October, 2006.   AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 2 (pg.7) report nominal catch of BET by Chinese LL vessel in WCPFC Convention Area: 11,324 mt   *SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013), China's LL catch for BET in the WCPFC-CA for 2012 was 10,573 mt* |  |