



**COMMISSION
NINETEENTH REGULAR SESSION**
Da Nang, Vietnam
28 November to 3 December 2022

**SIDE BY SIDE COMPARISON OF DRAFT AUDIT POINTS AND SECRETARIAT
dCMR CRITERIA**

**WCPFC19-2022-27
15 November 2022**

Paper by the Secretariat

1. In response to a request from the Members of the Forum Fisheries Agency, the Secretariat has prepared a side-by-side comparison of the TCC18 recommended draft audit points against the Secretariat criteria for assessing compliance in the dCMR for 2022 which relates to RY21. The purpose of this is to provide CCMs with information that may be helpful in deciding whether to apply the adopted audit points to the 2022 dCMR.
2. The attached annex sets out the detail of the side-by-side comparison of the list of 60 obligations. The final column includes a preliminary assessment of whether the audit points are the same or different from the criteria used by the Secretariat. This is a preliminary assessment and may be subject to change on further reflection.
3. In considering the detail in the table, CCMs should note the following:
 - (a) The columns include relevant information from the Secretariat's spreadsheet of criteria. However, it does not include some additional detailed information, such as the applicability of the obligation and the template Secretariat responses.
 - (b) The obligations are ordered according to the audit point paper. The order differs in the Secretariat criteria (which is by CMM, not theme topic).
4. The preliminary assessments column categorises the comparison into different "buckets": Same, Differ, Mostly Same, and New. The breakdown of the comparison for the 60 audit point obligations is as follows:
 - (a) 31 obligations are the same. These are limit and reporting obligations.
 - (b) 5 obligations are different. These differences relate to the way in which the obligation is assessed.
 - (c) 23 obligations are mostly the same. These are generally implementation obligations where the way in which implementation is examined is different in the audit points compared to the Secretariat criteria.
 - (d) One obligation is new.

5. As can be seen, at least 10% of the obligations in the dCMR will need to be re-examined, not taking into account the implementation obligations, if the adopted audit points are used in the 2022 dCMR. The Secretariat approach for the implementation obligations is mostly the same as the adopted audit points, although the Secretariat approach also examines whether the CCM has taken action in response to any potential infringements.

6. The use of the Secretariat approach for the implementation obligations would facilitate the use of the adopted audit points for the 2022 dCMR.

7. The Commission is invited to note this paper.
--

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
Part B: Quantitative Limits in CMMs for Tuna and Billfish					
1	SWP Str Marlin 2006-04 01	L	The CCM reported in AR Pt2 the number of its flagged vessels fishing for MLS south of 15S and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported number of vessels and confirm that the CCM's allowable limit has not been exceeded.	<p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline (number of their fishing vessels fishing for MLS in the Convention Area south of 15S to the number in any one year between 2000-2004) for most CCMs has been confirmed through past CMRs</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR Pt 2, including report on implementation of CMM 2006-04 04 report, should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable vessel limit was not exceeded check other sources eg SPC ACE tables or otherwise relevant summary data on level of vessels based on submissions of scientific data to be provided. Any catches reported as h/s transhipped in RY? check other sources eg CCM may also include catch or effort statistics in AR Pt 1 	SAME
2	SWP Str Marlin 2006-04 04	R	<p>The Secretariat confirms that the CCM submitted in its ARPt1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the number of its flagged vessels that fished for MLS south of 15S between 2001-2004 and has nominated the maximum number of its flagged vessels that are permitted to continue to fish for MLS south of 15S the catch levels of CCM flagged vessels that have taken MLS as a bycatch the number and catch levels of its vessels fishing for MLS south of 15S. 	<p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>Based on Secretariat records, and/or advice from SPC-OFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> did CCM submit equivalent and complete scientific data has not been submitted to SPC-OFP? was the required report submitted? what was the level of catch and number of vessels for RY reported and as confirmed by SPC? 	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
3	Swordfish 2009-03 01	L	The CCM reported in AR Pt2 its total number of flagged vessels fishing for SWO south of 20S and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported catch level and confirm that the CCM's allowable limit has not been exceeded.	FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT: 1. AR Pt 2, should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable vessel limit was not exceeded 2. compare applicable limit with report on implementation of CMM 2009-03 08 report in AR Pt 1, 3. check other sources eg SPC ACE table or otherwise summary data on level of vessels based on submissions directly in reference to CMM 09-03 08 reporting requirement in AR Pt1, and may include submissions by SPC members of operational level catch and effort data. Any catches reported as h/s transhiped in RY?	SAME
4	Swordfish 2009-03 02	L	The CCM reported in AR Pt2 its total catch of SWO by its flagged vessels in the area south of 20S and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported catch level and confirm that the CCM's allowable limit has not been exceeded.	DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline (Limit the catch of swordfish by its vessels in area south of 20S to the amount in any one year during 2000-2006) for most CCMs specified in Annex I of CMM 2009-03 FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT: 1. AR Pt 2, should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable catch limit was not exceeded 2. compare applicable limit with report on implementation of CMM 2009-03 08 report in AR Pt 1, 3. check other sources eg SPC ACE tables or otherwise any summary data on level of catches based on submissions directly in reference to CMM 09-03 08 reporting requirement in AR Pt1. Any catches reported as h/s transhiped in RY?	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
5	Swordfish 2009-03 03	I	<p>1. CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that ensures that CCM flagged vessels do not shift effort (for swordfish) to the area north of 20S describes how it is monitoring its flagged vessels to ensure they do not shift effort for SWO to the area north of 20S and how the CCM responds to potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement. <p>2. The Secretariat can verify that the CCM's flagged vessels have not shifted effort to the area north of 20S.</p>	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement for CCMs not to transfer fishing effort not shift their fishing effort for SWO to the area north of 20°S CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements compare the LL ACE Tables report for S20S catches, with the WCPFC sheet catches for SWO. See if there is any discernable trend indicating a possible growth in effort N of 20S from 2016 - 2020 that may need an explanation 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
6	Swordfish 2009-03 08	R	The Secretariat confirms that the CCM submitted the required information contained in the template in Annex 2 of CMM in its AR Pt 1.	<p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR PT 1 should include a report should meet the template in CMM 09-03 08 Annex 2. check ACE TABLES xx LL vessels caught xxMt in area S20S. 	SAME
7	NP Str Marlin 2010-01 05	L	The CCM reported its catch level in AR Pt2 and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported catch limit and confirm that its allowable limit was not exceeded.	<p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline for most CCMs has been confirmed through past CMRs</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR Pt 2, including report on implementation of CMM 2010-05 08 report, should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable catch limit was not exceeded check ACE TABLES xx Mt based on June ACE tables Any other sources eg CCM may also include catch or effort statistics in AR Pt 1, Any catches reported as h/s transhipped in 2020? 	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
8	SP Albacore 2015-02 04	R	The Secretariat confirms that the CCM submitted information on annual catch levels by its flagged vessels taking SP Albacore, as well as the number of CCM flagged vessels actively fishing for SP Albacore south of 20S, with catch levels reported by species groups.	FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: Based on Secretariat records, SPC Ace Tables and/or other advice from SPC-OFP: a. did CCM submit equivalent and complete scientific data to SPC-OFP? b. was the required report submitted? c. what was the level of catch and number of vessels for RY reported and as confirmed by SPC?	SAME
9	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 24	L	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal CCM or PNA Office on behalf of PNA Parties+Tokelau notified their EEZ PS effort or catch limit or collective PNA+Tokelau EEZ effort or catch limit to the Secretariat. Coastal CCM confirms in AR Pt2 that its notified EEZ limit or the PNAO confirms on behalf of PNA+Tokelau that the notified collective EEZ limit has not been exceeded and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the notified EEZ or collective EEZ limit has not been exceeded. 	<p>Comparable paragraph in 2020-01 assessed in RY21</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- limit on purse seine effort in their EEZs is specified in Table 1 of Attachment 1 of CMM 2020-01 <p>Note those coastal CCMs who had not notified limits prior to development of Table 1 of Attachment 1 of CMM 2020-01 should have notified limits by 31 December 2018</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> check other sources eg SPC ACE tables or other summary data based on submissions by SPC members of operational level catch and effort data CCM may also include catch or effort statistics in AR Pt 1 	MOSTLY SAME: PNA+T LIMIT

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
10	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 25	L	CCM submitted its high seas PS effort level in the area between 20N and 20S in AR Pt 2 and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.	<p>CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should have provided verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- either: :- a.limit on purse seine effort in their EEZs is specified in Table 1 of Attachment 1 of CMM 2020-01 (EU and CNMs limit applies only to WCPFC CA excluding overlap area with IATTC) or b. for PHP only:- total effort PH flag fishing vessels operating in the HSP-1 does not exceed 4,659 days or 36 catcher vessels</p> <p>2. Check other sources: AR Pt 1 and SPC ACE tables or summary data based on submissions by members of operational level catch and effort data</p>	SAME
11	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 Att 2 03	R	<p>1. CCM submitted reports to the Secretariat at least 24 hours prior to entry and no more than 6 hours prior to exiting HSP1-SMA in the required format: VID/Entry or Exit: Date/Time; Lat/Long</p> <p>2. Secretariat review of VMS alerts for CCM vessels operating in HSP1-SMA against received entry/exit reports does not show any discrepancies and Secretariat confirms CCM has no vessels with VTAF data gaps or other VMS reporting anomalies.</p>	<p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the entry and exit reporting requirements for the HSP-1 SMA</p> <p>2. CCM should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>3. Based on Secretariat databases and datamarts make a determination as to</p> <p>a. whether all expected entry/exit reports were submitted? [compare reports received with VMS alerts (assumes all vessels are reporting correctly to WCPFC VMS)]</p> <p>b. whether all relevant vessels are fitted with VMS and reporting? [were any vessels identified as having VTAF data gaps or other VMS reporting anomalies]</p>	DIFFER

#	CMM/para	Cate gory	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESS MENT
12	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 37	L	The CCM reported its total bigeye catch in its AR Pt2 and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported catch level and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.	Comparable provision in 2020-01 assessed in RY21 DEFINING THE LIMIT: As specified in CMM 2020-01 Attachment 1 Table 3 (and where relevant considering any previous year overages, and/or notification of IATTC overlap area choice) FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS: 1. AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- limit on bigeye longline catches as specified in Table 3 of Attachment 1 of CMM 2020-01 2. check other sources a. monthly reporting to WCPFC as per CMM 2020-01 41 b. check other sources eg SPC ACE tables (this should exclude notified charters of a flag CCM to PICTs, refer para 8 of CMM 2020-01) 3. CCM may also include catch statistics in AR Pt 1	SAME
13	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 38	R	The Secretariat confirms that it received 12 bigeye longline catch reports for each month of the reporting year.	Comparable provision in CMM 2020-01 assessed in RY21 REPORT REQUIREMENTS: Report monthly to the Secretariat the amount of bigeye catch caught by their flagged vessels FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: Based on Secretariat records, were 12 bigeye longline catch reports received for RY?	SAME
14	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 40	L	CCM reported its total bigeye catch in its AR Pt 2 and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported catch level and confirm that it does not exceed 2,000mt.	Comparable provision in CMM 2020-01 assessed in RY21 FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS: 1. AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- longline catch limits for bigeye tuna during previous calendar year (2,000mt annually) was not exceeded 2. check other sources eg SPC ACE tables (this should exclude notified charters of a flag CCM to PICTs, refer para 8 of CMM 2020-01)	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
15	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 42	L	The CCM reported its number of CCM flagged PS vessels >24m with freezing capacity and operating between 20N and 20S and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.	<p>3. CCM may also include catch statistics in AR Pt 1</p> <p>Comparable provision in 2020-01 assessed in RY21</p> <p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline limit of current levels of number of purse seine vessels >24m with freezing capacity between 20N and 20S for most CCMs has been confirmed through past CMRs.</p> <p>Take into account any new LSPSV constructed or purchased to replace a previous vessel or vessels, shall have a carrying capacity or well volume no larger than the vessel(s) being replaced, or shall not increase the catch or effort in the Convention Area from the level being replaced. (para 46)</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- Limit by flag on number of purse seine vessels >24m with freezing capacity between 20N and 20S.</p> <p>2. check other sources: - ARPt1, SPC may have advice on number of vessels, FFA good standing list may also assist, and list of relevant vessels >24m</p>	SAME
16	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 44	L	The CCM reported in AR Pt2 its number of flagged LL vessels with freezing capacity targeting bigeye and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.	<p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: for most CCMs baseline limit of current levels of number of LL vessels with freezing capacity targeting BET has been confirmed through past CMRs.</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- Limit: by flag on number of longline vessels with freezing capacity targeting bigeye above the current level</p> <p>2. check other sources: - ARPt1, SPC may have advice on number of vessels, FFA good standing list may also assist, and list of relevant vessels</p>	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
17	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 45	L	The CCM reported in AR Pt2 its number of flagged ice-chilled LL vessels targeting bigeye and landing exclusively fresh fish and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported information and confirm that the allowable limit has not been exceeded.	<p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: for most CCMs baseline limit of current levels of number of LL for ice-chilled vessels targetting BET and landing exclusively fresh fish has been confirmed through past CMRs.</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMITS:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- Limit: by flag on number of ice-chilled longline vessels targetting bigeye and landing exclusively fresh fish above the current level or above the number of current licenses under established limited entry programmes</p> <p>2. check other sources: - ARPt1, SPC may have advice on number of vessels, FFA good standing list may also assist, and list of relevant vessels</p>	SAME
18	Pacific Bluefin 2021-02 08 (2020-02 05)	R	The Secretariat confirms CCM submitted a complete report to the Secretariat on total fishing effort and catch levels of PBT by fishery for the previous three years and catch information includes discards.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS:</p> <p>CCMs shall report to the Executive Director by 31 July each year their fishing effort and <30 kg and >=30 kg catch levels, by fishery, for the previous 3 years, accounting for all catches, including discards. The Executive Director will compile this information each year into an appropriate format for the use of the Northern Committee.</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>CMM para. does not specify how the data is to be provided</p> <p>1. Based on Secretariat records was an annual report that fully meets the requirements of the CMM para received for RY?</p> <p>* fishing effort and <30 kg and >=30 kg catch levels, by fishery, for the previous 3 year, accounting for all catches, including discards?</p> <p>2. Were any supplementary reports included in AR Pt 1 and/or AR Pt 2 and/or to the Northern Committee?</p>	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
19	Pacific Bluefin 2021-02 02 (2020-02 02(1))	L	CCM reported its total level of fishing effort by CCM's flagged vessels fishing for PBF north of 20N in its report to the Secretariat as required by paragraph 8 of the CMM, and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported total fishing effort and confirm that the CCM's allowable limit was not exceeded.	DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline (Total effort by vessels limited to 02-04 level N20N) for most CCMs has been confirmed through past CMRs and reporting to the NC. FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT: 1. CMM 2021-02 para 14 report that was to be submitted Secretariat and NC by 31 July 2022 should provide the report on implementation of CMM 2020-02 2. CMM 2021-02 para 8 report that was to be submitted Secretariat and NC by 31 July 2022 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded 3. CCM may also include catch or effort statistics in AR Pt 1 or AR Pt 2 and/or separately to the NC	SAME
20	Pacific Bluefin 2021-02 03 (2020-02 02(2))	L	CCM reported its total catches of PBF less than 30kg and 30kg or larger and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported total catches and confirm that the total catch level does not exceed the CCM's allowable annual limit.	DEFINING THE LIMIT: baseline (50% of catches of Pacific bluefin tuna less than 30kg in 2002-04 level) for most CCMs has been confirmed through past CMRs and reporting to the NC. Note CMM 2020-02/19-02 includes provision for carry over of overage, and underage but the latter is not more than 5%. FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT: 1. CMM 2021-02 para 14 report that was to be submitted Secretariat and NC by 31 July 2022 should provide the report on implementation of CMM 2020-02 2. CMM 2021-02 para 5 report that was to be submitted Secretariat and NC by 31 July 2022 should provide additional information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded 3. CCM may also include catch or effort statistics in AR Pt 1 or AR Pt 2 and/or separately to the NC	MOSTLY SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
21	Pacific Bluefin 2021-02 04	L	CCM reported its total catches of PBF 30kg or larger and the Secretariat can verify the CCM's reported total catches and confirm that the CCM's catch of PBF 30kg or larger has not increased by more than 15% above its allowable limit, or that the CCM's catch of PBF 30kg or larger has not exceeded 10mt beyond the CCM's applicable baseline catch limit.	New obligation	NEW
22	Pacific Bluefin 2021-02 14	R	The Secretariat confirms receipt of a complete report by the CCM on national binding measures adopted to implement paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 of the CMM, and that the report includes results of the CCM's monitoring of international trade of products derived from PBF.	Comparable provision in CMM 2020-02 REPORT REQUIREMENTS: Annual report to Executive Director a. annually measures they used to implement paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 13 of CMM 2020-02 b. annual results from monitoring the international trade of the products derived from Pacific bluefin tuna Due by 31 July FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: CMM para. does not specify how the data is to be provided 1. Based on Secretariat records was an annual report that fully meets the requirements of the CMM para received for RY? 2. Were any supplementary reports included in AR Pt 1 and/or AR Pt 2 and/or to the Northern Committee	SAME
Part C: Additional Measures for Tropical Tunas					
23	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 14	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits CCM flagged PS vessels from fishing on FADs between 1 July and 30 September in EEZs and high seas between 20N and 20S. b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged PS vessels to ensure they do not fish on FADs in EEZs and on high seas between 20N and 20S and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	Comparable provision in CMM 2020-01 assessed in RY21 FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the required purse seine 3 months FAD closure (July, August, September 2021) 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements	DIFFER PNA+T

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
			*FOR PNA MEMBERS THAT NOTIFY EXEMPTIONS AS PER FOOTNOTE 1: In addition to the statements required in a and b for its flagged vessels operating in other EEZs and on the high seas between 20N and 20S, the PNA member submitted a notification to the WCPFC ED within 15 days of its approval of an arrangement to which domestic vessels that the 3-month FAD closure will not apply in PNA member EEZ.		
24	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 15	I	<p>Based on the CCM's notification by the required deadline of its choice of implementation of which two consecutive additional months of FAD closure on the high seas, the CCM has submitted a statement that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits CCM flagged PS vessels from fishing on FADs on the high seas between 20N and 20S during the chosen additional two months closure period b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged PS vessels to ensure they do not fish on FADs on the high seas between 20N and 20S during the chosen additional two months closure period, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	<p>Comparable provision in CMM 2020-01 assessed in RY21 FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement for additional reduction on FAD sets during current year, except Kiribati flag when fishing in the high seas adjacent to Kiribati EEZ and Philippines operating in HSP1 in accordance with Attachment 2 2. If not already made, CCM may provide in AR Pt2 their choice of consecutive month high seas FAD closure (CCMs were to have made their notification by March 1 2018, but in 2019 some CCMs have notified a different choice of two sequential months to that notified in 2018) 3. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	MOSTLY SAME DEADLINE QU

#	CMM/para	Cate gory	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESS MENT
Part E: Mitigating Impacts of Fishing, Including on Species of Special Interest					
25	Cetaceans 2011-03 01	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits CCM flagged PS vessels from setting a purse seine net on a school of tuna associated with a cetacean (if sighted prior to commencement of the set) b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged PS vessels to ensure they do not set a purse seine net on a school of tuna associated with a cetacean where a sighting occurs prior to commencement of the set, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement to prohibit their flagged vessels from setting a purse seine on a school of tuna associated with a cetacean if the animal is sighted prior to the commencement of the set as per (CMM 2011-03) PROTECTION OF CETACEANS 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
26	Cetaceans 2011-03 02	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires the vessel master of CCM flagged PS vessels to follow safe release guidelines in the event a cetacean is unintentionally encircled in the PS net b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged PS vessels to ensure safe release guidelines are followed and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the two requirements in the event of unintentional encircling of cetaceans in the purse seine net, including taking of reasonable steps to ensure safe release and incident reporting requirements as per (CMM 2011-03) PROTECTION OF CETACEANS 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
27	Sea Turtles 2018-04 06	I	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires operators of CCM flagged LL vessels to carry and use line cutters and de-hookers to handle and promptly release sea turtles caught or entangled and where appropriate, carry and use dip-nets in accordance with WCPFC guidelines b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged LL vessels to ensure this requirement is followed and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures to (1) require that the operators of all such longline vessels carry and use line cutters and de-hookers to handle and promptly release sea turtles caught or entangled, and that they do so in accordance with WCPFC guidelines, and (2) ensure that operators of such vessels are, where appropriate, required to carry and use dip-nets in accordance with these WCPFC guidelines. 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 3. CCMs should have included in AR Pt 2 either as a response to this question or as CMM 2018-04 para 2 required report (2) information collected on interactions with sea turtles in fisheries managed under the Convention, (3) confirmation that vessels are required to record all incidents involving sea turtles during fishing operations, and the results of such reporting is provided to the Commission in accordance with paragraph 5(e) and 7(d) of CMM 2018-04 through annual reporting of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission, and (4) all ROP observer data collected on interactions with sea turtles is provided to the Commission in accordance with CMM 2018-04 paragraph 3. 4. check SPC DORADO report for reported instances of sea turtle interactions in longline fisheries 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR & REPORT INTERACTI ONS

<p>28</p>	<p>Sea Turtles 2018-04 07a</p>	<p>I</p>	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM’s implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires operators of CCM flagged LL vessels to employ at least one of the three mitigation methods listed in paragraph 7a of the CMM b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged LL vessels to ensure that at least one of the mitigation measures in paragraph 7a of the CMM is being employed, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. <p>and the Secretariat confirms that CCM provided information in AR Pt 2 of any CCM vessel interactions with sea turtles in fisheries managed under the Convention and confirmation that CCM vessels are required to record all incidents involving sea turtles during fishing operations.</p>	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures to implement sea turtle mitigation measure requirements for shallow-set longline vessels fishing for swordfish as per (CMM 2008-03) MITIGATING THE IMPACT OF FISHING ON SEA TURTLES, specifically to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure that the operators of such vessels, while in the Convention Area, are required to employ or implement at least one of the following three methods to mitigate the capture of sea turtles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Use only large circle hooks, which are fishing hooks that are generally circular or oval in shape and originally designed and manufactured so that the point is turned perpendicularly back to the shank. These hooks shall have an offset not to exceed 10 degrees. ii. Use only finfish for bait. iii. Use any other measure, mitigation plan or activity that has been reviewed by the Scientific Committee (SC) and the Technical and Compliance Committee (TCC) and approved by the Commission to be capable of reducing the interaction rate (observed numbers per hooks fished) of turtles in shallow-set longline fisheries. b. The requirements of paragraph 7(a) need not be applied to those shallow-set longline fisheries determined by the SC, based on information provided by the relevant CCM, to have minimal observed interaction rates of sea turtles over a three-year period and a level of observer coverage of at least 10% during each of those three years. <p>""Shallow-set"" fisheries are generally to be considered those in which the majority of hooks fish at a depth shallower than 100 meters, however, pursuant to CMM 18-04 paragraph 7(c) CCMs are to establish and enforce their own operational definitions</p>	<p>MOSTLY SAME MONITOR</p>
-----------	--	----------	---	--	------------------------------------

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>""A mitigation plan"" details the actions that will be taken to achieve specified reductions in sea turtle interactions.</p> <p>2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>3. CCMs should have included in AR Pt 2 either as a response to this question or as CMM 2018-04 para 2 required report (2) information collected on interactions with sea turtles in fisheries managed under the Convention, (3) confirmation that vessels are required to record all incidents involving sea turtles during fishing operations, and the results of such reporting is provided to the Commission in accordance with paragraph 5(e) and 7(d) of CMM 2018-04 through annual reporting of Scientific Data to be Provided to the Commission, and (4) all ROP observer data collected on interactions with sea turtles is provided to the Commission in accordance with CMM 2018-04 paragraph 3.</p> <p>4. check SPC DORADO report for reported instances of sea turtle interactions in purse seine fisheries</p>	
29	Sharks 2019-04 05	R	The Secretariat confirms that CCM reported in AR Pt 2 information on alternative measures not contained in the CMM that the CCM is applying in areas under CCM's national jurisdiction.	<p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>1. AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to Q-051(R) under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 which describes the alternative measures in para 5, if applicable</p>	SAME
30	Sharks 2019-04 23	R	The Secretariat confirms CCM submitted a report in AR Pt2 that addresses each of the elements contained in the template at Annex 2 of the CMM.	<p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>1. AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to eight (8) RY specific questions under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 (Q-051(R) - Q-059(R))</p> <p>2. AR P2 (Implementation Obligations) response should have included responses to six (6) implementation questions under heading of MEASURE : (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS (Pr-113 - Pr-118</p>	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
31	Sharks 2019-04 07-10	I	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires CCM flagged vessels to fully utilize any sharks that are retained on board and to prohibit any finning from taking place, or required alternative measures to ensure individual shark carcasses and their corresponding fins can be easily identified on board the vessel at any time b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged vessels to ensure that sharks are being fully utilized and fins are naturally attached to the carcass or alternative measures are applied as per the CMM, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirements as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS * take measures necessary to require all sharks retained on board their vessels are fully utilized and that the practice of finning is prohibited (para 7) AND * require vessels to land sharks with fins naturally attached to the carcass (para 8) or require alternative measures to ensure individual shark carcasses and their corresponding fins can be easily identified on board the vessel at any time (para 9 and para 10) 2. AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to Q-053(R) CMM 2019-04 07 - 10 under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 which <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. details their implementation of the measures in paragraph 8 or paragraph 9 as applicable. The report by CCMs shall contain a detailed explanation of implementation of paragraph 8 or paragraph 9 as applicable including how compliance has been monitored. CCMs are encouraged to report to TCC any enforcement difficulties that they encountered in the case of the alternative measures and how they have addressed risks such as monitoring at sea, species substitution, etc. b. where para 9 is applicable that also provides the information specified in CMM 2019-04 Annex 2 paragraph 4 3. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
32	Sharks 2019-04 11	R	The Secretariat confirms receipt of a report from CCM in AR Pt 2 with information on CCM implementation of measures taken to require CCM vessels to land sharks with fins naturally attached to the carcass, including a detailed explanation of implementation of paragraphs 8 and 9 of CMM 2019-04 and CCM's compliance monitoring activities.	FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: 1. AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to Q-053(R) CMM 2019-04 07 - 10 under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 which a. details their implementation of the measures in paragraph 8 or paragraph 9 as applicable. The report by CCMs shall contain a detailed explanation of implementation of paragraph 8 or paragraph 9 as applicable including how compliance has been monitored. CCMs are encouraged to report to TCC any enforcement difficulties that they encountered in the case of the alternative measures and how they have addressed risks such as monitoring at sea, species substitution, etc. b. where para 9 is applicable that also provides the information specified in CMM 2019-04 Annex 2 paragraph 4	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
33	Sharks 2019-04 12	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits CCM flagged fishing vessels from retaining on board, transshipping, landing, or trading any fins harvested in contravention of CMM 2019-04 b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged fishing vessels to ensure that no fins are retained on board, transhipped, landed or traded, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures to prohibit its fishing vessels from retaining on board, transhipping, landing or trading any fins harvested in contravention of (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
34	Sharks 2019-04 13	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires CCM flagged fishing vessels to land or tranship all shark carcasses with their corresponding fins and in a manner that enables inspectors to verify describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged fishing vessels to ensure that all shark fins that are landed or transhipped with their corresponding carcasses can be verified, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures to ensure shark carcasses and their corresponding fins are landed or transhipped together, in a manner that allows inspectors to verify in accordance with (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
35	Sharks 2019-04 14-15	I/R	Based on the CCM's notification to the Secretariat of which option will apply to the CCM or its individual vessels, the CCM has submitted a statement in AR Pt 2 that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires its flagged LL vessel or vessels to apply the CCM's selected option describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged LL vessels to ensure that the selection option is being applied and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where applicable, AR P2 (Implementation obligations) response should have included response to Pr-115 under heading of MEASURE: (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS Secretariat should have also have received reporting in accordance with CMM 2019-04 para 15, advising of selected option and when it changes - this should accord with AR P2 report. AR Pt 2 should also include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the selected option/s as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
36	Sharks 2019-04 16	R	The Secretariat confirms CCM submitted a report in its AR Pt 2 of its management plan for CCM's flagged LL vessels targeting sharks (note report guidance in CMM Annex 2 para 5).	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where applicable, AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to Q-053(R) under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 which includes a management plan for longline fisheries targetting sharks that is developed in accordance with CMM 2019-04 para 16. 2. The reporting of the management plan should be in accordance with CMM 2019-04 Annex 2 para 5. <p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS:</p> <p>Annex 2: Template for reporting implementation of this CMM. Each year CCM shall include the following information in Part 2 of its annual report: 5. The management plan in para 16 that includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) specific authorizations to fish such as a license and a TAC or other measure to limit the catch of shark to acceptable levels; (2) measures to avoid or reduce catch and maximize live release of species whose retention is prohibited by the Commission; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. AR Pt 2 should also include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement management plan for longline fisheries targetting sharks as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS 4. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	DIFFER

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
37	Sharks 2019-04 18	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires CCM flagged vessels with observers or electronic monitoring cameras on board to haul any sharks that are caught alongside the vessel before being cut free to facilitate species ID b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged vessels with observers or electronic monitoring cameras on board to ensure that any sharks caught are hauled alongside to facilitate species ID, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement when an observer or electronic monitoring camera is present, to ensure that sharks that are caught are not to be retained, hauled alongside the vessel before being cut free in order to facilitate a species identification as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
38 39 40	Sharks (OWT, SS) 2019-04 20 (01-03)	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that: a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits CCM flagged vessels or vessels under CCM charter to retain on board, tranship, store, or land any oceanic whitetip or silky shark, in whole or in part; requires release of any oceanic whitetip or silky shark that is caught, in accordance with applicable safe release guidelines; surrender in whole any unintentionally caught oceanic whitetip or silky shark that are frozen as part of CCM flagged PS vessels' operation to the responsible government authorities or discard them at the point of landing or transhipment, upon which any surrendered OWT or SS may be donated for human consumption b. describes how CCM is monitoring its flagged vessels or vessels it charters to ensure the requirements are met, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.	FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION (para 01): 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM and a chartering CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement to prohibit its flagged and/or chartered vessels from retaining on board, transhipping, storing or landing any oceanic whitetip shark or silky shark, in whole or in part as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION (para 02): 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM and/or chartering CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the obligation to require flag or chartered vessels to release any oceanic whitetip	MOSTLY SAME (3 oblig's) MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>shark or silky shark, that is caught as soon as possible after the shark is brought alongside the vessel, and to do so in a manner that results in as little harm to the shark as possible, following any applicable safe release guidelines for these species as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS</p> <p>2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION (para 03):</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM and/or chartering CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the obligation in accordance with national laws and regulations, and notwithstanding 20(1) and 20(2) to require flag or chartered purse seine vessels to surrender the whole oceanic whitetip shark or silky shark, to Government authorities or to discard them at the point of landing or transshipment as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS</p> <p>2. CCMs should confirm that any oceanic whitetip shark or silky shark surrendered in this manner, are not able to sold or bartered, but may be donated for purpose of human consumption.</p> <p>3. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements.</p>	

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
41 42	Sharks (Whale) 2019-04 21 (01-07) 2019-04 21(04)	I/R	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt2 that:</p> <p>a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that: prohibits its flagged and chartered vessels from setting a purse seine on a school of tuna associated with a whale shark if the animal is sighted prior to the commencement of a set, or retaining on board, transshipping, or landing any whale shark caught in the Convention Area, in whole or in part, in the fisheries covered by the Convention; ensures that all reasonable steps are taken to ensure safe release of incidentally encircled whale sharks and that the incident is reported to the CCM's relevant authority</p> <p>b. describes how the CCM is monitoring its flagged and chartered vessels to ensure the requirements are met and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.</p> <p>*CCMs with vessels authorized to fish in the EEZ of any member of the PNA shall include in their statement in AR Pt 2 the requirement for this prohibition to be in accordance with the PNA 31A. (para 21.3)</p> <p>*CCMs with vessels authorized to fish in EEZs of CCMs north of 30N, the CCM shall implement the CMM or compatible measures consistent with obligations in the CMM and provide a description of those measures in AR Pt 2. (para 21.4)</p>	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION (paras 01-07):</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM and chartering CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement to prohibit their flagged and chartered vessels from setting a purse seine on a school of tuna associated with a whale shark if the animal is sighted prior to the commencement of the set as per (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS</p> <p>2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS (for para 04)</p> <p>Annex 2: Template for reporting implementation of this CMM. Each year CCM shall include the following information in Part 2 of its annual report: 8. Description of compatible measures as referred to in para 21 (4)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <p>1. AR P2 (Implementation Obligations) response should have also included a response to implementation question Pr-118 under heading of MEASURE : (CMM 2019-04) SHARKS indicating an alternative approach to implementation in EEZ north of 30N deemed to be consistent with a prohibiting their flagged vessels from setting a purse seine on a school of tuna associated with a whale shark if the animal is sighted prior to the commencement of the set.</p> <p>2. AR P2 (RY Specific) response for RY should have included responses to Q-056(R) under heading of REQUIRED REPORT: SHARKS CMM 2019-04 PARA 23 & ANNEX 2 which describes the compatible measures applied in EEZs north of 30N</p>	MOSTLY SAME (2 oblig's) PNA+T MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
43	Mobulids 2019-05 04-06, 08, 10	I	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt 2 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that: prohibits its flagged vessels from retaining on board, transshipping, or landing any part or whole carcass of a mobulid ray, and require prompt release alive and unharmed any mobulid ray that is caught, in accordance with safe handling practices in the CMM; requires CCM PS vessel operators to surrender any unintentionally caught and landed mobulid rays to the relevant government authorities at the point of landing or transshipment, or discard them where possible, and allows observers to collect biological samples of mobulid rays that are caught and dead at haul back b. describes how the CCM is monitoring its flagged vessels to ensure the requirements are met and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirements as per (CMM 2019-05) PROTECTION OF MOBULIDS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * prohibit vessels from retaining, transshipping or landing any part * require vessels to promptly release alive and unharmed to the extent practicable, encourage use of handling guidelines *in purse seine where unintentionally caught and landed as part of PS vessel operation, vessel must surrender to approp authority or discard where possible *ensure that fishers are aware of proper mitigation, identification, handling and release techniques, encouraged to use handing practices in Annex I * observers may collect biological samples when mobulid is dead at haulback 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR
Part F: Operational Requirements for Fishing Vessels					
44	VMS 2014-02 09a	I	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CCM submitted a statement in AR Pt 2 that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of national binding measures or management plans that require its flagged vessels to comply with the Commission standards (contained in CMM 2014-02 and the VMS SSPs) for WCPFC VMS including being fitted with ALCs/MTUs that meet Commission requirements. b. describes how the CCM is monitoring its flagged vessels to ensure the requirements are met and 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should follow CMM 2014-02 Annex 2 template for reporting on implementation, and include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, of national measures or management plans to implement CMM 2014-02 9a. CCMs should detail and specify the mechanism/s used to implement the requirement for its flagged vessels to install ALC units that are on the Commission ALC/MTU Approval List. 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this 	DIFFER

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
			<p>how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled.</p> <p>2. The Secretariat confirms that CCMs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. have binding measures or management plans requiring vessels to install ALC units that are on the Commission ALC/MTU Approved List; b. have binding measures or management plans outlining its processes for taking action when vessels that are ‘fishing in the Convention Area beyond their area under national jurisdiction’ stop reporting to the Commission VMS; and c. have MTUs/ALCs that are successfully activated and reporting to the Commission VMS. For any unsuccessful activation, the Secretariat shall confirm whether this is an issue requiring flag CCM or Secretariat action. d. [In cases where after a successful initial activation, transmission problems are experienced, the Secretariat shall confirm whether: i) the flag State is(has) cooperating(ed) with the Secretariat to resolve these issues and ii) whether, pending reactivation, the vessel concerned has been reporting to the flag State and all positions have been transmitted to the Secretariat.] <i>still under discussion</i> 	<p>obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements.</p> <p>Note that CMM 2014-02 Annex 2 footnote 4 may also be useful as guidance: Monitoring CCMs' compliance with this item can be streamlined if 1) CCMs monitor and update their vessel's status (e.g., "In Port", "Out of Convention Area", "Manual Reporting", "new VTAF data submitted to Secretariat", etc.) using the new interactive utility in the VRST at least every 31 days, and 2) the Secretariat updates all vessels' VTAF submission status on a daily basis as outlined in the draft revised VMS SOPs. In that case, CCMs may simply refer to their VRST review/update process in response to relevant AR Pt 2 questions.</p> <p>3. Based on Secretariat records,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. what were the number of vessels flagged to each CCM that were on RFV in RY? b. what was the count of vessels reported to have fished in RY? c. what was the count of vessels with VMS manual reporting in RY? d. what is the count of vessels identified as having potential VMS reporting anomalies / count reported to have 'fished' by gear type? e. what is the average days per year of vessels that 'fished' by gear type, that are identified as having potential VMS reporting anomalies? <p>"Potential VMS reporting anomaly":=</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. did CCM advise that vessel 'fished'? if no, then no issue. b. if yes, was vessel in good standing on FFA vessel register for entire RY? if yes, then ok c. if no, for days that it was not on FFA vessel register for good standing in RY, was a VTAF data submitted and was vessel showing regular VMS reporting counts? if yes, then ok 	

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>d. if no, did the vessel submit manual reports regularly over the days? if yes, then ok</p> <p>e. if no, was the VTAF undergoing process of activation by the Secretariat ? if yes, then explained</p> <p>f. if no, did the flag CCM provide another explanation eg in dry dock, outside convention area. if yes, then explained</p> <p>g. if no, this would appear to be a "potential VMS reporting anomaly."</p>	

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
45	VMS SSPs 2.8	R	<p>1. The Secretariat confirms that CCM's flagged vessels are on the FFA Good Standing List.</p> <p>or</p> <p>2. The Secretariat confirms that the CCM has provided complete VTAF details.</p>	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <p>1. AR Pt 2 should follow CMM 2014-02 Annex 2 template for reporting on implementation, and include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement to provide specified ALC/MTU VTAF information to the Secretariat for each of its vessels required to report to the Commission VMS</p> <p>2. CCMs should also provide in AR Pt2 information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>Note that CMM 2014-02 Annex 2 footnote 5 may also be useful as guidance: Monitoring CCMs' compliance with this requirement can now be automated via the VRST if 1) CCMs monitor and update their vessel's status (e.g., "In Port", "Out of Convention Area", "Manual Reporting", "new VTAF data submitted to Secretariat", etc.) using the interactive utility in the VRST at least every 31 days, and 2) the Secretariat updates all vessels' VTAF submission status on a daily basis as outlined in the draft revised VMS SOPs.</p> <p>3. Based on Secretariat records,</p> <p>a. what were the number of vessels flagged to each CCM that were on RFV in RY?</p> <p>b. what was the count of vessels reported to have fished in RY?</p> <p>c. For all vessels that 'fished' had CCM submitted to WCPFC either the required VTAF data OR were the vessel(s) on FFA Register with status of Good Standing?</p>	DIFFER

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
46	RFV 2018-06 09	R	The Secretariat confirms that a fished/did not fish report has been received from the CCM using the required template.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: List of all vessels in CCM RFV during preceding year together with WIN and indication whether each vessel fished for highly migratory fish stocks in the Convention Area beyond its area of national jurisdiction. The indication shall be expressed as (a) fished, or (b) did not fish., and the report is to be submitted before 1 July of each year. ** A template was prepared by WCPFC Secretariat to assist CCMs with meeting this requirement, and this was sent to all relevant CCM contacts in February 2020.</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: 1. Based on Secretariat records was a fished and did not fish report using the template provided by the Secretariat received for RY? 2. Based on Secretariat records what were the # of vessels, by vessel type eg carriers, longliners, purse seine that were reported to have "fished" in RY?</p>	SAME
47	RFV 2018-06 03	I	CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt 2 that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that prohibits fishing by CCM flagged vessels beyond areas of CCM's national jurisdiction without the appropriate CCM authorization b. describes how the CCM is monitoring and ensuring that its flagged vessels are not operating beyond the CCM's areas of national jurisdiction without the appropriate CCM authorization, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled. 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures to not allow any fishing vessel entitled to fly its flag to be used for fishing in the Convention Area beyond areas of national jurisdiction unless it has been authorized to do so by the appropriate authority or authorities of that member. 2. CCMs should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p>	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	
Part G: Activity Related Requirements						
48	SciData 01 (annual catch estimates)	R	Assessment is in accordance with Tier-Scoring Evaluation Level:	NOTE: this year AR Pt 2 has one combined question for SciData (rather than five separate ones) - answer from CCMs may not be populated when AR Pt 2 answers are transferred into dCMR. So may need to be manually added (or left blank) FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: Based on Tier-Scoring Evaluation Level as determined by SPC-OFP	SAME (five oblig's)	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Tier Score of III = COMPLIANT A Tier Score of I or II = NON-COMPLIANT/PRIORITY 			
			I			No data are provided, or data have been provided but they have where none of the data provided can be used in assessments). has by far the greatest impacts on the scientific work of the Co
			II			Data have been provided, most of which can be used for the sc there are one or several (minimum-standard) data fields not pr not according to the requirements. In these cases, some of the be undertaken. The % value assigned in this category represent attribute data provided compared to the full set of key attribut data submission guidelines.
49	SciData 02 (number of active vessels)					
50	SciData 03 (operational level C/E data)					
51	SciData 05 (size composition data)		Data have been provided, there are no gaps in the data provide the requirements.			

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
52	Charters 2019-08 07	R	The Secretariat confirms that it received a report from the chartering CCM on the catch and effort of vessels notified as operating under charter to the CCM.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: Unless specifically provided in other CMMs, the chartering Member or Participating Territory shall report annually to the Executive Director catch and effort of chartered vessels in the previous year</p> <p>The WCPFC has published a online list containing the charter notification information (https://intra.wcpfc.int/Lists/Vessel%20Charters/By%20Year.aspx)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check AR Pt 2 if CCM said YES or N/A 2. If YES, check if there were any Charters notifications by this CCM for RY 3. If N/A, check if there were any Charters notifications by this CCM for RY 	SAME
53	Charters 2019-08 02	R	The Secretariat confirms that notification from a CCM of which vessels are to be identified as operating pursuant to a chartering arrangement with the CCM was received within the required timeframe.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: CCMs are notify the ED, within 15 days, or in any case 72 hours before commencement of fishing activities under a charter, lease or other arrangement, including the submission information that are specified in CMM 2019-08 paragraph 2 during the previous calendar year.</p> <p>The WCPFC has published a online list containing the charter notification information (https://intra.wcpfc.int/Lists/Vessel%20Charters/By%20Year.aspx)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check AR Pt 2 if CCM said YES or N/A 2. If YES, check if there were any Charters notified by this CCM for RY 3. If N/A, check if there were any Charters notified by this CCM for RY 	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
54	Transshipment 2009-06 29	L	<p>The Secretariat verifies the information reported by the CCM in AR Pt 2 and confirms that the CCM's allowable limit of PS vessels transshipping outside of port has not been exceeded.</p> <p>*Note additional reporting obligations for COVID19-related requirements:</p> <p>The Secretariat has received information in AR Pt 2 of the CCM's approach to implementation of the suspension from 20 April to 31 December 2021.</p>	<p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. flag CCM should have provided in AR Pt 2 information / details providing verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- any authorisations of purse seine vessels to engage in transshipment in the Convention Area outside of port as per CMM 2009-06 REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT requirements 2. CCMs should have also provided AR Pt 2 information in response to COVID-19 B. 01(1) and 01(2) which clarifies their approach to implementation of the suspension from 20 April - 31 Dec 2021 3. Secretariat records and datamart tools can be used to check the list of vessels with "YES PS Tranship" and "YES PS HSTransship". This may indicate that the PS vessel had been permitted to transship at sea. <p>Note PHP may have had exemption as per relevant tropical tuna CMM, and in these cases the expectation is vsl_under charter = NO. If vsl_under_charter = YES: CCM-flagged (then this may suggest fishing in EEZ waters outside of HSP1-SMA)</p> <p>EXCEED LIMIT: = Applicable and ACTUAL is value other than zero or as specified</p> <p>COVID decisions subparagraphs (1) and (2) provide clarification that vessels are still expected to follow Port State requirements, and other WCPFC requirements, It is acknowledged that this is a matter for flag CCMs and port States, It appears that for the most part transshipments are taking place in an area designated by the port State as within its jurisdiction for transshipment purposes, either at the wharf or at a designated area within the general area of the port, even if not at the wharf, One port State has designated an area beyond 3 nautical miles for this purpose, but most port States have not adopted this approach.</p>	SAME

#	CMM/para	Cate gory	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESS MENT
55	Transhipment 2009-06 11	R	The Secretariat confirms receipt by the CCM in AR Pt 1 of the required information in the prescribed format contained at Annex II of CMM 2009-06, and confirms that the report includes the required information for all CCM transshipment events in the Convention Area of all HMFS covered by the Convention, as well as HMFS taken in the Convention Area and transhipped outside the Convention Area, in accordance with paras 10, 11, and 12 of CMM 2009-06.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS:</p> <p>An annual report on all transshipment activities covered by this Measure (including transshipment activities that occur in ports or EEZs).</p> <p>Each CCM shall include in Part 1 of its Annual Report to the Commission:</p> <p>(1) the total quantities, by weight, of highly migratory fish stocks covered by this measure that were transhipped by fishing vessels the CCM is responsible for reporting against, with those quantities broken down by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. offloaded and received; b. transhipped in port, transhipped at sea in areas under national jurisdiction c. transhipped inside the Convention Area and transhipped outside the Convention Area; d. caught inside the Convention Area and caught outside the Convention Area; e. species; f. product form; and g. fishing gear used <p>(2) the number of transshipments involving highly migratory fish stocks covered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. offloaded and received; b. transhipped in port, transhipped at sea in areas of national jurisdiction, and transhipped beyond areas of national jurisdiction; c. transhipped inside the Convention Area and transhipped outside the Convention Area; d. caught inside the Convention Area and caught outside the Convention Area; and e. fishing gear. 	SAME

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>In doing so, CCMs shall take all reasonable steps to validate and where possible, correct information received from vessels undertaking transshipment using all available information such as catch and effort data, position data, observer reports and port monitoring data. The report should meet the guidelines at CMM 09-06 Annex II and be submitted based on the template that was approved at WCPFC15.</p>	
56	Transshipment 2009-06 34	L	<p>The Secretariat confirms that none of the vessels for which the CCM is responsible has engaged in high seas transshipment, unless the CCM indicated in the WCPFC Record of Fishing Vessels or by other means of communication that the vessel or vessels are authorized pursuant to paragraph 37 of CMM 2009-06 to engage in high seas transshipment activities.</p>	<p>DEFINING THE LIMIT: RFV SSPs provide the mechanism for notifications that a flag CCM has determined, in accordance with specified guidelines that it is impracticable for certain vessels to operate without being able to transship on the high seas, and should be prior to transshipment taking place as per RFV timelines</p> <p>1. Based on Secretariat records and datamart tools how many vessels for CCM were reported to have been involved in high seas transshipments in RY? : = LIMIT</p> <p>FOR CHECKING COMPLIANCE WITH THE LIMIT:</p> <p>1. Flag CCM should have provided verifiable data applicable to the reporting year that confirms the applicable limit was not exceeded:- ban on high seas transshipment, unless the CCM has determined impracticability in accordance with (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT para 37 guidelines, and has advised the Commission of such</p> <p>2. Based on Secretariat records and datamart tools how many vessels were reported to have been involved in high seas transshipment activities when the "YES" was NOT entered in high seas tranship authorised field on RFV during RY? : = ACTUAL</p>	SAME

#	CMM/para	Cate gory	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESS MENT
57	Transhipment 2009-06 35(a)(ii)	R	The Secretariat confirms that CCM indicated its flagged vessels authorized to tranship on the high seas, including by completing the relevant data field in the RFV data.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: In accordance with CMM 2014-03, this advice as per (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT is required to be included by flag CCMs in their updates to vessels on the RFV i.e. should include a "YES" in high seas tranship authorised field prior to transshipment taking place as per RFV timelines (see para 34)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: 1. Based on Secretariat databases and datamarts determine how many vessels were reported to have been involved in high seas transshipment activities when the "YES" was NOT entered in high seas tranship authorised field on RFV during RY 2. If any were not updated at the time of transshipment, check RFV history to see if any updates have been made.</p>	SAME
58	Transhipment 2009-06 35(a)(iii)	R	Where a CCM (or chartering CCM) has indicated that it has authorized its flagged vessels to engage in high seas transshipment and indicated such authorization in its RFV, the Secretariat confirms that it has received the corresponding WCPFC high seas transshipment notification in respect of each CCM-authorized vessel in accordance with Annex III of CMM 2009-06 or WCPFC ER Standards for high seas transshipment.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: The responsible CCM, for reporting against the offloading and receiving vessel, each provides a notification to the ED at least 36 hours prior to each transshipment event that occurs on the high seas (meeting information requirements of Annex III of (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT or in accordance with WCPFC E-reporting Standards for high seas transshipment declarations and high seas transshipment notices)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement that the responsible CCM, ensures its offloading and receiving vessel, each provides a notification to the ED at least 36 hours prior to each transshipment event that occurs on the high seas (meeting information requirements of Annex III of (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT or in accordance with</p>	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>WCPFC E-reporting Standards for high seas transshipment declarations and high seas transshipment notices)</p> <p>2. CCM should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>3. Based on Secretariat databases and datamarts make a determination as to whether all expected advance notification reports were submitted to the Secretariat? [compare notification reports received with transshipment events detected through post-transshipment declarations received by the Secretariat]</p> <p>4. Based on Secretariat database records how many advance notification reports for high seas transshipment events were submitted compared to the number expected?</p>	
59	Transshipment 2009-06 35(a)(iv)	R	Where a CCM (or chartering CCM) has indicated that it has authorized its flagged vessels to engage in high seas transshipment and indicated such authorization in its RFV, the Secretariat confirms that it has received the corresponding WCPFC high seas transshipment declaration in respect of each CCM-authorized vessel in accordance with Annex I of CMM 2009-06 or WCPFC ER Standards for high seas transshipment.	<p>REPORT REQUIREMENTS: The responsible CCM, for reporting against the offloading and receiving vessel, each provides a declaration to the ED within 15 days of completion of each transshipment event that occurs on the high seas (Information to be reported is listed in Annex I of (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT or in accordance with WCPFC E-reporting Standards for high seas transshipment declarations and high seas transshipment notices)</p> <p>FOR REVIEWING THE REPORTING: 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by a flag CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement that the responsible CCM, ensures its offloading and receiving vessel, each provides a declaration to the ED within 15 days of completion of each transshipment event that occurs on the high seas (Information to be reported is listed in Annex I of (CMM 2009-06) REGULATION OF TRANSHIPMENT or in accordance</p>	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR

#	CMM/para	Category	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
				<p>with WCPFC E-reporting Standards for high seas transshipment declarations and high seas transshipment notices)</p> <p>2. CCM should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements</p> <p>3. Based on Secretariat databases and datamarts make a determination as to whether all expected post-transshipment declaration reports were submitted to the Secretariat? [compare declaration reports received with transshipment events detected through post-transshipment declarations received by the Secretariat]</p> <p>4. Based on Secretariat database records how many post-declaration reports for high seas transshipment events were submitted compared to the number expected?</p>	

#	CMM/para	Cate gory	SWG DRAFT AUDIT POINT	SECRETARIAT CRITERIA	ASSESS MENT
Part I: Observer Activity Related Requirements					
60	Tropical Tuna 2021-01 Att2 05-06	I	<p>CCM submitted a <i>statement</i> in AR Pt 2 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. confirms CCM's implementation through adoption of a national binding measure that requires CCM flagged vessels to employ a WCPFC Regional Observer while operating in HSP-1 SMA b. describes how the CCM is monitoring and ensuring that its flagged vessels are not operating in HSP-1 SMA without a WCPFC Regional Observer, and how potential infringements or instances of non-compliance with this requirement are handled 	<p>FOR REVIEWING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OBLIGATION:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AR Pt 2 should include a statement that confirms the adoption by the CCM, in accordance with its own national policies and procedures, of binding measures that implement the requirement for 100% ROP observer coverage on fishing vessels 2. AR Pt 2 should also include a statement from the CCM that confirms the adoption of procedures to fulfill the requirements for advance notification of observer deployment needs for activities in HSP1-SMA (noting para 6 gives priority to observers from other ROP programmes) 3. CCM should also provide information showing that it has a system to monitor and ensure compliance with this obligation and has taken action in response to any potential infringements 4. Based on Secretariat records, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. was a request from the CCM circulated to other CCMs (as per CMM 2020-01 Att 2 para 6)? b. did CCM provide ROP placement information to verify the level of ROP observer coverage achieved? 	MOSTLY SAME MONITOR