|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 10-07 04**  **(ii) Catch and effort reporting for target species** | Each CCM shall include key shark species2, as identified by the Scientific Committee, in their annual reporting to the Commission of annual catch and fishing effort statistics by gear type, including available historical data, in accordance with the WCPF Convention and agreed reporting procedures. CCMs shall also report annual retained and discarded catches in Part 2 of their annual report. CCMs shall as appropriate, support research and development of strategies for the avoidance of unwanted shark captures (e.g. chemical, magnetic and rare earth metal shark deterrents).  Footnote 2: The key shark species are blue shark, silky shark, oceanic whitetip shark, mako sharks, and thresher sharks, porbeagle shark (south of 20S, until biological data shows this or another geographic limit to be appropriate) and hammerhead sharks (winghead, scalloped, great, and smooth). |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Reporting requirement = annual retained and discarded catches of sharks in AR Pt 2 |  | YES (fully implemented) | Australia's retained and discarded catches of key shark species (retained in tonnes, discarded in numbers) was: - Blue Shark: retained: 12.0t; discarded: 3180 - Silky Shark: retained: 0.2t; discarded: 47 - Oceanic Whitetip Shark: retained 2.7t; discarded: 239 - Shortfin Mako Shark: retained: 66.1t; discarded: 400 - Thresher Shark: retained 4.4t; discarded: 165 - Porbeagle Shark: retained 0.2t; discarded: 2 - Hammerhead Sharks: retainted 3.9t; discarded: 180 |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Cook Islands |  | YES (fully implemented) | All operational level data and observer data provided to the Commission, via the Part 1 report and through submission of all data to the SPC/OFP Scientific Service provider.   Retained shark species catch estimates based  on observer data calculated by SPC, below 20 S totalled approximately 782mt within the CA.  This is reported by species in AR Pt 1, 2013 pg.10 |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | Such figure is available in the data submitted to the Commission before April 30. |  |
| Ecuador |  | N/A |  |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Refer to Fiji's 2013 Part 1 Report on the details.   AR Pt 1 (Table 8) list shark catches for 2012 by species |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Indonesia | 2010-07 Sharks para 4: Report retained and discarded catches in Part 2 AR • No report on retained and discarded catches of sharks in Pt 2 2012 • In response: “No data collected”  *Indonesia is still developing the logbook system. Therefore, the data of shark still cannot be separated by on retained and discards catch.* | NO (not implemented) | But Indonesia has been trying to collect the data through fishing log book. |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | We submitted partial data. Now we are collecting the data of sharks, and we will submit all the data of the key shark species in future. |  |
| Kiribati |  |  |  |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1 Table 4 shows annual catch of key sharks for 2012.  missing is porbeagle shark |  |
| Nauru |  | N/A | ref to Part 1 Report, No Shark Species Data received per ROP and vessels report. Very little Longline Activity. |  |
| Niue |  | N/A | There was no fishing in Niue EEZ in 2012.  Niue is not a flag State (AR Pt 1, 2013) |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | NO (not implemented) | Has not been provided but SPC did confirm relevant data can be estimated using observer data.   Information on shark catches provided in AR Pt 1 |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Bycatch (2012): - makos: 13 mt Discards tonnages observed (2012): - blue shark: 10 mt - silky shark: less than 1 mt - oceanic white tip shark: 1 mt - thresher sharks: less than 1 mt - porbeagle shark (south of 20°S): - - hammerhead sharks: less than 1 mt |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | All catch and effort statistics are reported to the Commission through the Part I Report . New Zealand undertakes regular scientific research into how to avoid shark captures, including but not limited to any measures recommended in the New Zealand NPOA - Sharks.   Provided in Table 8 and 9 AR Pt 1, 2013 (pg.10) |  |
| French Polynesia |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Philippines | 2010-07 Sharks para 4 Report on key shark species…. • There are reported catches of sharks but need species level identification | YES (fully implemented) | Catches of sharks are reported but not identified to species level. But all shark catches are retained and fully utilized. Philippines have observers onboard fishing vessels especially those operating in HSP1 and as practiced all catches are retained, landed and fully utilized. |  |
| Palau |  | N/A | AR Pt 1: Palau is a shark sanctuary. Subsection 181 of RPPL 6‐36 prohibit act to the use of any licensed foreign fishing vessel to fish, as that term is defined in 27PNC Chapter 12, for any shark, or any part of any such, or to remove the fins of or otherwise intentionally mutilate or injure any such shark.   Information on shark catches 2008 - 2010 provided in AR Pt 1 |  |
| Solomon Islands |  | NO (not implemented) | Solomon Islands works to develop a plan to manage shark is planned. Solomon Islands shark fishing s closed within EEZ |  |
| El Salvador | 2010-07 Sharks para 4: Report retained and discarded catches: • More information needed El Salvador advise that shark discard is prohibited  *Catched: Whitetip: 2 Hammer: 33 No identified: 33 Silky Shark: 1724  Retained: Other: 0 Whitetip: 0 Hammer: 0 No identified: 0 Silky shark: 6* | YES (fully implemented) | AR Pt 1, 2013 (Table 8) list the number of bycatch of sharks for 2012   Scientific data provided to the Secretariat on 23 Apr 2013 also list the bycatch of sharks by species |  |
| Tokelau |  | YES (fully implemented) |  |  |
| Tonga |  | YES (fully implemented) | Vessels are required to record sharks by species but the Ministry and the industry is still working on species identification with help from SPC. |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  |  |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | Please refer to our Annual Report Part 1 which will be submitted to the Commission one month before the SC9 meeting. See Attachment for CMM 2010-07 for annual retained and discarded catches of key shark species |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | The U.S. included key shark species as part of its annual reporting to the Commission in its data submission sent 27 April 2012, in its part 1 Annual Report submitted 7 July 2012, and in its part 2 Annual Report submitted 29 June 2012.   For the Convention Area, the number of retained and discarded catches of key shark species for blue, oceanic whitetips, mako, silky, and thresher sharks for the longline fisheries in 2012 were as follows (data is from 19.8% observed American Samoa longline trips, 100% observed Hawaii shallow set longline trips, and 20.4% observed Hawaii deep set longline trips).  Blue shark retained: 0 Blue shark discarded: 16,022 Oceanic whitetip shark retained: 2 Oceanic whitetip shark discarded: 258 Shortfin mako shark retained: 155 Shortfin mako shark discarded: 848 Longfin mako shark retained: 9 Longfin mako shark discarded: 83 Unidentified mako shark retained: 0 Unidentified mako shark discarded: 16 Silky shark retained: 0 Silky shark discarded: 438 Bigeye thresher shark retained: 32 Bigeye thresher shark discarded: 1,611 Common thresher shark retained: 0 Common thresher shark discarded: 1 Pelagic thresher shark retained: 6 Pelagic thresher shark discarded: 92 Unidentified thresher shark retained: 0 Unidentified thresher shark discarded: 125 Scalloped Hammerhead shark retained: 0 Scalloped Hammerhead shark discarded: 2 Smooth Hammerhead shark retained: 3 Smooth Hammerhead shark discarded: 11   The retained and discarded catches of blue, oceanic whitetips, mako, silky, and thresher sharks for the U.S. purse seine fisheries in 2012 were as follows (100% observed trips, data are provisional): Blue shark: No data Oceanic whitetip shark: 0.2 metric tons, 100% discarded Mako shark: No data Silky shark: 12.85 metric tons, 99.6% discarded Thresher shark: No data Hammerhead shark: No data |  |
| Vanuatu | 2010-07 Sharks para 4: Report retained and discarded catches in Part 2 AR • Please report retained anddiscarded catches of sharks. • All locally based foreign fishing vessels retain sharks caught. The information is collected but was not submitted. | YES (fully implemented) | Data provideed in Part 1 report. |  |
| Wallis and Futuna |  |  |  |  |
| Samoa |  | YES (fully implemented) | Annual catch estimates of shark provided in Table 3, AR Pt 1, 2013 (pg. 7) but does not distinguish whether they were retain or discard |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | See Report on sharks attached   Note:  AR Pt 2, 2013 attachment provides a report on the progress of implementation of IPOA-Sharks in line with para. 2 CMM 2010-07. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM 10-07 07**  **(i) Catch and effort limits for target species** | CCMs shall require their vessels to have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board up to the first point of landing. CCMs that currently do not require fins and carcasses to be offloaded together at the point of first landing shall take the necessary measures to ensure compliance with the 5% ratio through certification, monitoring by an observer, or other appropriate measures. CCMs may alternatively require that their vessels land sharks with fins attached to the carcass or that fins not be landed without the corresponding carcass. |

| **Applicable CCMs** | **Limit/Reporting Requirements** | **2011 Assessment** | **2012 Implementation** | | **TCC Assessment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Australia | Limit = all CCMs to require vessels have on board fins that total no more than 5% of the weight of sharks on board up to the point of first landing (note para 11 may be possible to apply alternative measures in areas under national jurisdiction including using NPOA-sharks) |  | YES (fully implemented) | Under the concessions in the Australia's Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery the number of sharks is limited to less than the number of tuna and billfish quota species taken per trip and must not exceed a maximum of 20 sharks per trip. The following condition are also implemented in this fishery: - a ban on the take of live Mako sharks, - compulsory carriage of line cutters and dehookers for all longline vessels, and - Australia boats must land all sharks with fins attached.   AR Pt 1 2013: Annual retained catch estimates of non-target, associated and dependent species, including sharks, by the Australian longline fleet from 2008–12 are presented in Table 2. Estimates of discards are in Table 3. |  |
| Belize |  | YES (fully implemented) | Belize has adopted a measure which bans the finning of Sharks. This measure has been circulated to all fishing vessel owners and are being monitored.   *While authorization was granted for transhipment, Belize strictly prohibits shark fining under FVC-008-2011 and thus the vessel was never authorized to tranship shark fins. Now that this matter has been brought to the attention of this administration, punitive measures will be taken to admonish this infraction.* |  |
| Canada |  | N/A | Canada has no directed fishery for sharks in the WCPO. Canada is not aware of any interactions with sharks in the WCPO. |  |
| Cook Islands |  | N/A | The Cook Islands had implemented an NPOA on Sharks.  This was since replaced at the end of 2012 by the Cook Islands Shark Regulations (2012), effectively banning the targeting and retention of all shark species or shark parts |  |
| China |  | YES (fully implemented) | Strict control for all Chinese vessels and regulation is in place (2011 CMR) |  |
| Ecuador |  | YES (fully implemented) | National Plan of Action for the Management and Conservation on Sharks and stringrays.  Ecuador is Latin American leader Full inspection in national ports of all type of fishing vessels including artisanal boats in every trip.   IATTC Resolution and Presidential Decree.  Control of landings in each fishing port all days. |  |
| Fiji |  | YES (fully implemented) | Fiji prohibits the use of shark lines on board its vessels and implements the relevant 5% fin to carcass ration. |  |
| Federated States of Micronesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | National legislation currently under review and includes implementation of this requirement (2011 CMR).  FSM does not have an NPOA sharks, and requires assistance for developing its NPOA-Sharks (AR Pt 2, 2013) AR Pt 1 was received when dCMR were being finalised, and so could not be considered in detail for this requirement |  |
| Indonesia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Indonesia has already regulate by Ministry Regulation No. 12 year 2012 on Fishing Business in High Seas and Ministry Regulation No. 30 year 2012 on Fishing Business in Fisheries Management Area of Republic of Indonesia |  |
| Japan |  | YES (fully implemented) | Japan established and has been implementing its National Action Plan on sharks in 2001, with a revision in 2009   In addition, CMR 2010 and 2011 reports that it is "required by domestic regulations to retain al shark catch". |  |
| Kiribati | 2010-07 Sharks para 7: Implement 5% fin to weight ratio • Potential compliance issue • Kiribati advise Kiribati is currently working on regulation for sharks which will address this issue. |  | Currently working on regulation for sharks which will address this issue (2011 CMR) |  |
| Korea (Republic of) |  | YES (fully implemented) | Korea has its NPOA-Sharks in place.   Pg.19 fo the NPOA states Korean flagged distant water fishing vessels are following the rules of prohibiting the rules of 5% fin to weight ratio |  |
| Marshall Islands |  | N/A | Same as above (186). MIMRA Act 1997 (as amended in 2011 through Public Law 2011-63).  Strict enforcement of total ban on possession/landing of any sharks by fishing vessel |  |
| New Caledonia |  | YES (fully implemented) | Draft NC regulation on sharks to be adopted by the Government (2011 CMR). AR Pt 2, 2013: New Caledonia shark and rays protection policy (effective May 2013):  - prohibition of any shark or ray product, including fins - discard of all incidental catch No New Caledonian vessel target sharks (AR Pt 1, 2013).     *In 2012 as the New Caledonia shark protection policy was not yet in place the shark-fin ratio was implemented through a monitoring of exports out of New Caledonia (there is no market for shark-fins inside New Caledonia). The shark-fin tonnage exported last year was 243 kg (dried weight). This information was checked by the customs office of New Caledonia and is available through the Internet at the following address:http://xt.isee.nc/xtc/xtc.php?xt=comext&xtex=24 (choosing 0305.59.00 as the customs code for this product). Applying a conversion factor of 0.4 betwwen dry and wet shark-fin weight the corresponding wet weight is 0.607 tonne which is 4.67% of the weight of sharks unloaded in 2012.* |  |
| New Zealand |  | YES (fully implemented) | Through the NZ High Seas Fishing Permit we require all high seas fishers to land sharks fins which are still attached to the shark trunk either artificially or naturally attached by ligament or skin.    NZ adopted a NPOA-Sharks in Oct 2008.  Actions outlined in the plan are on-going with a full review planned in 2012.  As an alternative measure in line with para. 11 of this CMM, the main HMS shark species caught by NZ vessels (blue, porbeale, mako) are managed under a quota management system within New Zealand waters.  The limits on catches are set at a level that allows bycatch in tuna fisheries but not targeted shark fishing.  Removing the fins from a shark and returning it to the sea while still alive is an offence under animal welfare legislation.  High seas permit conditions require landings of fins attached to the trunk.  Monitoring of foreign vessels occurs in port and includes checks of the fins and trunks on-board. |  |
| French Polynesia |  | N/A | Fishing for sharks is prohibited, except for mako shark. Finning is prohibited (2011 CMR) |  |
| Papua New Guinea |  | YES (fully implemented) | National Shark Fishery Management Place in place   Advanced stage proposal in place with CSIRO-Australia to conduct assessment for shark resources and bio-economic modelling of the fishery   Circle hooks trials with WWF for longline vessels |  |
| Philippines |  | YES (fully implemented) | Philippine Fisheries Observer program, port sampling monitoring and other mechanisms are in place to monitor Philippine compliance.   There is yet no existing FAO on Sharks except for the FAO on whalesharks and manta ray.  However, there is existing NPO on Sharks. NPOA for the conservation of sharks in the Philippines has been published and adopted.  As practiced, all catches are retained, landed and fully utilized including sharks |  |
| Solomon Islands | CMM 2010-07 Sharks para 7: Implement 5% fin to weight ratio • Potential compliance or implementation issue • SB's working to develop a plan to manage shark catches is planned. | NO (not implemented) | Solomon Islands work to develop a plan is planned. Shark fishing is not allowed within SI EEZ.  SI flagged vessels license conditions requires fishers to release sharks |  |
| El Salvador |  | YES (fully implemented) | El Salvador prohibit shark finning.  Advice on shark finning prohibition received by Secretariat on 27 Sept 2012 |  |
| Tonga |  | YES (fully implemented) | Tonga is currently working on a NPOA for sharks.  However, the requirements in this CMMs are currently included in the license terms and conditions |  |
| Tuvalu |  |  | Form part of the terms and conditions of the license – no target fishing for sharks.  Also stripulated in the Marine Resources Act that 2006 that all vessels comply with RFMOs CMMs, to which Tuvalu is a party to (2011 CMR) |  |
| Chinese Taipei |  | YES (fully implemented) | See Attachment for CMM 2010-07   The attachment reports that 5% fin to weight ratio is incorporated into the regulation on sharks.  It also reports on catches of retain and discard by key shark species.  AR Pt 1, 2013 Table 5 also provides catches of key shark species |  |
| United States of America |  | YES (fully implemented) | Please see explanation under section 186. The US in 2000 enacted the Shark Finning Prohibition Act (16 U.S.C.1857, http://uscode.house.gov/), prohibiting the practice of shark finning in the U.S fisheries for all species of sharks.  In 2011, the U.S passed the Shark Conservation Act (Public Law 111-348, http://uscode.house.gov/) prohibiting any person from cutting the fins of a shark at sea and from possessing, transferring and landing shark fins (including the tail) that are nto naturally attached to the corresponding carcass.  In addition, it prohibits any person from landing a shark carcass without its corresponding fins being naturally attached |  |
| Vanuatu |  | YES (fully implemented) | Introducing the implementation of the CMM through new policies, and new regulations in the near future. Pre-fishing inspection restricts the use of trace-wire on fishing lines   2011 CMR:  Vanuatu Fisheries Act endorses international Conventions including the WCPF Convention.  Therefore the WCPFC CMMs, including CMM 2010-07 are automatically binding in law for Vanuatu |  |
| European Union |  | YES (fully implemented) | A ban on shark finning is in place in EU legislation since 2003 (Article 3 of Council Regulation No 1185/2003). This Regulation has been recently amended by Regulation (EU) No 605/2013 of 12 June 2013 which put in place an obligation to land sharks with their fins/wings naturally attached to their bodies. |  |