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| **From draft CMR\_rev 1 (WCPFC-TCC9-2013-dCMR\_rev1) - posted 14 September 2013** | **Additional Information provided by CCM post-14 September** |
| --- | --- |
| **CMM Paragraph** | **CMR Section** | **CCM Implementation** | **WCPFC Secretariat Evaluation Explanation** |
| CMM 2007-01 Attachment K Annex C 06  | (iv) Observer and VMS coverage | Approximately 10% observer coverage was achieved on all fishing vessels licenced by the Cook Islands.AR Pt 2: All Cook Islands Observers are accredited with FFA/SPC. All observer data is provided to the WCPFC Science Provider (SPC/OFP)   AR Pt 1 2013, table 1 b reported that high seas longline effort was 33,745 hooks beyond this CCMs EEZ. AR Pt 1 2013 page 10: 2012 observer data has been provided to, and is being processed by SPC.  AR Pt 1 2013 page 9: Eighteen Cook Islands flagged vessels were active and authorised to fish within the Convention Area in 2012. Among these, two domestically based vessels were authorised to fish within the Cook Islands area of national jurisdiction and the remaining fifteen vessels were licenced to fish both within the Cook Islands EEZ and the High Seas, though rarely fished beyond the waters of national jurisdiction. Three vessels based in foreign ports were authorised for the High Seas only.  SPC advised that 98 non-ROP trips were expected in 2012 for this CCMs flagged longline vessels and 2 non-ROP observer trips for longline trips by this CCMs flagged vessels during 2012 have been received to date (as at 16 July 2012). . [Notes: Estimated trips determined from VMS and raised logbook data and represent the best information at hand.  It assumes that a trip is defined as the time between a port departure and port return.  This definition does NOT take into account transhipment at sea which would normally terminate a trip (it is not possible to determine this definition of a trip at this stage). At this stage, the “Estimated non-ROP trips” assume that the domestic fleet listed fishes exclusively within their waters of national jurisdiction.  This may not be the case in some instances, and the number may be revised] | Flag CCM Requirement: no later than 30 June 2012 achieve 5% coverage of effort the effort in each fishery under the jurisdiction of the Commission.  Requirements for high seas transshipment activities and purse seine are covered by specific CMMs (CMM 2009-06 and CMM 2011-01).  CMM 2007-01 Att K Annex C defers implementation of the ROP for troll and pole and line vessels.   ROP scope is vessels fishing exclusively on the high seas of the Convention Area; and vessels fishing on the high seas and in the waters under the national jurisdiction of on or more coastal States and vessels fishing in the waters under the jurisdiction of two or more coastal States (CMM 2007-01 para 5).    This requirement is applicable because this CCM advised that it had 4 longline vessels that fished within the Convention Area beyond this CCMs   area under national jurisdiction in 2012, and three vessels based in foreign ports that were authorised to fish in high seas only.   WCPFC does not presently receive directly from this CCM regular supporting information on observer placement.  A plan on how 5% coverage requirement is intended to be met would be informative.  Such information could assist the Secretariat with improved monitoring compliance 5% observer coverage requirement. In discussing with SPC the best way to evaluate this requirement, it appears that the the number of ROP trips expected from each CCM flagged longline vessels is not presently able to be estimated, and further consultations with individual CCMs is required. Given this, this requirement becomes mostly a self-assessment, however WCPFC found that many CCMs did not provide specific enough information in either AR Pt 1 and AR Pt 2 to verify the implementation of this requirement, and based on this information provided therein the following evaluation is made:  **Potential compliance issue: It would appear that if Cook Islands flagged vessels based in foreign ports were active in the latter half of 2012 that 5% coverage of the effort in these longline fisheries by the ROP should have been achieved.  However, it is unclear from the information provided in AR Pt 1 and AR Pt 2 (2013), exactly what level of observer coverage for ROP longline trips by Cook Islands flagged vessels was achieved from 30 June - 31 Dec 2012. From 30 June 2012, Cook Islands should have achieved 5% observer coverage of the effort (which may be based on ROP trips), for Cook Islands-flagged longline vessels in the Convention Area** | AR Pt 1 (revised on 19 Sept) pg 10: In 2012, the Cook Islands National fleet consisted of only longline vessels that operated within the WCPF-CA. Seventeen Cook Islands flagged vessels were active and authorised to fish within the Convention Area in 2012. Among these, two domestically based vessels were authorised to fish within the Cook Islands area of national jurisdiction and the remaining fifteen vessels were licenced to fish both within the Cook Islands EEZ and the High Seas, though rarely fished beyond the waters of national jurisdiction. Three vessels based in foreign ports were authorised for the High Seas only. In addition, seventeen Chinese flagged Chartered vessels were licenced to fish within the Cook Islands EEZ and the WCPO High Seas |
| CMM 2010-02 02 | (ii) Catch and effort reporting for target species | AR Pt 2 2013: One Cook Islands Flagged Vessels transited through the E-HSP on a humanitarian trip to Penrhyn Atoll (Cook Is.). The vessel complied with all its reporting requirements to the Commission.Count of vessels detected in ESHP by WCPFC VMS= 3Count of alerts that are generated by the WCPFC VMS for vessels entering or exiting the EHSP-SMA of the Convention Area :VMS Entry alert = 1 entry alert from1 FVVMS Exit alert =2 exit alert from 2 FVsWCPFC did not receive any manual position reports during 2012 for this CCMs vessels Count of Manual Reports received by WCPFC reporting entry and exit by fishing vessels into EHSP-SMA during 2012:CCM flagged vessel provided manual entry report for EHSP-SMA = 2 report from2 FVsCCM flagged vessel provided manual exit report for EHSP-SMA = 2 report from 2 FVs(Assuming good compliance with WCPFC VMS reporting requirements, the number of reports should match the number of vessels that were detected on VMS)   | Reporting requirement = entry/exit report to the EHSP  WCPFC did receive manual entry or exit reports from two of this CCMs vessels A review of WCPFC VMS data during 2012 detected 3 vessels flying this flag operating in the EHSP-SMA, and 1 vessel did not provide entry or exit reports.    Compliance with this reporting requirement, including timeframes for reporting, should be able to be verified through checking of entry and exit report, with VMS, sightings and HSBI reports and any other relevant data sources.  This has been done to the extent currently possible for this dCMR evaluation, and is based on comparison of count of number of reports received by WCPFC and the number of entry/exit alert from the VMS.   In addition to the noted sources above, if WCPFC were to receive summary information from each CCM on annual activities of its vessels in the EHSP-SMA, this might also assist the Secretariat with verifying compliance in future dCMRs of the reporting requirements of the EHSP-SMA. **Potential compliance issue:  based on the available information, there appears to be discrepancy in that the number of EHSP-SMA entry/exit reports received is less than the total number of vessels flying this CCMs flag which were detected through WCPFC VMS to be operating in the EHSP-SMA during 2012.** | On 19th September WCPFC received a copy of an outstanding entry and exit report for a Cook Islands flagged vessel for EHSP-SMA. The submission of the entry and exit report correlates to the time and date of the VMS alerts.  |
| CMM 2011-02 9a VMS SSPs 7.2.4 | (iv) Observer and VMS coverage | No qualified VMS auditors currently present in Cook Islands, however regular MTU audit inspections are done by FFA authorised agents on behalf of member countries including Cook Islands. | Requirement=  conduct periodic audits of a representative sample of installed ALCs to verify SSPs are being complied with and no visible evidence of tampering.  Number of audits is to be planned on an annual basis, and deteremined by cost/benefit, logistical and practical aspects.  CCM is to provide Secretariat for previous calendar year a list of all ALC inspections by flag and vessel type, including a summary of the results of each inspection Section 2, para 13: is to be provided in Part 2 report   CCM had vessels on the WCPFC RFV and reported that some fished during 2012, based on the wording of the requirement in the VMS SSPs the number of audits to be conducted is subject to determination by each CCM. **No details of MTU audit and inspections conducted by this CCM of its flagged vessels in 2012 were provided in AR Pt 2, but CCM seemed to confirm that none were conducted in 2012** | On 15th September, WCPFC received a list of 11 MTU inspection certificates (conducted by FFA) for Cook Islands flagged vessels during 2012.  |
| SciData 03 | (v) Provision of Scientific Data | SPC advice (as at 17 July 2013)date of receipt = 30 Apr 2013gear types covered = LL, TR Individual sets by LL = YES  days fished for troll = N/A  | Assessment of Operational Level catch and effort data submission for 2012 (based on SPC advice and associated notes as at 17 July 2013) Were operational level catch and effort data received by the deadline = YES SPC advised operational Logsheet data provided to SPC by their member countries on a regular basis **Individual sets by LL = provided but SPC advise:  Catches of KEY shark species have been provided, but (i) not all KEY SPECIES COVERED, and/or (ii) COVERAGE of shark species catches is considered LOW.** days fished for troll = n/a | CK advised (email: 7 Sept): The main reason for this is that the implementation of the new SPC harmonised logsheets across all the vessels has taken some time, and as a result some of the older logsheets were still in use during this period, as advised at last year’s TCC. The older logsheets do not have detailed species breakdown for sharks. MMR has undertaken an awareness programme with the companies and circulated the logsheets as widely as possible, and would note that this work is on-going.However, since we were unclear as to what constitutes a ‘discard’, we are not sure how the recently declared Cook Islands ‘shark sanctuary’ (non-target/non-retention) regulations impact on the provision of this information in logsheet data. We have taken the position that having a shark on the line, which is then cut loose either alive or dead (but not brought on board the vessel) would still constitutes a ‘discard’, but are seeking advice from SPC on this point. If this is the case, we will then require the vessel to include any such interactions on the logsheet, including by species wherever this is possible. |